THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday, March 14, 1983.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.20 a.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Deputy 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 and Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry)
Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.
Mr. L. E. Sandiford, M.A. (Econ.)
Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)
Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)
Mr. B. M. Taitt, B.A. (Hons.), M.A., LL.B. (Hons.)
Hon. L. R. Tull, Q.C., M.A., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign Affairs)
Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour, Social Security and Sport)
Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, M.A., M.Sc., (Econ.), (Minister of Agriculture, Food & Consumer Affairs)
Dr. R. C. Haynes, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.)
Mr. P. M. Greaves
Mr. R. E. Brathwaite
Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, B.A., M.A., PhD. (Minister of Health and Community Services)
Mr. M. A. King, LL.B.
Mr. A. Truss

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, March 8, 1983.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of March 8, 1983 be taken as read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no objections or observations, let the Minutes stand confirmed.

ORDER OF THE DAY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that Government Business be the instant Order of the day.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 1.

APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983

Order No. 1 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the services of Barbados for the year ending 31st March, 1984.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Estimates time is upon us again, and I can think of few occasions when the 12 months that have preceded the Estimates have been so fraught with disorder, real, imagined or projected, as has been the economic disorder in the world and in Barbados over this time.

We have seen every country in the world reach levels of unemployment that, in developed countries, at any rate, we thought we had put behind us forever. We have seen the entire Caribbean shaken and racked by the influence of world affairs. We are clearly in the process of seeing even those most-favoured nations of the epoch 1973–1983, the oil producers, finally begin to feel some of the weight of the economic disorder that the oil price increases have introduced in the global economy. So we have had to make adjustments within the last 12 months in Barbados, perhaps in the last 18 months, we have seen other countries make adjustments, and we will now be seeing, finally, the very oil producers and oil exporters making adjustments for a change in a direction which may benefit the rest of us in different ways rather than benefit those who gratuitously possess the means of producing oil.

The effect of world economic disorders on Barbados in the last two years has been a halting in that process of growth which was initiated in 1977 in our island. The true significance of January 1, 1977 is not any loss of independence, it was an increase in prosperity. The important things that were happening in January, 1977 were that a Government had been elected, committed to expansionary policies, sound domestic economic management gave the power, and the Government found the tools, which it used to unlock the productive spirit of the Barbadian people and to double our standards of living in the five years that followed the change of Government in 1976.

Perhaps the standard of living for the middle class has not doubled, but we have never put ourselves forward as a political party intent on running Barbados in the interest of the middle class. Our effort was aimed at and designed to improve the lot of the unemployed, of the underpaid working class elements of our country, and we are satisfied that, in seven years, we have seen the salaries of maids, labourers, industrial workers in estates and shop assistants multiplied by three. We have made some progress towards lifting up the living standards of the entire country, from the bottom.

Last night, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was asked by an old friend, as staunch a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party as one could find, if I thought that the depression in Barbados was as bad as the depression in the 1930s. I said to him, "That is a question which you can answer yourself." You must not be led away by the propaganda of the other side. You must not be led away by the false perceptions of the extremists at this time. You must really have a look and see what our situation in Barbados is as opposed to what our situation in Barbados is being represented to be.

It is clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that, for the man in the street in Barbados, life was much worse in 1975 than it is now, despite the economic recovery in other parts of the world. The same statistical methods in use now reveal that at the end of 1975 there was 22 percent unemployment in this country. Persons working in the Government Service were working for as little as $43.50 a week, and you paid Income Tax, if you worked at that time, on $25 a week.
10.30 a.m.

Economic activity in Bridgetown was such, led by the restrictionist policies of the Democratic Labour Party, that small businesses were closing down, employment in the retail and service sector had fallen to 16 000 persons, there was no business confidence in the country, and the Government indeed had money in the Treasury but did not know how to use it in 1975. There were no projects of any substance being undertaken by the Government at that time.

There was widespread dissatisfaction with the economic management of society, there was a complacent Cabinet, full of themselves, full of the habits of arrogance bred after 15 years in power, full of the ignorance of persons who eventually come to delude themselves with their own propaganda, and full of all that *hubris* which is embodied in the maxim "pride goes before a fall". We see that, having fallen, having being driven out of what they regarded as the heaven of power, the Lucifers of that day are still fulminating and proving that, like the Bourbons in France after their fall from power, they had learnt nothing and forgotten nothing.

I will divert myself for a brief moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this point, to speak of the recent activities of the Opposition and the Democratic Labour Party. I am a man who likes to give credit where credit is due, I give Jack his jacket, and I make no secret of the fact that I admire the initiative of the Democratic Labour Party in setting up what purported to be a series of non-partisan seminars on national reconstruction. I think that political parties which can take that kind of initiative are, in the end, political parties that can both lead and represent society in positive forward directions.

I think that the Democratic Labour Party is spending its time much better in putting forward plans for national reconstruction than in paying Eric Sealy to abuse the honourable Member for St. Michael South East on political platforms, or some of the Opposition tactics which we have seen exemplified in a particular honourable Member over the last two or three years.

I was particularly heartened, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by the reported speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael West on matters of trade and industry. I was exceptionally heartened by the fact that he appeared to have received some enlightenment on trade policies, import policies and price control policies, in that the remedies he put forward seem to owe little to past error.

It was therefore with a grievous sense of disappointment that I read the speech and listened to the Leader of the Opposition and saw him on television – in these days, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is not only permitted, he is welcome on the television – when I found that the speech contained nothing of any relevance to the problems of Barbados in 1983. The speech lacked only an encomium of motherhood – I do not think he said he was in favour of motherhood – to make it a set piece of the cliches which led our country into economic destruction between 1971 – 1976.

I heard that we are not to have foreign investment. I do not know where Barbados would be without foreign investment. I heard that we are to have more employment, more tourism, lower interest rates, reduced prices, higher salaries, all the things that all of us want, but which we well know cannot be achieved together, and whose pursuit, in the form in which it was put, has dragged down many Caribbean countries into an economic morass, the like of which, even under the Democratic Labour Party, Barbados never reached.

I have long told persons in private that if it is one thing to look forward to the Estimates Debate for, it is the speech of the honourable Member for St. John, because generally the obscuritism of the other 364 days vanishes and the experience of 25 and more years in Parliament comes through. I very sincerely hope that in his speech today he will treat us to some forward thinking and not stick to pursuing cliches of the past.

I will go on record as saying that in Barbados we regard foreign investment as important for our future development. I will go on record as saying that when we sign a loan agreement, or a technical co-operation agreement, with the United States, the People's Republic of China, with the Dominion of Canada, with the Government of the United Kingdom, with the European Economic Community, I do not regard it as begging anybody for anything.

I would like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to have the same confidence as the honourable Member that there is already a sufficient level of corporate and private savings in Barbados to finance all our economic development. Unfortunately, I cannot agree with him. I think that our saving effort is not sufficient to finance both the levels of consumption to which we have become accustomed and to finance the investment which we need. I think the honourable Member, in speaking of savings, is speaking of financial savings, not economic savings, and it is in that sense that I am using the word.

We are not yet in the state of Japan, a country which has sacrificed a great deal of social welfare to maximise investment. We do need foreign investment even in the hotel industry, in my opinion, and I do not intend to reject out of hand all applications for a foreign hotel investment. I do not know if by saying that the Opposition rejects foreign investment in hotels and tourism that that means that the Democratic Labour Party, if returned to power, would refuse to allow the Admiral Beach project, $60 million worth of it, to continue. But I will give those who put forward that and other tourism proposals the assurance that while we are in power, there will not be a blind anti-foreign bias and that we recognise what foreign investment has done for Barbados, and can do in the future.
10.40 a.m.

Sir, to close on the question of general economic development, before we run away with the idea which honourable Members seem to have, I think it only fair to say that while the Government is calling for sacrifice and imposing measures of austerity – credit, chiefly, and the restraint of Government expenditure – Barbados is not the worst off Third World country and is not the worst place to be in the world.

Our level of unemployment, 13½ per cent approximately, is more than the single figure, single digit level which was found on Census night in 1980, but still very much less than the 22 per cent of 1975. In any real sense, it is a much lower level of unemployment than exist, say, in Great Britain or probably Canada.

I have said in here before, and I will repeat: we stand by our statistical methods, but the statistical methods which applied to calculating of unemployment in developed countries, would reveal that Barbados has one of the lowest levels of unemployment in the world – if we use the methods in vogue in Great Britain, or Western Europe or the United States. Put a different way, the percentage of adults actually working in Barbados remains one of the highest in the world. There are still 100 000 people working in Barbados now.

I am not saying that we are satisfied, I do not mean to be complacent about unemployment, but one of the greatest concerns shown by the National Insurance Department is that we have very severely over-provided for unemployment relief in the country. For while the Unemployment Relief Fund at the National Insurance stands at over $10 million, and it was not intended to be

a capitally funded programme. However, the claims on it are so small that the Fund continues to grow even as unemployment expands. There are only a few hundred people claiming unemployment relief at any one time, and we are giving serious consideration to the representations of the Barbados Workers' Union that we make the qualification level for unemployment relief more generous.

There seems little doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the burden of economic cutbacks in Barbados has fallen on two particular industries, the sugar and the tourist industry, and that in those industries it is rather more difficult to claim unemployment relief. It may not matter so much with sugar, but certainly in tourism there tends to be under-employment and loss of earnings rather than outright loss of jobs.

So, while we are not complacent about unemployment, it is clearly not as severe a problem as it was in Barbados seven years ago. I think that this is so whatever the general perception may be at our level in here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because politicians hear more about unemployment than the rest of the community since people come to us to ask us to help them get jobs. The problem of unemployment is one of the areas where the public perceives that there has been some success in the Government's economic management.

I do not like talking too much about the per capita income of Barbados. It is a measure that has caused us a great deal of trouble in the international financial institutions because the prosperity that has come to the island has made its way into the per capita index in a way that it never does in most of Latin America, for example.

It is worth, however, remembering that we took over a country with a per capita income of something like US $1 600 and that the per capita income last year was around US $4 000, which puts us, theoretically – because I am sure it is only theoretically – in the class of virtually all Eastern European countries, except East Germany, Ireland and one or two Western European countries, and in the first, 3, 4 or 5 of Third World countries, since we have overtaken many Third World countries in these last six to seven years of economic difficulties.

I would also point out that the revenue and expenditure of Government is now going over the $500 million mark and that US$250 million is a very great deal for a country of 250 000 people to be spending on its current expenditure alone. Honourable Members are not aware that in CARICOM Barbados has the third highest Gross Domestic Product – I do not mean per capita, I mean actual – that although our population is so much smaller than that of Guyana and we are not a country with the land resources of Guyana, we have a higher Gross Domestic Product than Guyana, and our levels of Central Government spendings are, in fact, much higher than those of Guyana. The Government of Guyana occupies a greater role in the economy, and therefore a lot of money which is spent by the private organisations in Barbados is a Government expenditure in Guyana, because it owns the utilities and so on. Central Government expenditure in Barbados is at a very high level compared to many countries in the world, not only in CARICOM.

I have pointed out on other occasions that the services provided in Barbados, public and private, are at very high levels. We generate more electricity than many African countries, countries so many times larger than Barbados, that it is not even worth comparing the land area. Our educational levels are still those of developed countries. Our levels of health care approach those in developed countries, and by the end of next year, should equal them.

We are not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a country that has anything to be ashamed of or afraid of, and there is all together too much fear being generated in this country about not only our economic future, but our economic present as well.

We, evidently, are a country of paupers, in the view of the Opposition, all 250 000 of us, who own 45 000 motor vehicles and are buying them at the rate of 300 motor cars a month now that we have relaxed restrictions to let the market finds its own level again. We are a country where, according to the Opposition, unemployment and starvation are rampant, but when the Commonwealth Secretariat puts together statistics, it finds that we have a higher daily intake of calories per capita than the United Kingdom, with protein consumption at the level of the developed countries of Western Europe. We are a country where the middleclass cannot afford to pay their bills, according to the Opposition, they are being overwhelmed with utility bills, where the cost of electricity has gone up only 18 per cent in something like five years; where there are 10 000 video cassette players in Barbados, where, according to the world telecommunication directory, there are 50 000 television sets, and where we are spending $40 million a year on foreign travel. This is the country of paupers in which we live, where the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse are riding down Broad Street driving everybody before them – if not into Westbury, at least into Delaware Clinic. 10.50 a.m.

I think it is time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we stop selling ourselves short. It is time that we recognise, and I am not saying it is the Government alone that has caused this, that we have weathered the economic storm as well

as any people in the world, that the traditional Barbadian virtues have served Barbados in good stead in 1981, 1982 and in 1983, and that before we seek to drag ourselves down by talking about hardships, about loss of independence, about begging the Chinese, begging the Americans, we recognise that self help and the practice of restraint have kept Barbados afloat in these last two years.

I read that the honourable Member for St. John talks about putting back import restrictions in Barbados. He wants to take us back to the days when, in his own words, it was not cockroaches and rats running about in the supermarkets, but the shelves were so empty that elephants could run through. He wants to take us back to those days of shortages. I, myself, think that Barbadians are glad that those days are behind us, and if the honourable Member wants to apply the thought, of which he was once capable, to the Barbadian situation today he would look at the fact that imports in Barbados, without any particular regime of import restriction, fell by 15 per cent in the consumer goods area during 1982. In other words, when you asked Barbadians to restrain their expenditure without any particular regime, the expenditure was restrained.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish honourable Members would sit quietly under the lash. It is one of the characteristics of a brave man that when he is getting blows he does not whimper. The honourable Members will have their chance today to give theirs too.

Now honourable Members want me to deal with the Estimates. I am going to deal with the Estimates in due course, but the Estimates, and whether the House votes the Estimates in this form, depend on the economic position of Barbados, and I cannot deal with the Estimates without dealing with the economic position of Barbados. Honourable Members know that perfectly well.

Honourable Members should be proud to live in a country where the Prime Minister can stand up, face the world, and deal with the economic position without apologising for it. Honourable Members should be glad to have a Minister of Finance who does not have to come into Parliament and go on television to announce widespread sackings, to announce devaluations, to announce some new hardship such as falls on so many of our Third World brethren every day. We do not have to come into the House to cry out about loans forgiveness and interest rate deferrals and so on. Barbados meets its liabilities, pays its debts and, so far, has conducted itself in such a way as to stave off the economic collapse that we read is so near and so prevalent in so many Third World countries. Without being an oil-producer, we can maintain the level of our foreign reserves; without being a country with an enormous land area, we can improve our agriculture; without being a Western European country with 100 years of development behind it, we can introduce and maintain levels of social and welfare spending that are matched by very few Third World countries.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I have been pushed into a little of the Barbadian vice of patting ourselves on the back, and I really don't want my speech to be taken as an exercise in self-congratulation to the last degree. I think we must strike a balance between excessive self-congratulation, to which, unfortunately, over the years Barbadians have been very liable, and excessive denigration, to which, since 1978, unfortunately a section of Barbadian society has also become very liable. We have to try to achieve a little balance, not to panic, not to run to extreme, but to understand what it is that has made us stay afloat and be sure that we continue so to do.

The Memorandum to the Estimates, Mr. Deputy Speaker, sets out the Government's immediate financial projections for the forthcoming year. Last year, we estimated that the revenue of the country would be $494,448,126. The projected revenue has come out at a little less than that, $485½ million, the reason for this being, undoubtedly, the contraction of economic activity in the world and in Barbados. The principal shortfalls in revenue have mainly come from indirect taxes on international trade and on economic activity of that nature, customs duties, consumption taxes and the like.
11.00 a.m.

At the same time, expenditure, which was projected at just over $501 million, has also contracted, so that it is now projected at $494.6 million. We are therefore expecting that, instead of the current account deficit of $7 million, which was anticipated at the time of the last Estimates, there will be a current account deficit of $9 million. Of course, the outturn figures are not fully to hand, this being the middle of March, and therefore these are only the projections. They are as up to date as they possibly can be, but we will not know, perhaps until I announce the final figures in the Budget, precisely how Government's revenues and the current expenditure performed in 1982–1983.

Capital expenditure, which was originally projected last year at $138.4 million, is now projected at $111.1 million, a low figure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and one which I will discuss at length later on in my speech.

Current revenue has so far grown by 6.8 per cent over the corresponding figure last year, current expenditure was increased by 4 per cent. A part of the very

small increase in current expenditure is due to sharp fall in the rate of inflation in Barbados during the year of 1982.

One of the only rosy clouds on the horizon of the economic confusion in 1982 has been the general fall around the world in inflation rates, and this has been reflected in Barbados. Although the episodic nature of our price movement means that the average annual rate has fallen by 4 per cent, which is a substantial amount, but only to around 10 per cent, where the point to point rate has fallen to below 7 per cent. The Government is satisfied with this performance and could congratulate all of those concerned, the commercial sector as well as the Government's bureaucracy itself and the suppliers of the services, for allowing the downward pressure on prices to have its full effect during 1982.

I will not deal, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at any length with the overall deficit at this time as I think it will more properly fall to be dealt with during the Budget. But since this is the month of March, and since the International Monetary Fund looms so large in the thinking of members of the Opposition, I would say that the figure for Net Domestic Assets of the Central Bank is, as of today, and as projected to the end of the month, are very, very substantially within the IMF target figure and we think that there will be no difficulty whatever in meeting it.

On the foreign reserves themselves, I had hoped, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be able to produce Friday's figures to the House, but I appear to have been let down by the representative of the Central Bank and I am at the moment unable to do so. But I would point out that during 1982 and into 1983, the level of Barbados' Foreign Reserves have been exceptionally high. The Central Bank's Monthly Report, the most recent one available, will show, if we look at the table that, apart from April 1981 when the overall reserves amounted to $192 million, in general we have had record levels of reserves in Barbados in 1982.

I do not think that honourable Members will have any difficulty in accepting that this is due to the measures of reasoned management, which the Government has applied, and also to the fact that our imports fell during the year, probably due to the restrictions of credit, but also due in some measure to voluntary restrictions undertaken by Barbadians. Gross National Product rose during the year, although when you apply it to the table there is no gross, but this increased income is not reflected in any increased level of imports.

There is just one more thing I would say. Barbados at the moment is going through the process of repaying a great deal of short term debt which was contracted by the Central Bank to match, more or less, that that part of our reserves that we have tied-up in the CARICOM Multilateral Clearing Facility. We have US $55 million tied up that CARICOM is unable to repay to us, and the Central Bank's policy has generally been to make sure that we have a sufficiency of short term credit to allow us some comfort in handling the reserves day to day. We are in the process of repaying some of that credit, something like $30 million will be repaid, this month, because we like to clear the books, we are not turning it over – and I am very happy to report to the House that the reserve level is such that we have easily accommodated the repayments and expect easily to continue to be able to accommodate them without any discomfort. We do not expect to be carrying severe short term foreign liabilities, such as we had to carry in October and November, 1981.

I would like to pay tribute to the Central Bank's management of the reserves, that there has never been a day when Barbadians, or anybody, have had even one second's delay in obtaining foreign exchange, that we have never defaulted not for one moment on a foreign debt, and that even when we had to put up with the insolence of some young Jack-in-office in the Trinidad Central Bank, who refused to honour an agreement for repayment of debts due to Trinidad through the CARICOM Multilateral Facility, entered into between the Governors of the Central Bank of Trinidad and of Barbados, we have yet had not the slightest difficulty meeting our liabilities. Even when promises have been made to us, that the supply of petroleum reformate from Trinidad could be passed through the Facility and we had given instructions to the local refinery accordingly, and we then had then another insolent Jack-in-office, the Managing Director of Trintoc, saying that the Governor of the Central Bank cannot tell him what to do, we have paid for it in US dollars in New York without complaint and without difficulty, indeed without a murmur. So, very fortunately, we do not have, the problems that some countries have had with their balance of payment and their reserve levels, and we are easily absorbing the payment schedule which the Central Bank, itself, has set at the present time.

The National Debt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Central Bank's Report will show, rose by a smaller percentage in 1982 than it did in 1981. Indeed, it rose by a smaller absolute amount. It rose by seventy-something million dollars, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which was much less than we ourselves could have conceived.

The official figures, that is not including the Central Bank's immediate credit to the Government, would have stood at $635.4 million on the 31st December, 1981, and $717.7 million on the 31st December, 1982, and $745 million on the 31st March is the projection of the National Debt at the end of this financial year.

11.10 a.m.

Honourable Members will also, I think, be happy to hear that the foreign component has also not increased by the same amounts as between 1980 and 1981, rising from $259.4 million at the end of 1981 to $286.9 million at the end of 1982. This is still a very modest amount for a country with an economy the size of Barbados'. The increase is very modest, and honourable Members should recall that that increase includes the sums that have been advanced by the International Monetary Fund.

Our debt service ratio, as it is called, that proportion of our exports of goods and services which has to be spent on servicing the foreign debt, remains low down in single digits. When one recalls that there are countries in the world, very prosperous countries as they appeared two years ago, like Brazil and Mexico, which for many, many years have seen considerably more than half of their exports of oil and agricultural products go to pay just to servicing their foreign debt, we may realise how fortunate Barbados is that even in the days of the Democratic Labour Party our debt service ratio remained very low. Even in 1973, when recourse was had to very high levels of foreign borrowing to support a current account deficit on Government spending, the levels did not exceed what is internationally regarded as prudent in terms of a country's capacity to repay.

Falling interest rates, Sir, have also made it possible for us to take a slightly less gloomy view of our Charges of Debt. I cannot refer to Head 22 during the proceedings in Committee, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to refer to it on the Second Reading, and honourable Members will note that where we voted just under $100 million last year for charges of debt, we have reduced this vote to $93 million this year to reflect the better profile of the debt as well as lower interest rates; better profile because since a rather higher proportion of our foreign debt is now in lower interest borrowings, we have a smaller proportion of debt service charges and a better profile locally, since the Government has been reducing the interest rates payable on Treasury Bills with every new monthly issue of the Bills so far this year.

On the foreign debt, it would remain only to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when you have to borrow on lines of credit drawn down from the big international banks and you pay 13, 14, and one time I think you were paying 16 percent. It therefore made sense, in our view, to try to get some money from an organisation such as the International Monetary Fund at 8 percent and improve the debt profile and reduce the interest charges, even if you have to put up with the trumpeting of the uninformed and the malevolence of the malicious in discussing the Fund and recourse to the Fund for borrowing purposes.

If the Democratic Labour Party never intended that Barbados should use its right to borrow from the International Monetary Fund, it should never have joined the International Monetary Fund in the first place. When you join an organisation in the nature of a bank and you say that it is wrong ever to make use of your subscriptions and your capital, the gold, the credit and the special drawing rights that you build up with that organisation, you are doing something that people do in Jenkins, something to no purpose, to no avail and that makes no sense.

I am not going to say any more about it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, except that the challenge, which has gone out to the Opposition, to say in what way we have had direction which has harmed the people of Barbados from the International Monetary Fund, still remains. We have been having accusations from the year 1977 that the Budget was being written in Washington. It is not the first time we are hearing it. Every single time an international economic adviser happens to find himself in Government Headquarters in the early part of the year – that is when they like to come, because the weather is good in Barbados in February and March when it is their winter – you hear that the Budget was written in Washington.

I do not know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it represents some oblique tribute to the quality of the Budget, or if it is that honourable Members still have the colonial slave mentality that you cannot write a certain sort of Budget by yourself at Government Headquarters, you need help from abroad. I do not know if that is what is intended, all I know is that, apparently, on one side of the House, there are a number of people who believe that the Government of Barbados and the International Monetary Fund are responsible for the small drop in Barbados' growth in 1982, and on the other side of the House, outside in the street, in the newspapers and in the world, there are a lot of people who know that international economic conditions have reached Barbados and are reflected in the condition of the Barbados economy. Honourable Members who think other than that, that the public of Barbados does not understand the reasons for the economic difficulties of our country, are sadly deluding themselves.

I take some comfort in the knowledge, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that, around the world, the general public of every country realises that the oil induced stagflation, whatever you call it, is responsible in the main, for the adverse economic conditions that every country in the world is facing at the present time.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to speak mainly about capital expenditure this year. There is very little to say about the current revenue and current expenditure. We will see it as we go through the Estimates, but, generally speaking, the Government is introducing no new programmes and is pruning the wastes in old programmes.

This is not the place to talk about revenue, although I will freely answer any questions that I can about the revenue estimates, since we have no other opportunity of discussing them except on Second Reading.

The capital works deserve slightly greater treatment in depth on this occasion. There was a time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we used to hear criticisms of the Government's capital programmes, of the bunching of capital projects, of how the Government was wrong to spend so much money on capital works, and I have had to answer this over and over and over again.
11.20 a.m.

You cannot run a country without spending capital. This is the way the country was run in 1975. If you do not spend money on capital works, you will have unemployment. Capital works are about investment, employment is produced by investment. If you do not spend money on capital, if you do not invest money on projects, people will have no work, and when the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that the Government was spending too much on capital, he was saying that the Government was giving too much work to people. That is what his statement means. That is exactly and precisely the economic inference to be drawn from a statement that "too much money is being spent on capital".

On the question of bunching of capital works, I have given instructions in the Ministry of Finance that the Government is to maintain levels of capital expenditure, even, if necessary, at the expense of current expenditure, which will provide a level of employment that is more suitable to the aspirations of the people of this country than the levels of capital expenditure which were prevalent in the past, that no anti-bunching concept is predominate, and that a target must be set for a continuous programme of capital works, which will maintain employment and build for the future.

You may say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that economising on the capital programmes to the extent of spending only $111 million during 1982–83 is to compromise on the principle I have just enunciated, and certainly on the face of it, projected levels of capital expenditure for 1983–1984, of $122.8 million, are substantially lower than the levels of capital expenditure, for example, in 1980, when I think $158 million was spent during the capital year and when certainly almost $200 million was budgeted for.

The first point I will make, and it is a very important point, is that there is one major capital work going on at the moment, and another due to come on stream in the new financial year, which, basically, are off-budget works. They are not being voted for in the sums now before the House.

The first of these is the on-going Cement Plant project. The cement plant is, of course, a very major project, a project costing some Bds. $200 million. It is being financed 40 per cent equity and 60 per cent borrowing, a very prudent gearing ratio, and of the 40 per cent equity, half is being provided by Trinidad and half by Barbados. Forty-five million dollars has been spent so far on it, $42 million out of equity, $21 million of this is reflected in our capital, and the remaining $3 million off-budget.

Next year, we will be spending $92 million on the cement plant. This is the next financial year. Almost $60 million of this will be spent on what we call off-budget. This will be spent in funds borrowed by the cement plant itself. It represents a capital investment by Government – in fact, Government's biggest capital investment ever – but it is not being voted for through the Estimates.

Nonetheless, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is clear that it has to be added to the figure in the Estimates if you are trying to calculate what Government's expenditure on capital works for the benefit of Barbados is going to be in the forthcoming financial year. That $60 million will be spent off-budget on the cement plant out of a total of the $92 million. Out of the $92 million, we are seeking to vote $16 million, the Trinidadians will be subscribing $16 million and the remainder will be off-budget. But all will be spent, and we expect that the cement plant will be completed during the financial year.

I want to say something about the cement plant, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I really do deplore that the publicity that has so far been given to that plant so far is so negative and so adverse, and I think that a word of praise really ought to be offered to the Opposition for not trying to jump on the bandwagon of criticism of the cement plant and all its works.

In 1959 and 1960, the then Leader of the Opposition could be heard at all times going into details of kicking workers at the Deep Water Harbour site or of driving trucks into the sea, going into industrial difficulties, of how the small man could not get a load of marl to drop and so on. I am glad that the 20 years which have since intervened then has made all political parties realize that what is miraculous in Barbados on major capital works of this sort is not the industrial disturbance, not the strife at the work site, but that the works are done so expeditiously and well.

This is a work of major importance and I think that Barbadians should be proud of our teams of local workers building the silos, bigger reinforced concrete structures and more complex than have ever been built before in this country, under conditions where the contractors themselves have admitted that productivity is at record levels and that the adaptability of the Barbadian worker has astonished them.

When I hear of men who, for the bonuses that are paid down there, work through the night in competition with each other to get the silos up, where they are raising them by the number of centimetres a day that you would expect in the most technologically advanced work sites in the world, I think we should be congratulating the workforce.

We should not be getting into which Belgian is living with which girl and putting her into which car, who is giving whose sister a lift in the truck and all the foolishness which has been the stock and trade of the gossip which has enlivened the pages of the newspapers about the cement plant.
11.30 a.m.

Seven hundred Barbadians – I believe we should use the term "Barbadians" liberally, for I think that one or two comrades from other Caribbean islands are included in that number – perhaps I should add, in deference to the Leader of the Opposition, with or without work permits – but 700 mainly Barbadians are working at that site and they are doing a good job for the future of this island.

The vision of the late right honourable Dr. Eric Williams in joining with Barbados in this project is one of his most outstanding contributions to Caribbean integration and Caribbean unity.

The cement plant, of course, will have many spin-offs, and the construction work on the plant also has one or two additional ancillary works which I will mention later on. But as I say, that almost $60 million will be spent on the plant off-budget for the year.

The other project, Sir, is the Central Bank building. Well, we have heard the Central Bank building described as "Courtenay Blackman's folly", we have heard how not a concrete block will go on this foundation if the Democratic Labour Party gets in power. Fortunately, I am in a position to say that I will be looking forward to entertaining the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and their other colleagues in the new Central Bank building when it is opened, as we expect it may be, before the next general election. Indeed, even if it is opened after the next general election, I have every intention of entertaining the Leader of the Opposition and his surviving colleagues on that occasion.

I want to make an announcement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and this is in the nature of a news flash. I am very happy to be able to report that we have just succeeded in negotiating with the Export Credit Guarantee Department of Her Majesty's Government, a credit of £11 million to go towards the building of the Central Bank building. This will take care of all of those foreign exchange components comprised in the building materials and other furnishings which will be obtained from Great Britain.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Honourable Members are chiding me for describing it as a news flash. On my right the honourable Deputy Prime Minister has always reminded me of my father's good advice, don't be sarcastic, especially with the Democratic Labour Party; they will always take you seriously. You can't even make a joke, not even with such a well known jokesmith as the honourable Member for St. Michael West.

The Central Bank building will also be spending a substantial sum of money during 1983-84 off-budget. The amount is projected at $20 million. It will be financed by the credit I have just mentioned and by other overseas credits which are being negotiated by the Central Bank towards the building, and I am in a position to give some idea of the benefits, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Central Bank building is not merely a prestige building. I have never called the Treasury building or the National Insurance building prestige buildings. It is true they earn no income for the Government other than from Government Departments, but I have never said that the building of the National Insurance building was any particular prestige project, because I have always thought that the face of Bridgetown has to be transformed, and indeed, although I am saying so for the first time, I think there was some substance to what the Leader of the Opposition said in Independence Square during the 1976 campaign, "They say we did nothing! Well just go down the road and look at the National Insurance Building." He did not think then that it was Barrow's folly or anything else; he was proud of the fact that a substantial office building had been constructed in Bridgetown for the service of the Government.

I am also proud that one of Bridgetown's slum districts – there is no point mincing words – will be improved by the whole Church Village Redevelopment Scheme. Those who live there will have their housing improved on re-location, and the area next to the Cathedral will become an area of which we can all be proud.

I would point out that the Central Bank building, first of all, will free space for the Government in the Treasury Building and the Public Buildings. Secondly, it will save the Central Bank the money that it is now paying to Trident House for renting of space for its computer department. They pay $1.50 per square foot per month. Thirdly, there will be 38 000 square feet of prestige office space available in the new Central Bank for private renters, and the Governor is projecting an income of $950 000 per year in rents from the new building

towards paying off its amortization – and that will not be from Government Departments; in some cases, that will be from international banks. While in Canada, I was personally asked by an international bank, in the words of its director, to let them have a piece of the action with financing the Central Bank and to reserve office space for them in the building when it is built.

Ancillary developments of the Central Bank have been what is going to turn out to be a great improvement in the supply of coral stone blocks to the building industry of Barbados, because it is intended that the building will be faced in this most traditional of Barbadian materials, and a builder has gone into business, using Italian technology that was identified by the National Scientific and Technology Council, which I set up soon after coming into office, to supply coral stone in smooth cut sizes, slightly smaller, twenty centimetres instead of 12 inches, but more in a form that can more easily be handled by Barbadian builders. That happens to be a by-product of this building, because the Central Bank had to be assured of a supply of coral stone facings before they could confidently go ahead with the design which has been chosen.

The improvement of Roebuck Street that has already been undertaken in the new building at the corner of Magazine Lane by some of the industrious Indian immigrants whom we have welcomed to our shores, is a reflection of the improvement of Roebuck Street that the Central Bank building will bring about, and there is a committee at work in the Ministry of Transport and Works studying the general rehabilitation of Roebuck Street – the repaving, the widening, the improvement of the buildings, the acquisition by Government of the vacant spaces, the improvement of the drainage – so that Roebuck Street will be able to join Fontabelle as one of Barbados' principal commercial arteries after the Central Bank building is constructed.

So to characterise the Central Bank building as any folly of the Governor, to pursue the Governor at a personal level with this pettiness, is to mistake altogether the nature of rehabilitation of a city centre and the need for such rehabilitation in our little capital of Bridgetown.

I wonder why the Barbados Workers' Union has not been visited with similar abuse for going to Harmony Hall. Apparently, it is only the Government and the Governor of the Central Bank who must not try to improve the face of Bridgetown and improve the amenities available to their organisation.

Now in outlining the capital Works which we are seeking, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will go through them in the order in which they appear in the Estimates. In Defence and Security, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the vote is principally for repair works at the Garrison in preparation for the National Youth Training Scheme. I am not going to go into this scheme in any detail now, but I will be happy to deal with it when we reach the Estimates. 11.40 a.m.

The vote for the Finance and Planning includes $1.6 million feasibility studies into energy saving, building material and other research projects now being carried on at the National Council of Science and Technology.

I would like to pay a tribute, Sir, to this council, which includes, under the chairmanship of Sir Sidney Martin, a number of engineers, architects, chemists and technical people who have put forward many, and in some cases very brilliant, ideas. Like most brilliant ideas, some are fundamentally very simple. They relate for example, to cooling some Government buildings by changing shades rather than putting in air-conditioners, changing the window systems, they include projects relating to paper re-use, they include the coral stone project that I have already mentioned, and I am well satisfied with the work of Dr. George Smith, its secretary, and of the Board, which looks over the ideas and feeds them up to the Ministry of Planning for possible use.

The vote also includes $3 million of the cost of the World Bank Technical Assistance Programme in Agricultural Diversification and Energy Conservation. This will be a very important programme in due course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and this is exclusive of the $1.27 million for the Wind Power project which has come on stream during this year. This involves the building of a new sort of windmill to generate electric power which will be fed into the national grill.

The equity vote, of $16 million or $17 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will go mainly to the Cement Plant, but we are also including funds for the equity of a broiler breeder chicken plant, which will reduce the chicken industry of Barbados reliance on imported chicks and the like.

Provision will also be made for equity contributions to Caribbean Airways and CARICARGO. CARICARGO has never been properly financed by equity contributions, either from the Government of Trinidad and Tobago or from Barbados, and provision is being made accordingly. We have, in fact, subscribed some small amount during the past week. Caribbean Airways remains very important, although the Government's ultimate aim is to devise some form of association with BWIA. Until that aim can be realised, we consider that we must keep Caribbean Airways flying in order to maintain the flow of passengers from Europe to Barbados. I do not want to deal with this in detail – the Deputy Prime Minister will be available to deal with this during the Estimates – but Caribbean Airways carries almost 30 per cent of the passengers who

come here from Britain and Europe, and we cannot do without the numbers.

In Agriculture, Sir, we are voting $4 million for rural development under the Rural Development Scheme, and $2.75 million for fishing harbours.

In Legal Affairs, there is a modest vote for improvements at the prison to allow the refurbishing and the subdivision of the women's prison to accommodate the overflow from the male part of the prison, which is now becoming overcrowded.

In Education, we are voting capital sums of $13.6 million for works at the primary schools, $3 million, and for works at Coleridge and Parry, Lodge School, the Alleyne School, West St. Joseph, Alexandra, Parkinson and the St. James Secondary School.

In Health, the vote is $8.675 million, including $3.2 million for polyclinics.

I have had to give Housing a slightly longer treatment, so I will reserve that until the end. During the year we anticipate spending $3.575 million on completing the new post office, and the Industrial Development Corporation, Sir, which has done so much to expand employment and to expand the manufacturing export sector during the last five years will be spending $8.2 million in the construction of new factories during the forthcoming year.

At the Ministry of Transport and Works, the road programme will be proceeding. Now some of this is also off-budget, Sir, that is the Tenantry Road Programme and such road reconstruction works that are financed through the Transport Levy Fund. The Minister of Transport and Works will be able to deal with that in detail. Some $2.3 million will be spent on completing the Spring Garden Road and the Wildey to Haggatt Hall Road.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government is in the process of completing the design studies for the remaining trunk roads with which these two roads are associated. It is intended that these roads will be linked-up by a road which will run up University Drive, which will be improved will go through the upper part of Cave Hill, along Hinds Hill to Warrens, and then run from Warrens through Friendship and Waterford to Belle to Haggatt Hall, to join the existing Wildey – Haggatt Hall Road. When we reach Wildey at the Cable and Wireless Building, where honourable Members will see that the major road junction being constructed is in its last few days of completion, we will build another major highway from that point to the airport via Newton Industrial Park. That is the plan. It is an industrial site access road.

Final details in the line of the road are now being worked out, because, clearly, to carry a road from Cable and Wireless area up to the airport you have to decide on a number of things: either you try to built it in vacant land where you might not attract so much commuter traffic, or you try to put it through Sargeant's Village, where you would discommode a great number of householders, or you try to carry it further down into Rendezvous which at the moment, is the preferred land, and discommode a smaller number of householders.

The design of all that is being worked on. This is not a project which will be completed next year, Sir. This is a major road development. We are looking at something like 23 kilometres of road in all and trying to line up the funding for it, so honourable Members can expect that sort of road work to be continuing probably for the next five years, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But we will have the first new road communication system, not connected with a project, built for 300 years in Barbados. Our present network of roads were virtually completed by 1680, and all new roads that have been built since then have either been connected with projects or have been connected with removing bottlenecks and other difficulties in the existing road network.

Asides.

11.50 a.m.

I hear the honourable Member for Christ Church West asking, "What about Rendezvous Hill and Graeme Hall?" If he is asking the Government to rebuild the roads in that district, I tell him I fear that the process of rebuilding may cause some of his constituents more disturbance that he perhaps now realises. But the preferred line of the road will in fact be running through Rendezvous Hill and Graeme Hall, where it is anticipated that it will go on its way towards Newton and then to the airport.

The other major road which honourable Members will see being built very quickly indeed is the road from Greenland to Checker Hall to accommodate the Cement Plant. I say "being built". We will have to carry out very, very substantial reconstruction of the existing road system from Greenland past Farley Hill, Portland, Pleasant Hall to the cement plant. It has been calculated that if we do not spend a great deal of money and reconstruct those roads, that, within seven months, you will ruin three separate sets of roads out of St. Andrew into the rest of Barbados – in no greater a time than that, and presumably then they will turn on to the East Coast Road and ruin the road through Bathsheba as well – and therefore, money has to be spent very quickly to accommodate the lorry traffic carrying the clay from Greenland to the cement plant. That work will be done later on in the year.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The East Coast Road is an old road?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hear an honourable Member asking if the East Coast Road is an old road. The East Coast Road is hardly a major communications artery. The East Coast Road is a scenic drive built over the site of an old railway.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a project dear to my heart to complete the East Coast Road all the way to St. Marks. My colleagues have to hold me back, and the Ministry of Transport and Works constantly over estimates the cost of building sections such as from Consett Road to Bath by a factor of five so as to deter the Ministry of Finance from telling them to get on with the job, but I would never suggest the East Coast Road is a major communications artery. I could never suggest that.

The final item of capital works I want to touch on is Housing, Sir, and I will mention inferentially one or two other matters of perhaps wider economic import. The Government regards housing as the major infrastructural priority, which now remains to be satisfied in Barbados. For a country with a per capita income of US$4,000 per year, we are inadequately housed. There are still far too many substandard chattel houses in Barbados. There are far too many impermanent houses which, even though they may be relatively new and quite comfortable at the moment, will inevitably wear out more rapidly than we would wish to see.

The primary steps are being taken. We are improving the supply of cement, we are improving the supply of clay block building materials, tiling and blocks themselves, and we are improving the supply of coral stone blocks. We look forward to improvements in productivity. To me, it is tremendously significant that, as soon as it became known that the USAID funds would be available only for houses that cost $35 000 or less, we began to get proposals, some of them very sound, for building houses out of concrete that cost $35 000 – no more, no less, they will cost exactly $35 000. Not $33 400 or $34 700, but we hear of a factory that will build these houses for $35 000 – "Give us 50 acres of land, we will subdivide it into lots of four or five thousand square feet and we will put on each lot a house which will sell for $35 000."

The Government is encouraging these builders, because, clearly, to achieve these prices a great leap forward in productivity would have to be developed. It is all these things that give us some hope that, within the years remaining in the 20th century, we can revolutionise housing in Barbados and do away with impermanent housing, make it a relic of the past as it is in Bermuda, where a wooden house is no longer permitted to be constructed.

To do these things, clearly funding is needed. The efforts made by the Government, through the National Housing Corporation, go back 28 years now. They were all right for their time. A large number of houses, small dwellings, were produced for rent to persons who lived in very substandard accommodation, or who, following the hurricane in 1955, lived in no accommodation at all.

I think mistakes were made. I think that the idea of a revolving fund for building houses for the middle class to buy, while financially sound, had it been properly administered, was socially unwise. It was not proper use of Government resources, but that is a matter of opinion. The Government has now abandoned that policy and will be seeking to concentrate instead on housing for lower income persons. We will still be building houses for rent of a higher quality than has been built in the past, but we are aiming at solving our housing problems mainly by providing funds to individuals to allow them to improve their housing at the rate that their incomes will permit.

The USAID funds will be a case in point. Our aim is to lend a man a few thousand dollars to put on kitchen, toilet and bath at the back of his house, later on lend him some more to turn the whole house into stone and improve the premises generally.

Unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at a time when the construction sector was, to use a well worn cliche, overheating, restrictions were imposed by the Government acting through the Central Bank, that had the effect of making a smaller volume of funding available for housing, especially, I must say, to the middle class person, who would otherwise have been able to undertake construction of a house without calling on Government resources.

Since that time, there have also been many movements upwards in the interest rates in the world, and the mortgage rate in Barbados also moved upwards, although it stoutly resisted any effort coming from any quarter – the insurance companies were particularly difficult – to raise the mortgage rates in Barbados above 12 per cent. If you could see what the insurance companies write to me to ask to give them exemptions for lending on their policies, mainly for housing, you would be astonished, Sir, at the narrow view they take of people's housing needs and people's capacity to repay.

I have held a number of discussions with the Central Bank about altering this situation, to remove the restrictions and to permit funds to flow into housing at a reasonable level once again. First of all, I have asked them to consider a proposal for compulsorily placing mortgage bonds directly with the commercial banks. That, which has received some publicity, should be regarded as phase two of my programme rather than phase one.

The amount of money which will be available in one shot is really too large for the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation to accommodate at this time. It may seem strange to be speaking in terms of too much money, but the $30 million that the steps I have contemplated could raise, is more than Mortgage Finance could possibly need and could possibly handle in the early stages of refloating the mortgage programme.

What I will be asking the Central Bank to do – it should be coming up at their end of the month meeting on March 31, – will be to remove the ceiling on bridging loans at the commercial banks. In other words, again make bridging loans available for house construction, to permit persons, who will be able to negotiate mortgages, to start building homes in the way that was customary four or five years ago.
12.00 noon.

At the same time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, interest rates will have to be reduced again. This owes little or nothing for calls made from various quarters about the reduction of interest rates. Interest rates went up when they had to go up. They have to come down when it is appropriate for them to come down. I will therefore also be asking the Central Bank to reduce all interest rates from next month.

This will not, however, at present apply to the mortgage rate, which was recently reduced from 12 per cent to 11 per cent not at present. I think that there must be some improved spread between deposit rates and mortgage rates to get funds flowing into mortgages again.

The argument used by the banks and trust companies for some time has been that they cannot afford to lend out mortgage funds at 12 per cent, bearing in mind what they are having to pay to obtain the funds. I am going to give that argument a chance to prove itself before taking any compulsory steps to channel bank funding directly into mortgage financiers' coffers.

The Mortgage Finance Company itself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is being refloated. This week we should be putting another million dollars in equity into it, which will improve its equity-borrowing ratio, which is very poor at the present time, and will give it a sounder basis for increasing it borrowings.

These steps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should, before many months have passed, result in some flow of mortgage funding back into the market, their ought to permit private builders – Corbin, Key Homes – who have done so much for middle income housing in Barbados, to start their building programmes again and should also facilitate one of the unsound heroes of housing in Barbados, Mr. Pillersdorf and his companies, in bringing house spots available to a range of working-class people to build permanent structures on.

You read so much in the papers, Sir, about organizations that shoot off a lot of hot air, organizations that hold meetings and pass resolutions, but you very seldom read of how Pillersdorf group of Companies have helped a lot of what we call poor people in Barbados to buy a piece of land. Their spots in Christ Church at the moment number in the hundreds – and not one or two hundred, I think it is something like 800, and they have developed land all over Barbados to let poor people have a stake in the country and improve their houses.

When I drive through – not even a Pillersdorf development, as I was doing yesterday afternoon – the new development at Cane Garden, St. Thomas, which at election time in 1976 was a lot of wooden houses looking rather bedraggled after they were moved, and to see that it is now a comfortable bungalow settlement, of permanent houses, with concrete blocks on every spot now, I am proud of the energy and industry of Barbadians in raising their standards of housing, raising their standards of living, and raising the standard of our island.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order. The honourable Member will have his time to reply.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Honourable Members are making a frivolous call, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so before I close on housing, I will mention one or two projects which are reflected in the vote in the Estimates, and I will tell them that when those projects are complete, I want to hear them repeat the call for elections that the honourable Member for St. Michael West just made. I want them to repeat it then.

The Estimates reflect a vote for the Housing Corporation to restart the projects at Lammings, St. Joseph and Maynards, St. Peter. The houses, which were started and stopped, should be completed in the forthcoming financial year. We will be building some houses at Gall Hill, Christ Church. We shall be opening a housing area at Checker Hall, St. Lucy, to accommodate the many hundreds of expected workers at the cement plant.

Sites and services programmes are now being developed at Haggatt Hall next to where the new roundabout is now being built. There will be 60 sites at St. Barnabas. I believe that will be the area. Sites and services projects are planned for Spooner's Hill, there will be some at Britton's Hill and we are planning the building of apartment blocks similar to those at St. Cecelia in the inner suburbs.

In particular, the Housing Corporation has been mandated to look at the whole Martindale's Road area to develop that as a special project. The Government

already owns a tenantry in Martindale's Road and we are looking at buying the other remaining large tenantry with a view to redesigning the whole of Martindale's Road, with a new concept of inner city housing. The vacant spaces and the houses, rather crowded on top of one another, will be developed and there will be some sites and services that will allow people to build their own houses.

We are also planning apartment blocks in Martindale's Road on the same style as the apartment blocks in St. Cecelia. I cannot promise however, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that he will have a swimming pool in Martindale's Road. He will just have to be content to see his constituents, and perhaps some people from other parts of Barbados, rehoused in fine new buildings in what, after all, is one of the main arteries of Bridgetown, because the road system of Martindale's Road, Jemmott's Lane and Hall's Road is being improved as an inner ring in the city.

The lay-outs are now going on for – I think it is something like eight acres – sites and services at Belfield in Black Rock, in conjunction with the new sports complex to be built in the area of the Nightengale Home. Areas at Wavell Avenue are also being examined for new housing and we intend to do general infills in the whole Fairfield – Belfield – Black Rock – Clevedale – Yearwood's Road area.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North East, along with Senator Griffith and myself and technicians, will very shortly be visiting the whole Green Hill area for the selection of a sites and service activity and to look at improvements on both sides of the north-eastern side and the northern side.
12.10 p.m.

It is anticipated that the new highways will cut off just a very small corner of what is known as Friendship Terrace, where it crosses the gully, and we are hoping to point the industrial areas in the direction of the new roads so that we can use the new residential development on the Green Hill side of the road.

In the general area of Lodge Hill, of Airlie Tenantry and Husbands, the Government is seeking to buy as much vacant and unused land as it can for further sites and services programmes to accommodate an increased population living in better conditions in that part of St. Michael.

But we are not looking only at St. Michael. In the Walkers Area in St. George housing developments are planned and the Church, of course, is trying to develop the St. George Glebe Land. We are, in fact, also looking to improve housing conditions in the more remote parishes. I know the new Minister of Housing is looking closely at the condition in St. Andrew. However, it is the inner suburbs – the City, Martindale's Road, Brittons Hill, Bonnetts right through – three honourable Members will be affected – where we think that infills are needed. The Roebuck Street Development will include the improvement of the last of what was described many years ago of Bridgetown slums, that is the Greenfields.

Honourable Members will notice that Ellis Village is being cleared. We are not just moving the houses away, we are going to put back some of the houses nearer towards Constitution Road and improve Ellis Village generally. We are looking again at parcels of land in Passage Road.

Aside

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member for St. Michael West is querying. We are looking again for anything like 150 house spots in the Passage Road/Strathclyde/Barbarees Hill area.

Aside

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member says, "Don't bother to come down there; he does not want his constituents any better housed." That is up to him. I want them better housed. The honourable Member wants roads for them. Well, we will give them roads.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that completes the part of my speech which relates to Capital Works. We have a whole week in front of us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I should indicate the order in which the Government intends to go for these couple of days. I am not going beyond the first two days. I do not want to anticipate the Leader of the House too much, but I think he would want me to take this opportunity of outlining what we intend. We intend to start, as in customary, with the Governor-General and proceed through to Judges, Parliament, Cabinet Office and the Judiciary.

Honourable Members will note that the Head of Judiciary is now divided. The administration of the courts has gone to the Registrar, and the judges, as such, are under the Prime Minister's Office. Although we are voting this money, we are going to have to make changes in the conditions of service of the judges who enjoy special privileges in relation to housing allowance. So I can tell honourable Members that Head 11 will undoubtedly have to be supplemented during the early part of the new financial year, but we must vote it as the law directs at the present time.

We are going right through the Prime Minister's Heads and the Minister of Finance's Heads, the Heads of the Minister of Defence and Security.

Then, we come to Agriculture. We had such a long debate on Agriculture last year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we thought we would defer Agriculture until a later point in the Estimates. We really have absolutely no fear of debating it. If honourable Members wish to deal with it, I dare say the Leader of the House will accommodate them, but we feel that so much time was devoted to it last year that other departments deserve an opportunity of analysis by the House rather than concentrate again on this Head merely because it comes early.

I cannot ever remember Housing and Community Services – certainly Community Services – being debated in the Estimates since I have been Prime Minister, and therefore we are going to try to reach some of the Heads which do not get adequate analysis because we do not reach them, and give the Opposition a chance to have their say on such matters.

We will do Legal Affairs. It is our intention to debate Education, but the Minister of Education will not be here before Thursday and therefore we do not anticipate reaching that Head until Thursday. We will do Foreign Affairs, Health, Housing and Lands.

I would not like to go too far, but I do not anticipate that we will be able to reach, for example, Information and Culture, but we would like to deal with Labour and Social Security – that is not a Head that has had much analysis – and certainly we want to do Trade and Industry and Civil Aviation. So the Leader of the House may have to pick and choose as the Estimates proceed to make sure that the Ministries on which there is something to say, and which have not had the benefit of honourable Members' experience and comment, do get such a benefit this year.

Honourable Members will probably understand if the Government is not any longer willing to offer the Opposition the choice of calling the Heads, because at a time when we were willing, the Opposition treated the offer with such contempt that we did not feel that we should invite them to reverse themselves at this stage, or any other stage in the foreseeable future. Nonetheless, we still intend to give a chance to debate the Heads that have not been debated.

I do not think that we will reach Annexed Expenditure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Post Office, although again I believe that if it was particularly wished to deal with some aspect of the Post Office, Members perhaps might be able to achieve debate on it by putting down the appropriate Resolution which the Rules allow or by speaking to the Leader of the House.

I think I am right, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in saying that the Government should take some heart that there is no department whose administration is being specifically questioned this year, since I would anticipate that if there was any department in which any honourable Member felt things were going wrong, he would, before the Estimates had started, have put down a Resolution to reduce its vote. If this is a tribute to Government, I thank honourable Members. If it is merely a tribute to the bureaucracy, I join in the tribute.

It would however be a mistake to think that every department is run at a level of peak efficiency, and honourable Members may expect to hear, not from one side of the House, but from both sides of the House, some reference to a few infelicities that may have taken place in departments during the past financial year.

If it should be heard from Ministers, the Civil Service should not take it that this represents any breach in protocol or customary attitudes, but where, for example, we find that a quite senior public officer has made a photocopy of a document, confidential in nature, and made it in such circumstances as give rise to a presumption that its contents were made known to the ambassador of a foreign country, in order to assist him in dealing with a problem which he had with the Government, it may not be altogether possible to maintain an attitude that there is total efficiency, loyalty and integrity in the bosom of every public officer.

12.20 p.m.

I mentioned this as an example and I would hope that I might not have to advert to it again. But the Government has no intention of blindly following any belief that Barbados consists of a large number of people, who are men and women with ordinary human passions, political feelings and political attitudes, and beyond those ordinary men and women, like you and me and all of us sitting down in here, there is another group of persons who never do anything wrong, have no political views and perfect in all their dealings, and they are called civil servants. I do not regard them as an "army of occupation", but I think that comments where comments are appropriate, on the bureaucracy, its composition and its functions should be made, if they could be made in a constructive way, to point the way that Barbados as a whole can go along....

I just drop these few remarks about the Civil Service, Sir. I think it is really time that we understand that Governments are only as good as the bureaucracies which back them and give some help to those bureaucracies, by way of constructive criticisms, to assist them in their task of faithfully, seizing any Government in power, whatever its political complexion, to the best of its ability.

The Heads on Personnel and the Establishment will be discussed, and I stand ready to answer questions arising under those Heads as, and when, they appear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the House has indicated to me that I should seek to close my speech before 12.30, and I am therefore hearing, if not the Umpire, the captain call time. He is declaring that my innings is closed.

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

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second the motion and.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if the honourable Member would give way, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought the honourable Member had given way to the Leader of the House. If the Leader of the House wants to make a remark at this time, I am quite prepared to hear him. The honourable Member did second the motion.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for lunch until 1.30 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just a minute, please. Will the honourable Member for St. Michael East please sit for a minute. Is the honourable Leader of the House asking to take the luncheon adjournment at this time?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, that is the motion before the House at this time, that we suspend until 1.30 p.m. today, Sir.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before this motion was discussed, you will recall that I was requested to give way to the honourable Leader of the House, which I did. I want to be assured that I will have the right to continue speaking after this motion is disposed of.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But since the honourable Member was on his feet at the time, it is obvious that, when we resume, the honourable Member will continue his speech.

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

12.30 p.m.

On Resumption:–

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not see a quorum. I suggest that Your Honour let the bell be rung so that we can have a quorum.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a quorum.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, will you please count the House?

A Pause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are ten members, including the Chairman.

When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Michael East was about to speak. I do not now see him in his place. In seconding the motion, the honourable Member had reserved his right to speak.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker,.....

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: What is this? Is the Government running from debate on the Estimates?)

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable Member for St. Michael South.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I can understand the agitation of the honourable Member for St. Michael South. The figures for the year 1982 have completely given the lie to all the propaganda which the honourable Member and his colleagues have been carrying throughout Barbados for the last 12 months, and the figures have demonstrated very clearly that the methodology of approach which was adopted by the Government was such that it contained the deficits which the honourable Member was predicting, that unemployment stabilised, and that Barbados is poised and is in a position to reap the benefit of any upturn in the economies in the rest of the world.

I think that one of the first things one should look at is that it is no longer possible for anyone in Barbados to pretend that the world economic situation is not of such a grave nature as to affect each and every country in the world. The most prosperous countries since 1975 have been the countries which were fortunate enough to have oil. There cannot be any doubt about that. The OPEC countries, and those countries who have found oil and were not members of OPEC, were the leading countries in the world in per capita growth, consumption, expenditure and things of that kind.

The impact of the price rises in oil, in 1974, 1975 and in 1980, were of such a devastating nature that all kinds of actions had to be taken by the rest of the world to adjust to this programme. Some countries in the world adjusted by a deterioration in the value of their currency *vis-a-vis* their traditional values. We have countries in Europe, such as Yugoslavia, Spain, France Belgium, Ireland, indeed the United Kingdom, in the OECD countries, which have all sought to adjust to the down turn in economic activity by attempting and trying to steal a march on their fellow competitors by juggling with the value of their currencies on the ground that that would increase their competitive position.

Secondly, Sir, the other groups of countries in the other parts of the industrialised world – Australia, New Zealand, and in other countries of the world – they, too, have tried to adjust by voluntarily reducing the value of their currency in order to stimulate economic activity.

Then, of course, we have the tragedy of Latin America. Latin America, particularly in the last year, has had all kinds of turmoil occurring in their economies. Whether it be Mexico, the Argentine, Brazil or Venezuela, each and every one of those countries has had economic turmoil.

That is the background the Barbados economy was operating in. Our only hope was to analyse the situation, to recognise that it was impossible for us to achieve significant growth during the period of this world economic turmoil, given our dependence upon the international economy, being an export economy, and, secondly, our only hope was to reduce any attempt to pressing the panic button in Barbados.

The leading exponent of pressing the button was the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. From the very beginning, in late 1981, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was trying to create panic in Barbados over the performance of the economy in Barbados. I am very pleased to say that in the course of that period of time, the Government has been able to carry on its capital development projects, and I wish to underscore this point.

There can be no significant employment in Barbados without the Government acting as the major pump primer in the economy. Whether you like it or not, the history of the Barbadian economy is that the Government has got to be the stimulator of the economy. The private sector in Barbados is not going to take the risk, whether it be in the traditional economic activities or in the newer economic activity, to stimulate the economy. It means, therefore that the Government constantly has to have a level of capital development programmes which would provide a stimulus for building and that type of activity in Barbados.

Given these facts, it would be totally irresponsible for the Government to have accepted the advice of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and collapse the Government's capital development programme. From 1981 the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was advocating a slashing of the Government's development programme. As I have had to say repeatedly in here, if we had not continued the Oistins project, the Spring Garden Road project, the Heywoods project, the cement plant, building the polyclinics and the schools encompassed in the World Bank Educational Development programme, unemployment would have reached the levels which the honourable Member's party had it at in 1975 and 1976. That is what the honourable Member wanted.

I have said before that the essential distinction between this side and that side is that this side has courage to implement its convictions – that side has neither convictions nor courage. So I am very pleased to say today that the methods of approach that we have adopted have been proven by the figures to be the correct ones. We have readjusted the Government's capital development programme, we are well on the way to completing some of our major projects, and I know that it is going to be a matter of great pride to the other side when we start the official openings.

It is going to be a matter of great, great, great pride to me when Oistins opens, as it is of great pride to me that I can now drive from my office in Fontabelle to Paradise in less than two minutes, as it will be in September or October when we open Heywoods, as it will be when we open the cement plant, because each of them is an economically impacting project. They are projects which are going to lead to the stimulating of development.

I know the honourable Members on the other side, in particular the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, are going to say that the manufacturing industry, the tourism industry and the agricultural industry are all in a state of collapse. I want to ask the honourable Member this: In these days, what industry is not in trouble? The great oil industry in the world, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is now under more attack than any other industry.

1.40 p.m.

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I know all the talk that he is going to give. The honourable Member has never come with anything constructive yet, and this is the point we have to deal with. Let the Democratic Labour Party say what are the alternatives. I do not want to hear from the

honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, because he has none. He is a critic.

I will hear from the honourable Member who was formerly a Member for Christ Church, Peter Morgan, because I know his policy. His answer to the question of stimulating tourism in Barbados is to devalue the Barbados dollar. The spokesman for the Democratic Labour Party on a major area of the economy such as tourism has advocated a devaluation of the Barbados dollar! Now, is that the policy of the Democratic Labour Party? I want to know.

It is not the policy of the Barbados Labour Party, because we have said from the beginning that, in our opinion, this temporary phase of currency fluctuation against the United States dollar will not last forever, and that if you take into account that the United States is your major trading partner, a very, very serious change in conditions will have to occur for you to reap any real advantage by changing the value of your dollar.

Now to Morgan, narrow-minded, petty-minded as he is. Of course, you know, Sir, some of us are very fortunate. Let it not be forgotten that some of us get out of our difficulties by the coincidence of unfortunate fires at the right time. Let us, not forget that. It has not happened once – but twice. The Lord has been good to you, you should be very grateful. The Lord has been very good to you.

The position, Sir, is that the competitive position of Barbados, both in manufacturing and in tourism, is intimately linked with the factors of production, wages, the value of the currency and things of that kind. And we, ourselves, have been calling over the course of the last two years for careful consideration to be given to these factors, but we have only received attacks from honourable Members on the other side.

The honourable Members on the other side have attacked us when we have tried to draw to the attention of the public of Barbados that in this particular era of economic disparity in the world, it was important for you, as a developing country which depended upon exports,to pay particular attention to productivity and to your competitive position.

We preached that message, and we were savagely attacked. But we have lived to see the world situation develop which demonstrates very clearly that all those countries who have not paid heed, who have not taken those factors into account, who have not adjusted, have had to have the adjustment imposed upon them by the reduction in the value of their dollar.

Australia is the nearest example. I want to hear the honourable Members on the other side on these issues.

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: But you had plenty of chance to talk, but you never talked.

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Head by Head.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. If the honourable Member for St. Michael South wants to make a comment, I would be grateful if he does it on his feet or, otherwise, if he will discuss with the Leader of the House what procedures they want to adopt. But if you keep interrupting members on that side, it is obvious that when you come to speak they will interrupt you. I do not want that behaviour to persist in this Chamber. Please!

The question of dealing with the Appropiation Bill or the Estimates in Committee stage should be discussed between the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House. Let that be settled in that manner rather than across the Floor of the House, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think you invited me to make my comments on my feet and I was just making the point that I would wish that the Government permit us to get on to debating the individual Heads of the Estimates instead of spending all of the time on the Appropiation Bill, as they did last year, the object of which is to prevent us from getting down and examining the detailed estimates of each Ministry. They did it last year – the whole of the first day.

I must apologise to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for my intervention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You cannot restrict the Government from explaining its position when it comes to the Appropriation Bill because that deals with the whole operations of Government for next year. As I said last week, the question of debating the Estimates should have been discussed between the Leaders of the two sides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, I know the global outlook is improving. The honourable Member cannot stand it! The honourable Member does not want the Opposition spokesman on the Ministry of Finance to talk, because he knows it is going to be very difficult for him to reconcile the multiplicity of conflicting statements that have emanated from the Democratic Labour Party in the last few days.

The former Prime Minister is now saying that we do not need any capital in Barbados, absolutely no capital in Barbados. We do not need a Central Bank Building. We do not need any building at all! What Barbados needs is

self-reliance and things of that kind, a lot of old phrases, trotted out without any analysis at all.

I am exceedingly glad to see that at long last the Democratic Labour Party has come around to the view that in Barbados there are some problems which were made by us. There cannot be any doubt that the attitudes of Barbadians in relation the sugar industry was such that by continuing to burn the sugar crop they, themselves, were responsible to a large extent for reduction in production the next year. I am glad to see that all sides are now agreeing on that. The Barbados Labour Party has been preaching that for a long period of time.

I welcome the fact that the honourable Member for St. Michael South has been able to persuade the rest of his colleagues that it is appropriate for them to come out with a public statement on this national matter. I hope that all of us will be able to see the rest of the three months past without any increase at all in the incidence of fires, because it is known that the economy of Barbados could improve if we were able to reap a crop without fires and that is a man-made problem.
1.50 p.m.

The other problem that we have to deal with is the question, as I like to put it, of being hospitable. If you are in the hospitality industry, you have to be hospitable. You cannot invite people to come here and abuse them. We are competing with Malta, Yugoslavia, Italy, France, Jamaica, Spain. If you are in the hospitality industry, you have to be hospitable, and I am very glad to see that we have reached a consensus on the necessity for us to have these healthy attitudes.

I know it is a matter of pain for the honourable Member that the indications are that we seem to be not standing still. We are not walking, we are not trotting, but at least we are gradually starting to move. The locomotive is gradually starting to move, so that may be causing a little bit of pain. That is politics.

The Government has no intention of stifling any debate. We only wish to emphasise that the outturn of the figures have indicated that we have finally trimmed our current account deficit, that our overall capital programme is progressing at such a speed and pace that the major capital projects will be completed, and that we will be able to start with some other major economic projects in the years to come.

Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this Appropriation Bill. This is my Second Reading contribution, and I notice that the honourable Member for St. Michael East, who had spoken, is now in his chair.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened with interest to the contributions from the other side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central was on his feet before you, and I must accept that.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

One of the exercises in good and responsible Government is the preliminary exercise that involves the forecasting of revenue and expenditure and a coherent and meaningful statement on how these resources are going to be allocated across the very multifarious social needs that a country like Barbados would have at this particular time. And if we were to be altogether objective in our evaluation of the Government's exercise in this planning and budgeting forecast, I believe that we would have to come to the conclusion that the Barbados Labour Party Government, in the face of very trying circumstances, has acquitted itself extremely well, and has been able to demonstrate that size and depth of resources do not necessarily exclude small societies from performing creditably in areas which are generally regarded as outside of the area of capability.

If you were to look at the situation that obtains in larger societies – and I am speaking now particularly of North America, Europe and the more developed countries of the world – any well-informed and objective commentator would know that Barbados, standing alongside places like Canada or the United States, has done extremely well. Indeed, it is a marvel to those who have not yet come to fully realise that small does not necessarily mean incapable; it is difficult for them to understand how a little place like Barbados, with the limited resources that we have, has been able to survive in what has been a very hostile economic climate over the past financial year, and has been able to come back looking as if its feathers have hardly been ruffled.

We have had some moments when, generally speaking, our society has had to look inwards for the inner resources, which are necessary in these circumstances, to allow us to weather the storm, and I am glad that, as we reflect now upon the exercise before us, we are able to look with great excitement and expectation to the future. I, Sir, would want to evaluate those areas which fall most heavily upon the needs of our society.

Barbadians, generally, are a class of people who, in my submission, are very mature, people who are able to think for themselves – and I am referring now even to the man in the street – to bring their own analyses to situations. They have a keen sense of judgement and they are able to realise when things are good and when things are bad. And as a mature and responsible people, they are forbearing and they are tolerant. They know when to expect their Government to perform better, and they know when it is not in the cards, to put it that way, to expect

more than the Government is able to offer in the circumstances.

Now, Sir, as you look down the road, the Minister responsible for Finance has already unfolded a very interesting ongoing picture of what Barbadians can expect from the Government which has had the good fortune to be serving them for the last seven years or so. One of the most pressing and urgent needs – it may well be the most pressing and the most urgent in the society – is the need for a broad-based and aggressive programme of urban and suburban renewal, with the major component being further infrastructural development in the area of roads and houses.

Within the last several weeks, Sir, Barbados has been tortured by a spate of fires, which are always plaguing the slums of any society, and although we do not like to hear that word in this century, in this age, in this year, it is still possible to point to some areas in our country which do not make us proud. And when you look at the fires that have been bothering us, for the most part these fires tend to be predominating in areas where housing and general living conditions are substandard.

In the area of St. Michael, Eckstein Village is one that I would describe as an area of blight. It is only one of several which we could easily and readily identify, and which cry out for urgent attention.

Part of the history and development of Barbados has been rooted in tenantries, and the nature of slum tenantries, generally, is that houses are crowded one on top of the other, with little or no infrastructural support, and it is not possible, within the context of what currently exists, for any significant undertaking in the area of urban reconstruction to happen.

2.00 p.m.

Roads cannot be improved because of the houses being too close one on top of the other and because of the fact that they are not laid out in any systematic or coherent fashion. There is a hodge-podge of houses chucked up on one another, with crude facilities outside in the yard. Some of these facilities are merely squatters thrones, if you want to call it that, Sir, they have no covering and often no protection from the elements.

I do not believe that in a society like Barbados, which is able to spend as much as we are spending – we have current expenditure for this forthcoming year of roughly $½ billion – that we can continue to tolerate our people living in those kinds of conditions, and the Government has therefore identified this aspect of our urban renewal as one of the most significant and pressing priorities in which it would engage during the coming financial year.

The Ministry of Housing has for many years been building very commendable terrace unit accommodations, but there is a need for what we described in Barbados as "sites and services," so that a number of persons who already own their houses will find a place upon which they can site those houses with the sense of security that goes along with owning a parcel of land. I believe, Sir, that one of the most important of the new initiatives that the Government is undertaking will be the provision of the necessary mortgage finance that will enable persons, who are usually those persons living in wooden houses, that end of the market which has always been left to scramble for itself, to improve the circumstances in which they live.

Barbadians are people who have long understood the importance of pride in ownership. They are people who may have been born in humble circumstances, but they are an impatient people who have fully understood that. They may not be able to give a comprehensive, social analysis of what social and economic mobility is all about, but they have always demonstrated that they have an inherent understanding of the process of pulling one up by one's boot straps, and they have always identified ownership of capital resources as paramount to mere consumption. And the average Barbadian, from the time he is born, almost wants to own a house. The thought processes direct him to a time when he will be able to buy his own house, regardless of how humble that house may seem to some of us. So there is pride in ownership.

I do not necessarily share the view that all of us in this society will be able to live in the kind of house that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central will live in, because, obviously, some of us do not have the unlimited resources which he is able to command. But I believe that people who live in wooden houses must be given an opportunity to put those wooden houses to a standard that they, themselves, and the rest of us can feel a sense of pride when we look at them.

Sir, I can remember that when I was a youngster, there was a house on Fairfield Road that made an indelible impression on my mind. It was a chattel house and it was aptly named "Tidy Cot". It was called "Tidy Cot" obviously because the owner recognised that a great deal of effort had gone into siting it and preparing suitable grounds for it, never mind the grounds were not vast. When you looked at it, regardless of the fact that it was not a mansion, you could immediately conclude that someone with a big heart and a great sense of pride lived in it.

I believe, Sir, that that is what we in Barbados have always stood for. And while I do not think that it is reasonable to expect that everybody would be able to build a house for $150 000 or $200 000, I feel that those

of us who only have enough resources to enable us to buy a house for $20 000 should be able to get the necessary capital to bring that house up to a standard that will give us the pride of which I have been talking.

Our neighbourhoods in Barbados, Sir, in my view over the last several years, have been going through a metamorphosis, through a change, that would indicate that our cities are burgeoning and that our economy is healthy even though it is not nearly as vibrant as it was, say, a year and a half ago. But the fact is that we can see changes happening before our eyes. I was in Jackson on a site visit last Monday with my colleague for St. Michael North East, and I was amazed at the number of housing starts that could be identified in that development. I counted over twenty-five new houses in the process of being built. A few years ago that part of Jackson was cane lands.

But clearly if there had not been a climate of a relative economic prosperity – the operative word "relative" – those houses could not start. And whenever I hear people walking about talking about how terrible things are in this country, I wonder which country they are talking about. All over Barbados there are indications that people are exercising an option which they hold, the option to decide that now is a time to realise a dream which they have always held, the dream of ownership, owning their own land and house, and they are putting that dream into reality.

It is coming to fruition, although it clearly cannot come to fruition in the absence of some kind of capital. Therefore, it is easy to conclude that, with the correct injection of mortgage money, thousands of more housing starts will happen. And there are people just waiting for the Government to say the money is now available and they will take their reserves, equity which they have been putting together for all of these years, and then they too will enter into the building boom and we will see Barbados cracking away again in the same manner as a few short years ago, because economic revival is happening.

2.10 p.m.

The economy of the United States has clearly indicated a turn around. Interest rates have fallen, which has always been a good harbinger of things to come. Barbados has weathered the storm admirably, and Barbadians are about to take off in a direction that will give the lie to the words often spoken by the Opposition, that this country is in a state of economic stagnation.

A community is not complete without a complementary infrastructure of roads. That link to social and economic progress that is unmistakably one of the first indicators of how well a country is performing is the state of its roads. I was in St. Philip last Saturday night and I had to ask one of the persons with whom I was talking to identify the country she was referring to when she was talking about pot holes in the road. I said just say it once more let me hear, because perhaps the people here sitting will think you are describing Barbados. She was actually talking about the United States and the state of the roads of Nassau County.

Obviously, Sir, when one does not have a point of reference, one is always tempted to believe that the grass is always unmistakably greener on the other side, and Barbadians sometimes allow themselves to fall into a state of complaining, which indicates to me that they do not have a full appreciation of the amount of progress they have been able to achieve out of relatively little.

I do not want to suggest that our roads are perfect, but I want to suggest that people will see, they will be able to point to and identify further progress, particularly in the area of roads. And if they use their eyes carefully now, they will be able to see that the further foundation for economic progress is being laid down by the improvement of a comprehensive network of roads. The Spring Garden project is a classic example of what I am talking about, and people who used to come across Highway 2A are now deliberately detouring at the top of University Hill so that they can get a chance to come down on the Spring Garden road, because so impressive a piece of highway it is that it is a joy to drive on it.

It was not constructed merely to bring a recreational sense to the inhabitants of Barbados. That is a piece of highway that has enormous implications for the further industrial development of Barbados, and we will continue to use our resources, such as we have, to generate the kind of activity that will allow us to continue to comfortably hold our heads high above the ebbs and tides of ill fortune that swirl around us.

The road now at Spring Garden will eventually find itself linking up with another impressive piece of highway that will pick up from the top of University Drive and sail straight on to the airport. That will mean that the industrial estates at the harbour, at Grazettes, at Newton, and at Six Roads will all be interlinked, which will have implications for the speed and ease at which goods and services will be available for export.

Part of the viability of any society is a good port, be it sea or airport. Barbados, in its rational development strategy, has put two good ports at the disposal of the manufacturers of Barbados. We have a very impressive airport and we have an improved cargo handling facility, which means that the industrialists will be able to get their goods moved at rapid speed from the point of

manufacture to the point of sale. For those who will not use the airport, we have a modern and impressive sea port, and to connect those two facilities we will have the road system that will ensure that traffic will not be snarled, but will be able to move with relative ease between manufacturing and the point of export.

I know that highway systems, while they have economic significance, are not always seen by politicians as priority items. They like to see action in the access roads, commonly called tenantry roads. They believe that unless you have a road that goes into Marley Vale, in between Miss Grannum's shop and Miss Burgess' place of residence, that something is wrong. We recognise that people should have comfortable neighbourhoods in which they can circulate, and part of the appropriation in this year's Estimates will be set aside for the purpose of improving some of these roads that are in very bad repair. So some Barbadians who are now able to say that under no circumstances will the doctor be caught down in this neighbourhood because of the roads being as bad as they are, will be able to walk with comfort upon what will be improved tenantry roads during the coming year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is inevitable in any society that we will have an uneven distribution of resources. That is one of the socio axioms to which all of us will have to become accustomed. There are a number of us who describe ourselves as social engineers, who believe in the ultimate redistribution of resources to a point where all of us will have an equality of resources. That is paradise, and the Good Book does point to a day soon when all of us will be able to put down our cares, and join one another and walk in what the prophet described as streets of gold. That is a reflection of his own sense of inadequacy. He could not find language sufficient to describe the unsurpassed beauty of the streets. They obviously were not barber greened, and they reminded him more of gold, so dazzling were they and so spectacular. That state, Sir, is a state to which we all aspire, but we are not to go around trying to make people believe that that is a condition which we will achieve here on earth.

It is a fact that some of us have more than others. It is a fact that the Governments that are sensitive to human wants and human needs will make every desperate effort to make sure that that unbalance is not such that it weighs down upon the shoulders of one class and provide the stepping stone for another class to further crush down another group.

2.20 p.m.

What we have to do, Sir, is to make certain that, in our efforts to redistribute wealth and resources, we do not create a situation in which those persons who have labourerd long and hard will feel the disincentive to continue that hard work and promote those who, charmed by this state of Utopia, will sit down and languish and wait for that time when, without effort, they will be able to come and claim what, really, they have not bothered to labour for.

Again, Sir, the book of which we all have knowledge in dealing with that subject cautions all of us to take an example from the ant. It says: "Go to the ant thou sluggards, consider her ways and be wise". The lesson in that, Sir, is that we must all recognize that it is by hard work, by industry, by productivity, that the resources which we allocate in here are made possible and all of our people must come to recognize that they have a contribution which they must make.

Some of us are going to be placed in a position where our contributions will necessarily be greater than others, but at least all of us must contribute to the extent that we are able to contribute. Those who no longer have the ability to contribute or who, because of some special set of circumstances, are not able to contribute at all, are our responsibility, and that, Sir, is where this concept of seeing after one another takes meaning. I can refer you to the book again, which admonishes us that we must look after the widows and the fatherless.

That is why this Government has always been sensitive and has always been inclined to bring a programme that does not encourage able-bodied people with lawlessness, but which recognizes that when a person has spent 65 years of his life working in the conditions of hard, hard drudgery, that person is entitled, in the evening of his days, to a guarantee that the rest of us who are able to carry on will look after him when he has ceased his labours. A large allocation in these Estimates is directed towards providing for those persons who are less capable than we are of providing for themselves.

For this, this Government must be congratulated. And whenever the people of Barbados are inclined to feel that they ought to listen to the nonsense that emanates from the other side, they in their wisdom must be able to sit down and evaluate and examine what used to be and what now is, and then in their rational minds conclude for themselves whether it is worse now than it used to be, or whether now, under the dynamic leadership that this Government has been able to provide, we have not been able to bring a measure of dignity to those people who were once plagued by want and were slaves to necessity.

Old age pensioners in this country are not now earning as much as we would all like to see, but they are earning many times more than they used to earn. They will continue to be provided for within the resources that this Government has at its disposal, and we will continue to make certain that not only will we give them a

pittance to keep body and soul together, but we will be providing shelter and clothing for them.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member's time has expired.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: We will provide shelter and clothing for them so that they will continue to live with a measure of dignity, and they will grow from strength to strength.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard three speeches from the other side on this Appropriation Bill. I do not know what they are responding to. It is quite clear to me that they are responding to a motion of censure – not a motion of censure brought by anyone on this side of the Chamber, but clearly to a motion of censure brought by the entire community, which is now feeling the serious effects of the extent to which it has been misled by the present Administration. Indeed, Sir, I do not think that any amount of propaganda as to futuristic developments in Barbados would remove, or ever erase, from the memories of the people of Barbados the extent to which this country has been precipitated in the serious economic and social difficulties for which they now have to pay a very serious penalty of adjustment.

I, Sir, would like to respond to one or two statements made by the other side. They seem, Sir, to try to cast the entire blame for the economic problems in Barbados on the international recession. In due course, I will be able to present to this Honourable House, on a more appropriate occasion, the extent to which we have contributed by our domestic mismanagement to the problems facing this country.

The problems, Sir, in tourism, in sugar, in some sectors of manufacturing, the widespread destruction of the moral fabric of this society by a leadership which does not understand that it has a moral dimension to play as part of the development process, are factors, which I think would more properly be dealt with in a Budget speech rather than in an Appropriation Bill. But you can rest assured that the extent of your domestic mismanagement will be thoroughly exposed now that the out-turn figures over the past two to three years are fully available – and no cover-up can be attempted at this point in time.

2.30 p.m.

We have heard, Sir, all sorts of statements about the period 1973–1976. The record needs to be put straight once and for all. The oil crisis at that time hit the Barbados economy as though there was a massive excise tax levied on this entire community, with the inevitable consequence of an element of stagflation in Barbados. But let it be clearly understood that we emerged from that situation with our foreign reserves, liquid and illiquid – and I want to make this point – in a very healthy state, we had a healthy balance of payments position, our national debt was extremely low, the foreign component of that national debt was one of the lowest for non-oil producing developing countries in 1976 in relation to its Gross National Product – a situation which is completely reversed today.

We were able to contain fiscal deficits without resort to taxation on the masses of people in this country. In other words, the basic social and economic fabric of this society was held together by the policy measures taken during that period, whilst the economy and the society as a whole were set on a path with a very low debt profile, and a high and increasing investment profile, so that it could take advantage of a tremendous increase in output in the coming years. Today, Sir, we are not in that position.

We were able to achieve that although the impact of the oil crisis was sudden, and although we did not have, to some extent, the ameliorating effects of the international banking framework for the recycling of petro-dollars – that was not present at that time – we were nevertheless able to protect our external position and maintain this country in a stable manner, without mortgaging its future and without surrendering its independence to external bodies.

I do not propose to speak to the question of inflation today. I would just like to say that when we left the Government, the levels of inflation had been the lowest experienced by this country in the past seven years, and the second thing is that during 1976, we were able to demonstrate that you can control inflation whilst promoting economic growth.

The present so-called drop in inflation in Barbados is largely due to a severe, deliberate compression of economic activity in Barbados, consequential on imposed demand management policies by the International Monetary Fund in collusion with a Government that has no self-respect – and no care for the welfare of wage earners in this country. Where the challenge would be, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is, when there is a resumption of growth in Barbados, whether these rates of inflation can be contained.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order: In my submission, the honourable Member is in breach of the Standing Orders in using insulting language in referring to members of the Government, by saying that they have no self-respect.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To continue, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would also just like to draw to the public's attention that when they hear figures on per capita income in this country, those figures do not apply to many important dimensions, such as the question of

transfers or the question of distribution of incomes in Barbados: And it is very interesting, Sir, and I was shocked to the tell the truth, when I saw the International Monetary Fund's assessment of the levels of wages in Barbados. They are shocking. People in Barbados are grossly underpaid, make no mistake about it.

When you look carefully and see how these figures average out, in terms of the analysis of the International Monetary Fund itself, it gives a complete lie to any statement made by anyone anywhere that wages in Barbados are so high, and when those figures are corrected for increases in the cost of living between 1975/1976 and today, and when you look at the subtle impositions as manifested in these Estimates, which will result in a further reduction in the real incomes of the people of Barbados, then you can understand why the people are finding things so difficult out there. And I am going to expose you all step by step and show how bogus indeed has been the assessment of these Estimates as presented to this Honourable Chamber.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order: the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said just now that the Estimates are supposed to be bogus. What I understand is that we are bringing a fraudulent document before Parliament, and at this point, if he is satisfied that they are bogus, and therefore fraudulent, the duty of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central who has just sat down is to move a motion asking to withdraw the Estimates so that the civil servants or anybody else cannot get paid.

You should stop using a lot of bogus terms out of Parliamentary ignorance. That is your trouble. You go and sit down with the economists at night, they speak economic jargon, you come in here, cannot understand what they are saying, and then cannot defend yourself like how you just condemned all the civil servants in Barbados for producing bogus figures. Vote against it. I challenge you to vote against it, you parliamentary nuisance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. James North, please take your seat. Will the Clerk at the Table get a copy of that portion of the speech so that we can verify whether or not the honourable Member did use the term "the Estimates are bogus?"
2.40 p.m.

A Pause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The transcript reads as follows:

> "When you look at the subtle impositions as manifested in these Estimates, which will result in a further reduction in the real incomes of the people of Barbados, then you can understand why the people are finding things so difficult out there. And I am going to expose you all step by step and show how bogus indeed has been the assessment of these Estimates as presented to this Honourable Chamber".

I do not consider the word "bogus" was used in relation to the document itself. It says bogus in relation to the assessment of the Estimates. The honourable Member narrowly escapes saying by whom the assessments have been made. Therefore in this instance I do not find that the word "bogus" is unparliamentary.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am exceedingly careful about the words I use in a parliamentary setting.

To continue, Sir, I think it is important that we address ourselves to the various statements that have been made. It was put forward as evidence of good management that this Government has been able to reduce its import bill without using trade restrictions.

I think it is important that we look at the alternative method by which this was done. This was done through a drastic reduction in credit, through rising levels of unemployment, through high interest rates, and through higher levels of consumption and other direct taxes on goods at the point of entry into this country. Our contention has always been that it is more socially desirable to seek to reduce your demand for imports in ways that do not place undue penalties on those who are less advantaged in the society.

Quite clearly, these policy measures are measures which the Government has had to undertake as part of their acceptance of the pre-conditions of the International Monetary Fund, and, of course, after entering into the stand-by arrangement, because the International Monetary Fund has as a matter of doctrine, as an article of faith, that you cannot use trade measures to address a balance of payment problem.
2.50 p.m.

The question, Sir, which we must ask ourselves is whether in the context of small developing countries like Barbados, that mechanism, which is totally disruptive of the society, and which weighs more heavily on the disadvantaged in the society, is the more appropriate policy mechanism to use in order to bring about adjustments in your import patterns. I would just humbly suggest, Sir, that it is not the best thing for Barbados. However, until Barbados recaptures its independence in determining a trade policy, this is the line along which they will have to follow, and we can only recapture that independence if we escape from the clutches of the International Monetary Fund.

I go, Sir, to the area of our foreign reserves. Earlier I pointed out, as I responded to statements made from the other side, that one of the very important factors which determined the viability of this economy and the viability of its external sector at the end of the last recession, the one which the Democratic Labour Party had to cope with, was the fact that we had a very low debt profile, particularly in the external sector, and also we had foreign reserve levels that were meaningful.

We had foreign reserves where, on any day of the week, on any hour of the day, we could go out there and buy potatoes from overseas. Look at the high levels of foreign reserves we have today – and make no mistake, this is going to be demonstrated to the public in due course. Well over half of our foreign reserves are in debts owed to us under the CARICOM multi-lateral Clearing Facility; and therefore not available for any purpose. That is a book entry until it is paid.

The second component is the large amounts of external borrowings that form part of our foreign reserves. I will invite Members to look and see what has been happening to the foreign securities of the Central Bank of Barbados, apart from its borrowings overseas in 1981 and 1982. I suspect that many of our foreign securities were traded off, were sold off in order to cope with the kind of problems created by this administration.

Sir, if you look at the foreign assets of the Central Bank of Barbados, you will see an alarming situation where in August of 1981 the Central Bank's U.S. dollar holdings were down to one million dollars, in September to $400 000, and in September 1982 to minus $800 000. That is why they went to the International Monetary Fund. The year before you went to the Orion Bank as a temporary measure and last year you went to the International Monetary Fund because we were insolvent. That insolvency very much centres around mismanagement of our external position. That will be explored in greater detail.

These are the kind of people who will come in here today and boast about high levels of foreign reserves, and boast how they have managed it, when, if you take those situations and you set them one against the other, you will see what a disastrous position this country was in when it went to the International Monetary Fund.

I have already said, Sir, that our public debt and our public guaranteed debt is way above the average for non-oil producing developing countries, and I will address myself once again to this nonsense of relating your external debt service to a percentage of your export earnings. Again and again on the Floor of this House I have pointed out that that was defective for a variety of reasons. Our statistical base in Barbados is relatively weak and we do not really know the percentage of imports involved in our export earnings. So we do not know what your net export position is at any point in time, not with the kind of detail that you should know if you want to use it as a specific factor.

The second point I have always emphasised is that in these developing countries whose development is largely an export-led development, who in order to sustain a given level of economic activity it is necessary to make sure that that external sector is always adequately managed at all times, you can reach a situation where, if you follow that index of debt service in relation to export earnings, you might find yourself in a situation where you are borrowing money and borrowing money, and then you get a sudden collapse of your export sector for one reason or another. In some instances domestic, in other instances external, but more often than not a combination of the two, and you are left out there with a high debt to service in the face of falling export earnings.

But what happens when you have to face the music? International organisations, like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, international lending agencies, come in and say, "we are interested in your public debt and public guaranteed debt in relation to your Gross National Product." Because our debt has continued to escalate whilst our Gross National Product has declined for two years in succession. There has been a contraction of this economy for two years, whilst our public debt continues to escalate.

The next point I want to address myself to, because I can deal with a logical argument in this area – I cannot deal with the kind of propaganda that I heard from the Deputy Prime Minister, of all people – and one would expect to hear it from the Prime Minister – is that by advocating proper management of the capital programmes of Barbados, we are in effect advocating unemployment.

Sir, when the profile of the deficits of Barbados in the past seven years and the profile of borrowings are revealed, when the profile of Central Bank accommodation is made clear and when the impact on our liquidity has been exposed, you will see why it is that that bunching of the capital projects in Barbados has been so disastrous to this economy.

Almost every developing country that has found itself in the clutches of the International Monetary Fund has done so because of a situation where, following a period of good export earnings, as in Barbados 1977 to 1979 and over to 1980, they proceeded on an inappropriate expansion programme, usually dictated by political reasons rather than economic reasons and they ended up with serious chaos in the economy. The political reason in Barbados was to purchase an election at any cost, even if the cost would be a massive escalation of the public

debt, and indeed considerable suffering for Barbadians, for generations to come.

No Minister of Finance in the past, no Minister of Finance in the future, no Government in the past, no Government in the future, not even this Barbados Labour Party Government, would seek to mismanage this country in the way in which it was mismanaged in the years 1981–1982. It will never happen again.
3.00 p.m.

And I will go further with this, Sir. I believe strongly that we need to look at the Constitution again, that we need to look at the Central Bank Act and we need to make it a criminal offence for that kind of monetary expansion to take place in Barbados in response to political needs. It could not have happened during the days when Barbados' external position was largely autonomous. It could not have happened in a situation where we did not have a financial institution to create money in this country. It should never have happened, but it has happened – and the penalty will have to be paid for a long time.

The temporary jobs created by that programme in 1981 have all since been lost long ago. It was a purely temporary phenomenon in Barbados, and indeed, Sir, you will notice that, despite that massive injection of printed money and that massive borrowing of money, we now have a cycle where our unemployment position in Barbados has started to rise again.

It is the kind of damage, Sir, which took place in the Jamaican economy prior to their going to the International Monetary Fund. Probably, Sir, the damage was even a bit more severe in relation to that country, because they have as a main thrust in their development programme an import substitution situation, where large amounts of their export earnings have to be absorbed in their domestic market. And whereas, fortunately in Barbados, we have pursued a slightly different type of export-led development, it might not be quite as traumatic as in that case. The situation in Guyana developed in exactly the same manner.

That is why, Sir, when you look at all these stand by arrangements entered into by Third World countries, you will see that as soon as the International Monetary Fund comes in, they slap a ceiling on the net domestic assets of the Central Bank. They say, "Hold your horses, no more printing of money around here. You have to restrict the accommodation of Central Government."

Secondly, Sir, to make sure there is no leakage, the next thing they do is limit your credit to the non-financial public sector, yes, things like the National Housing Corporation and so on. I will get on to that later on. I will not go into these things in detail.

Thirdly, they say: "You have borrowed enough! We will lend you the money. We will keep you on a string and you meet your debt repayments to those organizations that are rooted in those countries that have provided us with the money to lend you."

The Government, in those circumstances, would have lost what is one of its primary responsibilities and what is one of the principal factors that flow from independence in management in economic affairs. What is that principal factor, Sir? That principal factor is the power to allocate the resources of your country to the maximum benefit of all your citizens. You can no longer do that. You have to bow to the whims and fancies of the International Monetary Fund.

I did not even have to read these Estimates. All I had to do was to look and see what are the revenue requirements as dictated by the International Monetary Fund. All I had to do was to look and see what are the expenditure requirements, and you will find it in this document inside here on Pages 41–45. It will tell you how much money you have to raise, how much money you can spend and how much money you can allocate to the non-financial public sector. I can tell you what will happen to every possible thing in the public life in this community. It is a disgraceful situation.

I can also tell you what is the gap between what appears in here as revenue for 1983/84 and what money you will have to raise during the next financial year in order to keep this deficit at $80 million and not the $125 million you have here. That is right. You are not going to spend a single cent more than $80 million on capital expenditure. You cannot!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir, I am speaking first for the Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have until tomorrow morning, Sir. And I would not have to repeat myself for the next year – there are enough infelicities in economic mismanagement in this country!

Now, Sir, the capital programme. We accept, and it has been the policy of the Democratic Labour Party down the years, to maintain a steady flow of capital developments in Barbados. And we accept fully the argument of the honourable Deputy Prime Minister, who has accepted the argument of the right honourable Member for St. John, that the capital development in Barbados, financed through the public sector, is a *sine qua nom* of

the development process, given the spread of financial resources of Barbados. We accept that. We have no quarrel with that.

What we have a quarrel with is the way how that programme is planned, and it is the planning element that we are concerned about. We are concerned about the debt profile that results from those programmes, which relates to the mix of the capital programmes. We have always contended that it would be wrong to have a series of infrastructural developments, which are all long term in nature, which do not generate foreign exchange in the short term, because it would be wasteful of the foreign exchange reserves of the country.

It is quite clear, Sir, that if you borrow U.S.$100 million which has to be repaid over a period of 20 years, and you plunge that $100 million, say, into projects of a long-term nature, somewhere along the line some other productive sector has to find the money to pay for that; whereas if you took that $100 million and you allocated it, part to short terms, part to medium term and part to long term development, you will have a situation where in the amortisation of that external debt, those projects, apart from generating foreign exchange, employment during construction and probably maintaining further employment, could be self-serving over a time.

They are the elements of planning that we were talking about. But what did they produce? They produced a series of infrastructural developments, they produced a white elephant in St. Peter, and they will probably soon come and tell you you have to bring in casino gambling in order to rescue that. It would not surprise me. Not one of them is generating foreign exchange today.

I do not know when the repayments will start, because very often, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they do not tell us the details of these loans. We have been forced from time to time to guarantee loans, and it is only when you go before administrative tribunals in this country, and when your legal representative demand that documents be put in there, that you discover that you participated in a debate that had implications for the poor people of Barbados and you did not know that the financial covenants were hidden and not brought to this Parliament. The guarantees came, but the financial covenants did not come. That is the kind of situation that you get into when you find yourself in this kind of thing.

Another very important point, Sir, and this is what is creating serious budgetary problems in Barbados today, is that this foreign borrowing is all right, but it does some very serious things. Domestically, it generates certain rigidities or flexibilities in your allocation of resources. For example, if, you look at the recent Estimates in Barbados, at Charges of Debt and things like defence spending, you will find that they have become built-in in such an inflexible manner that there is little area for manoeuvre left, and this has a direct impact on the individuals employed in the Government Service. That is when you get on to wages and salaries, and in the other areas of the various subsidies, but we would come on to that later on.

At this stage Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER ordered that certain remarks made by the honourable Member (Dr. Haynes) be struck from the record.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We heard a list of capital works which will be taking place during this financial year. There was a section in these Estimates that used to be entitled "Highlights of Capital Expenditure". Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am quite sure you recall that this was introduced in the Estimates about two to three years ago. Right under Capital Estimates they used to have "Highlights"; this year there is a blank. There are no highlights at all. We are told that the highlights are of a non-budgetary nature, like the cement plant and the Central Bank building, and we have heard all the virtues of the Central Bank Building.

Sir, you must have some sense of priorities. It is one thing to say that you can get two new helicopters for the army, sophisticated helicopters involving millions of dollars of taxpayers' money eventually, and because you can get helicopters now and you pay for them later, it does not matter. It is one thing to say that you can borrow £11 million to meet the foreign exchange cost of a building, but it has to be paid for some time later. It is one thing to say that because you do not have to make the outlay immediately, you should proceed with this building.

I was hoping, Sir, that at the end of the day I would have heard a return on that investment that would justify the $70 million or so which will be spent. What I heard, and you can correct me if I am wrong, is that it would probably yield about $950 000 a year.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: A month.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I heard "a year."

It would seem to me that what is likely to happen is that the pre-appropriation profits of the Central Bank would probably, instead of going into the Consolidated Fund in future, be wrapped up in that as one of its capital assets for the purpose of amortization. Now you see what begins to happen? That means some $6 million or $7 million, and what sometimes used to be $10 million before the Central Bank found itself in a situation where it had to seek lines of credit with other Central Banks

in 1981 and 1982 as a consequence of gross mismanagement of the Minister of Finance. There was a time when the Central Bank was able to pay over into the Treasury up to $10 million, but interest rates romped up in 1981 and romped up again in 1982, substantially reducing the pre-appropriation profits that were available to be turned over to the Consolidated Fund. It is my judgment that that loss would be a loss to the people of Barbados; that that loss will go to service the external debt.

Indeed, Sir, one of the things we have to be very careful about in external borrowing is that we always have to make sure that we gain more out of the borrowing than the interest that we have to pay as a consequence of the borrowing. In other words, there must be some kind of net profit to us, otherwise that foreign borrowing represents a net loss of a very valuable resource, namely, the foreign currency of Barbados, which we slave to earn in the industrial and service sectors of the economy, where people put masses of capital at stake in order to generate those foreign earnings to maintain a reasonable level of living in Barbados and promote growth in the community.

Sir, the final common denominator in terms of economic activity in Barbados as a generation of those foreign exchange earnings and how they are allocated, is of fundamental importance in determining how efficient management is in this country. Judged by that criteria, this has been the most incompetent administration in the history of Barbados. Between the settlement and 1976, we owed away $50 million. Now, it is at least $300 million, according to one type of calculation. When you add the public guarantee external debt to that, it is another matter, and it will shock you all if you were to ever see what the IMF and the World Bank anticipate levels of foreign borrowings in Barbados will be by 1986.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I cannot give you everything at one time. Take a little at a time. It is going to take us many a year to recover from this calamity that has been inflicted on this nation by severe mismanagement.

Sir, on this whole question of housing, I get goose pimples. It is a peculiar sensation any time I hear anyone on that side talking about housing. We in the Democratic Labour Party in 1976 thought that the honourable Member for St. John was exaggerating at the time when he told me, personally, that the development programmes that he had would last this country for some ten to fifteen years, and that the major area of development in Barbados has got to be housing. That is why Sir, a separate manifesto was provided for the people of Barbados to read in 1976.

When you look at the assaults on housing inflicted by this Administration in the past seven years, it is quite incredible: rents, harassment, taxation, manipulation of Property Tax in such a way that they become real taxes when before they were not real taxes. Price increases generated largely by the high duties and high Consumption Taxes on building materials when they come through the harbour, high interest rates aided and abetted by international agencies and quite irrelevant to the domestic economic situation. All of these factors have combined to have a serious negative impact on housing in Barbados.

3.20 p.m.

On top of that, tax changes which considerably, limit the amount of money that you can deduct in any given year in relation to repairs, and the classification of bridging loans for some two years now as consumer loans, making loans not available to people who would want to proceed with building and later convert that into a long term loan, have all been separate assaults made by that Administration – on housing in Barbados. And now they are finding themselves in a situation where they can get a few dollars from USAID, which will go to balance of payments support, and whilst advancing small amounts of money towards housing, they now discover for the first time that housing is important in Barbados.

I remember, Sir, distinctly, during one Budget presentation, that Members on the other side did not realise what they were clapping about. When the honourable Member said that you no longer had to pay for the right to live in your own home and he was abolishing the gross rental value, everybody thought it was a wonderful thing. What they did not know was that, from the next day, they could no longer deduct the insurances on their houses – and there are lots of people whose houses are under-insured in Barbados. What they did not know was that from the next day they would not have an automatic right to deduct all interest payments and that the Minister of Finance could set the limit. What they did not know was that, as a consequence of the abolition of that gross rental value, which was an imputation of income to someone owning and living in their house, the next day he could limit the amount of money you can claim for repairs.

They did not realise that. So you are soaked all around, and then soaked with increased amounts of property taxes. And those property taxes are not tax deductible any longer, because since there is no income, there is nothing to write off against! That is how you were tricked!

I can remember the honourable Member for St. Andrew. I can still see him clapping now. I can see very well, and I said, "He really fooled 'Brath'". I could not

believe it. Sir, the honourable Member for St. Andrew is a very perceptive man, but it just shows the persuasive powers of certain characters, that they can succeed in getting people, who are normally balanced people and people who are consistent, who, when they listen to a Budget, listen to find out exactly how it is going to hit them next day, not to recognise how they got hit.

Sir, the first thing the Government has to do is recognise that, in housing, you cannot do it by borrowing more money, and you cannot do it through the public sector. The public sector can make its contribution. Restore what was there before. Give back the people what they had before. Remove the tax penalties. Restore the tax deductible of those elements which were tax deductible before. In this way, you would put large amounts of money available to people so that they can either maintain their homes or they can plan to build a home. The public sector can only help to keep it going. You will never meet the housing needs of Barbados through the public sector activity only. You can just forget that. At any rate, the cost of meeting it through public sector activity will be prohibitive, and that is a fact that you have to face.

Sir, there is one thing that could be said. At least they resisted the temptation by a famous international agency to make mortgage money as expensive as all other monies in Barbados. That is about the only thing that can be said for it. They capitulated in respect of every other condition – but they held their ground on the 2 per cent difference, and they managed to insist that they would keep mortgage interest rates below the general interest rates.

Now, Sir, we hear about an investment programme. Sir, there are all sorts of investment programmes that you can have for a country. Last year, one of the main areas of investment in Barbados was in the Barbados Light and Power Company. The installation of a low speed diesel engine, some $60 million or thereabouts....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would not like to interrupt the honourable Member, but I believe that there is a convention that where matters of this nature is before a tribunal of any sort, it should not be discussed in this Chamber for fear that anything said in here might prejudice the outcome of those proceedings. I would be grateful if the honourable Member would avoid discussing that particular aspect at this time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my understanding of the rule is that it states, "in a manner prejudicial", which I would not do, of course. The point I was trying to emphasise is that you can have a $100 million in capital investment, which may represent two pieces of equipment coming into Barbados.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not wish the honourable Member to discuss the Barbados Light and Power Company.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not talking about it,....I am speaking in general, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member started his discussion by saying that last year the area of investment was Barbados Light and Power. Therefore, I do not want the honourable Member to discuss Light and Power at a time when there is a matter before a forum – and you are involved in it as well.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is right. I agree with you.

3.30 p.m.

Sir, I will make the point that you have to watch the spread in capital investment in a country. The capital influence might indeed reflect in your nominal growth investment, but, in point of fact, over time it may indeed turn out that it could be a net loss to the country whilst placing immediate impositions on the individual citizens. I agree with the honourable Member for St. John, I understand what he was getting at quite clearly.

On this question of foreign aid as the main stimulus of the development process, there is something you have to watch very carefully. That aid eventually makes you a slave to it. It brings with it its own technology. In many instances, the country offering the aid is the only source from which you can get spare parts, the source from which you can get the technology for maintenance, the source from which you can get various other forms of supplies, and so on; so you may find that the aid might bring with it certain factors that might eventually result in a net drain on your investment process.

One of the very interesting things about Barbados is that we have been able to develop to the point where we were in 1976 without submitting the citizens of this country to any massive commitments in terms of foreign indebtedness, and I say, that this country will be enslaved for another 20 years. Indeed, just as I mentioned earlier that your rigidities in your expansion pattern can be triggered by debt, similarly your rigidities in your external fund use and your external reserves allocation can be triggered by debt. So you could be left with very little in order to maintain the services of the island, or even to deviate or deflect your line of development if you think that is appropriate at any point in time. These are concepts, Sir, which need to be addressed.

The honourable Member accused us – in fact he accused me personally – of trying to spread panic in 1981 when I told this country that the economic situation was such that we were heading for an economic

crisis. What the honourable Member should be accusing me of is telling the people the truth. The wrong word was used, the word was not panic, the word you should have used was "truth". If the truth had been told, I will tell you what would have happened in Barbados today. Despite your adjustment programme, there would have been fewer bankruptcies, because many businessmen would have allocated their resources differently. Many of them would have realised that there were difficult times ahead. They would have set about to try and bring their overdraft positions down, they would have reorganised their inventory and their stock position, and instead of finding themselves in a situation where they had to service some very high debt with high interest rates, they would have consolidated and would have been able to maintain reasonable levels of growth and reasonable employment levels in Barbados.

It is that kind of damage that failure to tell the truth to a people results in. There are many businessmen in Bridgetown today who are just hanging on, because of a misallocation of their resources in 1981 when they were fraudulently told by some persons that they never had it so good. They are hanging on now because of the decisions made then. The tragedy, Sir, is that it is the small businessman who will not normally take up the Central Bank reports or look at the international reports and so on to come to an independent judgment, so it is the small business man in Barbados who will suffer.

If you look at the big companies and you look at the investment profile of companies like Shipping and Trading, companies like the Goddards group, you will see that they were never led astray in 1981. As a matter of fact, those companies would have had experts available to them to give them independent advice as to what was happening.

It is very important that the truth be told to the country by the Government, because we are not like the United States. The President of the United States, or an aide, can make any statement he likes about the economy tonight. There are several independent agencies – newspapers have well qualified economists and analysts that do nothing else – that monitor the economy, so when the businessman opens the paper next day, he will have in the New York Times probably six or seven different evaluations of the opinion either of the President or an aide to the President.

That does not happen in Barbados. When the Minister of Finance says that you never had it so good, or words to that effect, when the Deputy Prime Minister says you never had it so good, people tend to believe them – and people take decisions that are ruinous to themselves and all of their savings.

So it is not panic, let us substitute the word "truth". I told the truth. All the evidence since 1981 has demonstrated that I was telling the truth. I am not saying that those on the other side necessarily were telling lies. It may be, as the IMF said, they did not understand what was going on. They probably did not. I want to be very generous to them.

As a matter of fact, to my best recollection, the IMF pointed out that the authorities failed to recognise that the serious crisis developing in the late months of 1980 was largely masked by good sugar earnings in that particular year. They failed to recognise it.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You cannot quote from a document without.....)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not quoting.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, on a point of order. Is the honourable Member allowed in debate to say the IMF says one, two, three, four? Is he allowed to do that? Is he allowed to do that in here without the document being laid? I submit that if a person seeks to substantiate his argument by reference to a document, that he is not allowed to speak to the document without the production of the document. If he is not called upon to produce it, how can I check whether he is not misrepresenting what is said? He cannot do that. Nowhere in any debating society is that possible, and I will ask for Your Honour's ruling on that, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is open to the honourable Member, or any Member on the Government side, to have their views as to what the honourable Member is saying. If the honourable Member says he quotes from a document and does not produce it, that is left to his veracity. It is therefore left to Members on the other side to contradict that by whatever means they feel like contradicting it. The rule says you cannot quote, you cannot use quotations or use the newspaper to substantiate a statement. The honourable Member has not used any document. It is left to the other side to give their version of the story.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the problem here is, I heard a lot of statements here this morning and I am going to reply to them one by one, I have made a brief note of them and one by one they will be answered.

Sir, they talk about a devaluation. He wants to know what is the Democratic Labour Party's policy on a devaluation. Let me tell you this. The Democratic Labour Party guided this country during the 1973 – 1976 crisis and at the end of that time altered the exchange rate of

the Barbados dollar in such a way that it represented a revaluation of the Barbados dollar. That decision was impactive on our trade position, on inflation, on employment generation and it was impactive on many other variables, our foreign reserves, balance of payment and so on, but we will not get into that area.

Our policy, Sir, is very simple. We intend to support the present Administration in its efforts to maintain the value of the Barbados dollar, and I publicly call on this country to trust their Prime Minister and their Minister of Finance when he says that the Barbados dollar will not be devalued. It may be difficult for them, but I am calling on them to trust him.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We want to hear your policy).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is our policy. We do not believe in devaluation, for reasons which I will state on another occasion, and it relates to the whole area of the cost price analysis in the external sector productivity and so on.
3.40 p.m.

The Democratic Labour Party is opposed to any change in the exchange rate between the Barbados dollar and the United States dollar. The Democratic Labour Party is opposed to any devaluation of the Barbados dollar. The Democratic Labour Party, will support the Government in its efforts to maintain the value of the Barbados dollar, and I personally invite the public to take one last chance and trust the Minister of Finance on that particular matter. It is as simple and straightforward as that. That is our position.

Sir, Mr. Peter Morgan's name was mentioned on the Floor of this House. At a seminar at the auditorium – a national institution, not a party building .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There used to be a statement in this Honourable House, "the boy stood on the burning deck."
Are you there alone, now?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir. The point I am trying to make is that, among about ten other suggestions for discussion, that matter was put up by Mr. Peter Morgan, but it has nothing to do with the Democratic Labour Party policy. So if you are planning to use that in any decisions you might be taking in the future, we want to state that we are not supportive of any devaluation, one-tier, two-tier, or any tier. That is our position. That is the Democratic Labour Party's position. When I speak on financial matters, that is the position of the Democratic Labour Party. I want to make this point clear. No one, neither Mr. Peter Morgan or anybody else on this side, ever advocated a devaluation.

Sir, the honourable Member is very smart, he is very clever, and I notice that, immediately after speaking about the devaluation of the Barbados dollar, he moved into this area of wage factors and other factors, cost of production and productivity. I understand clearly where he is heading. The signal came across to me. It was not missed.

But, Sir, I would just like to remind him that there are many non-wage costs of labour in Barbados that have risen far more than wages in the past two years, and that relates very much to taxation, and that if you find some disturbance in our labour-wage cost production in your export sector, then you should look very carefully at your non-wage cost. In other words, look very carefully at your pattern of taxation.

He then goes on, Sir, and talks about cane fires. I want to pay tribute today, to an individual who is not involved in politics, but who has demonstrated something that is very important in the political and economic life of this country. Mr. Douglas Lynch, a gentleman in the private sector in Barbados concerned about cane fires, looked at the plantations owned by the company for which he works and did a tentative analysis, and that analysis just discarded, threw out of the window, all of the theories that have ever been used about cane fires in Barbados. That study, I gather, has been subsequently expanded, and the one conclusion that you could come to on the basis of the evidence before you was that the cane fires were industry-related, a fair conclusion.

For all the years, they have been accusing us of setting fires to the canes. They have been accusing us of going on platforms and urging people to burn canes. It is that failure to bring some kind of objectivity, some kind of study, some kind of celebration, to bear on national problems that is a hallmark of the kinds of activities with which that side gets themselves involved. They get up there and they pontificate. They make all sorts of theoretical statements. They make all sorts of allegations – but they never sit down and put pen to paper and proceed to analyse what is before them.

The interesting thing here, particularly for those in public life for a longer time is that since that study was enlarged, I gather that the Sugar Producers themselves then looked at a more global picture and came to the conclusion that cane fires in Barbados were not politically motivated, that the fires were not started by children, that they were not started by malicious people; but that if you were to look at matters such as insurance, methods of reaping and various other pressures that build up in the industry during the period of reaping, you might find the cause of the cane fires.

Since certain steps were taken in relation to insurance in Barbados, there is a dramatic drop in cane fires, and I suspect that if the manufacturing sector of the sugar industry maintains the capacity to accommodate the green canes from the beginning right through to the end of the crop that that would be another important factor of keeping the level of cane fires down.

Cane fires are nothing to do with us. The problem is that both sides have been talking and making appeals, down through the years, and they have been falling on deaf ears. I have not heard any appeals this year. As a matter of fact, I heard the view expressed that since you have probably dealt with the problem, it is better not to go and make appeals so as to sensitise the population to a habit which seems to be broken for the time being. But the instructive thing about it is that the process of thought, the process of research and the process of application has been applied to a problem that had bedeviled the sugar industry for many years, and there is every prospect that there may be some kind of a solution.

Then, Sir, sometimes in our innocence we make statements and we do not understand what we are saying. The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central made a valid point that because we are small, provided our domestic factors of production are kept in proper alignment, we will not benefit from a massive increase in world growth and we will not suffer from a massive increase in a world recession in a way that a larger country would react to these two situations. In other words, what he is saying is this: we are a small dot on the periphery of world activity and it means that if we do not develop serious structural problems in our main productive sectors, and if our planning had been more careful, and if we would spend less time boasting and more time working out policy positions in Barbados, our situation today would have been much better. It is a very valid point you are making. It is the best point I have ever heard you make in this House of Assembly.
3.50 p.m.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: On a point of elucidation, and the honourable Member has given way, because he realises that he is putting words in my mouth. I only made a statement; he is making an analysis of that statement and he ought not to be attributing his analysis to me.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But it is a very perspicacious observation in that you recognise the truth of the situation, and the truth is that if you look at the sequence of events in Barbados, the domesticity of our problems cannot be denied, and the subsequent impact of our problems can be readily demonstrated. I would like to hear the honourable Minister of Agriculture explain to me how in 1980 we could produce 135 000 tons of sugar, get a windfall price, and the next year produce 90 000 tons, and attribute that to external factors. It would require remarkable hallucinatory efforts in thinking to be able to explain that on the basis of external factors. When I am ready to deal with the honourable Deputy Prime Minister in Tourism, that will be another matter.

So far, I have replied to the statements made by the other side. I have demonstrated beyond any doubt that the attempt made here this morning to try to tell the people of Barbados that things are much better than they really are needs to be rebutted, and it can be rebutted if you take it point by point and deal with it. That is the way I propose to deal with you all in the future, and that is why I am glad that three of you spoke before I did.

I want now to look at some aspects of the Estimates. Let me tell you what these Estimates indicate. They are no different from the Estimates of last year, except that they represent a continuation of the economic crisis in Barbados, a projection that that crisis will continue, and also reflect a failure of the adjustment programme which the Government entered into in September 1982, which has proved to be a complete failure. Indeed, the response of the economy to those measures has been as disastrous as the monetary and fiscal policies which induced that unfortunate situation.

These Estimates, Sir, reflect and predict continuing contraction of economic output in Barbados in 1983 and 1984. They indicate that there would be a further reduction in the real incomes of people in Barbados. They do indicate that the Government is now putting in place a policy of administered prices, a policy of further reduction in subsidies, and they indicate a further run-down of all the social services, which constitute the basic prop for the poor and the disadvantaged in Barbados.

They are a signal for further taxation, largely on the poor, through indirect taxation, they are a signal for a further unsustainably large fiscal deficit, to be financed by foreign borrowings and by further Central Bank accommodation. (Thank God at least for one thing because of the IMF being here, they have put a ceiling on the net domestic assets of the Central Bank). They are an indication of a further misallocation of the resources available to the Government, and Sir, taken in conjunction with last year's Estimates, a clear indication that the taxable capacity of this country has about reached exhaustion, an indication that the public debt of

Barbados will rise significantly, and that the external component of that debt will continue to rise.

As previously pointed out, it is important to look at these Estimates in the context of the political and economic background which we are facing. I think the right honourable Prime Minister made that point and I think it is a very valid point. What is the political situation we are facing? A Government that has lost confidence in its leader, a leader who no longer enjoys the confidence of the community, Ministers who have lost confidence in themselves. Indeed, all the hiring and firings that have been taking place over the past few days are an indication of total confusion even at Cabinet level, and because of the policies pursued, we are today witnessing a total disintegration in the morale of the Public Service, largely due to your economic policies and your attitudes towards public servants.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are functioning in a situation where the Government has surrendered its autonomy in the management of the affairs of this country to the International Monetary Fund.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Members, the reporters complained earlier today that the cross talk was causing some difficulty in their making proper reports of what is being said. I do believe in a certain amount of cross talk between both sides, but I would wish honourable Members to bear in mind that they should limit that amount of cross talk so as to accommodate the reporters.

4.00 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question of Barbados joining the IMF. I heard the question posed today, "Why did Barbados join the IMF if it did not intend to borrow money from it?"

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were ordered to be expunged from the record by the Deputy Speaker.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, sometimes I get a little confused. You know the Greek "idios" means a private person.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable Member gets confused, he should leave his confusion outside and not bring it into the Chamber.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is in the language, Sir. It has "idios" in Greek means a private person as distinct from a public person.

I just cannot imagine that a Prime Minister of a country and a Minister of Finance would pose the question, "Why did you join the IMF, if you did not intend to borrow from it?" I have heard other statements in relation to the IMF. I would understand it if some other honourable Member had asked that question.

The IMF as you know, is part of the Western financial system and you can enjoy either a creditor or debtor position within the IMF because you are part of the Western financial system. If you get into trouble, you can go to the IMF, but it depends on what facility you go to. I have heard it said recently at a party conference that "when we went to the IMF in 1977, nobody complained." It is a fact you went to the IMF, but you went to the compensatory facility, and you went under 50 per cent of quota – and nobody knew anyhow. So, therefore, under 50 per cent, under the compensatory facility – no problem. It is when you go into a stand-by arrangement, where you have to enter into agreements that compromise your sovereignty, and which in fact, are harmful to small, open developing countries like Barbados, that this becomes a matter of major public debate.

Against this economic background, there has been two years of negative growth. One would have expected to see in these Estimates some evidence that the Government was going to pay attention to the problems of economic growth in Barbados. They have devoted the past 18 months to the most disastrous, compressive monetary and fiscal policy. There has been no evidence whatsoever of any kind of economic growth, or policies geared towards economic growth, and one had hoped that, within the constraints of the capital programme, one would have seen policies emerging from there that would suggest that the Government would be addressing itself to the problem of economic growth, how that would impact on the economy, and get it out of the mess that it is in. But, so far, we have heard nothing about that.

We have heard that sugar is in a mess. Everybody knows that sugar is in a mess. We have had debates here last year, and I think very salutary debates, which point to one thing, that whatever may be happening outside in relation to sugar, the major problems are here in Barbados.

Manufacturing is a very interesting sector. If there was any sector in Barbados which perhaps would be more susceptible to the effects of an international recession, it should be the export sector of manufacturing. That has not happened, for two reasons. One reason was advanced by my friend, the Member for St. Michael West Central, who pointed out that we are such a small country that the recession could hardly affect us and that our problems are domestic.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: On a point of order, Sir: the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is persisting in misquoting me, and he knows that he is doing that, and misinterpreting what I said. He cannot mislead the House. The record is there. He knows exactly

what I said. I was saying that as Barbados is a small country and that it is a marvel that such a small community, with limited resources, was still able to withstand the economic recession as it is.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I was doing the analysis for him. It was the logical consequence of a statement, and it is a proper statement, which should be subjected to proper analysis. I agree with that.

There are also the points that the honourable Minister of Agriculture and the honourable Deputy Prime Minister have made all along about the infrastructure being in place for the manufacturing sector. Because our domestic situation was in order, the manufacturing sector has not been hit significantly by the international recession.

People look at figures differently. Let us look at the revenue requirements in these Estimates. We see there, Sir, a revenue requirement of some $508 million, and we are told that is an increase of 4.8 percent over 1982–83. But I will tell you this, and many people do not notice it, that in order to get the figure of $508 million, there is an estimate in there of $73 million going into the Treasury during the month of March in this year.

If you look back over the past two years, 1981–82 and 1982–83, the figure for February and March was $105 million. Now with your imports falling, your receipts from duties are down, your receipts from Consumption Taxes down, almost certainly with a reduction in your receipts from Corporation Taxes, and certainly a decrease in growth, are you telling me that you are going to generate $73 million in the month of March?

I would like to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is almost impossible, that you will not generate $73 million in revenue in the month of March. But it also conceals a more serious problem and this is the problem, I am charging this Administration here, that if they are not careful, they will embarrass themselves before the international financial institutions if they continue to allow domestic payment arrears to build up.
4.10 p.m.

Did you notice that soon after the IMF left here they decided to pay the $12.5 million to public servants? That is one that the IMF identified. And you may recall what the IMF did to Chile when they discovered them, particularly at this time of the year, playing with the figures in relation to domestic arrears.

There are many other areas where there are significant domestic arrears payments developing in Barbados, so that figure of $508 million represents, in my view, an over estimate of the revenue collections this year. Because, as I said, it is unlikely that you will get $73 million, and if, indeed, you make your domestic arrears payments, then this situation would look very different.

The trouble is that you are not paying the money, but you are inflating the figures, and you are also now inflating the figures on the actual amount that you will spend next year, because what is going to happen now is that the domestic arrears that have been built up in fiscal year 1982–83 will be paid in 1983–84. Therefore, the figure of $494 million not only conceals a serious deficit on current account, but it also inflates the amount of money that you will be spending next year, since a significant proportion of that money would be in respect of arrears due and owing, and payable, during income year 1982–83.

That is a device of preparation that I am fully aware of and which I would spot immediately. It did not escape me, so I will imagine that the deficit on current account would be substantially higher than what is shown here.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: What would you say it is?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It depends on how much money you owe away. I do not know, I know you owe away a lot. If you pay the $12 million to the civil servants before the end of March, I would suspect that that would drop by $12 million at least, so you have some idea of what the figure would be like.

The honourable Member made a very good point, Sir. Sometimes in asides some very interesting things crop up. He said that the Government would get back about $5 million. I tend to agree with him, but it underpins the basic folly of their wage restraint policy and how it is impacted on Government revenues. He made a very valid point there, and you have to pick up these things. Where they are going to get an increase in incomes and profits from for next year, I do not know. We have to wait until the Budget, but I rather suspect that we can look forward to some generous tax harassment as far as Income Tax is concerned in the year 1983–84 – what the IMF calls improving the tax collection mechanisms. You can expect that, Sir, because I do not see the corporations' tax position improving in 1983–84, and with the wage restraint policy in the public sector, and with an increase in unemployment, I do not see an increase yield from private incomes.

This whole business of substantially reducing the purchasing power in the community has now spread from wage earners; it has gone into the professional classes. There are dentists in this country who are not making a living. There are doctors not making a living, there are lawyers not making a living. That is a fact. People would

only go to a dentist if they have a toothache, all the fancy work is finished. It is a serious problem, and my suspicion is that you are going to find that there are serious problems in terms of revenue generation from the professional sector in Barbados.

For the first time, Sir, I gather that accountants are faced with the extraordinary situation now where such a large percentage of the books that they audit show the clients are making a loss, that they find it embarrassing to send a bill. What they are doing now is saying, "Put me on your payroll. Instead of paying my fee of $5 000 one time, pay me $400 a month," or something like that.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what you have inflicted on this country. You do not understand what you have done.

(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: The causation is all wrong).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The causation is your demand management policy, and you do not understand. If you do not understand administered prices, I am going to show you how you are going to administer them to the public very shortly.

Administered prices are prices in relation to that demand-supply balance as theoretically worked out by the IMF, where when they reduce subsidies in the non-financial public sector, they prop this up by various prices, as in the case of bus fares and so on. We will get on to that later on, because when I come to your transfers to the non-financial public sector, and when I come to the limitation of credit, then the honourable Members who are responsible for the ADC, the National Housing Corporation, the Transport Board, all of those things that come under the non-financial public sector, the BMC, they will know exactly what is coming to them.

The Minister of Finance, in collusion with the Deputy Prime Minister, is going to give all of you in the service industries a rough time this year, and your best friend is me over here in order to expose it. So, if I say it, at least you can go to your constituents and say it is the Prime Minister who will not let you function. Do you understand what I tell you? Good.

They expect an increased yield in Property Taxes this year. This is not a year for revaluation. Last year you know we had a tremendous harassment of property owners, and we have reached a situation in Barbados where it would be better to invest in the right kind of motor car than to invest in a piece of land. It happened in Jamaica too, you know.

The only way you are going to get a further increase in Property Taxes is if you continue that policy of harassment of property owners, people in one of the main areas of savings in this country. When you destroy the confidence of people in the investment in property, you must realise that you are creating serious instabilities within the society.

Sir, goods and services. We have had a decline last year and a decline is projected. I suspect that it is in that area that you are going to get further impositions. Do not mind that we see in the Estimates there is a decline, it is in that area you are going to get impositions.

Sir, under Non-tax Revenue, this has been scandalous for years. If you were to go through the Estimates and you see what constitutes non-tax revenue, you will see that they are the services provided by Government and Government departments to the poor people of Barbados, and it is the poor people who use them in volume. If you are a millionaire, you only change your passport every ten years. If you are poor, you change your passport every ten years too. There are only two millionaires in this House, and there are 25 other people who would have to get their passports. The two millionaires are the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister.

Sir, Stamp Duties. I think that that is projected to yield $18.5 million. When last year we estimated that those Stamp Duties would yield somewhere in the region of $18 million – $20 million, they said that we were wrong. But we know that we were correct, because even with a contraction of imports, by pursuit of the policy that has no discrimination in it, one imposed by the International Monetary Fund as I outlined in accordance with that rule, you were yet able to realise $18 million or $18.5 million, so I suspect you are going to get soaked there again.

4.20 p.m.

But, Sir, when you come to the expenditure side, and you start analysing the significance of these Estimates and the impact on the poor people in Barbados, then you really see that we are in for a further rough year.

I take the point, Sir, and that is why I was very, very careful to agree in detail with the point made by the honourable Deputy Prime Minister, that the public sector activity, particularly the capital programme, is an important indicator and, in fact, a necessary prerequisite in this kind of economy for the generation of employment and the generation of certain elements in the community.

So, let us see what we are doing here. I have already pointed out that you have got a build-up of

arrears of payments for 1982–83. Now, in 1983–84, you show an expenditure increase of only 2.7 per cent. It is less than the level of inflation, because you are not going to get down to 2.7 per cent unless you further compress the economy to a point where there is very little going on. The point I am trying to make is that it is a consequence of serious economic compressing.

As I have said, the challenge is, how do you maintain low rates of inflation with economic growth? Reagan and Thatcher did the same thing. They pushed the interest rates up. They put 10 million people out of work and they brought the inflation rate down. That is what they did.

You have compressed the economy in the same way, and the inflation rate have dropped. Not to the levels you are saying, because they started at much higher levels, and I am going to surprise you, at the right time, with an internal analysis of what were the true rates of inflation. I did not realize that there were three indices that you could use and, over a time, using a linear regression technique, you can discover whether or not the published inflation rates were correct or not. They follow a specific pattern and the suggestion is very strong that our inflation rates have been understated considerably over the past five years. Anyhow, we will deal with that another time.

Sir, wages and salaries. I spoke earlier about the inflexibilities developing in Government expenditure patterns. I will say something here, that, in order to reduce those expenditures, they reduce wages and salaries. They cannot change the debt service. That has come down a bit from nearly $100 million to $93 million and this is purely a response to interest rates, at least $4 million of the $7 million.

But that policy of wage restraint has been uniformly disastrous in Barbados. It is not informed by any rational position in relation to the factors that determine wages in Barbados, or the role of wages in the maintenance of reasonable levels of domestic economic activity in Barbados. It is clearly in pursuance of a doctrinaire position, which is completely irrelevant to the needs of Barbadians or the needs of the economy, that that policy has been pursued, and the Estimates indicate that there will be more layoffs in the so-called "non financial public sector." Some Transport Board employees will go home. Some BMC employees will go home. The Ministry of Transport and Works people will go home.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You already said you are sending up the busfares and sending home people anyhow.

Despite these economic constraints in Barbados today, we can find money to increase our spending on defence and security under Current Expenditure! We have a fixed expenditure under Charges of Debt to the tune of $93.4 million. Mr. Deputy Speaker, even with falling interest rates, even with the reduction in the Treasury Bill rate from the disastrous level which the Government had put it at in order to strangulate the private sector and to divert much available financial resources as they could to a Government that was struggling to find some means of survival, despite all of that, they found themselves in a situation where they could only bring this down from $99 million to $93 million.

I have a shocking revelation to make, Sir. Do you know how this thing catches up after a period of time? Let me tell you something. From 1972–1977, Barbados spent $4.58 million on Defence and Security. From 1977–1984, it spent $82.5 million on Defence and Security, (let us forget the debt obligations for the ships that came – and the helicopters that are to come). Under Charges of Debt, Sir, in the period 1972–1977, we spent $94.3 million. Since those jokers came to power we have spent $430.4 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are no jokers in this Chamber, except as you may find them over there, and that gentleman has to retract that statement, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To continue, Sir. I give those figures on the amount of money spent on Defence and Security between 1977–1984, exclusive of our debt commitments on capital and current account and the amount spent on debt charges, to make the point that if we had not embarked on that policy in relation to Defence and Security, spending $82.5 million in that six-year period, if we had not committed ourselves to the kind of borrowing externally which we committed ourselves to, we would have $512.9 million in the kitty to spend this year. In other words, we have spent enough money on Defence and Security and debt charges over the past six years that you could have given people one year free of all tax and still have $512 million to spend. That is a fact.

4.30 p.m.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The National Insurance money could probably have been invested elsewhere. As a matter

of fact, I am looking at certain aspects of that national insurance fund.

The point I am making, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we have spent as much money in Defence and Security and in Charges of Debt between 1977 and 1984 that it amounts to $512.9. And if that money was not spent in that way, there would have been no need to raise a single cent in revenue – and the people could have a tax free year.

I reflected earlier on the rigidities in Government expenditure pattern which obviously creates special problems at the moment for any Minister of Finance, and he will make it worse for anyone who succeeds him in the future if he continues to commit this country to these fixed types of expenditure over the years. Where is he going to cut? I pointed out that he is going to cut back in what affects the people most, that is in the area of wages in the public sector. Now he is going to go for the social services.

We have heard over the years that this Government intended to establish a National Health Service. Since 1976, this was their constant propaganda. The health services in Barbados today are worse than they have been at any time in the past twenty years. Many of the specialist doctors are crippled because they do not have the facilities to work with. The output of surgeons is sometimes dramatically reduced to 25 per cent of what they can put out because facilities are not available – operating theatres not available, gowns not available, anaesthetic gas not available.

There are greater problems today with the acquisition of drugs in Barbados than at any time during my experience in this country. It is easier for me to call a colleague in St. Vincent, or call a colleague in one of the other islands, and ask him to send up certain drugs. If they had drugs where the continuity of supply is critically important, you could not guarantee it here in Barbados. But we will be able to deal with that at a later stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought the honourable Member would deal with the principle of the Appropriation Bill. It appears that as the honourable Member proceeds, he is going into the details of the Estimates. I would only like to remind the honourable Member to keep to the principle of the Appropriation Bill.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is a good point. I will let up on that one. Anyhow, what I am saying is that these Estimates surely indicate that the social services, health, education and areas like housing would be severely hit. The Minister of Transport and Works, you are going to have serious problems there, and you are going to be faced with the problem of sending home people and putting up bus fares. The Minister of Agriculture, you are going to find it very difficult in maintaining the kind of image projection which you have managed, somehow, over the past year or so.

I thought that in these Estimates one would have expected to see that the Government would have learnt at least that an export-led development is all right, but if you are going to tie that in, you must have that base. I see no evidence here that the Ministry of Agriculture would have an adequate allocation of resources out of these Estimates here before me at the moment, and if you look back over the past two years, you will see that the Ministry of Agriculture has not been given the kind of priority in Government spending which the economic situation would dictate.

I understand, Sir, that there has been a revival this year in the growing of cash crops in Barbados, and it would seem to be largely a response to the state of the sugar industry. I suspect that is what it is, but what it does show is that the productive capacity is there, and that if the Ministry of Agriculture is properly upgraded and given the resources to handle the marketing and other aspects of agriculture in Barbados, we would not only enhance our position domestically, but we can multiply the effects of other export sectors in Barbados, particularly the tourism sector.

I want to deal with the area of subsidies and other current transfers. If you were to look at these Estimates, you will see a very interesting thing cropping up in here, and the honourable Member for St. Michael East would be very interested in my analysis of what is happening in here. Under this area, you will see, if you look at the introduction to the Estimates, this drastic reduction in the non-financial, public sector.

They will be a lot more drastic than what appears in the Estimates, because if you really want to pick up the actual amount allowed in that area, there is another document you have to look at. You will find that National Housing is going to be in a whole lot of trouble. I presume the Natural Gas Corporation will manage on its own. You are going to have some financial problems up at Civil Aviation.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I can only look at the figures here "to make a reasonable projection for the rate of inflation, reasonable projections for reasonable revenues" and you can anticipate what would happen in every sector, and you will also pick up changes in policy and changes in policy direction.

Let me illustrate the extent of the change in policy directions to you. Subsidies to households 1981–82 $49 million, 1982–83 $42 million, 1983–84 $5.8 million.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If you take out what is funded and add it to $5.8 million you will see you are a way down, probably to $20 million. If you take out the funding part, you will see that you are still down, well below $42.4 million. I examined all these aspects of this Head before I spoke on them. It may be a good thing that there will be a reduction in the funds available to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. With the Agricultural Development Corporation, it is the same problem. The same with the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I have referred to the problems at the Transport Board already. The Industrial Development Corporation is going to be severely hit in that twin policy of reduction in transfers to these statutory boards, and the IMF policy of a limitation of credit.
4.40 p.m.

So that you are being hit in both ways – what is transferred out of the Consolidated Fund and the extent to which you can make use of credit within the society. There are two areas in which those boards would come under severe pressure. That is why I tell you that those tax free Boards cover a pretty large area of economic activity in Barbados. When you see that kind of financial compression being utilised in relation to those Boards, you know beyond any doubt that if these Estimates reflect anything at all, they must reflect a serious reduction in economic activity in Barbados in 1983–84.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am addressing myself to the Estimates as distinct from what other people did, because I am capable of taking up those Estimates and looking at the gross figures and seeing policy changes and policy positions. It is not for me to indulge in misinformation and propaganda in this Honourable House. It is not for me to use a bucket full of words to express a teaspoonful of ideas like the honourable Prime Minister. It is for me to deal with the Resolution before the House and try to interpret these figures, and see what are the policy measures that must emanate from the Estimates as they are presented.

Another area that is of grave concern to me is that we are now beginning to see the impact of importing concepts of public utility financing on Government expenditure. If you are to look at the cost of water, gas, and another public utility, and see how that has escalated over the past three years, you will recognise that it has taken a major slice of Government's income.

What is the reason for that? The reason is that the Government has never understood basic principles behind public utility development in a developing country. Certain concepts were pushed down their throats and, because of easy access to borrow funds, they went ahead and borrowed money, not realising that they were borrowing a package. You were borrowing money, technology, and a philosophy of financing, that is what you were borrowing, and I am urging you to return to the concept of the lowest feasible cost, to maintain public utility services with reasonable rates of development, and back off very quickly from that whole concept of long run marginal costing of public utilities. It is deadly; it is disastrous to developing countries.

Instead of looking at what it costs you today to provide water or gas, you look and see what it is going to cost you in 10 or 15 years, and you find all kinds of artificial means to bump up the basic cost of water, for example, or gas, all kinds of notional expenses, even threatening to breach the Income Tax laws of Barbados in order to do it. That is the kind of thing you get when you have to shift from one system into a system which bears no relationship to the economy with which you are dealing.

The water rates in this country have reached the point where many people find it very difficult, or almost impossible, to meet their water bills – and a further increase is scheduled. Indeed, I am just giving an example to illustrate that if you use a different type of approach to the question of public utility financing, you can end up with costs to the consumer which he cannot afford, and which, in the long run, will create serious problems for the public utility itself.

I gather that there is a serious problem with pumps, there are no spare water pumps. And if you live in the Cave Hill area, days may pass before you get a bath from time to time. I am not sure if that is the case, but those are the reports which I am hearing. You are paying more and more money for a less and less efficient service, and a lot of your money is being taken from you. That is what I mean by administered prices. When you take away the subsidies and when you limit the credit, then the only way the operation can become viable is by increasing the prices to the consumer. That is the point.

Take the problems at the milk plant. You see how the removal of subsidies can cause a virtual collapse of an important industry? Do not mind the IMF. They cannot come and take over Barbados. They cannot send an army in here. All you have to do is do not pay them back immediately, do your own thing, and try and run the country in the interest of the masses of the people. Do not be scared of them.

But that is all that is in these Estimates. You do not see it, but I see it. Instead of a presentation dealing with the Estimates, we got a political harangue; not an attempt to analyse these Estimates, to project to this Honourable House what are the Government's views on these Estimates, how they impact on the economy, what kind of policy measures will they represent, and how will this assist in getting yourselves out of this economic mess that we are in today. None of that took place at all.

When you read the IMF's Minutes, when you listen to even Mr. Arthur, an economist who recently left the Government Service, who recently presented a paper at the University of the West Indies, they confirmed beyond any doubt what Mr. Michael Howard was saying, and he stands out today as an outstanding economist in Barbados, who had the foresight and guts to come out and say what he thought would happen to Barbados as a consequence of a mindless capital programme and inordinate printing of money in this country. Not even your own economist, who worked on the IMF programme now introducing in their papers, words like "pre-conditions", when I was saying the pre-conditions existed from.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is well aware of the Standing Orders of this Honourable Chamber. If he intends to call the name of any person or comment or their activities, he should give notice to the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Favourably or unfavourably? I thought that applied when you are making an unfavourable.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you are going to call the name of any person in this Chamber, you should give notice of that.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I agree with that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are attempting to compare one person with another.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir, they both said the same thing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us maintain the Standing Orders, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We now turn our attention to the fiscal deficit. I have brought it to the attention of this House that the Government has run out of ideas in relation to generating a proper mix of capital programmes and that they are relying now, from what I can see, on the same type of housing programme and the types of policies which we advocated in 1976 in relation to housing in the overall development process in Barbados.

But that fiscal deficit that is facing this country is something that you have to watch very carefully. It, of course, will be bridged or financed this year by borrowings. The sources have not been indicated. One would have thought that some attempt would have been made in the introduction of the Estimates to tell us how that gap would be serviced, but there was no mention of that. As I pointed out earlier too, there are no highlights of any capital expenditure, because there is nothing to highlight.

4.50 p.m.

But, Sir, we have now had three years when there have been deficits on current account, and we have now had three years of massive deficits, actual or projected, on capital account. (You just cannot go on indefinitely, the day of reckoning must catch up with you.) If there was a continuing economic activity to reflect the levels of those deficits, or if there were levels of employment in Barbados that would reflect the level of those deficits, then at least you could reflect on two positive gains, but they are not there.

We have increasing unemployment, we have a distorted pattern of investment in Barbados. Do not mind what you see in the figures as investment gains. As I was trying to point out earlier, a lot of that investment might well relate to a few pieces of equipment. That capital formulation might well relate to that. If anything, from what I understand from the commercial banks, there has been a persistent rundown in savings in Barbados, or the tendency is there, and unfortunately when you look at the Central Bank reports and you see the reports on savings, it is very difficult to see what is happening to the individual within that context. It is difficult to analyse how he is utilising his savings at this point in time, so one has to rely on reports that you get from the commercial banks, which would give you a much better picture of what is going on. People, for example, have been taking money off their savings accounts to buy motor cars and that kind of thing, or to contribute to the purchase of motor cars and various other areas like that. It is a kind of activity in relation to savings which is a bit unusual in Barbados.

I want to say this before I sit down. You are not fooling me, because I know the amount of revenue that you have to raise. I will say it is about $42 million more than what is in the Estimates, and I know what you have been doing all along. What has been happening in Barbados has not escaped me, that tax is being put on from week to week and from month to month, so that you cannot identify it in relation to a particular Budget. It does not fool me.

Only a few weeks ago, we had the taxes and the assets of banks and that is showing up now as $2.5 million in these Estimates for 1983–84. You are not fooling me, you are fooling yourselves. I am fully aware of all of these devices. I have a careful note of each tax measure. So part of that $42 million will show in the taxes that were levied late in last year, but go into next year. You are not fooling me. The fact that they will not appear in the Budget Speech does not mean that they are not there.

Current expenditure is likely to be depressed. The figure that you see there does not coincide with the amount allowed by the International Monetary Fund. There will be no capital spending to the extent that they have projected in these Estimates. It will be at least 20 to 30 million dollars below what is projected in there. And to compound it, even the reduction in the transfers in the non-financial public sector would be considerably reduced. So we will not be getting even what you see in the Estimates.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that, as I have set it out, honourable Members would be in a better position to appreciate the impact of these Estimates on current economic activity in Barbados, to understand how they arise out of current economic situations, and the monetary and fiscal response to those economic situations. I am very disappointed that I can see in these Estimates no evidence whatsoever of any major thrust in economic development which would lead to lasting growth and lasting benefit to one and all in this community.

I thank you for your patience, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy 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. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

5.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Michael East was about to speak. He may now continue.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on occasions such as this, the general approach to discussion of the Estimates is to deal with the subject matter as one in which the Government is represented as a fabled "Judge Monkey" distributing largesse to the respective Ministries.

We believe that the object of any such exercise is for improvement of human beings within the society and, therefore, I propose to deviate from the economistic emphases which characterized the previous speeches and attempt to show that these Estimates remain faithful to the objective of the Barbados Labour Party Government, as a democratic socialist Government, to the furtherance of the welfare state in Barbados.

A brief look at the Estimates will indicate that Social Services will consume at least 50 per cent of the projected expenditure, and that, in particular, it is noteworthy to examine the allocations for Health, Education and Welfare, which collectively constitute the most important indicators of a Government's social policy.

In 1975, $42.4 million were spent on Education. It is projected that in the next financial year $108 million will be spent, just under 300 per cent increase. The area of Health, in 1975–76 just over $32 million were spent during this year, and projected to be spent next year is something in the vicinity of $90.7 million, again, an almost 300 per cent increase over the financial year 1975–76. In the area of Welfare, in the year 1975–76 $10.3 million was spent, and again just under 300 per cent increase is represented in the projected expenditure of the financial year 1983–84 of $30 million.

With that record, which indicates an ever-increasing proportion of the expenditure of Government shared by the Social Services, it is pretty obvious that it is absolutely erroneous to argue that tight fiscal measures, which the recession necessitated, would result in an undermining of the social programmes of the Government.

Before I go on to indicate further that the statistics, themselves, conceal some other radical developments in the area of policy implementation in the social field, I believe that it is necessary for me to reflect upon one or two of the points made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central expressed amazement that certain policies restricting demand were implemented with a view to easing balance of payments pressure.

I believe the economic policies of the Democratic Labour Party, from its inception, illustrated clearly the course that Government was embarking upon, namely a course of deepening its economic dependence upon metropolitan countries. Its record of expansion of the tourist industry, its record of expanding the policy of industrialization by invitation, all bespoke a policy that closely followed what is known as "the Puerto Rican" model, the outcome of which firmly and inextricably linked the fate of Barbados to the Western World economy.

It is recognized that this programme brought with it material rewards, which another course, which de-emphasized economic dependency upon the external world, would have avoided. And the policy-makers, in embarking upon the pursuit of the course of following the Puerto Rican model were cognisant of the monumental risk involved in following this course, because it meant that when there was a boom in the metropolitan world, it favourably affected the economies of the developing world in pursuit of these policies, and when there was a decline, the adverse effects of the decline in the metropolitan countries were also felt. Therefore, the economic recession that is racking the Western World, and has been racking the Western World for the past two years or so, would have been expected by anyone to have the consequences on the Barbados' economy that they had.

Clearly, therefore, where the vast majority of your tourist arrivals come from a depressed area, and bring with them precious foreign exchange, when they are no longer able to come and spend at a level hithertofore experienced, it was bound to have serious consequences for the foreign exchange earnings of Barbados.

The foreign exchange earnings of Barbados were further affected because of the inability to get the required price for sugar, based upon certain external factors which involved an increase in the price of sugar, which was undermined by the fact that the Barbados dollar, tied as it is to the American dollar, moved upward *vis-a-vis* the European currency unit in which the price of sugar is paid to sugar exporters. It was also reflected internally in the ravages by fire which were experienced during the year 1981 and last year, ravages which were maliciously encouraged by inflammatory speeches coming from the platforms of the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was surprised to hear members from the other side today disclaiming any responsibility for this situation. I think that they have now recognised that no useful purpose will be served in destroying the entire sugar industry, since God knows that their entire record in the domain of agriculture in no small way contributed to the present problems of the sugar industry in particular, and agriculture in general. 5.25 p.m.

The famous, or infamous, cane blade speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, using his immense influence and prestige as Prime Minister of this country, dissuaded many people from making agriculture their career. The wholesale abandonment of agricultural land and the uncontrolled residential development to which these lands were committed left this Government to inherit agricultural lands significantly diminished in acreage. Therefore it comes strange from the lips of a member of the Opposition, who professes not to understand why agriculture finds itself in the depressed condition in which we inherited it.

Not only that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable member for St. Michael South Central said that he found it difficult to understand why the Government uses the argument that the debt service ratio should be related to export earnings. The answer is very simple. External debt servicing is paid for in foreign currency, and it is precisely from our exports that we receive foreign currency. It therefore stands to reason that the most appropriate index for determining whether one is going over the threshold of danger in accumulating foreign debts would be one's projected capacity to earn foreign exchange.

He then went on to indicate that one could never be absolutely certain about maintaining the level of export earnings, because of the fragility of the economy. Given the nature of the fragility of the economy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot be sure about maintaining our position in anything! The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, immediately after, indicated that there would be a decline or that there were two successive years of decline in the GNP, and later in his speech he lauded the Government in a concealed and underhanded way, but it was praised nonetheless, for creating the ethos in which the export sector could continue to be dynamic – in spite of the recession.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact that the export sector continues to be dynamic, even though the manufacturing sector is basically export oriented, gives confirmation of the Government's view in its correctness in tying the question of debt servicing to export earnings, visible and invisible, because whereas globally there has been a decline in production within the economy, within the export sector and the sectors from which we earn our foreign exchange, we have been able to maintain a certain level of vibrancy. It not only justifies the Government in tying debt servicing to export earnings, but it also justifies the Government in taking early and timely defensive action in seeking assistance from the International Monetary Fund.

The question was posed today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as to why the Democratic Labour Party sought membership of the International Monetary Fund. It is a valid question. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central attempted to give an answer and shortly after confessed on the floor of the House that he was in a state of confusion, when he tried to explain why the Democratic Labour Party joined the International Monetary Fund.

At this stage Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER ordered that certain words spoken by the honourable Member for St. Michael East be expunged from the record.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: It constitutes dissembling and subterfuge of the most despicable kind for Members to come into this honourable and august Chamber and assert that the Government stands condemned before the bar of public opinion for entering into a relationship with the International Monetary Fund, when Barbados was led into this international institution by the Democratic Labour Party, and it was led into this institution, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, the honourable Member does not realise that my indications were that we entered the International Monetary Fund in order to help lend money to other people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: But you also borrowed money from the International Monetary Fund, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the moment that Barbados chose to embed itself further in the western economic system, then the logic of associating itself with the multilateral institutions that the western countries had developed to facilitate the economic interaction, was compelling, cogent and unavoidable.
5.35 p.m.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when you pursue a programme based upon the economic model of Puerto Rico, instituted by the Democratic Labour Party, it has these risks. It will bring with it greater material benefits to the people of the country, but it carries with it the risk that when the metropolitan countries to whom you are linked are enjoying prosperity, it would be washed over into a peripheral country, and when they are experiencing a decline, that also will percolate to the periphery.

Now that the United States of America and other Western countries are in a state of economic decline, I consider it to be intellectually dishonest for anyone to pretend that Barbados would not be affected in the way in which it has been affected. There is no metropolitan country that it is not grinding under the toils of the recession at the present time. There is no metropolitan country that is not suffering high unemployment. There is no metropolitan country whose businesses are not suffering a decline in profits. There are no metropolitan countries in existence where failed businesses are not proliferating in the thousands, and sometimes in the tens of thousands, month by month.

Germany, for the first time in post-war history, has unemployment at the level of 2 million persons. It is a pervasive international problem, and because Barbados is part of that system, and a very small part of that system, whenever it is in economic turmoil, Barbados will be in economic turmoil.

The developed countries of the world did not call the World Bank into existence for the benefit of Barbados. They did not call the International Monetary Fund into existence to impoverish countries such as Barbados. They called the International Monetary Fund into existence because it is recognised that, in the nature of international trade, there will be ups and down, there will be contracts and expansions. And they recognise that, historically, whenever countries have experienced serious trading problems, they have rushed to the solution to the protectionism – and an attempt to use protectionist policies, catapulted the entire Western World into the calamitous depression of the 1920s and 1930s.

It was felt, therefore, that if you have a mechanism to smooth, facilitate and lubricate trade within the world, that depressions that have their genesis in trade wars will be averted. This is precisely why the International Monetary Fund was called into existence. And every country whose trade has been affected, and which consequently experienced balance of payment problems, has in the past gone to the International Monetary Fund for assistance. It depends on the nature of the problem.

When Britain went to the Compensatory Facility of the IMF in 1964 or 1965, it went under circumstances where the general world economy was in a state of boom. Most countries that go to the IMF for assistance now, go because they are experiencing an economic depression. I do not know why we keep using the word "recession" over and over again, because elementary economic text books have argued that from the time the unemployed in a developed country is in excess of 10 per cent, that you are, in fact, in a depression. So let us call a spade a spade. We are in an economic depression and, because of the severity of the problems, the more radical remedy is what is called for at this time. And Barbados has absolutely nothing to be ashamed of within this present situation.

When countries like Japan, Germany, and the United States are wheeling in a state of economic shock, when these countries' economies are in the grips of depression, then I think the fact that the Government of Barbados has been able to produce Estimates where the welfare state continues to remain intact, is exemplary. In fact, as I will explain later on, when the allocations of the Ministry of Health and Community Services come up for discussion, the social services are alive and well and are increasing in dynamism as new and creative programmes have been devised in order to deal with the problem that we are living in a period of very scarce resources. I will deal with that. I just mentioned the statistical information to ensure that there is a proper balance, proper parallel development moving toward a closer integration between the economic and social policies of this Government.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Yes, I believe it, and I will demonstrate it when I speak on the Head, Health and Community Services. You will hear that we have moved away from the reactionary practices of 15 years under the Democratic Labour Party regime, where the people of this country have been effectively parasitized through the social services. You will hear how we have moved away from that situation of individual dependence and indignity and have put the Government of this country firmly on the high road of social development, where people who are the beneficiaries of social policy, are invested with dignity. We have moved away from the programme where people voted for funds for the Welfare Department and other agencies because they felt it was an obligation imposed upon them by Government, but where policy makers, if they can be so described, were bankrupt of any ideas whatsoever within the area of social policy.
5.45 p.m.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Like having their light bills paid).

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I can also show that more people benefited in the last financial year from having their light and water bills paid than in the previous year.

Aside

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: In the same area? I do not know what he means by "in the same area".

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael West must stop the cross talk. During the Committee stage the honourable Member will have all the time he wishes to discuss any particular idea he has.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, policies conceived by the wisest men must come to nought if they are not implemented in an efficient way. I believe that in Barbados today there is a serious problem with respect to the bureaucracy, and this is extremely important for expenditures. In the colonial past, bureaucrats were adjudged to be efficient if they saved money. That kind of saving was abysmally spurious, because in refusing to spend money on certain social services, they exacerbated the problem, with the result that these services festered. And when it became impossible to ignore the problems any longer, more money had to be spent than would have been spent if the problems were nipped in the bud.

I believe that the whole problem of the bureaucracy is rooted in certain habits of thought which I believe we, as a Government and a country, must do everything in our power to change. The concept of productivity within Government seems to be an alien one, and very often bureaucrats believe that they have accomplished their work to their own satisfaction by moving a file from one desk to another. One can often hear these men, in a spirit of self-congratulation, saying, "I pushed 30 files today," and at the end of it all, the problems of the people to whom services are to be delivered still remain unsolved. Indeed, the entire question...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Much as I enjoy listening to the honourable Member, I must inform him that his time has expired. If he wants to complete the sentence I will allow him two minutes more to do so.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Thank you. There will be no point in completing the sentence.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that you do now.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was trying to assist.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To move that the House go into Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To move a motion, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member has no authority to move a motion during Government Business.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill and to give it my support. We meet today at a time when the whole global situation in terms of finance is in a state of disarray.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, Sir, at the very beginning of his speech the honourable Member starts to refer to the international situation. The honourable Member who just sat down referred to the international situation. I draw to Your Honour's attention the rules of this House concerning the repetition of speeches. The honourable Members who have spoken so far have all repeated one another, and I am drawing to Your Honour's attention the rule concerning repetition of speeches.

If it is the intention of the Government to use up the time having everybody speak, the least they can do is

to speak on different topics or speak differently. Estimates are not normally used for this purpose, but if they must use them for this purpose to draw out the time, let them at least not get up and repeat what has gone before.

This is nothing personal against the honourable Member, but we on this side cannot look with favour on the fact that these are the Estimates when the expenditure is to be examined, Ministry by Ministry, and what we are getting is, in my view, Sir, a long repetition of speech after speech, known in some other Parliaments as filibustering.

I draw it to Your Honour's attention for what it is worth, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the honourable Member for St. Michael West is not *au fait* with Government procedures. That is the only conclusion I can come to, for the simple reason that we over here conduct Government business.

If you feel within yourself that we are filibustering, and that my colleague has started his speech by repeating what my friend behind me said, then you are not going to speak at all, because you can only recite what your colleague said. What he said here today – and you can go through all the Estimates and the Supplementary Resolutions that came before Parliament and see it – has been on the international situation right through. You will not be able to speak, because you are his copycat.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Referring to the statement of the honourable Member for St. Michael West, there is nothing in our Standing Orders which deals with one Member repeating something of an international nature. As far as I know, a Member cannot repeat himself, and if the honourable Member is inviting me to rule that the honourable Member for St. Andrew cannot speak now because he is likely to repeat something said by the honourable Member, remember it will fall on both sides of the Chamber. The Government is at liberty to conduct its business in whatever manner it sees fit. It is left for the Opposition to deal with a matter in a way which accords to parliamentary procedure.

The honourable Member for St. Andrew may continue.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to thank you for the ruling which you have made. I had no doubt in my mind whatever that you would rule according to the rules of this House.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. There must be order so that the honourable Member may make his speech in silence.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Whenever the time comes for the other side to be so elected to govern – and I believe that time is still a very long way off – they can do it exactly how they like to do it, and I do not think that the honourable Member is qualified to tell me or any person on this side of the House how to speak. He speaks, and he speaks as he likes, and nobody tells him how he should speak, and therefore I do not think that he has the right to tell anybody over here how they should speak.

The whole position is that I have got to address the issues in this country with respect to finance in the terms of the whole world situation, because we cannot isolate ourselves. Of course we are not going to allow the other side to get away with the idea and cause the country to feel that Barbados is in a unique position in the sense that its economy can be vibrant and stable in the face of a world depressed situation, and that is exactly what we are dealing with. As a matter of fact, we feel the Government is to be admired and complimented for the necessary measures they have been taking over the years in order to keep the country still afloat and buoyant in the face of the situation which confronts the world today.

We have heard a lot of play made today on the question of health, on the question of agriculture and on the question of national housing, and I am going to deal briefly with a few of those issues.

5.55 p.m.

When the time comes for us to move into Committee stages on the Appropriation Bill, I suppose members will be so enlightened from the type of speeches that they would have heard here that it may not be necessary for them to debate matters.

We have sat here, and to some extent with great pain, listening to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. But although we were listening in pain to the lecture in economics he was giving us, the type of lectures we have been hearing for the past few years now, we nevertheless accepted the fact that since we are in a Parliament of diverse views we must listen, no matter how intolerable the situation might be. We are not going to say that we are a one-party state and therefore we are not to entertain the views of the other side. We have

never advanced that as an argument. They are on record as doing that, but we have not.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central dealt very exhaustively with the question of housing in this country and he said that the Government has been doing little or nothing. He said "I get goose pimples when I have to consider the question of housing." I do not know if the Member or his party is qualified to deal with the question of housing in this country from a governmental point of view.

The people of this country are largely aware of the problems which they have had to face over a number of years in relation to housing. The Government, regardless of how sympathetic it is to the cause of the unhoused people of this country, cannot afford to find money to build houses to house everybody. Government must largely depend on people assisting themselves, and the private sectors' involvement in order to meet the national demands.

The Barbados Labour Party is very much aware of the great need for housing. To this end, and contrary to the arguments advanced by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, the Government has done a considerable amount to alleviate the pressure and the burden on people who own chattel houses in this country. If you borrow money to build a chattel house, you are entitled to up to $6 000 in tax relief on that house. In addition, you can claim for any repairs done to your chattel house, provided that you present the necessary receipts for labour and materials.

I am surprised that the honourable Member, who is so knowledgeable in matters of building and finance, did not go to the trouble to investigate what the Government has been doing to assist people in this direction. The Government has been dong a considerable amount. We have made provision whereby the people have been given loans of a very large amount in order to assist them in the building and the purchasing of houses in this island.

I recall very well when we came into office the limit set on mortgages was in the region of $40 000 to $45 000. Today it is well over $80 000. I cannot recall offhand the actual amount, but Government contributes a considerable amount of money towards the building of houses and assisting people in the purchasing of houses in this island. The Government has been doing everything that is practical and conceivable in order to help people in that direction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of building houses to house people who might not be in a position to buy their own homes, or build their own homes, Government has been building a considerable amount of houses all over the country in an effort to house the people in this island. They have started construction at Maynard's in St. Peter. They have been building houses in the Ivy. They have built houses in Bonnetts. They have built houses in Fernihurst and they have been looking at other areas. In the constituency of St. Joseph they are about to restart building houses at Lammings.

And they are not only building houses in those areas, but, in addition, they are looking at other areas for sites and services to assist people in moving their houses, if they so wish, and to help them construct toilets and baths in their homes and to make houses more feasible for working class people to live in. In addition to this, as a result of the Government's enlightened policy in introducing the Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act. Government has set about subdividing the lands in the various tenantries so that people would be able to purchase their own lots in these areas.

We are not a Government that is concerned about building houses and keeping them as Government properties forever. We are a Government that is making sure that the small man is getting a stake in the community by the ownership of his land, as a result of our instituting measures whereby the plantation tenants are now able to own their lands and it is to your discredit that you stood away and refused to vote with us when we sought to make amendments to the Constitution to ensure the workers in this country, the tenants of this island, could own that land. We did it successfully, but you did not support us in the amendment to the Constitution.

Asides.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Why were you not here? You said you were not here. Why were you not here? You did not support the measure at all. We had to rely upon our two-thirds majority at the time, which was necessary to bring about the constitutional amendment. You are not qualified, I respectfully submit, to speak on housing in this country, because you have done nothing, absolutely nothing, to assist the people who live in tenantries, be it the plantation tenantry or any other tenantry, where we have given the people of this island an opportunity to purchase their lots. We have sought to liberate them from the plantation system and give them a new lease on life. That is what you never did.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I submit that the honourable Member is misleading this House. He said that the Democratic Labour Party is not in a position to speak on housing. He then said that we were away from the debate concerning the tenantries. He said that we walked out. That is not true.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

6.05 p.m.

The honourable Member, as I understand it, is trying to clear up a misconception as he perceives it, made by the honourable Member for St. Andrew in relation to a vote taken in the House. That cannot be a point of order. As I understand it, a point of order deals with a breach of the Standing Orders of this Honourable House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With respect, Sir, I was drawing to your attention that there is a Standing Order which says that a Member may not make statements which mislead the House.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no Standing Order which says that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: There is a Standing Order which can be so interpreted. If I make an untrue statement in this Chamber, knowing it to be untrue, then I am in breach of the Standing Orders. Is that correct?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member questioning the Chair?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, I am seeking guidance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I rule that it is not a point of order.

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

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I have tried to convey, and which I will seek to reinforce, is that the Opposition at the time did not do anything to facilitate the Government in passing a piece of legislation which had as its effect the amendment of an entrenched clause in the Constitution to make provision for plantation tenants in the country to be able to own their house spots. You did absolutely nothing. You should be ashamed of yourselves! Rather than argue with me or His Honour, the Deputy Speaker, on this question, you should bow your heads in shame and go out, or say you apologise for the very wrong action which you took at the time.

You did absolutely nothing about it. On the contrary, you went about preaching and telling the people not even to purchase the land. We can recall very well that a number of writers sympathetic to you wrote in the Press saying that we were telling them to buy the land, and advised them not to buy it because they were paying 8 cents, 5 cents or 10 cents a week for it. You came with that cheap argument. But you forgot entirely that those people wanted to build bungalows, and they are building bungalows today and they are improving their homes. Therefore, it is to your shame and not to your credit that you did not support this amendment to the entrenched clause in the Constitution.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was abroad representing the country in Zambia along with one of the Clerks and His Honour the Speaker. We all were there and I got a call from the Prime Minister's office asking me to get back to Barbados in order to vote. I had to return because we were not sure, and we were quite correct in our thinking, that you would not have supported us in the amendment to the Constitution.

And you have paid for this, and you will continue to pay dearly for it, because we will not fail to remind the people in the country that you did absolutely nothing to assist them on that.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, they did not want to speak, they think that we should not speak either. Now they have discovered that we are determined to speak, they want to get their point over as well, and I hope that they will stick firmly to their commitment of not speaking any more; but they are not going to tell us over here how over here is to be managed. We already understand our position and the country knows that we are very determined as far as a battle is concerned, and we are not at all worried. I will advise the honourable Member for St. Michael West to keep quiet. His noise will not deter anybody here, neither will it obtain him any favour in the country.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central dealt with the question of high interest charges, the high cost of building, taxation, tax deduction for repairs and bridging loans. I have touched on the question of taxes, and I hope that the honourable Member was hearing what I was saying in respect of what the Government has been giving in terms of deductions for this. You can check to find out if it is true or not.

On the question of bridging loans, a bridging loan is a private loan. How are we going to do it? If you are giving loans on the one hand and you are making arrangements whereby assistance can be given to people, you cannot at the same time organise a bridging loan for a person. It is not easy to do, and we are in an awkward position. We cannot do it. Wherever it is possible we make provision whereby – and the Minister of Finance has the authority to do it – we can reduce the interest rates and make money easier for the people to borrow.

Every moment you get up, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you hear about the International Monetary Fund, the difficulty of getting loans and what have you. Sometimes it is good when loans are difficult to get, because it does not permit people to unnecessarily run to get them, and when you are in a situation where problems and difficulties can easily arise, it is sometimes good to steer people away from moving into difficulties.

In the United States, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the record shows that thousands and thousands of people and businesses are going into bankruptcy and houses are being sold out for little or no money being owed towards these houses. Sometimes it is a good thing in a society to protect people from themselves. Government cannot, like private enterprise, encourage people to do things which would put them at great risk, because when you tell a man to invest all he has in a property or a home, that man, when he has to lose it, is never going to forgive you for encouraging him to put money into that house or into that property.

People who have large sums of money, probably like the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central or the honourable Member for St. Michael West, can take certain risks. Other people, maybe like the honourable Member for St. Michael South and myself, cannot afford to take those risks, and therefore we have got to play it very carefully whenever we are investing money. I believe I am right in saying this. I cannot risk bringing along the honourable Member for St. Philip North in this. He might be too affluent and certainly would feel that he is let down when I bring him along in a measure such as this.

I would think, Mr. Deputy Speaker that, by and large, given the circumstances, given the financial climate in which we are operating at this point in time, that the Government has been doing extremely well. In terms of its agriculture, in terms of its health services to the community, in my opinion it has been doing much better than at the time when Dr. Caddle was the Minister of Health and came into great conflict with the second most powerful man in the land. I think that the social services in this country are doing considerably well, and I do not think that the Government can be easily faulted at this time for the approach which it has taken.

When we come to Committee on the Heads of Estimates, I will take the opportunity then to propound the system which I hope to introduce within housing in order to make the National Housing Corporation as vibrant as it possibly can be, and also to point it in a direction where it would be a positive influence for good in this country in terms of being a trendsetter in the building of houses, if at all it is involved in that direction, with the setting up of high-rise houses within the metropolitan area in order to alleviate the very serious problems which now exists in the City of Bridgetown.

The City of Bridgetown in particular, and St. Michael in general, have been areas of great neglect over the years, and it is my view that the time has come when a very serious approach should be made to the problems of the City of Bridgetown and the whole area of St. Michael. I will be looking at these areas, and I have no doubt whatever in my mind that when a proper and comprehensive plan is put forward for the National Housing Corporation, the Government will give a sympathetic ear toward the plan which is put forward.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting this Appropriation Bill.

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

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

Head 10 – Governor General – $192 745 was called and passed.

Head 11 – Judiciary – $36 173 was called.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Under Head 11 in the Personal Emoluments against the Puisne Judges, you see there is a S.I. salary scale, but the Estimates calculated for 1983–84 totalled $114 156 which does not tally with the S.I. salary scale in the back. I wonder if this is an error; and, if so, what is the correction that should be made on this?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would like to congratulate the honourable Member in his perspicacity in observing a very genuine discrepancy which is of very considerable importance. What has happened is that the entire emoluments of the Chief Justice and the Puisne Judges are under consideration at the moment.

Traditionally, the judges have always been on the same salary level as the Director of Public Prosecutions, which is, in this case, S.I. However, some departure from principle was made on two occasions. One, when, because there is no separate Court of Appeal, the judges were given a non-taxable and non-pensionable Court of Appeal allowance. This could perhaps be accommodated within the principle, but a more serious departure was made when they were also given a non-taxable, but pensionable, housing allowance.

As honourable Members will know, housing allowances in the Public Service have been abolished. They have been incorporated into salary. In the case of ordinary public officers, this presented no difficulty. One or two public officers have obtained a surge in income, because they do, in fact do occupy houses, and they are now getting the benefit of the salary as well as the houses. There is some consideration being given as to whether they should be brought under the general rule that public officers who occupy government premises pay a certain percentage of their salary as a rent, depending on whether the accommodation is furnished or unfurnished.

I, myself, tend rather more to the opinion that if you tell a man that he has to live in premises, you are not really giving him a house at all. This surely applies to the Defense Force and to the Police Force. The Defense Force is obliged to live in barracks and, therefore, it would be unreasonable to charge them rent for the occupation of the barracks. The nature of their duty is that they have to live in the barracks. Basically, indeed, this applies to every single officer in the Defense Force, from the Colonel back down, although the Colonel was deprived of his housing allowance because he lives in one of the properties in the Garrison. I, myself, have some doubts as to whether if a man is required to live on premises – he really is not given the option of living other than on the premises – you can make him pay rent for it.

The situation with the judges is different. You cannot incorporate their housing allowances, which were less than public officers' housing allowances, into their salaries, because they will then become taxable and the judges will suffer a diminution of salary, which is forbidden by the Constitution.

At the moment we are in the process of negotiating with the judges on the basis that their housing allowances will be grossed-up and added to their salaries. This will also be done in the case of the Chief Justice, although the grossing will be on a less generous scale.

Since the matter is under review, I am in no position to correct the anomaly to which the honourable Member for St. Philip North has drawn attention. All I can do is to outline to the House that this is an ongoing situation, in the process of negotiation, and that, in due course, the House will necessarily be given the opportunity to discuss it in some depth.

The Chief Justice is not at present in the island. He is doing duty in London in Her Majesty's Privy Council and, therefore, I cannot even give you any idea as to what his reaction would be, although I have addressed a letter to him about the subject. But honourable Members will appreciate the difficulty of incorporating a non-taxable housing allowance in a taxable salary.

In the fullness of time, some other description will no doubt be found for the level of judges' salaries in the Estimates. But in the meantime, I am of the general impression that we must be treating their salaries as if they have not yet been raised. I think you will find that, if you add it up, what is being voted as statutory expenditure will not tally with S.1, because that is the same as the salary they were getting last year.

I hope that I have given honourable Members all of the information that they need on this subject and that they will understand that I cannot go into it at any greater length. But I will mention that we have to be prepared for the fact that in order to give judges the same emoluments as they are, in fact getting now, their salaries will have to be greatly increased, because their salaries now will have to be increased by an amount to permit them to pay the amount of tax to get the same emoluments as they were getting before.

6.25 p.m.

In the case of the Chief Justice, if it is decided that his occupation of a house is not necessary to his office, he will come under the provision of having to pay either 8 per cent or 10 per cent of his salary, whatever it is, for the occupation of his house, and so the grossing-up of his housing allowance, which, since he does not get it, will not have to be grossed-up to the maximum, will yet have to be grossed up beyond his pensionable nominal allowance, plus an amount sufficient to allow him to pay the rent for his place.

I will point out to honourable Members that there is at least one other person paid from the public Treasury who is in that position.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is what is bothering me, Mr. Chairman, because I am not sure I follow the arguments which the Prime Minister used for the judges. It seems to me that when you came to abolishing house allowance, the anomalies which would have been created as a result of that decision ought perhaps to have been dealt with, allowing those persons to continue to have a house allowance. Otherwise, you are going to continue to have anomalies for judges.

For example, how are you dealing with ambassadors overseas? Ambassadors overseas necessarily live in the ambassadorial residence. They have other peculiarities connected to their employment, but they are public officers. At least the ones who are civil servants are public officers, and therefore they fall into the same category as the judges.

The Prime Minister, I believe, falls into this category as well; the Prime Minister who is given a house and who therefore, for purposes of this argument, falls in the same category. Does it mean then that the Prime Minister –

and I am not dealing with this Prime Minister, although he is a good example – will get the total salary while living in the house?

I do not accept his argument, although I understand the motivation, that if a man has to live in a particular house, you cannot be said to be giving him a house. This is the kind of thing that has occurred in the Anglican Church where the Rectory forms part of the priest having the Cure. He is required to live in the Rectory, but the Rectory provides the shelter for him. Now, whereas in the case of a civil servant, or judge in this case, it may be only for a few years, in their case it is from, say, age 22 to age 65.

Let us suppose that a Prime Minister stays in office for 20 years. Either you will have to form a system where the salary of the Prime Minister finally falls below that of his other Ministers, or you will raise the salary of the Prime Minister in the same ratio as you have been holding *vis-a-vis* the other Ministers, while providing him with an official residence. It seems to me that there is something inherently incorrect about that kind of logic, unless you take the position that a man is entitled to X amount of money.

That is why, for example, the President of the United States has a "salary" of $200 000, and it is hardly ever moved over fairly long periods. It is recognised that you could not equate the salary in relation to the movement of other salaries around him, otherwise there would come a point where it would be ridiculous and make no sense. So there are a lot of people in the United States who, theoretically, earn more than the President of the United States, just as there are people in Barbados who, theoretically, earn more than the Prime Minister. But there is a price which a man has to pay when the assumes a certain office.

When a man or a woman becomes an ambassador, he or she should be paid a proper salary and proper allowances to allow that person to carry out their duties in accordance with the wishes and the status of the country they represent, and indeed the status of the job *vis-a-vis* other jobs. I cannot see how you can say that his living in the ambassadorial house is not giving him a house to live in, especially when his colleagues who are below him have extreme difficulty in paying a small amount for lesser accommodation. I am not sure I understand the logic of the Prime Minister's argument.

I want to raise another question. He said in his Second Reading speech that he had divided the Judiciary into the judges *per se* and the administration of the courts, if I understood him correctly, has now gone to the Registrar. I wish to be certain I understand him. The Estimates as they are outlined here, both the substantive Estimates and the Personal Emoluments, in essence deal only with the personal emoluments of the judges. Is it now that the Registrar is the Accounting Officer for the Judiciary? What is his administrative relationship with the judges.

Can the Prime Minister explain what he means when he says he has transferred the administration to the Registrar? Does it mean that the Registrar will be allocating the magistrates and these people, or will the Chief Justice still be doing this? Will it be a functional relationship or a line relationship? I am not sure how it is working, and I really want to be enlightened, because I want to raise some questions and there is no place under this Head to raise those questions. We will therefore have to raise those questions relating to how the Judiciary functions under the Registrar. I wonder if the Prime Minister would seek to enlighten us a bit more before we go any further.

One last question. I am not sure I understand why the Prime Minister leaves an S.1 in the Estimates. I would have thought that where there are anomalies, in the olden times, it seems to me that it is customary to vote the existing amounts so there should be a tally between S.1 and the emoluments appearing in the Estimates, so that even when subsequently you raise the level and you fix the classification, that is when you would come back during the year for the change. But if you do this, I think you should take advice from the Legal Department if, in fact, you can do this. We are actually voting for an amount which purports to be in conjunction with a certain statement in the Addendum to the Estimates, that is, the Personal Emoluments, but in fact that is not what we are doing.

I do not think that is correct. I think we should vote as if they were getting S, and subsequently when you have settled the matter, you come back in and you vote new amounts. In this way your Final Appropriation Act will not have any anomalies in it as far as this is concerned.

I think we would like to hear the Prime Minister on that before we go any further.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hope honourable Members will forgive me, because I know the lawyers love all this and I will lose track of what is going on.

The first point is this. It really does not matter what you vote or what you put in the Schedule of Personal Emoluments – you can only pay what the law allows.

Point Two. The subject "Judiciary" has been a little bit of football between the Office of the Prime Minister and the Office of the Attorney General. The

judges have – in my view, properly – often made submissions that, since they are appointed by the Prime Minister, they should be dealt with by the Prime Minister and the Governor-General. Indeed, their correspondence is always addressed either to the Prime Minister or the Governor-General. It had been difficult to accommodate the judges' stand in the past, because in the old days, when 'Judiciary' included the enforcement of Maintenance Orders abroad, to take an example, it was no place of the Prime Minister to worry about collecting $5 a week from a Barbadian who had gone to Florida to work on the sugar farms there. But all of this used to be in the subject, Judiciary, just because of the old classification.
6.35 p.m.

We have therefore had a reclassification of the subject so that the judges, their salaries, their terms of conditions and service, their travel, the utilities of the Chief Justice's house, their National Insurance contribution and their leave are all dealt with in my office. Indeed, I have said that the Accounting Officer is the Permanent Secretary in the Prime Minister's Office. I believe that in fact, the judges tend to operate not through the Permanent Secretary but through the Head of the Civil Service, so even there there is a very small dichotomy. I have separated the judges from the courts. This is the judges as personnel officers, occupying a constitutional position and the rest of the subject of 'Judiciary' has gone to the Attorney General. I am very glad. He is much more competent than the Prime Minister to deal with the enforcement of Maintenance Orders abroad and the other small files I think there are actually 122 files that were sent over to my office when the subject came back to me. Well, they have gone back now to the Attorney-General, and they will be found under Legal Affairs.

Honourable Members will notice that the name of the Ministry has changed. It is not now "Ministry of the Attorney General," it is Ministry of Legal Affairs, and the Ministry of Legal Affairs will now handle the legal affairs, but not the judges, as individuals, for the purpose of administering the Judiciary.

In relation to housing, what the honourable Member said, is well said.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member will give way. Who will look after then the physical arrangement for the judges? If a judge is not communicating with the Ministry of Legal Affairs, will he now write to the Prime Minister and ask the Prime Minister if he could get some airconditioning in his office, and the Prime Minister will write to the Minister of Legal Affairs and ask him or will the Registrar be dealing with all such matters and the judge will communicate with the Registrar.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, honourable Members know that I am not going to interest myself with the furniture in the judges' lodgings, the airconditioning and so on. Honourable Members know that the Registrar will deal with matters of that sort.

This will not be the only anomaly that exist. For years and years the magistrates used to complain that they had no control over the marshals in their courts. The Marshals were policemen and were under the general control of the Commissioner of Police. Magistrates have been known to tell the marshalls to arrest somebody, Mr. Elliot Mottley on one occasion, and the Marshal said, "Who me?", and so on. So the courts are familiar with divided authority.

On the question of the housing, the honourable Member's point is well made. As I said, I, myself, am inclined to the view that, for example, a soldier cannot really be asked to pay for the barrack accommodation. Indeed, many of them may regard it as more of a burden than a benefit. On the other hand, the honourable Member is perfectly correct in saying that officers below the rank of ambassador are asked, I believe, to pay a percentage of their salary for the accommodation they occupy. The matter will clearly have to be worked out.

One difficulty, however, is that if you charge the ambassador 10 per cent of salary, he will be out-of-pocket on what he now gets, and that will absorb the whole house allowance which he did not get before. So you will have to look at all of the equity of the situation.

Clearly, it is not necessary for the Chief Justice and Prime Minister to occupy the houses provided. They are free to occupy others if they so wish, but there are still abundant anomalies in that case. We are pensioned on the value of the house, whether we occupy it or not. The honourable Member for St. John draws a pension for the housing allowance that he, in fact, never got. He never drew the housing allowance, but his pension is as if he had drawn it. The whole matter is clearly fraught with anomalies, which will have to be ironed out and straightened in due course.

I would like to mention to the honourable Member for St. Michael West that the Prime Minister has never argued that he has to have a higher salary than anybody else in the country. Indeed, the salary that we are proposing for the Chief Justice is, in fact, higher than the salary that the Prime Minister now draws.

(Asides.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: My colleagues are suggesting to me that I should not think of myself but I should think of future occupants of the office.

But these are anomalies which will, in due course, have to be straightened out. I believe that honourable Members will understand that this is not a question of trying to scratch anybody's back. It is a question of trying to do away with this whole concept of paying a man to live in his own house, which is what all the Civil Servants used to get. Now that we have abolished that, you have to try to get rid of the anomalies associated with it.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words, if I am in order, about the condition of the courts where the judges operate. I do not know if the division of the responsibility will permit me to make it here.

(Asides)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I should wait until Legal Affairs? Okay.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to talk about the judges themselves. It would appear to me that a study of the courts and the administration of justice in most of the Commonwealth countries reveals that these countries should be moving from the position where judges' remuneration is based on terms similar to those of the normal Civil Service. One of the distinguishing features of the judges' remuneration in other countries is that they are guaranteed 100 per cent remuneration on retirement. And I am suggesting that this is the way that Barbados should move.

Under the old colonial system, a judge had to enter into an agreement not to practice within the same jurisdiction in which he exercised his judicial duties. Because of the abolition of the colonial judicial service, we have the position where a judge can return to private practice after he has left the Bench, and my own view is that there is nothing to prevent any of the present holders of judicial office in Barbados from returning and practising at the Bar after they have either resigned or completed their term of service as judges.
6.45 p.m.

One of the ways in which this problem has been dealt with in some Commonwealth countries is to guarantee a judge 100 per cent pension. A couple of years ago – probably no more than two to three years ago – the Government of New Zealand set up a very high-powered Royal Commission to enquire into the remuneration and the employment of the judiciary. After studying the precedence in the Commonwealth and elsewhere, they came to the conclusion that such an approach was to be preferred.

I believe that in Barbados a judge's pension is about two-thirds of his highest salary. I believe that there is one Commonwealth Caribbean country which has moved to the position of 100 per cent of salary as pension, and I wonder whether the Government has any plans to look at this problem.

In relation to the problem of housing, it seems to me that there will always be certain categories of persons within the administration, for whom houses must be provided because of the nature of the office which they occupy. Mr. Chairman, let me give you one example. I do not believe it would be fair to ask the Governor-General to pay a percentage of his salary towards living in Pilgrim's Place or the Governor-General residence. Likewise, I do not believe it is right that the Chief Justice or indeed the Prime Minister should be asked to contribute a percentage of salary towards living in a house which is provided by the State.

The reason why Prime Ministers have been singled out is because we politicians think that it would be popular with the public at large to argue the point that a Prime Minister is being given a house to live in free of cost. That is a false way to approach this problem. We can conceivably get a Prime Minister who is not in a position to have a house of a certain standard in keeping with his office, and there is no need why the State should not be asked to bear the reasonable cost of the three highest offices in the land being a public charge.

I cannot understand the immodesty and the fear on behalf of people to recognise that this is almost standard form in every country in the world that I know of. There is no way that President Reagan pays a percentage towards living in the White House, and, as I understand it, in most countries of the world it would be unreasonable to expect that this is being asked for. Why do we hesitate in the Caribbean to face up to the point and not try to educate the public that it is not the man's concern, but it is the particular office which you seek to make sure that you make proper living conditions available during the time that that person holds the office?

My plea to the Government is to begin to look at 100 per cent pension for the Judiciary and, secondly, to ensure that their living and other conditions are adequate in keeping with their office.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe that you can do with an extra supernumerary judge in the law courts. I know that we have provision to eventually move towards a Court of Appeal, and perhaps an independent Court of Appeal. At the present rate at which it is going, it is not reasonable to expect that before 1986 or 1987 we will be getting a Supreme Court building, and it seems to me that when one looks at the loads of the court that it is not unreasonable to have a supernumerary judge, who will be there to relieve the judges from time to

time and to assist in the work load which there is in the courts.

It is a figment of the imagination to assume, that the courts' work load has not increased. It has increased! I believe that judges are finding it difficult to get extra time to do the necessary research. They are not being provided with even research assistants who can assist them in this way, and I would strongly suggest to the Government, even ahead of bringing in the new Supreme Court Act, that it would be useful to create another post for the judges.

The other point I want to raise is that, having regard to the recommendations of the Cox Commission Report, I want to ask the Prime Minister, "When is it assumed that the changes will be made in the Constitution to revert to the position that existed prior to the 1966 changes in relation to the Judiciary?"

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, there are two short contributions I want to make. The first one, which is not of a substantive nature, is to enquire of the Minister if, because of the re-arrangement which has now taken place in the format of the Estimates where the judges are now separated from the rest of the administration of justice, there will be a decrease shown in the Estimates under the Head where the judges formerly were placed.

If the decrease is shown there, should not an increase be shown structurally in the Estimates under Head 11? Because when one looks in the appropriate columns of the Approved Estimates 1982–83 – whether increase or decrease – these columns are left blank. I am wondering if it makes any difference to the structure of the Estimates if the decrease is shown one place and the appropriate increase is not shown in another section.

The other very brief point which I would like to make relates to the actual functioning of the courts. It seems to me that a lot of time is wasted by the judges in writing notes in long hand from the evidence of witnesses who come before the courts, and I am wondering if the time is not appropriate when some assistance can be given to judges, perhaps in assisting them in the recording of evidence, either by the provision of steno-typists with the assistance of a tape recorder – one, or the other or a combination of both. It seems to me that a lot of time would be saved to the judges in speeding up the work which they have to do, and that might, to some extent, would relieve any need for any supernumerary judge, as the honourable Member for Christ Church West has pleaded for.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, let me now make the substantive point I wanted to make on this issue, and it follows what has been said by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central and the honourable member for Christ Church West. It is in some way a perennial statement by me, but I think it is necessary to make it anyhow.

The honourable Member talked about judges having to do their own research and my colleague just spoke about having to transcribe from their own notes. I really believe that the time has come in Barbados when our approach to the administration of justice can follow and attach itself to the other areas of advance which we have made towards the 20th century. I believe that judges should have either, collectively, one, or, individually, one each, but there ought to be available to the judges a trained lawyer acting as law clerk to the justices.
6.55 p.m.

I believe that what purports to be a tradition that precludes this from the thinking of countries like Barbados, operates to the detriment of the swift bringing about of justice. It really is not acceptable in 1983 to have a judge having to go into the library and pull down the law books, go through the cases, and read up the digest, and check to see whether the matter has been advanced since the last time it came before His Honour. I would not like to think, as it has been said in some other countries, that some judges operate to the level of their knowledge and, beyond that, they leave the rest to fate. I would like to feel that we wish our judges constantly to be competent and up to date.

(Mr. Chairman, do you think the Prime Minister is listening to make these notes?)

It is possible that the lawyers appearing before the bench would bring the cases and the update into the contemplation of the judge. But there are many times when a judge may have to go beyond what the lawyer present to him or her, and I believe the time has come for judges to be able to call on serious research in rendering their decision.

As we move more and more towards constitutional cases and the recognition that the written Constitution is going to be the basis on which a number of cases come before the courts, more and more it would be necessary for the judges to become *au fait* with what is happening. I have said this before. I said this a few years ago and I believe at the time the honourable Member for Christ Church West was the Attorney -General. He indicated his agreement at that time, but it does not seem as if the Minister responsible for the Judiciary can bring it within him contemplation to consider this.

I hope that although it is not included this year, that some consideration is being given to this matter. I believe that it will go some way towards improving the

quality of justice in the community, and I think that, perhaps, it would obviate the necessity of supernumerary or additional judge. But I do not put this as an alternative to that, because if, as the honourable Member says, the number of cases going before the courts have increased considerably, then that should be able to stand on its own merits.

I believe that what I have to say should apply whether we have one case or one hundred thousand cases. I believe that each person who appears before the courts in Barbados has a right to expect the highest possible quality of justice. And I believe that justice requires, in the last quarter of the 20th century, that decisions be properly researched.

I must say that those persons who are familiar with the West Indian reports sometimes look with a certain amount of consternation at the lack of research which appears in some of the decisions coming out of some of the West Indian courts. When one can compare the Jamaican and, to a lesser extent, Trinidad decisions, one sees a very high quality of scholarship in some of the decisions.

It is to the credit of Barbadian judges that, inspite of the difficult conditions under which they apparently operate, they have still been able to maintain their position at the level of quality. I do not know if we should continue to rest on their good laurels. I think we ought to do something to assist them.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to let the honourable Member, who has just spoken, know that I share his concern that the level of efficiency of judicial service in Barbados will slide, and slide drastically, if certain support services are not provided, and in the area of research, I believe very strongly and that assistance and support should be given to the Judiciary.

I am also very concerned at the moment with the amount of delay in the hearing and adjudication of matters that come before the courts. There are several cases that have been heard in the Supreme Court, and years have passed and decisions have not been given. I think it has a lot to do, not with the evaluation of evidence or argument that is presented before the court, but the fact that the judges either do not have the time or the inclination to do the type of research that is required to give a reasonable and scholarly judgment. So, he is speaking to the converted when he makes these points. I do want to make a brief reference to the point the Prime Minister has made over the, as he called it, "the football between the Ministry of the Attorney General, as it then was, and the Prime Minister's Office." There is a great overlap, and the bulk of the work and responsibility fall squarely in the lap of the Attorney-General.

If I am to make the type of contribution in the development of the efficiency in the judicial services in Barbados, as I am expected to make, there has to be a two-way understanding between the judges and the Attorney General. My difficulty, and this is why I feel somewhat reassured by the statement of the Prime Minister – I had not heard it before, was what I was smarting under the persistence of the rumour that if a particular judge does not want to deal with a particular Attorney General, the whole system is going to get messed up because of that. That is the sort of thing one was hearing and I was prepared when we get to the Head that I was responsible for, Head 28, not Head 11, to say exactly how I feel in relation to these things.

I am not going to be making out any case for judges, their services, conditions or assistance they need if I cannot communicate with them. It is as simple as that. I serve notice to everybody in that regard.

One of these days I will have to go before the courts and practice law again, and I know that it is a common thing for people who have to practise law to make nice sounding noises about judges to guard against the day when they have to appear before them. Nothing in my background has conditioned me for that kind of behaviour and I will have to take whatever I get when I go back to practise.

But it is important that I lay on the record that I can only operate within the confines of the responsibility that has been given to me. I have thought long and hard about this. I do not know precisely how the situation will evolve in time, but I certainly will do the best within the limits of my responsibility to work towards the efficiency in the law courts and the development of legal services in the interest of the public of Barbados. I have a responsibility to do that.

I read recently in the newspaper that prisoners were held in cells in Bridgetown for 72 hours, longer than they should have been held, because there was no magistrate at work in District A Courts. That is a situation that is completely untenable and one that I cannot easily countenance. I was not sure if I had gone to the Chief Justice and asked him about that state of affairs that I would not have been talking out of turn, and I was not sure either that if I had written the Chief Magistrate and asked him how come he had not allocated his staff to deal with these matters that I would not have been written back and asked what business it is of yours.
7.05 p.m.

I am hoping that with this new dispensation, the lines will become a little less blurred, and that one will be able to know within what parameters one is able to

operate in in the interest of Barbadians, who seek their rights in litigation before the courts of this country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The matter of the fifth judge is being pursued by the Government. I have already written to the Chief Justice raising the possibility. The Attorney General will advise on the matter of the Law Clerks in due course.

The question that Head 11 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 12 – PARLIAMENT – $954 588

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that Head 12 stand part.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in looking at this question of Parliament, there are a number of areas which Members on this side would wish to explore as far as this Head is concerned. I believe that it is time that we really take an in-depth look at Parliament, not at the level necessarily of facilities provided and so on, although that is important, but at the level of the very functioning of Parliament and the place of Parliament within the political institutions of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are debating the Estimates for Parliament. I do not believe that there are many Members in this House who actually saw the Estimates for Parliament before they appeared in this particular document that is before us, and I am very concerned about that, because in the least important statutory body in this country, the members of that statutory body actually shared in some way in the formulation of the Estimates relating to that statutory body. But here, we are in Parliament, which is one of the great independent institutions in this country, and the Members of Parliament itself, know very little, if anything, about the formulation of the Estimates of Parliament.

I think something is wrong, and we have got to try to rectify these matters. I think the time has come when we can no longer brush these things under the table, or under the carpet, but we have to bring them out in the open so that, once and for all, we can get the whole status of Parliament sorted out, and its particular role and function in our society. I am therefore calling for a complete restructuring, reorganisation and rethinking of Parliament, both in terms of its status as well as in terms of how we do business in Parliament.

We are supposed to have a committee system in Parliament. At the start of each Parliament we set up a number of committees. Some of these committees, Mr. Chairman, have not met at all during the last 12 months; in other words, since the last Estimates. Some of the committees which we have solemnly set up in Parliament have not actually held one meeting, and I believe that this is a very serious state of affairs when in the very Parliament which is supposed to be the great law making body, and which should be exercising and administering its business with the greatest efficiency possible, some of the committees that we have set up have not even met!

I am a member of some of these committees. I am a member of the Debates Committee, and I believe that committee has had about three meetings. I believe steps are being taken, and I will pay a tribute to the efforts being made by the Leader of Government Business – and I make no bones about that – for the measures he has been trying to take in order to bring some kind of vitality into that area. I believe he has tried; and I will say that from the Floor of this House.

But it still remains a fact that that committee system has not functioned adequately, effectively or efficiently over the past year. We have other committees in here, and we are going to have to do something about it, because year after year we go over the motions. We pass a certain amount of money, we establish these different bodies, but then the reality falls short of the theoretical bases on which we should be operating.

Let us take the question of the staff of Parliament. We have been talking about the regrading of certain posts in the Judiciary, but I must say that, as far as the staff of Parliament is concerned, there seems to be a dragging of the feet somewhere along the line as far as matters relating to the regrading of the staff of Parliament may be concerned. I do not know what are the factors contributing to that, but it is a fact that this very Parliament, the staff of this very Parliament, suffers, because, for one reason or another, the necessary regrading procedures are not working as speedily as they should. I think that is a shame! I think something is wrong when we cannot treat the very staff, which services the highest court in the land, with the kind of urgency that it should be given!

7.15 p.m.

Consider how we have been functioning! Let me give an instance of the kinds of problems that we have been having inside of this Parliament. The office of the top administrator in Parliament has been vacant, or declared vacant, or whatever, or however you want to put it, from time to time. We have gone through a number of Clerks of Parliament, and we are now into an acting situation. So when you get these kinds of changes in the very top administration posts in Parliament, I believe that it is indicative that something is wrong in the State of Denmark.

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Pay them more? I do not know. I am saying that something is wrong, because it has started from that very top position. We have had serious problems, and it percolates down, and part of our problem may be stemming from how we treat our staff in this particular situation.

I speak on this matter, Mr. Chairman, not only from the point of view of my responsibilities and my service on certain Committees in Parliament, but because I am a dedicated parliamentarian. And I believe, like you, Sir, that Parliament, being one of our prime institutions, should be serviced and should be considered with the utmost attention; it should be given the utmost attention and the utmost speed in deciding upon any issues which may be outstanding as far as Parliament is concerned.

I do not want to go into too much detail on these matters. I would wish to draw the attention of the House again, in terms of comparison, with what happens in the British House of Commons, because sometimes we believe that everything is well here, that we are doing all right, and that when matters are raised they are not fundamental problems.

I think that one of the major problems concerning this Parliament is that it does not have the kind of independence that a Parliament should have. I think that the Parliament of Barbados is too much bound up with the Executive in this country. Sometimes I have a feeling that Parliament is being treated as though it is another Government department, rather than being one of the independent institutions of this country. And the sooner that this Parliament negotiates its independence from the Executive, I think the better for this country!

I am not advocating any American-style Government, although I believe that we can do well to adopt some of the principles in the American system. I am talking about the British system itself, because about 1978, as far as I can recall, the British House of Commons found it necessary to establish a House of Commons Commission, not to investigate anything, but to take control of the entire staff of Parliament, of the pay and other matters relating to the staff of Parliament and all of the arrangements relating to Parliament. And that was after a former public servant, I believe he must have been a former Ombudsman, or whoever he was, had proposed a system which would have brought Parliament closer into the entrapment, let me put it this way, of the British Civil Service! But Parliament passed the House of Commons Administration Act in 1978, as far as my memory serves me, to ensure that Parliament itself has control over matters relating to Parliament.

We are supposed to be following what we call the Westminster model, or what we believe to be the Westminster model! But yet we continue to treat Parliament in a way that does not conform in essence to what prevails there or what is best for the Parliament of this country. And I am making a plea here, Mr. Chairman, that we must really get down, once and for all, to examining these matters, having them sorted out and giving the Parliament the kind of independence that it should have.

I may speak a little later in this debate. I believe that you are indicating that my time is up.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I think maybe this is going to be one of the shortest speeches that I have ever made in Parliament, I support almost everything that my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Sandiford) has said.

I will go on record and reiterate that we as parliamentarians have sold ourselves cheap to the public, and, therefore, we try to treat the institution in which we sit today equally as cheap. I support almost everything that you have said. In relation to the sentiments, the little rose, which you handed out to me, do not really expect, unless you are very deserving of it, that there is going to be any reciprocity.

Sir, I beg to move that you 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. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until Tuesday, March 15, 1983 at 10.00 a.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Deputy Speaker suspended the sitting accordingly.

7.25 p.m.

On Resumption:–

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

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

RESUMPTION OF HEAD 12 – PARLIAMENT

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just a few observations on Parliament. Last year I made a few critical remarks concerning the administration of Parliament, and I believe it is only reasonable in the circumstances that where some of those criticisms have been answered, one ought to take cognisance of them.

I would like to state that the quality of the reporting of the debates has improved since I last made comment on them. I wish, however, to draw attention to the anomaly which still exists where the young man who is performing the duties of Editor – and he is doing a creditable job in the circumstances – is still, as far as I understand, attached to the Printery. I believe that that creates an anomaly in the context of the authority of Parliament, because according to tradition and law, when Parliament speaks the Hansard is supposed to be a true reflection of what occurred, and only those officers attached to Parliament are authorised to intervene and/or interfere with the records of Parliament.

I wish to recommend, therefore, that the suggestion or recommendation made some time ago, that there be an Editor attached to Parliament, be followed through so we can regularise the position. If it is felt that there should be an Editor attached to the Parliamentary staff – and we have had enough experimentation now where we can have a definitive position on this – then provision should be made for such an Editor.

At the same time, I wish to draw attention again to the absence of the requisite number of persons for the smooth reporting of parliamentary debates. I do not believe that the staff of Parliament has been augmented sufficiently to allow for comfortable and easy reporting duty. As usual when I speak on this Head, on this particular subject, I like to remind that I, myself, have had some experience in seeing a system similar to this work efficiently and effectively in the United Nations' Secretariat, and I believe that the key to it is the quality and quantity of the reportorial staff which is available for the continuity that is absolutely necessary if the record is going to be correct.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that during the past year we voted a supplementary to take account of the need for a fifth reporter, and therefore I am not going to push that point, except to say this: I believe that if you have five reporters – and I hold no brief for any particular person attached to the staff of Parliament – I think that there ought to be provision made for a Chief Reporter. In all of these systems there is someone who is nominally or actually responsible for the reporting staff, for the allocation of that staff, for the supervision of that staff to the extent that it is necessary and/or desirable. I do not believe that the Clerk of Parliament ought to be burdened with, or is indeed capable of successfully dealing in entirety with the reportorial staff, and I believe that we ought to regularise the position in the reportorial staff.

I wish to say, notwithstanding the fact that the Speaker as Chairman is not with us, that the Debates Committee, Parliament itself, is going to have to regularise the line of authority within Parliament itself. During the last year or so there was an unfortunate incident, which I believe did nothing to maintain the integrity of Parliament, where the Clerk of Parliament, following what he believed to be the proper procedures concerning the recruitment of staff, was in the process of holding an examination, and someone walked in and brought the examination to a halt. The individual, a Barbadian citizen, had done no more than to make an application and to follow what seemed to be reasonable and normal procedures, and had come to take an examination for a post in Parliament.

It is not in keeping with what is dignified and what is desirable that anyone should be able to walk into an examination room, while an examination is going on, and bring it to a halt. I believe that Parliament must speak on these matters so that whomever it is that holds a position of trust and a position as a servant of Parliament will not come to feel that he or she is above Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, the dictates of taste require that I be no more specific in my remarks concerning this particular question, but I believe that it is wrong in the circumstances, and I hope that what I have had to say will fall on the right ears.

The other point I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, is that, so far as the position of the Clerk of Parliament is concerned, for some reason we seem to be having difficulty finding a permanent solution to the position of Clerk. I believe that we ought to restore the position of Clerk to its eminent position in the hierarchy of things. I do not believe that a person who becomes the Clerk of Parliament ought to have such a flimsy tenure that he or she is unable to see his or her role as a career role. I do not believe that we necessarily have to have a full-time Clerk, because the system has worked in the past with a part-time Clerk, and I believe the attempt to make this job a full time job may indeed have contributed to what was perceived by the Speaker as a diminution in the quality of the performance.

I do not like the idea that a Clerk of Parliament can be fired in the same way that a gardener can be fired, and I do not like the idea that a Clerk of Parliament should feel that he can be mistreated. I go no higher than that. A Clerk of Parliament should feel that he is holding a position of trust. He should be able to be impartial in his approach to his job. He should have no fear of the Members of Parliament or any officers of Parliament, and he should be able to protect his staff, of course, and himself, following the dictates of good taste and the requirements of Parliament in the traditions of Parliament. I do not believe that we ought to have the kind of *contretemps* or *impasse* which we have been exposed to from time to time during the last few years.

I know that it can be said that these are matters which ought to be discussed in Debates Committee, but I will make a declaration here. Unless the Debates Committee or any other committee of Parliament is being conducted in a manner commensurate with the recognition that Members of Parliament are adults, that they are persons representing the entire community, and that they are at the highest level of representation a person can have the honour to hold, because they are chosen by their comrades and colleagues and citizens, and therefore they are not to be pushed around like children in school, and primary school at that, I will not be seen in attendance. I believe that a presiding officer should recognise, and should be capable of recognising, that he is a colleague, that he is a guide, and that he is there when his colleagues will step across the border to bring them gently, and sometimes firmly back into line. But I will never be a child of anyone, and I do not believe any of my colleagues in this honourable forum should wish to be a child of any other colleague, elected in the same way.

I think it is high time that parliamentarians who sit in committees recognise that the behaviour in a committee is also part and parcel of what happens in Parliament. I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to carry this to a point of contention, so I will stop here because I believe most of my colleagues know of what I speak. I would like, finally on that particular issue, to hope that we as a group can transmit to each other certain concepts concerning behaviour in committee.

10.15 a.m.

I sit on the Public Accounts Committee, and when I can, I go to those meetings, and the exchanges which occur between honourable Members from that side and this side are courteous, they are civilized, and they have as a genuine goal the interest of the community, if one is able to gauge what that Committee does from its performance. I wish to say that that Public Accounts Committee behaves in that way, in my view, because of the guidance which it gets, and no doubt got, from the chairman who sits as chairman in Public Accounts Committee meetings of Barbados. That is the level and the standard at which Committees of this Honourable House should operate.

I remember once sitting on the Committee of Privileges, and I told my colleagues that I would never sit on that Committee again under that chairmanship, bearing in mind the manner in which the proceedings occurred. It had to do with when the then Leader of the Opposition was advertently put on television to make an apology to the nation. The circumstances were such that it was alleged and it was claimed that a *prima facie* case had been made out, and when we came to the proceedings in that committee, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that it made palm tree justice, tamarind tree justice, and all those kinds of phrases seem majestic compared to the manner in which honourable Members were treated on that Committee. It was a travesty on all that was good and proper concerning the democratic system which we have come to know and which we have come to expect. I told my colleagues that I would never go back under those circumstances and I, for one, would not sit on any committee where the members are treated like primary school children. I have said enough on that.

I wish to say that the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. CRAIG) has been making a valiant effort. I am not praising him. It is a statement of fact. I have no praise for him. It is a statement of fact. He is making a valiant effort to upgrade the standard and quality of the surroundings of Parliament and I believe that the atmosphere around Parliament is easier. I wish he would carry out his other duties with the same equanimity. But that is another story.

I wish, however, to draw his attention to a view which I have. I know that from time to time there has been an attempt to bring a certain rigour in the administration of the Gallery. It is a fact that those persons who come to sit in the Gallery of Parliament will not be as *au fait* with the requirements of Parliament as those of us who sit in the well. It is unlikely that the members of the public would know what is happening or what should happen unless they are told, and unless it is made abundantly clear to them, what the rules are. It is entirely possible for an innocent person to walk up those stairs, sit in that Gallery and, out of ignorance, find himself or herself on the wrong side of the authorities.

Now, it is true that we have a principle that ignorance of the law is no excuse, but there is no excuse for our not letting the people of Barbados know what is the standard of behaviour required in the Gallery. It is therefore our duty to publish and place in conspicuous places the requirements of the behaviour in the Gallery so that persons may not innocently find themselves on the wrong side of the authority.

It is embarrassing when you are sitting in the Gallery of Parliament to be thrown out when all, in fact, you might have done was to laugh – and you may be the one who was spotted finishing your laugh while others may have been responsible for the disturbance. It is somewhat like being in the classroom and you getting the punishment when somebody else actually performed. We are all aware and familiar with that. But I am saying that we all have a duty to publish for the public what is happening, why it is happening and why we wish to have a certain standard, so that persons coming into Parliament would know what to expect.

I also wish to ask this Honourable Chamber to reconsider for the future Standing Orders 75, 76, 77, and 78, where we have reposed, generally, the power of Parliament in the presiding officer. To the extent that it is exercised capriciously and whimsically, it does not satisfy the intention of Parliament, and I wish to suggest that at the appropriate time, in the same way that from time to time we have reviewed those rules, we should ourselves indicate what constitutes a reasonable standard for persons who wish to enter Parliament.

I do not believe that a person coming into Parliament with an exercise book has the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition or any other honourable Member, in any danger. I do not see if anyone walks into Parliament with a book that that should be seen as a mischief, or a missile which will be used as a weapon. The truth is, if any person in the public decides that one of the honourable Members in here should be eliminated, they are going to eliminate us anyhow; and if they want to do it spectacularly, they will not choose Parliament, because the Press cannot be spectacular in here.

I believe that we have a democracy and we have to preserve it on both sides. We have to ensure that those who are in the public do not go too far – and that is why we have the law – but we also have to ensure that any penalties and/or any sanctions we devise are themselves reasonable.

From time to time one reads in the newspapers that a particular journalist has been banned. I have never had the privilege on the Floor of this House of hearing why journalist A or journalist B has been banned. I believe that when that power is exercised the House should be brought *au fait* with the circumstances, either confidentially, if necessary, or openly. I do not believe that we as Members of the House ought to be reading in the newspapers that action has been taken against X or Y. And you cannot even confirm it! I believe the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is seized of these matters and therefore I do not think it is necessary to go any further down the road.

Finally, I want to make a suggestion concerning the actual publishing of the debates. I believe that only Parliament can make that decision, but when the debates are published you will see in Hansard Mr. Forde or Mr. Sandiford. When you read the Hansard and you are not familiar with Barbados, you do not know where Mr. Forde is from, you do not know where Mr. Sandiford is from. I believe that the parliamentary record would probably be more efficacious for at least the researchers if they are able to know that Mr. Forde is from Christ Church West and Mr. Sandiford is from St. Michael South.

10.25 a.m.

I do not think it would create any particular problem; I do not know of any tradition which it would cross: but it would not hurt, if you do not wish to do it each time a person speaks, if the first time the honourable Member enters the debate the constituency he represents could be included in the indicator that he is about to speak, so that it would then read Mr. St. John, Christ Church East Central etcetera.

Mr. Chairman, those are the only few remarks I wish to make at this time concerning Parliament. I thank you for your indulgence.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, there is a tremendous amount of good sense in the contributions made by the two honourable Members who have spoken so far in this debate on the subject of Parliament, and if I may say so, I believe that their speeches have not been at all made in a partisan vein, but in keeping with the very high tradition which has been noticeable in the Parliament of Barbados over the last fifteen years.

I think it is true to say that we have had an improvement in the level of representation and in the standard of debate in this Parliament, and I wish, before I follow through on a few additional suggestions to congratulate both the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. Sandiford) and the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. Taitt) on making some valid points which I think, if acted upon, could go a long way to improving the standard of the conduct of Parliamentary affairs and, at the same time, help bolster the maintenance of parliamentary democracy in our country.

I think that any debate on this subject must begin from the premise that parliamentary democracy as practised in Barbados is on the wane in most countries in the world. Yet, it is a very valuable asset. I always say, and my own subjective view is, that I have known of no other system of Government which has been evolved down through the centuries that could equal the system of Parliamentary democracy. It allows for dissent, it allows for pressure groups to express their views,

it places some sort of tremendous value on the individual and at the same time it gives the majority of people an opportunity, periodically, to change their Government if the Government is not performing satisfactorily in their view. Indeed, even when Governments have been performing satisfactorily, sometimes they are still changed, because the people may feel that they need new ideas or a new orientation. I think that anything we can do to preserve parliamentary democracy in this way is well done for the benefit of this island.

I think that the Government has taken a few steps that deserve commendation. I believe it is a tremendous improvement to have appointed a Minister with specific responsibility for Parliamentary Affairs (Hon. L. S. Craig), and who, at the same time, acts as Leader of the House. I have noticed, Mr. Chairman, an improvement in the level of consultation between the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who deals with parliamentary affairs on the side of the Opposition. In almost every case I think it has helped to improve the method with which we deal with the people's affairs.

I recognise that from time to time tempers do flare in the House, and there may be one or two occasions that you have a few, what I may call, personal remarks. But, by and large, the level of co-operation manifested between the Government and the Opposition within this Parliament had been, I think, a great improvement on what I have seen before. I want to congratulate both the present Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, in bringing a degree of maturity and a sense of the importance to the national interest in dealing with the day-to-day business of Parliament.

I think, however, Mr. Chairman, that there are some areas in which we can have improvement, as both honourable Members have seen. I would have expected that this Head of the Estimates would come under the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and not under the Ministry of the Prime Minister. I believe that if you have a Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, he must be given his own staff and he must be able to operate as a full-time Minister in the Government, placing the accent as it is in countries such as Canada on the importance of Parliament in the scheme of things. Therefore, I will strongly recommend to the Government that next year in the Estimates one should see an improvement where the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will be responsible for this vote, and he will act as the liaison between the Government and the Parliament in getting some consideration for what Parliament needs.

I wish to make this point, because I think it is a point that has probably escaped the notice of members of the Cabinet, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs also needs money! A lot of the things that we are asking for to improve Parliament cannot come unless there is a proper vote for Parliament as well as the capital grant for Parliament to improve the facilities of Parliament. There is no point having a Minister, who, obviously, is full of ideas, if he is not being given the tools to work with. And from the back bench I think I would be failing in my duty if I did not say that I would like to see the Government move a step further along the road in strengthening democracy and follow through on this initial step which they have taken and make the Minister into what I call a full-time Minister, with equal responsibility and money as compared with other of his colleagues in the Cabinet.

Sir, I am making the point because I believe it ought to be made, and made openly. I am not saying he is a part-time Minister, I am only saying that he needs money that he can carry out the programme which he has outlined to this House. I am not satisfied from looking at the Estimates that he is being given the money which he deserves for that purpose.

Let me highlight some of the things that I believe we have noticed in this House and in the Parliament that escapes the attention of the public. Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that the standard of Parliamentary debates has improved considerably. I have listened to debates from the side of the Opposition as well as from the side of the Government and I have compared these with debates in Parliaments in the United Kingdom, in Canada, in the United States, in Russia, wherever you want, and I believe that the Barbados Parliament has within its members people as equal to, and in many cases better than, the Parliaments in many of the other developed countries of the world. I believe that we as parliamentarians have nothing to be ashamed of in the standard of our understanding of regional, international and national affairs, and our debate on these matters, be they social, political or economic.

If you listen to the honourable Member, let us say, for St. Michael East (Hon. D. G. Blackman) or indeed the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, (Dr. Haynes), although one does not always agree with his point of view, you will find a standard of debate that is exceptional. When it comes to the use of the English language and point and counter-point in debates, I think the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. Sandiford), has very few rivals. When it comes to someone with a breadth of vision of world affairs, economic matters, anything from the environments if you will to the most recondite views on scientific matters, there are very few who can rival the right honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams). When you come to the breadth of vision again and

maturity and experience, I believe that there are very few people in the Commonwealth who can equal the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow).

This country ought to be proud of its parliamentarians. There is too much attack. We, to a large extent, have been responsible for it. There is too much attack in putting down ourselves, when in actual fact parliamentarians have been contributing significantly to raising the level of debate on public affairs in this country.
10.35 a.m.

I believe that the calibre of the representatives, the experience of the representatives, their depth of knowledge and their educational standard has risen considerably from past Parliaments. I believe that Members are now paying greater attention to constituency matters than we used to do in the past. I think that at this time you can see several Members in their constituencies regularly, and they are making themselves available for consultation.

Sir, the debates. I believe that we ought to congratulate the Government and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs for the fact that the debates are now published regularly and are now out within a couple of days of debates in this House. The public now has no excuse for not knowing what goes on in the Parliament of Barbados. I think that in this regard we are singular in the Caribbean. It is something that escapes the notice of the public from time to time. I wish to congratulate the Minister on having followed through, along with the Minister of Information and Culture (Senator N. A. Barrow), on this project and seeing that we have successfully accomplished this project. It is one of the things that I know the right honourable Prime Minister was very keen on when he was the Leader of the Opposition. He and the Speaker would often speak on this subject, and it has been accomplished within the life time of this Government.

I say, however, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is room for improvement, and I could not agree more with what has been said by the two honourable Members who have spoken before me. The physical facilities of this Parliament are not in keeping with what we would expect of Barbados with a parliamentary tradition of some 350 years.

I think that if one looks around at the physical conditions available to the staff of Parliament, they are almost sub-standard. I do not know of how many Members who take the opportunity to go into the room where the shorthand reporters work. Sometimes the sizes of the cockroaches running through that area of Parliament are unbelievable – in circumstances where they are probably eating their food at the same table on which they are working. There are no adequate facilities for the female members of staff far less the male members of staff. I believe, that there is not even a sick bay available within this Parliament for these persons who are working here in Parliament sometimes long hours.

This can only be remedied by money being made available to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and I am asking that the facilities for the staff of Parliament be upgraded within this financial year, because I think that they are unbearable as they stand at the present moment.

And so too are the facilities for Members of Parliament! We have begun by making some attempt at trying to improve the facilities that exist, but it is difficult to really entertain – I do not mean in the sense of the drinks or anything of the sort – to see your constituents at this Parliament is almost impossible.

If you go to Ontario, you will find that every Member of the Provincial Parliament of Ontario, far less the Federal Parliament, has available to him a room – sometimes he shares it with another Member – in which he can see his constituents and other Members of Parliament. There is a secretary available to every three Members of Parliament so that you can deal with their complaints immediately.

Here, there are no secretaries available. If you want to do anything, to move even an amendment to a Bill, you are at a loss. The facilities for research are totally lacking. The library is in a deplorable state. The honourable Member for St. Michael South and I sat on a Committee and dealt with Mr. Land, I believe, from the Canadian Parliament on this matter, and a report is available. Yet nothing has been done to deal with the facilities available for research. How can a parliamentarian do his work properly if these facilities are not available to him?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two more minutes.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, you are going to have to give me a couple more minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can speak again.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I want to move on to the question of the Constitution, because Parliament is important. The Government gave an undertaking in its Manifesto that it would have a full debate on the Cox Commission Report. I believe that we are far enough in this Parliament that the Government must honour that commitment. There is no point having appointed a commission, having had the Commission's report and leaving it button holed without this Parliament looking at the matter to see whether or not there

can be a consensus or means of improving the Constitution under which this country is governed. And I am sure that there may be areas of difference between the Democratic Labour Party and ourselves, but I am sure there are several areas in which we will get consensus, and we may well get ideas to improve on the recommendations of that commission.

I want to touch on the question of integrity of Members of Parliament. I was flabbergasted to hear a former Senator, the Rev. Hatch, say that the Senate dealt with the Integrity legislation by doing nothing, so that the legislation could die.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all politicians suffer from allegations of corruption from time to time. The longer you are in Government, the more reckless are the allegations that you hear from Parliament. I still contend that it is in the interest of parliamentarians and in the interest of the Government that there should be a proper Integrity Commission. Even if the Draft Bill which we had brought down did not meet with total acceptance, the Government should again look at bringing a White Paper on this issue and get a bi-partisan view to come up with proper legislation for our own protection on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, time has run out. I intend to speak again. I hope the Minister will not reply because this is an area that I believe ought to be ventilated very strongly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make two short points. The first concerns the topic touched on by the honourable Member who just sat down and that is the facility of the library. There are some of us who would like to bring some serious approach to our parliamentary affairs, and in the absence of a functional library, it is very difficult.

There is also a little problem, which, I believe, can be solved by some administering instructions, and that can go a far way towards assisting us in our research. This relates to non-confidential material which is not yet published.

I will tell you what I mean. I was seeking to do a comparative analysis on housing starts etc., but the Housing Authority reports are only up to about 1979. The information is available. I do not think that it is confidential information, but it seems to me that the people who work in these offices have some type of fear about releasing the information.

I will give you an example of what I mean. Only this morning, I sought through the appropriate authority at the National Housing Corporation to get the number of houses completed over the last couple of years. I identified myself, and the manager admitted that the information is available, but he said things are so funny, he does not know if he can release it, and will I call him back after he had spoken to his Permanent Secretary.

What I am saying is that if there is some administrative arrangement where parliamentarians can have access to information that it not confidential, but not yet in booklet form, it will assist in the updating of your information and it will also assist in alleviating a very serious problem – something that I have heard mentioned here – the attempts of parliamentarians to get information from Ministries in a back-hand way. This has happened in the past and is likely to happen in the future if the information cannot be made available to you when you ask for it.

10.45 a.m.

I am asking the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, since he is the person, I think, who would have to bring it up, if as an administrative arrangement offices can be made aware of the fact that information that is not confidential, but not yet in report form, can be made available to parliamentarians, if they identify themselves properly. This would assist us in doing our work in Parliament and assist us in giving better standards of debate.

Thank you, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would just like to say something about the point made by the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin), a sound point, as so many that has come from that honourable Member.

I am very disappointed that he has had this difficulty with the National Housing Corporation, but his premises may not be entirely correct, because he said that the information is available. I wonder how far that is true.

One of the greatest difficulties the Government has had is obtaining accurate figures as to housing starts. You see, for a great many years in this country – I am talking about 20 or 25 years – the Government has interested itself only in the Housing Corporation and what the Housing Corporation was doing for housing. Nobody has ever paid any serious attention to private housing activity. Nobody therefore knows with any accuracy how many housing starts there have been in this country over the last 25 or 30 years.

I have had a great deal of difficulty with the Town Planning Department in trying to persuade it to prepare accurate figures of housing starts in the country. All kinds of bureaucratic excuses have been given to me. I have even

tried to make it a matter of discipline, and discussed it with the Chief Town Planner himself, with threats that if the department could not prepare accurate plans for housing starts, I would have to ask the Public Service Commission to consider how far the department was inefficient within the meaning of the General Orders. It has gone to that length.

So it is not only the honourable Member for St. Philip North who cannot get figures on housing starts, the Prime Minister has great difficulty getting them too! I have difficulty getting them because of the lack of cooperation, in some cases of persons, whose duty it is to co-operate in providing statistical information about the nature of their work.

The most reliable source in printed form that the honourable Member can find on housing starts will not be in the reports of the National Housing Corporation, they will be found in the annual economic reports which I lay in Parliament. Those reports make estimates on the basis of the number of new electricity connections, the number of new waterworks connections, the Housing Corporation itself, and such information as is available from the Town Planning Department.

What we are in fact doing at the present time, is insisting that a Certificate of Compliance has to be obtained from the Town Planning Department before a new house can have its utilities, and therefore the Town Planning Department will obtain the information really on housing starts, because, theoretically, you will not be able to start building until you have the certificate that you are starting. Whether this will help, I do not know, but I remember on one of the occasions of quite exceptional strictures that I offered officials of the Ministry of Housing, which then embraced Town Planning, they sent me an enormous document which I seem to remember calculated housing starts on the basis of 11 different indicators; some waterworks, some electric, some town planning and so on – and each one gave a different result.

There is no doubt that in this country there is more housing being built, not less, than the official statistics ever show, because we have not yet mastered the means of measuring the conversion of a chattel house into stone. There is no system that I can think of, except one eventually proposed by the Town Planner, can measure that. The system the Town Planner recommended was that we ask the public health inspectors physically to count the houses in every district ever so often. Theoretically it is a good measure, but it will break down on the basis that the public health inspectors do not always go to the districts that they are supposed to. There are sufficient numbers of charges against public health inspectors before the Public Service Commission, of making false returns and never going near the districts where they are supposed to be working, for us to be doubtful about any statistics obtained through that method. Nonetheless, we are trying to produce the statistics accurately.

If honourable Members think that in 1979, which appears to us to be the year of maximum house building or house conversion recently, the statistics were overstated, honourable members.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are still on Parliament really.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will come back to it.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Parliament has two houses).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Honourable Members will be interested to know that in that year the official return of the number of houses being built in St. Michael was 16. If anybody believes that in 1979 only 16 houses were built in St. Michael, they ought to have their heads examined.

The point raised by the honourable Member (Mr. W. O. Franklin) was not directly a point on housing. it was a point on information. The Government still stands by the doctrine enunciated some years ago by Mr. Cameron Tudor, that any Member of Parliament is free to engage any public officer during working hours in conversation about those parts of his duties which may be published. I will, however, draw to the attention of honourable Members that the Official Secrets Act is very restrictive in its permission to give out information to members of the public, even to Members of Parliament, and that some public officers, without meaning to be impolite, may be hesitant about supplying Members of Parliament with information that they are not sure is freely to be communicated to members of the public.

It is not only members of the Opposition, it is also members of the Government, and I quite frequently get a request from a Permanent Secretary to be allowed to supply information to a Member of Parliament. I am fairly sure I have had I think more than one request from public officers to be allowed to supply information to the honourable Member for St. Philip North. I can recall requests to supply information to some Senators. But this, of course, is the proper action to be taken by a public officer if he is doubtful.

What I would not like to see is public officers having a private line to members of the Opposition and supplying them with information without making a record in the department that such information was supplied. I would remind public officers, and officials of the Central Bank also – we are reviewing the application

of the Official Secrets Act to the Central Bank – that great mischief can be caused by seeking to play politics and seeking to assist Members of Parliament, be it in the Opposition or on the Government side, by supplying private information, particularly of a financial nature, particularly related to Town Planning and related to other things. Sometimes the danger is political, sometimes the danger is financial, but I think public officers should be very careful indeed. (At the moment, the Royal Barbados Police Force has a matter being prepared for reference to the Director of Public Prosecutions relating to a breach of the Official Secrets Act).
10.55 a.m.

I will remind honourable Members that it is as much an offence to receive information as to be supplied with it, and I will remind honourable Members that the expression "retained information" used in the Official Secrets Act is so widely defined that the Deputy Prime Minister and I could not believe our eyes, when we, in the company of the Head of the Civil Service, observed that just to make a copy could amount to retaining, which is an offence carrying, I believe, a number of years imprisonment. Subject to these circumstances, any Member of Parliament is free to ask a public officer for assistance with information which will enable him to discharge his duties as a Member of Parliament.

The information is not intended to be given as any secret, it is intended to be openly given. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is free to ring me and ask me what the foreign reserves stood at on any given day, he can ask me what is the most recent figure for the Net Domestic Assets of the Central Bank, he is free to ask me all these questions. He really does not have to embarrass any public officer or official of the Central Bank by asking him or her any questions relating to the performance of the economy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Christ Church West.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the point of integrity but the point about making information available to Members of Parliament was, I believe, one of the promises in the 1976 Manifesto of the Government, and I am glad to hear that they are making some progress, or about to make some progress, in making information available to Members.

There are two areas that I would like to highlight. One is to make more use of Committees of Parliament to suggest and improve legislation and the other is to associate ordinary Members of Parliament with the machinery of Government. I believe the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) spoke on the former point last night.

Let me say that, certainly in the period 1976–81, there were significant bits of legislation that were discussed in Select Committee. I recognize that there were one or two occasions when the Opposition said that they did not wish to sit on that legislation, particularly the legislation dealing with integrity and the Emergency Bill. My own view is that even although the Opposition may disagree and put in a minority report on parts of the Bill, that it is in the interest of proper parliamentary Government that that type of legislation, particularly where it is controversial, should have the benefit of the public at large as well as the benefit of the Members of Parliament on both sides.

Now, in regard to associating ordinary Members with the machinery of Government, I believe that we still, as a Parliament after 350 years, leave a lot to be desired. There were occasions again in 1976–81 when one or two Papers, particularly on aspects of foreign affairs, were made freely available to both the Opposition and this side. But one sees too little of that!

It is virtually impossible for the ordinary Member of Parliament, be he in the Opposition or in the back bench, to get information and to understand what is going on. I believe that is why we find on some occasions that some Members may take to asking one or two civil servants, who may either be sympathetic to their party or something, to get hold of a document and make it available to them. I do not believe that that is the way it should be . Any time a request was made when I was in a Ministry to the Ministry and it came to me, I said, "Of course, give the information."

The Official Secrets Act is an outdated piece of legislation. A lot of the information that civil servants, or Ministers for that matter and Government think they have to hold to their breast is no longer really worthy of being held to their breasts, because there is nothing secret at all about it. I always recall the case where the late Sir Garnett Gordon once asked Mr. William Demas, who was then working in the High Commission for the Federation, not to give out certain bits of information. That information was printed in the *Financial Times* on the same day and he really was not aware of it.

I think we regard too much information as though it was secret, when there is really no secret about that information, and I think that the public and Members of Parliament deserve to have much more information. And in fact, sometimes it is to the credit of the Government to give out information!

I can say that the Government has been doing extremely good work in some areas, but is suffering from the lack of publicizing the work in an objective way, Ministers seem to shy away from going on television. I

believe the Prime Minister is a notable exception in this respect – his Press conferences are informative – but these days one regrets to see that that sort of information is not being given out as it ought to be.

Mr. Chairman I was speaking on the issue of integrity and morality in Government, I said that the last Parliament passed a Bill which died because it was deliberately killed in the Senate, particularly the independent members of the Senate.

Now, it is a fact that this country always gets rumours of corruption, true or untrue. Parliamentarians and politicians, above everybody else, suffer viciously from attacks, many of which are unfounded, and to me it seems very short-sighted of Members to believe that we should not continue with proper legislation dealing with disclosure of financial assets and liabilities.

It is true that the Bill that came down probably did not meet with the full support of the Opposition. That is no reason why we should not make a second start, perhaps this time by way of a Green Paper to get the maximum amount of consensus. But it is not in the interest of politicians to continue to believe that we can hide behind a so-called non-disclosure position – to finally find ourselves being attacked sometimes completely incorrectly, on the grounds of corruption.

Everybody believes that if you are a politician, you are a thief, you are hiding something, you are doing some deal – and it is one of the things that eventually will run decent people out of public life. But we, to a large extent, have ourselves to blame, for it, because some of us plant the seed, the blame and the rumours ourselves. We refuse to deal with the matters as they are dealt with in many Parliaments of the world, and I regret very much to hear that a person such as Rev. Hatch, who was Deputy Chairman of the Senate, can boast that they made haste slowly in order to kill a Bill that passed through the Legislature.

I hope that Government will see fit to honour the 1976 promise which it made and that there will be no fear in the Cabinet to come forward again with the legislation. I intend to speak out on it every time I get an opportunity, because I cannot believe that the Government, the Barbados Labour Party, can promise a matter in 1976, allow independent Senators to kill it in the Senate, and lack the guts to come forward with the legislation again, even if they do not bring down the Bill in the same form in which it was brought down.

I personally am in favour of the Bill. I have said so, both within my Party and publicly, and I think it is about time that this country gets in step with other countries on this aspect of the matter. Trinidad is coming with it now. Are we going to wait until we get an O'Halloran situation in order to bring it?

11.05 a.m.

I will bring it as a Private Members' Bill. If the Attorney General says he does not want to bring it, I will bring it as a Private Member's Bill and let the Government vote against it. But I cannot understand a Government promising it in 1976 and now telling me they do not want to bring it before the House. That is the position.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not care whether it is a new Government in 1981. They said they are continuing the position and it is about time that it should come forward. The honourable Member can express his views. I do not know if he has anything to hide; I do not know if anybody has anything to hide; but why should the Government be afraid to bring forward integrity legislation?

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Prime Minister says that the Government is not afraid. Well, bring it if you are not afraid for it! I strongly support my party, but I must also tell the party that there are areas where I think we should stick to what we have promised the public.

I want to deal with parliamentary privileges. The right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) has the habit of misleading the public into thinking that parliamentary privileges are there in the Act in order for parliamentarians to curse the public at large. There is no Parliament in the world, that I know of, which does not have some rule dealing with the privileges for freedom of speech within the Parliament. And if that is the view of the Democratic Labour Party, it is a misguided and stupid view to be advanced at all, and it is against parliamentary democracy, in any respect, to say that you should skit the whole Parliamentary Privileges Bill!

What is needed, Mr. Chairman is that the Chair – not yourself or any present incumbent – should exercise control when there are attacks on individuals and people in their personal capacity, and we should comply with the rules. But it is a mistaken view to make the public of Barbados believe that you do not need parliamentary privileges, and if the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) was not really campaigning to try to get back the Government, he would not give this view at all. But, again, there are politicians and politicians. Some people must say whatever they think in that way because they believe they are getting votes for it. Some of us have a little bit more candour and will express our views on these sort of matters.

The last point I want to make, Sir, is on the question of the Rules of Parliament. I believe the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford)

spoke about this. There should be an ongoing exercise in relation to the Rules of Parliament in order to improve them. It is obvious that the rules as they stand are not the ideal rules that we can use. There are several precedents in the Commonwealth, particularly in areas like Canada, and there is no reason why a bi-partisan Committee could not look at these rules in order to improve debates and to cut out personal references that you frequently get from one another in this Parliament and improve the standard of debate in Parliament.

Sir, if I have spoken strongly on one or two issues, I still want to end up as I began. I believe that there has been positive steps taken by the Government during its tenure of office to improve the level of parliamentary debate. I believe that both sides of this Parliament, and of the past Parliament, have shown that they have the capacity to debate properly and to put forward, no matter we may not agree, different points of view without rancour and with the highest standard of integrity that we can find in our country.

I believe that our debates rival and reach the height in any Parliament that I know in any part of the world, and Parliament should not be frightened of telling the public that we do a reasonably good job in trying to put forward the public's interest in this House, even although we do not at times seem together on other points.

I believe there are areas for improvement, and I think we should not shirk away from those areas. We should be prepared to debate the areas among ourselves and to take the public into our confidence, because in the long run, this country can only survive outside of dictatorship, be it military dictatorship or personal dictatorship, if this Parliament and parliamentary democracy are maintained at the highest level.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my support to the honourable member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) in urging the Government to honour the many election pledges which they made in 1976 and which they subsequently reneged on. I believe that that particular request goes to the heart of democracy in Barbados, and indeed, coming from the honourable Member, I now begin to understand why it is that he could no longer associate himself with the present Administration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Deal with Parliament now.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On the question of Parliament, Sir.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of elucidation, the honourable Member (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is absolutely mistaken that I cannot associate myself with the present Administration. I completely support the Government. When I disagree with the Government, I will say so, without fear or favour, either within the party or publicly, but I support the Government 100 per cent, so he can be in no doubt about that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I understand. He supports by disagreement. To continue, Sir, on this area of information in relation to Parliament, I sometimes wonder how it is that major legislation can come before this Parliament and the last people to see the piece of legislation would be members of the Opposition and the backbenchers on the other side. For example, when the Companies Act was being introduced, we heard that it had been seen by all sorts of people in Barbados but the last people to have the opportunity to look at that legislation was the legislators in Parliament themselves. I believe that when you get legislation of that kind, perhaps it might be desirable, when the Bill reaches a certain point of drafting, to let Members of Parliament have a look at it and perhaps make some kind of input before it comes up for final debate within this Chamber.

I would issue a note of caution to civil servants in relation to giving information to Members of Parliament, because many of them listening to the honourable Prime Minister might decide tomorrow morning to pass on a piece of unclassified information to a back bencher and then might find themselves fired the following day. I would rather urge them to make sure they get ministerial clearance before they take such action, because I know the extent to which the Central Bank Officers have been harassed on the assumption that they give me information, although I have said again and again on the Floor of this House that the only officer in the Central Bank whom I know personally is the Governor of the Central Bank himself.

I know for a fact that officers in the Ministry of Finance have been harassed on the grounds that they gave me information, and the only two people in the Ministry of Finance whom I know happen to be the Minister of Finance and the Director of Finance and Planning. So if anyone has given me the information, it has to be the Minister of Finance himself. I would not put it beyond the Minister of Finance to be passing on the information to me.

I go even further. I happen to know that an officer based in Washington has been harassed by the honourable Prime Minister on suspicion that he passed information to me, although that particular officer campaigned violently against me in the St. George by-election and supported the Barbados Labour Party. The last person that he would pass information to would be me.

11.15 a.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we should say in Parliament that a

civil servant is harassed by the Prime Minister unless you are prepared to say a little more than that. We do have rules about these things. That the statement is false, goes without question. Nobody expects that the honourable Member (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is telling the truth.

I do not even know the officers in Washington, except for Mr. Skeete the Ambassador, and Mr. Charlie Hinds, the Tourist Board representative. I do not think that I can name the others, far less harass them. I certainly had no talk with them. I really do not think that the honourable Member should make these unwarranted and unjustifiable charges. It is an abuse of the very privilege that the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) was just referring to. I am glad to hear that there are officers in the Embassy in Washington who have the good sense not to be deceived by the honourable Member in his electoral attempts.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To continue, Sir. On the question of Committees of Parliament, I believe, particularly looking back on the type of debates that we have been having in here over the past 12 months and the quality of debates, that we need to establish in this Parliament a permanent Select Committee on Science and Technology. I would be very happy to sit on it. I remember the high standard of the sugar debates that took place in this Parliament last year, and to really understand what was going on in those debates, it would be necessary to understand a lot about sugar technology. To participate in such debates in a meaningful way, there must be a body of information available to both sides of Parliament, and such a committee that could sit from time to time, and probably invite the experts in the field.

For example, let us say that we are concerned about an increased fibre content in sugar cane, or reduced yield in the amount of juice, or why there has been a fall off in the sugar yield per acre over the years. We should be able to have the experts come up and discuss these matters with us. So, over a time, you would get a sufficient body of information in Parliament so that you can really deal with these matters in a constructive manner. The same thing relates to Health, to Education, and to Housing. If you do not really understand the technology of housing, how can you really make a meaningful input? The whole thing impinges on every aspect that you can think about in terms of development of housing in Barbados.

That kind of information must be available to parliamentarians, and the only meaningful way in which I can see it can be widely disseminated is if such a permanent Select Committee on Science and Technology is established in this Parliament. The findings of that Committee could then be disseminated to all Members so that you will get more and more information being fed to Members. It is a form of self-education among parliamentarians themselves, and in this way, you will be able to improve and make a greater input on the whole question of the solutions to the problems facing this country.

I will never cast my vote for another guarantee of any loan in this Parliament unless the honourable Minister of Finance brings out all of the information. I have not checked whether I have voted for a particular guarantee or abstained, but I was shocked to discover that we voted for the guarantee in this Parliament and that the covenants, which were an integral part of the guarantee, were never brought to this House. And it is only when they had to be brought before another tribunal that you realized that you might have cast your vote in a situation where you did not know what was really going on!

So under no circumstances again, not even if you come in here with a guarantee for one penny, will I vote for it unless I hear everything. I want to see the details of the information. It is nothing secret. You, yourself, have just said, and I agree with the honourable Member for Christ Church West, that a lot of the information which is supposed to be covered by the Official Secrets Act is information that can be made available to everybody. The Act perhaps is too wide in its application at the moment, and when you come asking parliament to guarantee large sums of money, it is important that all of the information be made available to parliamentarians so that they know exactly what they are voting for or against.

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. Haynes were ordered to be expunged from the record by the Chairman at this stage.

11.25 a.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You may continue your speech.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was really coming to the end of my speech when I got on to the area of freedom of speech in Parliament, and I think that every effort should be made to reinforce the principle that Members should be free to express their views in Parliament.

I believe that one of the reasons why there is an Amenities and Privileges Bill is because, from time to time, in the interest of society, statements made have to be made in Parliament which may not meet the kind of quality of proof which would be required in a court of law. However, it is important that that particular privilege should not be abused by anyone, otherwise we may find ourselves in a situation where the society and people who are not Members of Parliament might find themselves subject to attacks and only have the kind of recourse

which they would normally have if the remarks were made outside.

I enjoy speaking under your distinguished chairmanship.

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

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I will not worry to go into the usual debate about the lack of proper facilities in this Honourable Chamber. Since I have been here I have heard that from many Members on both sides of this House, and we have been given the assurance by the Government that in the very near future, as soon as the Post Office moves from downstairs, that the facilities in Parliament will be upgraded.
11.35 a.m.

In my view, Parliament must be upgraded, because even research material is difficult to come by. On occasions when Members on the other side have been speaking and I have called for debates that go back 3, 4, 5, 7 years, it has taken me an hour to get them. And by the time I have secured the information, I can no longer speak, because we are dealing with a different Bill! So one would have to anticipate what the Opposition spokesman will say, and do the research beforehand, to be armed in order to answer him when he speaks! I believe that it is true for all Members of Parliament, perhaps with the exception of the Members of the front bench who sit in privileged positions.

On the parking facilities, I need not say that there are days when you come here and it is impossible to find a place to park your car. The general comfort of the House certainly must be upgraded.

The point which I would like to raise is in relation to the Deputy Speaker. Since His Honour the Speaker has been ill, the Deputy Speaker has been acting in his place. I am wondering if any provisions have been made in these Estimates to ensure that the Deputy Speaker be paid the salary retroactively from December 1982, when the Speaker took ill. I do believe that he is functioning well, and he is entitled to be paid for the job which he is doing. I just thought I should toss that out because it is an item which I believe Government should look at.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) stated that people at the Central Bank and the Ministry of Finance and Planning have been harassed for giving him information. I do not think that is true.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order! I never said that anyone was harassed for giving me information. I said they were harassed by the Prime Minister because it was felt by the Prime Minister that they gave me information and that is not correct.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Thank you for the clarification. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central knows only too well that I would not likely misrepresent him. The point is that his information is always so inaccurate that I find it inconceivable to believe that the Prime Minister would go out of his way to be critical of someone within his Ministry.

From time to time, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central gets into this Honourable Chamber and makes speeches, he speaks for a very long time. As a matter of fact, I have had to comment on many occasions that never before in this House have I heard a person speak for so long and said so little as when the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has spoken on many occasions. But what worries me, Mr. Chairman, is the fact of the lack of information and I believe that I speak for members of the Opposition as well as members of the back bench. It is virtually impossible to get accurate and up-to-date information if you want to come into this Chamber and make a contribution on any Bill.

If you call a Ministry, you find that the Ministry officials hide behind the Official Secrets Act, and I agree with the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) that that Act will have to be looked at seriously. If you call a Permanent Secretary or a high official in the Ministry and ask a simple question, they are afraid to answer. I would like to assume that they are afraid. I would hate to think that there are members of the Democratic Labour Party and are refusing to give me the information, so I assume that they are afraid to give the information.

I have been in the position where I have called the Central Bank and asked "What was the inflationary rate last year," and been told, "That information is unavailable to you." When I asked why not, I was told, "We cannot give out this sort of information." My view is that as a representative of the people, selected by the people to come to this august Chamber and make contributions to Bills that will affect the lives of the people, I am entitled to have information.

The difference between making a good speech and no speech at all is information. That is all it is. You do not have to be an Island Scholar to get up in this Honourable House and make good speeches. As a matter of fact, there are Island Scholars who get up and make bad speeches, make a fool of themselves, where you will get ordinary members from both sides sticking to the point that they would like to drive home and making a very valuable contribution.

On the matter of inflation, I have asked what course are we going to adopt, because there are several approaches that several countries use. Are we going to adopt the average approach when arriving at inflation or are we going to adopt the December to December approach. I have been told, "I cannot give you the answer to that question."

I am not an economist, Mr. Chairman. I can only get information if it is available by way of public records or if I have access to some Government institutions, and when I say so, I mean as a Member of Parliament. Members of the Opposition as well as members of the Government on the back bench and Senators in the Other Place complain of the same thing, the general lack of information. I believe that debates in the House of Assembly would improve tremendously if Members were able to understand what they were dealing with, rather than coming in here and casting aspersions and making wild innuendoes because they lack the facts.

If I ask the question "How much does the Spring Garden Road cost today, and when will it be completed?", I cannot get an answer. What about the St. Barnabas Highway? What is the projected time for the completion of such a highway? To date, how much money has been spent and how much more money is expected to be spent between now and completion? I cannot get any information, so when there is a debate in here on the Estimates, how can I be expected to make a contribution that is significant if I cannot get the information.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West referred to the Leader of the House as "a part-time Minister" and said that he really should not be blamed for being a part-time Minister .....

Asides

Mr. A. TRUSS: You will get your time to talk. The part-time Minister is here to represent himself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please, please! The Chair has not heard any honourable Minister being referred to as a part-time Minister, and I am sure I am hearing correctly.

Laughter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I distinctly thought I heard the honourable Member for Christ Church West, sitting to my right, making that statement. The point is this. Between 1976–1981 the Deputy Prime Minister, the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John), was Minister for Tourism, Civil Aviation, Trade, Industry, Commerce and Parliamentary Affairs and then Leader of the House. Since the last election we have seen a division. There is now a Leader of the House and Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, and one individual holds that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I do not necessarily wish to interfere with the honourable Member's speech. I do not hear him often, and today is a special day, but I believe, that the Head he wishes to speak under now cannot accommodate the comments he is making.
11.45 a.m.

I submit that Cabinet Office would be the appropriate place to discuss the allocation of Ministers and portfolios. We are discussing Parliament, and it is true that they bear some relationship to Parliament, but I suspect that he is out of order, otherwise some of us who have comments concerning that aspect would wish to do the same thing. I draw it to Your Honour's attention. The honourable Member can wait for the next Head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought we were discussing Parliament. The point I was making is that there is a distinction. We have a Prime Minister, we have a Deputy Prime Minister, we have a Minister of State and we have a Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Now the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, unlike what my colleague on my right has said, has an important job, because prior to his being a Minister of Parliamentary Affairs he wore shirtjac suits; he now wears three-piece suits with diamond studs and Yves Saint-Laurent socks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are dealing with personal tastes, nothing whatever to do with the subject of Parliament in this debate; so please refrain from these references.

Mr. A. TRUSS: The point I was trying to make, Sir, is that the Minister conducts himself like any other Minister. Perhaps he is the best dressed Minister in here, but I do not agree that he is a part-time Minister. I agree that he is a Minister without any money to spend, but that does not make him a part-time Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you are really not with it right now.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, that was arising out of what one of my colleagues had said, and I thought that, in the interest of clarification, I should inform the House as to the thinking on this side. I do not refer to our Leader of the House as a part-time Minister. That is the point I am trying to make.

I will get back to the mainstream of what I was discussing. Under Cabinet I will have an opportunity, as suggested by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, (Mr. B. M. Taitt), to deal more fully with the portfolios and the reallocation of the Ministries and whether or not there are too many or too little or whatever. We will deal with that then, because I have a few comments to make there as well.

I hope, Sir, that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will do his best over the next year or two, certainly before 1985, to make sure that the facilities at Parliament are upgraded. I really, on behalf of Members on both sides of this Honourable Chamber, would urge him to work expeditiously to force the hand of the Minister of Finance to let him have some money to spend in Parliament. I do not mean to physically force his hand, but to drive home the importance that Parliament is the highest forum in the land and we, as parliamentarians, must not short-cut ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, there are times when you go to the wash room to wash your hands and you cannot get a paper towel to dry them -- and this is Parliament!

Aside.

Mr. A. TRUSS: It is not the Minister's fault, and that was an aside which I did not appreciate. You know that and you should know better than that.

The point is that the Minister has the jurisdiction over these things, and he should ensure that the people who are hired to look after these things do their job, and if he needs more money to ensure a more efficient and cleaner Parliament with better facilities, then I am in favour of that, and the Government can get my support as far as that is concerned.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a short comment on the debate in relation to parliamentary action in relation to legislation. At the heart of the integrity of our system, a system based on the Rule of Law, is the need for the integrity of the legislative system. The point has been made repeatedly that the Opposition and other members of the public are not involved at a sufficiently early stage in the preparation of legislation. I want to address that on two fronts.

The words do not fit well in the mouths of the Opposition to make such a contention, because on occasions when the Opposition has been invited to participate with Government in Select Committees, to consider and analyse legislation and come up with a position with which we could all agree, they have repeatedly turned down the invitation of Government to do so.

Despite that fact, Mr. Chairman, I have no need to be hostile to the suggestion that there should be wider consultation on important legislation. I know, for instance, Sir, and these things are causing problems, that in many Commonwealth countries, and indeed countries beyond the Commonwealth, medical ethical questions arise in relation to legislation, and this bears some relation to the recent debate on abortion. The questions relating to tissue transplant, at what point does death take place, whether it is right to have euthanasia, whether the heart of one person should be transferred to another, are areas in the medical, legal and socio field that can do with a great deal of consultation between wide areas of the community, and we need a multi-disciplinary approach to important legislation in areas such as these. So I have no quarrel with that.

We will however have to work out a *modus operandi* in respect of these things; no spontaneous ad hoc recommendations on either side will go to the heart of something that is of such fundamental importance. I get the feeling that during these debates people get up on the spur of the moment and say something that has just come to their minds, without thinking more deeply of the implications of the contribution they are making.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to have to interrupt you for one moment, but the Hansard Reporters are having problems hearing the speakers when honourable Members are having their own conversations. Speak softly if you have to speak. Please continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am interested, for the time that I have the job of Attorney-General to do and have responsibility for legislative drafting and the preparation of legislation, to have creative and constructive recommendations as to how there could be this multi-disciplinary approach to important aspects of legislation, but I want the Opposition to think clearly about what they are saying before they make their light and superficial statements in this regard.

In relation to the Companies Bill that was referred to during the course of that contribution, I know that, for better than a decade, there has been the widest possible consultation, and I know for a fact that members of the Democratic Labour Party were involved in much of the consultation on the Companies Bill. Indeed, my recollection is that the Committee was set up by Frederick Smith at the time he was Attorney-General back in 1967, 1968 or 1969, and that his successor, George Moe, also did a lot of work with a committee in the preparation of the Companies Bill. I further know that at every point subsequent to that, the Bill was circulated among the widest possible group in Barbados, which would be interested and concerned with these matters, to make an

input before the Bill was finally brought before Parliament in 1982 – after a gestation period of some 14 years! That is why I feel that it is very easy to make a lot of bright statements to capture people's attention, but statements that are not based on the actual facts.

I do not, like some people in political life, profess to know everything – I have my limitations – and I will be glad if I could have the benefit of the knowledge of people who have a special interest and expertise in legislation that is coming before Parliament.

I also want to deal very briefly with the whole question of priority of legislation that comes before this House. There are two agencies involved, the Attorney-General's Chambers, with its drafting section, and the Cabinet, and we have to determine in all the circumstances what is priority legislation.
11.55 a.m.

It is easy on the one hand to bring a lot of glamorous legislation in rapid succession that does not meet the immediate and pressing needs of the society, and, on the other hand, one can sit back and take a look of what is required and make some hard decisions about what is more immediate and pressing in this country. While I am occupying the position of Attorney-General in this country, I will make the decisions in respect to many areas as to law reform as to what is appropriate and opportune.

I know, for instance, because of the whole change of the commercial climate in Barbados, that there should be a new Sale of Goods Act. I know that the whole area of criminal law needs to be reformed and that there must be a new Evidence Act. There is need for criminal procedure reform and there is need for reform in the area of evidence.

I know that we have to come to grips with new technology. How long can you continue to exclude new computer technology from the law courts – the whole idea of looking at the law in relation to the admissibility of evidence on tape recorders and other electronic media? Every single child now has a video and a big juke box, and the electronic media is finding itself in the homes of every person in Barbados – and the law courts remain cut off and isolated from the main stream of activity.

These are pressing areas, and these are areas to which I am at the moment turning my attention so that we can bring new legislation to bring the law and the operation of the courts and the criminal system in line with modern developments.

On the question of information, again I sit down here with a great deal of anger at the words I hear – words bandied about the difficulty in getting information. This Government has a proud record of making information available to the public of Barbados. Any Minister who is not prepared to give information on his Ministry means that he does not feel that he is doing a good job. But sometimes you do it at a cost. When I was in the Ministry of Education we learnt the hard way. I received a letter from a certain member of the Legislature asking me for information on developments in the Ministry of Education over the period of when I was superintending that Ministry. I minuted on the letter to my Permanent Secretary to prepare the information requested and pass it on to the person who had asked for the information, and, further, I said in that very minute that I was proud of my achievements in the Ministry of Education; so the information could be made available to anybody, including the Democratic Labour Party.

But what happened by this freedom of information that we are talking about? The letter that came to me, plus my handwriting on that minute to the effect that I have just given, found itself into the hands of the leadership of the Democratic Labour Party and became a catalyst for political action by the Democratic Labour Party. That is how it works! What I wrote could have been published on the wall of the Public Buildings.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: He asked me what I am talking about. I always decide that anything I write on Government file can be printed or published on the walls of the Public Buildings for the whole of Barbados to see. I have nothing to hide. And if the honourable Member for St. Michael South is having some difficulty in understanding what I am talking about in respect to that particular letter, let him ask the Leadership of the Democratic Labour Party.

When the honourable Member for Christ Church West was Attorney-General, he circulated Ministries asking for their comments on a new Freedom of Information Bill, because, as he said in his contribution earlier in the debate, he felt that a lot of information in the Ministries, which is kept closeted in the presses of civil servants and so on, is information that could be usefully made available to the public.

The criticism, however, that I am hearing is of the Ministries and of the Government. It is not the Government who is reluctant to make a lot of information available to the public of Barbados; it is the civil servants themselves! I well remember the comments that were made. The civil servants were saying that they do not want any more freedom of information. They do not want the files, the reports and data of that sort in the Ministries to be passed on to the public and made available for public inspection, because it would put them, the civil servants, in a very difficult position. They would not

feel free to write what they really feel on files. They would find it difficult to be critical of situations and people on file if they knew that sometime in the future these files were going to be open to public scrutiny. You cannot blame them for that. They are not politicians. What I write, I do not care who sees, and what I feel I will say in here or outside, publicly. But you cannot expect the civil servant to be in that same position.

Having said all that, I believe that they are a little bit too careful. I have been in a Government Ministry for well nigh seven years now, and I must say in all honesty that 99 per cent that all the information that I have ever seen in Government can be made public to anybody. That is my experience; I do not know what is the experience of other people who serve as Ministers; but 99 per cent of the stuff I deal with can be seen by anybody.

Honourable Members, including two or three who have spoken on this point, have on occasion in the past asked me for information in respect to my department, and I have made the information available. Therefore, it is a little bit unfair for those same honourable Members to get in here today and give the impression that the Government operates like a lodge, these secret things they have which do not allow you to pass on information. If any honourable Member wants to know anything in my Ministry, he can ask me. He can ask me openly on the Floor or he can telephone me, I will give him the information. There are things that I would like the honourable Members on that side to know.

Mr. Chairman, finally in respect to this whole business of information, I want to make the same type of appeal that I have made in respect of participation by non-government groups in the preparation of legislation. It is that we do not adopt a vague and superficial approach to something of such fundamental importance, but we work out a system by which information can be passed on to interested people, and particularly Members of Parliament, that will not admit of one person or the other, or one group or the other, feeling that there is a situation of one up-manship, because they get a piece of classified information that other people do have. That is what is prevailing at the moment! People get perfectly innocent bits of information from a Ministry and they have that cloak and dagger attitude to fool everybody that they have a great piece of information, that they have acquired it by stealth and all that, and that has become a virtue!

I do not believe that I have called a newspaper editorial group in this country six times in my whole life. I understand that it is a practice of a number of people in political life to call newspapers and complain about one thing or the other and twist their arm. I do not know anything about that. I have called the newspapers about six times in my whole life. But I was moved in December to call one of the newspapers.
12.05 p.m.

I was reading the debate about the IMF and one day I saw the Letter of Intent published verbatim in one of the national newspapers, and two or three days after this was carried without comment, in the sister newspaper I saw a person, who had by deceit and stealth and fraud carried away, or collaborated with somebody to carry away a public document that was of the utmost confidentiality, elevated to the position of Man of the Week.

My money is in that newspaper – I must declare my interest – and I had to call and ask, "Is this what I waste my money in this newspaper for? For you to practise this type of wickedness and elevate evil to a position of Personality of the week? Are you now saying to all of Barbados, where we are trying to maintain certain moral standards against intense pressure, that for a man to cheat, be deceitful, to use subterfuge and to encourage people to commit a criminal act in carrying away highly confidential Government documents – are you really telling the people of Barbados that a man who does a thing like that is entitled to be given the position of Personality of the week?"

The Letter of Intent was published, and this alarmed me, Sir, because I do not get into these things. The right honourable Member for St. John, Hon. E. W. Barrow always warns people in this country not to exercise themselves in matters that are too high for them, so I do not get into these things. But what I do know is that the Letter of Intent that was published in that newspaper did not support the contention of the people who were critical of it. That is why I was amazed that there was no comment on it. Every single word in every paragraph of that document had been stated before by the Government of Barbados, through the Minister of Finance, prior to the publication, and it would have been an honest editorial policy for that newspaper to have said, having published this thing, that this thing supports *in toto* the statements that had previously been made by the Government of Barbados.

I just say that in passing, but I just want in two sentences to sum up the reason why I was moved to stand. This relates to the freedom of information, and I totally agree that more information should pass from Government to Parliament and the public at large, but a proper *modus operandi* must be worked out for such a development. Equally, I am quite prepared to bring a multi-sectoral approach to the preparation of important and key legislation in Barbados.

It is not necessary for anybody to think that they are scoring points by bringing legislation on important matters in here without consulting the widest possible interests and thinking that you have one up on the other guy. That is no part of my system, Sir, and therefore I welcome this recommendation or suggestion, or whatever it is. But I would like to think that after the talk is over and we move on to other Heads of the Estimates and the Estimates debate is finished, that it would not be allowed then to lie fallow, but that we will be able to work out the way in which we can address the difficulties that I have heard articulated in this debate, and in a way that is consistent with the dignity of Parliament and of the role of the Government as the organisation that was given the mandate to carry out the important social and legislative reform of our time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I really do not understand how the last honourable Member (Hon. L. R. Tull) who sat down, in the process of indicating that he is interested in bringing better information and more public information to the public, could seek at the same time to raise questions concerning the Democratic Labour Party in that process.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with Parliament.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, we are dealing with Parliament and parliamentary information. The honourable Member talked about somebody performing a criminal act – he used deceit and fraud and similar words – and then he complained about the person being Man of the Week. But the Barbados Labour Party managed to induce someone to steal the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party – and that person was not Man of the Week, they went on to higher office!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with the debate on Parliament in the Estimates.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing nearer to Parliament than a Manifesto. The Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party was to see how many people we could get into Parliament, that Manifesto is the basis on which we came to Parliament, and that honourable Member (Hon. L. R. Tull) and his colleagues benefited and went and paraded the document that was stolen. We wrote to the Commissioner of Police – and I do not believe the right honourable gentleman ever got a reply – stating information that a document was stolen out of the Customs.

Now talking about stealing from the Customs, Sir, public information is the sort of thing which we would like to get. If we had proper public information, there would not be rumours about why the honourable Member for St. Michael North East Mr. L. L. Sisnett was fired. I believe the Government has a responsibility to people to tell them why he was fired and reinstated. I do not think it is fair to him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must tell the honourable Member, please take your seat. I would like to ask all honourable Members not to be provocative in their speeches for one thing, and, on the other hand, please deal with the matter which we are here to debate. We are debating Parliament, and, as I take it, the discussion now is on the question of information to parliamentarians, information to Parliament. Let us not drag on the debate on matters which certainly do not concern us at this time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Your Honour's ruling and suggestion, but, Sir, as a parliamentarian, you would appreciate that if another parliamentarian indicates that someone by fraud, deceit, et cetera, got a document, it would be incumbent on us as a Parliament to hear a response to that particular line, and all I am doing is indicating to the honourable Member, the Attorney-General, that when he is bringing down his new Information Bill to accommodate the former Attorney General, who apparently used to bring esoteric legislation – and he is changing that now – that esoteric legislation that the honourable Member for Christ Church West, (Hon. H. deB. Forde) used to bring, the new Attorney General.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the honourable Member Mr. B. M. Taitt will give way, the legislation which was brought down to this House was neither esoteric nor indeed.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT rose.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Let me deal with it, Sir, he has given way on a point of explanation.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just want to know if the honourable Member.....Order, please!

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Right. You are quite in order now.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The legislation of which the honourable Attorney-General has spoken, which he intends to bring, was left in that department by me. Mr. Mahy carried out all the criminal legislation, it is before Mr. Justic Williams. I ensured that the Ministry of Consumer Affairs had an expert to look at the form of consumer legislation, and I am glad to see he has the common sense to continue good work.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I am not going to get between the Attorneys-General past and present, but the one obviously feels that the legislation which was brought down in the past was totally unnecessary, and that is borne out by the fact that a substantial amount of that legislation, which we went through in this Parliament and passed, has not been proclaimed by that Government. A substantial amount of the legislation, the Administrative Reform Act, the Reform Administrative Tribunals Act, all those things..... Oh, dear!
12.15 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation: there are only three Bills that have not been proclaimed that were passed, and that is because they were waiting for money in order to implement them. The Administrative Justice Act has been proclaimed, the Ombudsman Act has been proclaimed, the Family Law Act has been proclaimed – do you want me to go on telling you about the reforms?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I would like you to tell me when they are going to proclaim the constitutional amendment that was passed to allow the people to have an independent Electoral Commission? If the honourable Member is saying .....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with that on another occasion.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: This is to do with Parliament. I would like to know why the Ombudsman has not been brought in. The Ombudsman is a Parliamentary commissioner.

The honourable Member (Hon. H. deB. Forde) the former Attorney General, got up and started the suggestion that he can give me a list. Let him tell us why they have not proclaimed the Ombudsman Act and why they have not appointed an Ombudsman.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation. The honourable Member (Mr. B. M. Taitt) is misleading the House. The Ombudsman Act has been proclaimed and it is part of the Laws of Barbados.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It has been proclaimed; let him tell us then why they have not appointed an Ombudsman, a parliamentary commissioner. Let us find out if it is valid criticism that he brought in the Ombudsman Act and it was proclaimed, but that the Government, now that a sober Attorney-General and the Prime Minister and others have reflected, does not feel that an Ombudsman is as urgent as when he was Attorney-General.

A parliamentary commissioner is obviously not as necessary in their view as it was when he was the Attorney-General. An independent Electoral Commission is obviously not as urgent for them as it was for him. That may be to their discredit, because they brought a constitutional amendment in this House and they now feel that, in spite of the fact that a two-thirds majority agreed that there should be an independent Boundaries Commission, they do not have to bring it until, as the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) said, when they are good and ready.

I hope that when they are good and ready does not mean when they have re-arranged the parliamentary constituencies so that they would be able to continue as the Government. I hope that is not what they mean. We intend under the appropriate Head to raise that question in a more fundamental way.

But I wish to return to this concept of fraud and deceit concerning the gathering of information. The right honourable gentleman from St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) as a parliamentarian stood up in here, for the whole public to hear, and broadcasted that he had information from some UN gentleman that the unemployment rate in Barbados was 25 per cent or 27 per cent when we were saying it was 12 per cent . And he has continued that information and he has now made it part of his official pronouncements, saying that the unemployment rate was 22 per cent in 1975; and there is no document, anywhere, which he can produce to show it was 22 per cent and he continues constantly from the Floor of this House, as a parliamentarian and as the Prime Minister, to tell the population of Barbados an obvious untruth that it was 22 per cent in 1975!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please, you cannot .....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member (Mr. B. M. Taitt) was never Minister of Planning nor Minister of Labour, therefore he probably had no access to the file. But I can give the House an absolute assurance, without any shadow of a doubt whatsoever, that the first report of the sample survey on unemployment in 1975 showed that for the quarter, October to December, unemployment was 22 per cent. He must not be misled by the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) who then, as now, stated it was 13 per cent. You can see the file, I do not have it with me, but there is no reason to hide it from you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not going to try to exchange words with him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me make one point, and I make it seriously. When two honourable Members are on their feet and continue to talk, that must form no part of the record. This is for the benefit of the Hansard Reporter. Please continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is no small thing to accuse the Minister of Finance and Planning of inventing a figure not based on documentation.

I will tell you this, Sir, I was mistaken, because 28 per cent was the figure for women. I have since discovered that from the file. But when he said that it was incorrect, I asked him to produce the file. He sat down there and he had the file opened in front of him showing 28 per cent for women and 22 per overall, and he would not produce it!

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) is discussing information for parliamentarians coming out of the official document. The information which we get on employment statistics can be found in the Economic Reports. They are official publications of the Government of Barbados. Either he is saying now that those publications should be condemned forever because they are wrong, and deliberately so, or he should get up and produce the employment rate in 1975, in the published information for Barbados. If he says now that you cannot look into the Economic Report or any Barbadian publication and find the published information, then, let it be known to the world at large that no information in the Economic Report is acceptable.

But no man living, whether he be Prime Minister or otherwise, can tell us that he is in step and everybody else is out of step. He said it was 28 per cent during the televised broadcast. He now says he was mistaken, I now put it to you, Mr. Chairman, that as he was mistaken then, he is mistaken now, He said just a few days ago that it was 22 per cent in 1975. Last year during the Estimates he said it was never more than 13 per cent. I do not understand.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Oh, it is your opinion. I apologise to the honourable gentleman. He said it was his opinion.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir: I said it was my opinion that true unemployment in Barbados had never been as high as 22 per cent and that it was my opinion that unemployment was not then whatever it was given to be, but that you had to go by published figures derived from the Government's methodology for producing unemployment statistics. That is what I said then.

I still believe that the rate of unemployment in Barbados has consistently been overestimated, but all that I can go on are the published figures. I have just sent for the Economic Report, which, unless I am mistaken, for year before last, quoting the Barbados statistical figure, it gave the figure as 22 per cent.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) is now saying that that was his opinion and he so believes, why then if he is seeking to make a point this year and that is his opinion – and he is the Prime Minister to whom people should look for truth and veracity – would he still use the figure of 22 per cent when he is saying that, in his opinion, it has been over-estimated? When it suits him, he will use the over-estimated figures to make a point.....

Oh, dear!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order. Are you pregnant? What do you mean by "Oh dear". Do you have pain?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I must draw this to your attention. I really listened to the debate from both sides and it surely has absolutely nothing, with great respect to you, Mr. Chairman, to do with Head 12. The Central Bank and all that has nothing to do with Head 12.
12.25 p.m.

I would just for the benefit of the Opposition say this: it has taken you two hours and five minutes to discuss Head 12. I believe when you get to Transport and Works, Planning and Health and so on, you will want ten years. What really is under this Head that merits 2 hours and 5 minutes of debate?

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: My submission to you, Mr. Chairman, is that none of what I am hearing about, diamond studs, which I will obviously have an opportunity to speak about at some future time – there is no doubt about that – has nothing to do with Head 12. I am drawing this to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before I put the motion, I would still want to remind the Leader of the House that he must not try to make a speech when he rises on a point of order.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 1.30 p.m.

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

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

On Resumption:

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

Mr. DEPUTY 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.

HEAD 12 – PARLIAMENT

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Michael West was winding up on Head 12. He may now proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I accept that I was winding up. I believe that the main thrust of the point that I wanted to make.....

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, before we had the suspension there was a question of information in which the honourable Member (Mr. B. M. Taitt) gave the impression to this Honourable Chamber that there was no documentation to prove that the unemployment statistics between October to December 1975 showed 22.5 percent. The Honourable Prime Minister got up and said he was sure this information was available, and honourable Members on that side contended that the Prime Minister was apparently pulling a figure out of a hat and that there was no documentation. I have here with me, Mr. Chairman, the first report of the sample survey done in 1975 for the months October to December, 1975, and it indicates a figure of 22.5 percent for unemployment as being correct.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member can bring that to the attention of the Committee in due course.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, it was all mentioned during the course of debate while in Committee.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I really do not understand the intervention of the honourable Member, and I do not know if he understands it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have just about four minutes left.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really wanted to touch on another matter. The honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss)..... am I correct that the honourable gentleman over there in the white suit is from St. Michael Central? I do not understand why after praise was showered by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) and myself on the efforts of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, the honourable Member for St. Michael Central felt bound to ridicule the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig). I do not think it was warranted. And whereas I do not wish to find myself in the position of defending the honourable Member for St. James North, the honourable Member for St. James North has always worn diamonds and gold rings and fastidious clothes for as long as I can remember, and I really do not understand whether he was saying that a Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has to dress differently from a Minister who is working.

I formed the impression, Sir, that what he was saying is that since the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has been deemed to be a part-time Minister by the Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) that he has reverted to wearing pretty clothes, whereas when he was in a real working Ministry as a full-time Minister, he used to wear shirt-jacs. I do not know if he is saying that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs wants some work and if he was calling on the Prime Minister in the allocation of Ministries – which I will touch on in the next Head, if they call it – to give the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs a full day's work to do. It seems to me that the honourable Member for St. Michael Central was lamenting the fact that he has no Permanent Secretary, he has no Secretary. Do you have an office?

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman, I did not continue in that vein because the very honourable Member who just sat down said it should be raised under a different Head, so he should not anticipate what I will be saying when we discuss Cabinet. I did not ridicule any Minister.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Well that is true, because he is no Minister, he is half a Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The matter that is being discussed at the moment is so very cursory and has so little to do with the matter under discussion now, that I can only conclude that honourable Members have nothing to say and no other contribution to make with respect to this Head. Please wind up and let us get on to another Head.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You made precisely the point I was trying to make, Mr. Chairman, but you did it much better than I could. I do not think it was necessary for the honourable Member to attack the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs personally. I will move on though.

I just want to finish this by saying that on the question of privileges for members of Parliament, I support the position that Parliament has to have some measure of protection if truth and/or information that could lead to truth can properly be aired in this Chamber. I think that the principle behind parliamentary privileges goes back to the freedom of a parliamentary representative to speak his mind.

I remember that the honourable Member for St. Thomas once said in here that parliament is not a forum of truth, it is a forum for enquiry. I think those were his exact words. I believe that there is some measure of validity in the desire to have privilege in Parliament so that persons cannot feel that they are oppressed or may be oppressed from stating things which they know. It is true that good taste requires that we do not say all that we know on the Floor of the House, but there comes a time.

I recall when the other side aired the cheques during the Budget debate. Personally, that was something which was not desirable for me personally, but seen from the point of view of the public good, if there was some validity to the raising of those cheques, then it was a proper action to take, just as we have some information, which we will reveal in due course, concerning certain matters which have occurred during the last two years or so.

I believe that Parliament is the place where we should be able to do this. If, for instance, the Prime Minister writes a letter to the staff of the Attorney General's Chambers in which he calls them crabs in a barrel, then we in this House have a right, if we acquire a copy of that letter, to make that information known, because it is important that people have some understanding of how, say, the Prime Minister is relating to his civil servants. I will have a few more things to say in that regard, but I believe you indicated my time has run out and I would not wish to come on your wrong side.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, honourable Members on the other side get up and tend to dispute statistics given by the right honourable Prime Minister. Mr. Chairman, I heard the honourable Member who has just sat down get up and actually contend that the figure which the Honourable Prime Minister gave as the unemployment statistics for 1975 was inaccurate.

I feel, that honourable Members should not mislead this Honourable House, because I took pains to send to the Ministry to find out whether, in fact, there was any documentation or whether there was a file in which this information was recorded. I have here with me the very file which substantiates what the Honourable Prime Minister has said. He is perfectly correct, because the first sample survey done in 1975, for October to December, showed that the unemployment as a percentage of labour force in that year was 22.5 per cent.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation, and I will sit down if he has not given way. First of all, you will see from the context of what I said that I could not have been speaking about any three months in 1975, because I accused the Prime Minister of saying that he had said 28 per cent then back down the road. I said 22 per cent, he said 28 per cent, then I said that only in his argument yesterday he brought up 22 per cent again when he was seeking to make a point. The figure was 22 per cent for 1975, and my contention has been that it was never any 22 per cent for 1975. Furthermore, I spoke about published information. Now he is bringing a file where somebody submitted the three months in 1975, and offering that as an argument. I am disappointed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In any event, all this never seems to be getting the Committee any where in getting its work done.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand how the honourable Member could think that Members in this Honourable Chamber can be that stupid. Published information is what is documented, and this is published information. The sample survey done in 1975 is a documentation; it is published information. Despite the fact that it is here recorded, it was published and was made available.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please address the Chair. Continue to make your contribution on Parliament and let us get on with the debate.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: We have got to be guarded when we are debating and making certain points in here. We have a Press, we have people who come to

this Honourable Chamber and listen to debates, and it is not fair to hear honourable Members from that side dispute what the Prime Minister has said when, in fact, he is telling the truth.

We have got to draw the line. If we are going to upgrade the level of debate in here, then we must understand that honourable Members must not seek to distort, or even say things that are not really true. I am going to say that the information which the right honourable Prime Minister has given is accurate. And there is testimony to it, because it is documented, and this document was made public.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it really is time – when you are in Opposition, the public is very tolerant and even the House is tolerant, especially in Barbados where the Press does not make it its business to analyse in depth every statement made by a politician, to see whether it is true or false. People are tolerant on the Opposition because the Opposition hear things and you know that all things they hear are not true. Therefore, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) gets up and makes all kinds of statements. I read some in the newspapers today about how the GDP of Barbados has fallen for two years. That is not true. But people are tolerant of it because they know that the Opposition by its nature, no matter how hard it tries, no matter how many friends it has, no matter how many leaks it holds its head under, cannot be as well informed as the Government. But when you say that the Minister is repeating something that is not true, the public have to give it more credence.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) got up on a point of elucidation to say that he is not talking about three months in 1975 and the information is not published. These are merely quibbles! I, myself, have been exceptionally careful in dealing with this particular statistic, because I always say "at the end of 1975." I challenge the honourable Member to find a published statement of mine in which I stated that the percentage for the whole year was that.

There is no such thing in my opinion as an average percentage for a year anyhow, although we published it in the Gazette. I think you must publish what it is on a particular date for a particular period. I do not know what it means to average unemployment for a whole year.

But with this year, I have never departed from saying "22 per cent at the end of 1975." The note by the Statistical Department, this is when we had been in power for three months as compared to the same period a year ago, says "The employment situation has improved. There is a larger number of females in employment. The male unemployment has dropped to 2.4 per cent as compared with 18.2 per cent last year. The female unemployment rate of 21.3 per cent is much lower than the corresponding rate of 28.2 per cent a year ago. The total number of persons seeking work now stands at 16 400 as compared with 25 500 a year ago."

Now, if you read our Manifestos, if you want published information, it is published in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. You will see that we state that at the end of 1975 there was 25 000 people out of work. You will see that we stated that at the end of 1975, 22.5 per cent of the work force was not working. We have been constantly harassed with this questioning of statistics!

Just at the beginning of 1977, the then Minister of Labour, the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) pointed out that the 3 000 jobs that we had promised in our Manifesto had, in fact, come about in the first three months of being in power. It is a fact, according to the statistics. As a matter of fact, unemployment was falling throughout 1976. That is the point, perhaps, honourable Members could make, not the point that the statistics are wrong or it was not 22 per cent in 1975.

The point which I make about my opinion. If you say I do not believe that it was not 22 per cent, so I should not say so, all right. Suppose you accept my opinion that it was only 18 per cent. My opinion now would be that it is between 8 per cent and 9 per cent. The whole point is that I think we do have built into our methodology an excess of perhaps 4 per cent. Maybe, indeed in 1975 it was more than that. The excess may have been more for this particular period than it is now, but it has varied between 4 per cent and 5 per cent according to other factors.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just want to make this point. All we are discussing now is the question of analysis and interpretation of statistics, and, quite frankly, I think that the Committee is wasting its time on this matter which is not really relevant to Parliament, as such. Wait until we come to the Head dealing with statistics, methodology etc., and deal with the subject at length. But I must express my feeling that this exercise is not relevant into the question of Parliament, and I would urge honourable Members to defer further discussion along that line until we come to the matter of statistics, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Should I make the point Sir? I was merely going to draw to the honourable Member's attention.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will allow you to make this point.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Even as he is explaining it, if you say to the ordinary person, "All right, at the end of 1975 the unemployment was 22 per cent," the average person, and even not some of the not so average persons, would believe that you are saying that the average return of unemployment for the year 1975 is 22 per cent.

If you say that at the end of 1975 it was 22 per cent, I acknowledge that the honourable Member is always careful to speak the truth in such a way that people hear what they wish to hear. That phrase "at the end of 1975" puts him in a position where he can say, "I was telling the truth, I meant the three months at the end of 1975".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. John; sorry, St. Andrew.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: You are getting me a bit nervous.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Pardon, this Chairman never gets nervous. This is the coolest Chairman you can find.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I think you misunderstand me. I said that I am getting a bit nervous when you say "the honourable Member for St. John".

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I am in a unique position representing the constituency of St. Andrew, to speak on the question of Parliament since it was a predecessor of mine in office, who claimed for Parliament its rights and privileges and obviously the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) would be certainly acquainted with this aspect of the development of the tradition, in which I have followed.
1.55 p.m.

On witnessing the discussion on this Head, Parliament, we certainly would have observed that there are developments among ourselves which are giving cause for great concern within the country with respect to how we take our parliamentary duties. While it is true that Parliament is not a Sunday School, and while we indulge in the cut and thrust of parliamentary debate, we should try to do this without the anger and wrath which we so often see developing on both sides.

I believe that if there is one institution which should remain intact in this society, it is our Parliament, with its long and distinguished traditions. Parliament is what the people, who are duly elected make it and whatever we do in here will be a reflection upon those people who in their thousands cast their votes in our favour. When we seek to score cheap political points with a view to public consumption and the hope of cheap popularity, we by our very action drag down this very important institution which we, who have inherited, should try to cherish and hold dear.

I do not believe that much as we have been having coups throughout the world, and coming close to the Caribbean in Grenada and Suriname, and not only coups by the Army but even coups through the ballot box as well, as is practised in certain countries within the area, that Barbados by its tradition will ever find itself falling in such an unfortunate situation. I believe that there is no country in the world that is more steeped in its parliamentary democracy than Barbados. It is for this reason that even though the call may go forth from time to time that there will be a replacement of the Government before the normal period of election, that the country will never hearken to this is based upon the concept that the Barbadians believe firmly in democracy and will never resort to any other course to maintain a lawful Government.

It is because of this that I continue to feel a very free man, and believe that even in old age I can lie down in my home in peace.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Old age when it comes.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: When it comes, Sir, because sometimes the Armies will not allow it to come. I would hope to be living in a democratic system, to be able to sleep peacefully in my house and not to be awakened by some friend or a siren to stop the invading forces from coming in.

I say all of this to say that it is important that we who have succeeded to this very precious legacy should ensure that at all times we try to keep the arm of democracy high and aloft. If we do not do this, we are going to find ourselves in serious trouble. Too often I sit in this Parliament and witness a group of young children and young people listening to debates, and see honourable Members only too anxious to score cheap political points, not realising the type of impressions that they are making upon the young and tender who will, in the fullness of time, become the masters of the country and the leaders who will take over.

I would like to see that we revert to some extent, to the high, lofty and noble standards which were originally set for parliamentarians. I recall very vividly, Mr. Chairman, an occasion when His Honour was in the House and made a ruling, when the Opposition stood up to a man and defied that ruling, something which I deplore very firmly, and something which, in my considered opinion, will not do good for the future of this country.

No one man can always be right, no one ruling can always be right. That is the reason why you have courts of appeal, and that is why as men you try to solve and iron out problems. But when the presiding officer, who is the embodiment of the authority of our Parliament, makes a decision, however aggrieved you may feel, it is your bounden duty in my respectful submission that you accept that ruling and that authority.

Provision is made whereby if you disagree with the ruling of the presiding officer you can bring a substantive motion censuring that officer. I would suggest that we look at the way in which we approach the institution of Parliament, and how we, as the custodians of those principles affecting Parliament, carry out our duties. In my view, the elected representatives of a people have a very sacred responsibility, and I think we should start from now onward to look very carefully at the manner in which we are functioning in this Parliament to ensure that we are doing nothing which will upset the very fragile balance which exists within our society.

Democracy it cannot be denied, is a very fragile system of Government, and living in the times in which we are living, unless you do those things which are right and assist in nourishing the fragile structure of democracy, we will find that we will fail and stand condemned by all generations to come.

I would like to see that the approach which was made by this Government from 1976 onward by way of improving the physical condition of this Chamber, is continued. I, myself, was a very proud man, Mr. Chairman, when on going upstairs just now, I had a look at the work which was done in my time as Minister of Communications and Works to improve the physical conditions within this building, and the amount of room that was brought into existence by the very good and dedicated workers within the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Mr. Chairman, I have never failed to say my piece about the Ministry's workers when they did not perform, but I have always said that some of the best builders, the best construction workers for roads and buildings can be found within the Ministry of Communications and Works, and I would hope that given the amount of good work which was done to assist with the offices for personnel within this Parliament, further work be done within this Parliament itself to the satisfaction of its Members and visitors who come here.

It is disgraceful, to say the least, that we should continue to sit behind tables made of plywood, in chairs that are broken – and you are never too sure if you can risk to go back for fear you may lose your neck – and generally operate in the deplorable conditions in which we have to work and operate.

2.05 p.m.

The public is entitled to hear the debates of Parliament and entitled to understand what is going on, because we have a duty to them to ensure that they have proper facilities in order to participate. Each person in this community is entitled to come to Parliament from time to time. We who are here, 27 of us, are here at their expressed wish, and it is because the 120 000 odd people who form the electorate cannot all occupy the 27 seats, that they confer upon us their rights and privileges to represent them in this Parliament.

I would like to see in our time, and very shortly too, some improvements made to Parliament. I have no doubt that the Minister responsible for Parliamentary Affairs, with his enthusiasm for hardwork and his initiatives in these areas, will try, given the opportunity in terms of finance, to put in train a number of alternations and improvements to make this Parliament a better place.

But even though you may put in all the mahogany in here, all the golden stands and all the richness that will go with the nature of Parliament, Parliament can only be a good and successful Parliament when men of goodwill dwell within its borders, and I would hope that we would rid ourselves of the hatred which sometimes come into debate and see ourselves just as servants of the people.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to briefly advert to a point made by the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) with respect to information which he sought to get from the National Housing Corporation. I am a bit disturbed that he found it difficult to get information from that source, because I think he has a better line of approach than the Minister and, obviously, he should not be in difficulty. If he is at all in difficulty, you will understand the position of the Minister himself.

But what I want to dispel from the minds of people who have heard the statement is this, that when he said that the Manager said that there is trouble in these areas at this time, he could only be having trouble with himself and he probably was looking at himself through a mirror at the time. He has no problems with the Minister as such and he would know what he can do.

But the National Housing Corporation may not be in a position to give all the information on buildings that are starting up. They may be able to give information on their own, but I do not know if it is so structured to give the information which is required. The Prime Minister spelt out a number of suggestions about how it could be done. It can be done by way of the Barbados Water Authority and the question of connections; it can also be done by way of the public health inspectors and the

amount of new houses that will come under their inspection. But the National Housing is certainly not able in terms of manpower nor in terms of the will to carry out those functions.

In truth and in fact, it should know. It has spent sufficient time as a housing corporation over the years that it should know.

But I would like to assure the honourable Member who has made the point that they cannot even tell me for sure if all the buildings, in terms of the people who are renting, are properly occupied. I cannot tell you if there are any freelancers in all. What I can tell you is that a lot of money is owing to the Government and the Corporation.

These are things that are being looked into, and in the fullness of time they will be remedied. But I want to say this. No one single Minister in a lifetime can cure the problems that dwell therein. We all try in our little way to see how well we can do in the public's interest to get this matter organized.

I know for sure that the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) has been trying to get information from a number of Ministries as well and I believe that I can speak with some assurance that my Ministry was one of the few that gave him any information. I want to tell all honourable Members that if you need information – we are Parliamentarians – come to me rather than going to the civil servants if you are fearful that you will be reproached there.

I am not too difficult to talk to. The Calypsonian says "all o' we is one", and no matter how you score points, or try to score them, at the end of the day the electorate out there are going to lob us into the same basket and there will be no difference. You will be seen as we are seen.

I will not be adverse to giving you information if you want that information, and, like the Attorney General, I feel that if information is given, you do not force people to steal information or bribe people to give information. I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I am willing and anxious at all times to give information to Parliamentarians who so wish, and if you find it is difficult to get the information from sources which you try to contact, put it in terms of a question either to Parliament, or put it to me, and I will be forthcoming with the information which you want to get.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make what may be the final interjection from the Opposition benches on this matter. I would not wish to add or subtract from anything I said yesterday evening during the debate, but I want to deal specifically with this Head in relation to the position of the Deputy Speaker in relation to Item 12, Subhead 1, Operating Expenses, and perhaps in relation to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

I am seeking some specific information and I would merely wish to make some general comments to the effect that I personally have found the Ministers to be forthcoming on a personal level with information if approached; but at a public level they seem to be a little less forthcoming; and maybe they may know why! But if the Ministers withhold information and then enterprising reporters, or enterprising Members, prise that information out, then the Ministers get a little uptight because they believe there has been some leak inside of their Ministry or whatever. It is they who have themselves to blame. But I do not really wish to pursue that matter anymore.

2.15 p.m.

Under Item 12 – Operating Expenses – I really do not know who is responsible for this Head, because the honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite), who made a very sound and balanced speech, did speak about the enthusiasm that the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig), shows. I know on occasion he does show that energy and enthusiasm!

I would like to get a break down of that particular Item – Operating Expenses. I know that last year I raised the question as to how much money had been allocated to Parliament for the purchase of books for the Library, and I was told, to my shock, that no money at all had been allocated for the Library of Parliament, so that a Member of Parliament inside of this Chamber can get no new material at all in relation to the Library of Parliament.

I think that is shocking. When we go through and we look at different Ministries and departments, we see that they have allocations for the Libraries, and you can get material, magazines, new periodicals and such information. In these Estimates themselves, if you look at them in a random way, I believe even the Library of the Ministry of Education has an allocation for the Library. I think it is $100. There is no serious reading taking place up there! They are all educated already up there. But most of the Ministries have allocations, and I would like to know how much money is allocated for the Library of Parliament for this coming financial year, and I hope the Minister can give me that information.

I, do not agree with what the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss) said about the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. It seemed to me that he

got himself deeper and deeper in difficulty when relating both to the holder of the post and to the post and office itself, because it is certainly within the province of the Prime Minister to allocate portfolios or not to allocate portfolios. Sometimes Ministers are given light portfolios so that they may be available for any special assignments, and it may be that in this particular case, that is what is happening. Then, again, I will have to come around and ask if that is really so, because I see there are all kinds of appointments and disappointments taking place in the Senate, so I am not quite certain what is happening and if that is the explanation.

But we have no doubt in here about the valuable work the Minister does, and I think it is wrong for a backbencher to speak in those terms about a senior Minister of that Government. I believe he is misguided. All it does is to show, and anybody can see it, that the Government, this great combination, is not combining. That is obvious to the people of this country, and many instances of this great combination not combining has been in evidence recently.

As far as the position of the Deputy Speaker is concerned, I would wish to join with the honourable Member for St. Michael Central in respect of the position of the Deputy Speaker. It is time that we recognise that Parliament should be treated in a particular way. I would like to take this opportunity from the floor of this House to hope that our Speaker would have as speedy a recovery as possible, but apparently, the Deputy Speaker will be occupying the Chair for a period of time, and I think we should address our minds to this question of acting allowances. It is done in Government departments, and Parliament at this stage should not be beating around the bush dealing with these kinds of matters. I say nothing about my own position. I have acted for extended periods as the Leader of the Opposition, but that is the position in here, and I think it is time that we come head on with these situations.

I know the Deputy Speaker cannot speak for himself and there is no one who will speak for me, so I will make these points; they will have to be made.

Then again, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the decor of this Parliament and the decorum and behaviour of Members and so on.

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am not getting into this thing about dress. My representative for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) has always paid great attention to sartorial elegance and also certain elegance in respect of the kinds of vehicles in which he travels. That is his style; I am not really getting into that.

What I am concerned about in Parliament is to find out what kind of style is being set. Will the Deputy Speaker, while he is in that Chair carrying out the duties of Speaker, come in with a gown and the wig, these kinds of trappings of the Westminster model? I know he likes all the trappings of office! What is the position in respect of his gown and wig? Why isn't he decked out in the full regalia? I wonder if the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs can tell us that. What is really happening, Mr. Chairman?

I hope the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs can tell me because yesterday I was asking for some simple information in relation to Parliament about how many meetings some of the sub-committees have had, and I was told that the information is not available. I do not know if it was locked away in some cabinets which, apparently, they cannot even find the keys for. What is happening to the cabinets? Are they still locked up? Parliament must continue, and I do not think that in this day and age we should have these kinds of secret cabinets locked away and files or whatever not available to establish continuity of Parliament. These are some of the few specific points I wish to raise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe the Minister can reply.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Minister is not here. Mr. Chairman, there is just one big point I think I should make for the Record. I never obtained any information or documents by stealth, or fraudulently and I am very surprised that whereas the honourable Prime Minister has said on several occasions that a foreign nation passed on these documents to me, all of a sudden today I am hearing that I obtained them by stealth and fraud. I would like to say that no foreign Government passed them on to me and I did not obtain them either by stealth or fraud. It was a gift.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, just briefly, which may be to the surprise of my colleagues on the other side and on this side, let me make it abundantly clear to some of them that I am very fierce in attack. I say no more about some of the speeches made. There is nothing better than to know when to attack, where to attack and how to attack, and I think honourable Members on that side of the House are well aware of the fact of the weight that I carry with this tongue in my head. Many of them have felt it and some over here know about it. I would simply say that fools rush in where angels dare not try, and I would not allow my 22 years of dint of hard work and toil to be upset by refugees.
2.25 p.m.

Secondly, I am not going to be taunted by any Member on that side or on this side with the hope of seeing this Parliament disintegrated. I have put too much work in it. If I am now referred to as "part-time", I

think it is because of the hard work and energy of the past 22 years. I share the office of those eminent and distinguished Members like the former E. K. Walcott, Sir Mencea Cox and Sir Edwy Talma. All I set out to do is to be better than they were. That is all. Those who showered praised on me for the work which I have done only demonstrate that I am capable of doing good work, at half speed or at full speed, and the public's perception of me as an outstanding Housing Minister will remain.

As far as the speech made now about wig and gown, is concerned, I believe that the Deputy Speaker is entitled to determine whether he should wear the full trappings of the Westminster model or if he should wear the trappings of the former Speaker Maxwell. It is a matter of choice and, therefore, I am in no position to determine that. Sir Horace King, the very outstanding Speaker of the House of Commons, was a man of no more than 5 feet 1 inch and he wore the trappings, so the stature of the man has no bearing on whether you look good in the trappings or not.

In relation to the acting allowance, I know that negotiations are already in train for the purpose of having an acting allowance. I believe that is but fair. I would say for Mr. Deputy Speaker that, in his few sittings, he has demonstrated the skills and shown the makings of a fine Speaker.

I recall very well when he was on that side he demonstrated a rugged approach in Opposition and he was equally as rugged in defence of his party when the occasion arose. Now, as Deputy Speaker, in that high executive office, I sit here at times and wonder how people can really adjust themselves. He is cool and calm, fair in interpreting the Standing Orders, is familiar with the Laws of Barbados already, and from his rulings so far, which at some times we all do disagree with, as with rulings by various Speakers, I am satisfied that his contribution is an outstanding one, and I sincerely hope that he would keep on that plane. I have seen them test him already to see how he would react, and he remained calm and cool.

Talk about the amenities in Parliament has been going on since I entered Parliament in 1966. There is no doubt that I would like to see the amenities in Parliament upgraded in keeping with the highest office in the land. There should not be too much to spend on this august and ancient Assembly, of which I am proud to be a Member. From farm boy to parliamentarian is a feat! From soleless shoes to diamonds is equally a feat.

As far as the Library and other facilities are concerned, let me reiterate again that I believe when the Post Office is completed and this whole building can be utilised for the purposes of Parliament, it is only then that I believe there can be justifiable criticism about Parliament. We are operating with a 27-Member Chamber, three Clerks, an extended Press Gallery, an extended Visitors Gallery, no more than we were using sometime maybe in the last century or this century, when decisions were made at cocktail parties and were only brought here to be ratified.

Today we have the cut and thrust of debates, Estimates for the last five days, presentation of Budgetary Proposals. But what has happened? The structure of Parliament still remains the same! For example, at Estimates time you have an ante-room there – this is a classic example – where you have Ministers discussing things with the civil servants, who are their advisors, and in the meantime, you would like to go and make a telephone call of a private nature, and you cannot find anywhere in there to sit down! I cannot understand this, I have questioned it before – how is it that you can have one instrument with six numbers on it and when you pick it up you have to be listening to somebody else's conversation and matters which, no doubt, are confidential.

Sir, we talk about the conduct in the Gallery. Mr. Chairman, as a young boy at Roebuck Boys' School, I came in here to hear the debates. I think it was Mr. Mackie Simmons, a former member to the Legislative Council, at that time a teacher at Roebuck Boys' School and a member of this House, who had brought the boys from Fifth Standard down to listen to the debates, and when I came in here I was actually afraid to sneeze, afraid to talk.
2.35 p.m.

I was told at that time that a visitor to the Gallery was here at the pleasure of His Honour the Speaker, and this has remained vividly in my mind. I was even more alarmed when I was told that the Speaker had the power to summon anyone to the Bar and that person could be confined. Subsequently, as years rolled on, I came in here as an adult before I was a Member of this Chamber when they had people like Mr. Thomas and Mr. G. B. Evelyn who, if I am not mistaken, was the Speaker. The rustling of his robes and the stern look on the face of the Marshal, I think his name was Elder, or Parris, controlled the Gallery, and I, as Leader of the House today, am prepared to see that standard of conduct continue in the Gallery in the interest of both sides of the House.

Any Member, from the Prime Minister back to a back bencher, who sets out to encourage the Gallery in conduct which I do not think is befitting of this august Assembly, I am going to take them on. I was an outstanding life insurance underwriter. All could not be luck. Do you mean I am so lucky? Do you mean that I am outstanding in whatever I do? As a half of a Minister I

am an outstanding half of a Minister, because I can hear the praise being showered on me today. I must be a genius! If I put on clothes, I look too good. If I walk, I walk too pretty. It is just me, this is me, but it is the copycats that get into trouble.

Sir, it is a known fact that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I get on very well, apart from many years of knowing each other. It would amaze you, if you could only know how, with the exception of one of the Members on the other side, I think we have a good rapport, and I have brought it to them to make them understand that today we are in Government, tomorrow we are in Opposition.

(A VOICE: Not the next time).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: When I say today and tomorrow, I make reference to the fact that this is what life is all about. I do not believe that this party is going to be in power for a hundred years. It would be a wish of mine, and obviously I would not be able to make a contribution at that time, but as long as I am around and I have the strength and energy I am going to make that contribution to make sure that we retain the Government of the country. It is true I have a way of saying goodbye to some Members on that side, and they always beg me not to put my mouth on them, but in another year or 18 months or so I will sort out who I will say goodbye to.

I think only yesterday that the Acting Clerk of the House and I were discussing a number of matters relating to the improvement of Parliament. I know that the Acting Clerk is very, very keen on the work of Parliament; I give that to the Acting Clerk, but I have no doubt in my mind that the lucrative income which the lawyers and the medical men, or some lawyers and some medical men, may be able to pick up outside of such institutions, be attractive enough to encourage the present Acting Clerk. I will say this about clerks. I do not care how academically qualified you are, to be a Clerk of Parliament experience is the real qualification. It is a job which can be relatively taxing. You have to advise Mr. Speaker and Mr. Chairman at times when voices are raging on both sides and on whether language used can be considered parliamentary or unparliamentary. There are always times when the occupant of the Chair, or the officer in charge of the debate can lean on the shoulder of the Clerk for advice, which can only come from experience.

The Hansard Reporters, Sir. This has been a problem for a while. I am told when I sought out the information that it is very, very difficult to get additional reporters. I believe this, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would agree with me on this, because he is on the Debates Committee, that when you send out advertisements to get a Hansard Reporter, I do not think that you can find three people in Barbados who are qualified to do the job of a Hansard Reporter. It is not a very easy job, I am told. It calls for a lot of concentration to be able to pick up what people are saying and to be able to write at the speed one is speaking, especially when someone like me is in full cry. That is a very very difficult job.

I know we are short right now during the Estimates. One of the reporters is not feeling well. I will say that there is a Mr. Errol Bailey who I believe would come back to Barbados now, and not to a funeral. I believe if you can find him and offer him the job as a Hansard Reporter he would accept it, because he was working here before the death of a former Senator who probably kept him out of Barbados for a while.

I believe we are now at the stage in Parliament where we can introduce palantype machines, I think they are called, which are used at the United Nations and other places, that we might as well start now to examine this, because the membership of Parliament is growing. Within 16 years in Parliament we have increased our membership from 24 to 27, and there is a greater work load in Parliament now than it has been in the past. I think that the Government must examine the possibility of having palantype operators, since there is such a scarcity of the shorthand – I am not talking about speed writing, I am talking about Pitman's, which I am told is something that is rare today.

The other points, Sir. As far as the Library is concerned, I believe the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is well aware of my views on that. Now, finally, the Select Committees. I have drawn some problems to the attention of the persons who are responsible for the summoning of Select Committees to work. We know there is a problem not only when you summon meetings and the meetings are called, but it is difficult even getting a quorum.

2.45 p.m.

I have been sitting on Committees and I can assure you that I have attended about four meetings that were aborted, and the argument for that is the time factor. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is always there. Some members claim that 10 a.m. is the time when they have to be in court, if they are lawyers. If they are medical men, they have to be looking after their patients or their clinics, and if they are businessmen, they have to perform their duties as businessmen. If you call a meeting at 3 p.m., you hear they have to go and pick up their children from school. I know the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will know that I am not trying to pull a fast one. This is a fact and we have been trying to sort out what time is best suited that we can meet to get a quorum.

Take the Library Committee as an example. I attended a meeting of the Library Committee on three occasions and on one occasion, I think I saw – the Member for Christ Church West Central and St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves). We do not see you too often. We know you are not a strong fellow. You do not really come out very often, but when you are out, your contribution is so futile that you could have stayed home anyhow!

Laughter

Asides

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: There is a good rapport between the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and myself and some members, excluding one; remember that. You do not know who is the one and I think that is the problem.

I hope that I have covered as much as possible. But it is foolishness to come back into here, and maybe at the next Estimates, and make criticisms on the amenities of Parliament again when we are well aware, those members who are on the Debates Committee, of saying that Parliament has outgrown its size and physical structure.

The Clerk and I have been discussing the precincts of Parliament, the parking in the courtyard and all of these things. I have a memorandum from him. Rickett Street which used to be closed off, is now a vibrant business area where you have trucks dropping off goods. You have supermarkets there and a travel agency, or a part-time travel agency, over there. It is a bit difficult now to block off Rickett Street which used to be blocked off many years ago, you will recall, to reduce noise when Parliament was sitting. Parliament is not to be interrupted.

I hope within a few months – I would not like to commit myself to any deadline – to be able to present a model of what the plans of Parliament are going to be like. We are examining all of these things – the mezzanine, this cheap plywood bar here that is tearing up your pants when you sit down, all the ends of pine, the cheap microphones. I believe the former E. D. Mottley used to pull this out when he was angry to demonstrate how aggressive he was in the evening of his years. It has three screws in it. I think the time has come when we should have hanging microphones.

Treat this Parliament, I think the third oldest in the Commonwealth, the way it should be treated, and I can only promise members on this side, as I have said in the past that as long as I have the tools, you can rest assured that I shall complete the job.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 12 stand part.

The question that Head 12 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 13 – SERVICES COMMISSION – $256 483

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that Head 13 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few general remarks. Since this Head 13 and 14 – I am not anticipating Sir, I am just making a statement – in my view relate to the same subject, I think I will take the opportunity under Head 13, Public Administration, to deal with the matters relating to the others.

Mr. Chairman, the first point I wish to make is that I am not satisfied, and I have not been for some time, that the structure within which the Civil Service in Barbados is administered in Barbados allows for the most effective and most efficient deployment of that most important resource to the development of Barbados. I believe that the public administration in Barbados suffers as a result of a wrong-headed approach, which has been going on for some considerable time.

I believe that, during the period when we had responsibility for the Government, genuine attempts were made to find answers to some of the problems relating to public administration in Barbados. I have to recall yet again, Mr. Chairman, that under, I think it was the United Nations Development Programme, an attempt was made to have a study done of the Public Service. I believe there was a man here called Mr. Soro who submitted a report, and it so happened that a number of the recommendations in that report coincided with views which I had held before coming to public office in Barbados, and views which I still hold to, concerning public administration in general and, more particularly, how we should administer the public sector in Barbados.

Perhaps I can sum up the recommendation by pointing out again that any system which effectively separates personnel administration, something which we euphemistically call Establishments, and training as three entities, distinct and separate and apart from each other, is a system which cannot bring out the most effective and the most efficient in those three areas.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that another problem which is dogging the public sector at this time is the misunderstanding, perhaps, or the failure to make clear the relationship between Ministers, the political directorate and the permanent secretariat, or the Civil Service as it is called.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that there ought to be by now in Barbados a clear picture as to where the political directorate stands in relation to the permanent Civil Service. I take the point that is made from time to time by thinkers in this field, that it is impossible in Barbados to have a political public sector, that is to say, where the higher echelons of the Public Service are appointed on a purely political basis. But that notwithstanding, Sir, I still feel that the Constitution of Barbados, even in its present state, provides sufficient basis for there to be clarification as to the role of the political directorate *vis-a-vis* that of the permanent Civil Service.

I believe that a misunderstanding of this role has resulted in a lessening of the quality of the Civil Service, which has been brought about by a severe drop in the morale of the Service. I think it is fair to say that there are a number of civil servants who, because of what may be called "executive confusion," find themselves unable to understand from day to day, week to week, month to month, which is the direction in which they should go to execute the policy of the Government or to carry out their function as they see them. Mr. Chairman, this manifests itself partly in the kind of activities to which reference had to be made to the debate of the last Head, it manifests itself in a number of dissatisfied persons at all levels of the public sector, but, more importantly, it manifests itself in the constant statement that is made from time to time, that the Civil Service is not producing at the level which it would be reasonable to expect.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that an unsatisfied or dissatisfied group of persons can produce at a high level, and I think that one of the major problems is the lack of feeling within the sector that it belongs somewhere, and that somebody cares for it, and that, in the end, it is going to be at least offered thanks for its efforts.

I had the honour of being a "civil servant" for a relatively short time in the Barbados Civil Service, but I was fortunate in that I was not recruited here in Barbados. I joined the Service laterally at a fairly high level in the sector and I functioned outside of Barbados, and therefore had a fairly high degree of autonomy, and was able to put into practice a number of systems which were 20th century then, because it was almost 20 years ago.

I make bold to say that here in Barbados the concept of management has not fully, if at all, – it is probably not fair to say "if at all" – or adequately been embraced into the Civil Service system in Barbados. I believe that it is fair to say that, except in very few instances, one cannot find what may be called the team management concept being applied in the Civil Service sector.

Unfortunately, the system we have of change of Government from period to period requires, apparently, that the new Government coming in must not only throw out the baby, but it must throw out the bath water and it must throw out the basin. I say "the baby" because I know that at least the right honourable Member, who is listening intently when he pretends not to be listening, would in fact feel that I meant "throw out the baby with the bath water," but what I am saying is this: a new Government coming in may feel that it wishes to throw out the policies.

The policies of the previous Government may indeed require, at least at the cosmetic level, to have the appearance of substantial change. After all, a Government which comes into power and immediately embraces all the policies of the previous Government, will be a Government to be seen as a fraudulent Government, because, invariably, it gets its power through recommending to the electorate that what they need is a change. But there is no need when they are changing the policy, or changing the face of a policy, to throw out systems which may have been used to implement that policy if those systems can be demonstrated to have been efficient. And I make bold to say that it is impossible to demonstrate that these systems were inefficient until they have been examined in the process of executing the new policies.

When one looks at the private sector in Barbados, not that it is too far advanced in the area of management, one can see that strides have been made in the use of 20th century concepts and methods in the management in the affairs of the private sector. When we look at the private sector, even if you take these Estimates, the very Estimates themselves demonstrate that we have not moved farther from, let us say, 1966, in terms of method or in terms of system – and in some areas, Sir, we have had a regression!

I take issue with the Minister responsible for Establishments, who happens to be the Prime Minister, that he has found it necessary, for whatever reason, to reduce the levels of training in Barbados in the public sector. I think, and I wish to urge on him, that he should re-think the concepts which led him last year, or year before, to reduce the level of training by way of reorganising the system.

I want to suggest that the amount of executive training which is now available in Barbados in the context of the Civil Service has been reduced. Even if that was not the intention, that has been the result. I want to suggest that the availability of scholarships and/or time for senior and middle civil servants to participate, either at Cave Hill or at other institutions, on a full time basis,

should never give way to the dictates and the needs or the apparent needs, of financial stringency. One can appreciate and understand the need to call on those persons who would benefit for additional effort, but where the system of financial constraint results in the diminution of the quantity of training available at the executive level, then I say that, whereas in the short term there may be an immediate benefit, in the long term it is the community at large that is bound to suffer.

There has been an influx in Barbados in recent times in the number of foreign professionals that have had to be imported to assist with the execution of projects. I believe that there is enough potential among the Civil Service in Barbados that could see us, within a relatively short time, training those persons, who show the aptitude, towards new methods of management – 21st century, if you will – to allow us to be able to execute those projects which are bound to come in Barbados, not necessarily in the regime of this Administration or indeed the very next Administration. We have got to prepare now for the capacity to execute projects that will take Barbados into the 21st century and it is my contention Mr. Chairman, that, based on observation of what is happening now, we are not making a sufficient provision for this.

3.05 p.m.

During my Administration, we attempted to establish a Civil Service College. I believe there were some people who had a genuine disregard for the proposed college, and I do not think that they disregarded it out of wickedness – (as you know, Sir, it is quite possible for two persons of equally good intention to disagree violently). But I feel that, in retrospect, anyone who would question the desirability of having some kind of institution that would be peculiar to the requirements of a public sector in a small tight developing economy.

I myself had hoped that the Institute of Management and Productivity would have been used to allow the public sector to rub shoulders with those persons from the private sector, while both sectors would be benefitting from new methods and new techniques as taught in that institution. That is one of the reasons why it was created. I have reason to feel that, rather than there be an increased use by the public sector of BIMAP, there has, in fact, been a reduction in the amount of civil servants participating in BIMAP courses.

I have a vested interest in BIMAP only from a psychological point of view and as a Barbadian who want to see it do well – and I want to see the public sector do well. I believe that if we have an institution like BIMAP and we have an institution like the university here within our shores, it is incumbent on the thinkers and the planners at the political level, or just below, to seek to utilise the facilities of both of these institutions to the extent that the country as a whole can see clear and distinct benefits arising out of having those institutions within our shores.

When we come to Education, no doubt we will discuss the whole question of school management and the whole question of teacher training. There, again, one sees a certain mentality being applied to the whole business of training. I do not believe that training is the orientation of the new civil servant into how to move a file from Ministry A to Ministry B, or the upgrading of typographical skills, or the introduction to the rudiments of the computer. That is vocational training, which should be an ongoing process. That is not what I am talking about. I believe that we ought now to be looking at a forward thrust, to the kind of executive training, for want of a better term, which is absolutely necessary.

We were talking not long ago about the need of good stenographers, not only in Parliament but in the courts. I would like to see us organising so we can send 10 or 15 persons, between the ages of 18 and 25, who show aptitude, to institutions outside of Barbados, such as the United Nations or UNESCO, or any of the major regional organisations, and give them attachments so that they can, over a two or three year period, acquire the skills.

As you have seen – you have been to the United Kingdom Parliament, you have been to the United Nations – what I am discussing is something that happens as a matter of course in these places, and these things are not done by persons with any superior ability than Barbadians. As a matter of fact, my experience has been that very seldom will you come across some of those persons in some of those agencies who have the capacity and ability of the average Barbadian.

Our native ability has to do with our geographical and other environmental attributes, and there are certain special qualities which Barbadians have, which they demonstrate every time they go out of this country and end up in some other major country, where their talents seem to multiply 15 fold. Part of the problem has to do with opportunity, and part of what I am discussing is an opportunity provided within the context of a total career.

It has to be understood by all of us that when we recruit an Administrative Assistant or a Senior Clerk, we are not recruiting a Senior Clerk or Administrative Assistant; we are in fact recruiting the Permanent Secretary of 15 years from now. We have to bring to bear the same kind of thinking for the recruitment of those lower level persons as we would think if we did in fact recruit our Permanent Secretaries at a later stage, and that is why it is necessary to provide them with the motivation and the opportunity for growth within their own chosen career. It should never be, Mr. Chairman, that as a man turns 40 years, and he is in the public sector, that he starts looking to see where he is going to pick up his berry when he comes out of the Service.

As a matter of fact, you will recall last year that I said that this country, as an independent country, will have to pass certain legislation and get certain law to preclude the kind of nonsense where a man could leave a sensitive post in one country and go and work in a sensitive post – it is not a sensitive post for them – on the negative side for us. The result has been a very unfortunate circumstances which, I think, good taste requires that I do not put on the Floor of this House at this time. But it is unfortunate for us, because it means that we cannot be secure and that has nothing to do with the spending of money; it has to do with our mental position; and the point I am making has to do with what kind of mental framework that we are going to create to allow those who join the public sector to develop the kind of loyalty that would not require anybody to say to them, "Thou must be loyal."

I recognise from you signal, Sir, that my first 15 minutes are up. I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, my contribution on this matter will be fairly brief. I wish first of all to state that I am one of those persons in public life who believe that this country owes a great debt to the Public Service of this country down the years. I think there can be no misunderstanding about this because, by and large, the Public Service in Barbados has been free from most of the excesses and scandals that other countries have suffered from, and generally speaking, that Public Service has exhibited a high degree of professionalism in the service of whatever political party may constitute the Government of the day. I have no doubt about that whatsoever.

It may be that, from time to time, Ministers of one particular persuasion may get a bit irked or a bit concerned about what may be considered leaks in the Civil Service, and may threaten them with all kinds of things and claims of all kinds of breaches of all kinds of Acts, including an old creaky official Act, which has been revised considerably in Britain in recent years.
3.15 p.m.

The whole concept of official secrets – what is official and what is not, what are the penalties attached, and what should not be – is a matter that has received considerable attention within the context of British Government and politics in recent years, and it is time that we come into line in that particular regard.

I want to perhaps reiterate a call that has been made by a former Government back bencher, the Member for Christ Church East (Dr. R. L. Cheltenham), who as I recall it, in a very learned and lucid presentation to this House, persuaded the House to pass a Resolution calling for the establishment of a body to review the Public Service. That was passed in Parliament, in this Honourable Chamber, but the Government in its wisdom has not seen fit to carry out the kind of review called for by the Member for Christ Church East. At that time he was on the back benches of Parliament and at that time he used to make some fairly perceptive speeches, but apparently the perception has become a little blurred over the years since assuming ministerial office! We do not hear from him very often now. It may be that he has to act so often for the Prime Minister in one capacity that he feels he cannot make those critical speeches he used to make at that time.

When we look at the developments, we would realise that over the years, from the middle of the 19th century, the British have been looking at their Civil Service, carrying out periodical reviews and making the necessary amendments and changes right from the Northcote-Trevelyan Report through those of Tomlinson and down into the 1930s, into the 1960s, reports after reports, and it was arising out of a report in the 1960s that the present structure of the British Civil Service has materialised.

We in this country still creak along. Whatever particular reform or possible change may strike the fancy of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, we may introduce it piecemeal, but no overgoing, thoroughgoing look at the mission of the Public Service, how that machinery should be structured, what are the resources that

should be provided for the Public Service, is done – and we expect it to carry all of the load which any modern Public Service should carry in the changeover from colonial status to the status of an independent country.

I think it is expecting a bit much, and if it is creaking at the seams, if problems arise from time to time, I think we have ourselves to blame for not instituting the kind of enquiry leading, hopefully, to some positive recommendations in which we can get the issues that concern the Public Service, and concern the good management of Government in this country, into some kind of relativity.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter; it is not one that has the kind of political interest that Members may work up any kind of enthusiam about, but it is certainly one that is very vital. We tend to take the Civil Service for granted, and when we look at those who are at the top of the Civil Service, in some places they are called the Mandarins, I believe that is a good term for those at the top in the British Civil Service. They used to be called the administrative class.

The question is raised, do they exercise policy making functions, or are they mere administrators following policy? That is the kind of question that there is no no or yes answer to. There is no doubt that in Barbados the top civil servants in this country exercise a lot of power and a lot of influence. Any Minister who has to formulate policy, or is trying to introduce any kind of new policy, can tell you that they exercise a lot of influence and a lot of power.

Sometimes, they save Ministers from their own excesses. I do not know if they help Ministers get into trouble sometimes, too I do not believe that, because by and large the top civil servants in this country have been a cadre of persons who are outstanding in a very large measure, and I think we have been fortunate that we have that calibre of persons to give the kind of guidance and advice and suggestion, not only in the area of formulation of policy, not only in the area of bringing certain departmental concerns to bear on the formulation and development of issues, but also in the whole area of training and of inducting new members into the Service so that they develop into good public servants.

I can speak like this, Mr. Chairman, because I had a brief stint in the Public Service myself. I believe it was at that time in the Premier's Office, and the Premier was the father of the now Prime Minister.....

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: With that decent background you went wrong?)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I can appreciate after having been associated and worked very closely with civil servants in this country, I can appreciate the role and functions of the Public Service, and I believe I am also in a good position to know some of the deficiencies which exist in the service.

It is no point trying to spell them out here. The point I am making, and which has been made already, is that we need a kind of review of the Public Service in order to ensure that it can be shaped for the kinds of functions and tasks which are required for a Barbados over the next 20 years or so, and the sooner we put that into train the better! I believe under another Head we will be looking at training, so I will not refer to the area of training now. I merely wish to make that call for a review of the Public Service at the top, the executive level and then in terms of the lower levels.

With the recent changes in the Public Service in Britain, where that kind of structure, the class structure, theoretically has been removed and you have a new kind of open structure, I think we have got to examine our own Service to see how we can make improvements in the Public Service.

3.25 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am really only intervening in this debate on this aspect of the Estimates to make a very limited comment. I think one has to recognise that the Civil Service in Barbados has grown at a reasonably terrific pace, and I think that any study of the Civil Service, and in this I include the statutory boards, must be directed to what is, I would say, probably the most economic way of using the manpower available.

I cannot concede that with Barbados' economy growing as it has over the last 15 years or even 20 years, one can allow the Service to grow at the pace at which it has grown. I believe that about $220 million a year of the revenue collected is spent on the wages of civil servants. That figure excludes the amount of money that is spent on statutory boards and, of course, other

boards such as the Central Bank, and I think that there ought to be perhaps a proper manpower study related to productivity to see the areas in which we ought to make economies.

I hasten to add that I am not recommending that civil servants be retrenched or laid off, but I do concede that there are probably some departments that might well be over-staffed, there are others that are under-staffed and, certainly in my experience, I do not believe that we always get the maximum productivity in the Civil Service or indeed in the private sector in this island.

There are, of course, several hard-working civil servants who go beyond the call of duty in this country. I am aware of several of them who go on weekends and work without expecting overtime, many of them who take home work, and some who go back to the office late at night to work. But I think when one looks back over the whole Civil Service, both the established and the unestablished staff, that there is room for an increase in productivity in some sectors of the Civil Service.

I will not be one to describe the Civil Service as "an army of occupation". I do not believe at all that they happen to be that. In some instances, the lack of productivity is probably due to working conditions. I was appalled, I must confess, at the physical conditions available to staff in the Ministry when I was a Minister of Government, and I hesitated on several occasions to improve my own working conditions in preference to improving the working conditions of staff working under me.

Staff cannot produce to the best of their ability if the working conditions are not up to scratch, and there are still several departments of Government in which people are crowded together! One example is the Ministry of Education. In some of those old buildings, which were formerly the old General Hospital, you see people literally sitting on each other. It is difficult for them to give of their best in those conditions.

Some of this lack of productivity may be due to the lack of supervision which staff get. I think that we are, to some extent, going through a bit of a crisis, in the Civil Service at supervisory level; not at the highest supervisory level but probably at middle supervisory level and below, and I would expect that the training programmes, which have been implemented on very small budgets, will go a long way to correcting some of these difficulties.

But I do not believe that we can merely continue to pay the wages of civil servants and people in the statutory boards without putting a halt to the rate of growth of the Civil Service itself. Just as I have observed in several aspects of the private sector that there is a lot of slack and a lot of dead weight that one has to attend to, I think that the Government set the example in the Public Service to make sure that we are getting value for service.

If I may cite another example, I think in some instances, too, that there is perhaps a lack of consideration for the people who are working in the Service. I cannot speak of many departments, but if I can use myself as an example, I always ensured that I knew everybody working within the departments under me and that I found time to talk to them and to encourage them. In fact, I would like to cite an example where on one Saturday the whole of the staff of the Ministry of External Affairs turned out in order to re-organize the Registry. And we did it not only in terms of moving files and reclassifying files, but physically cleaning up the conditions from the Permanent Secretary, Minister, Senior Assistant Secretary, right down; everyone was there giving a helping hand. I think that was a sign of leadership and encouragement.

I believe that we have a very honest Civil Service. From time to time, I know there have been one or two cases brought against people for defalcation, but, generally speaking, in Barbados today I think that the standard of honesty in the Civil Service is a tribute to the good name of this country. And if you compare the Barbados Civil Service with other people in Latin America, you will find that corruption is, generally speaking, absent from our Service. I am not saying that there have not been defalcations; I am not saying that the opportunity sometimes is not there; but by and large I would think that our Civil Service has performed very well in this respect.

I am not sure that a commission is necessarily the answer. I believe that we have within the Establishments Division, within the Services Commission itself, and indeed within the Prime Minister's Office under the Head of the Civil Service with the Management Section, people who are capable of looking objectively at the matter and I believe that this ought to be an on-going process.

I do not think that there is much new that a commission might be able to tell us about the Civil Service. We have come a long way from the colonial days of the Civil Service. There were some very good aspects of colonial administration which we should not run down. On the other hand, I do not believe that the administration of those days would be suitable to Barbados in the 20th and 21st centuries.

If I can again compare the performance of the Barbados Civil Service with the Civil Service in some of the developed countries, I would think that we do very well. I have always been deeply impressed at the fact that two or three, sometimes no more than five, Barbadian civil servants can go to a Commonwealth Heads of Govern-

ment Conference, or a meeting of the IMF, or a meeting of the World Bank or one of the ACP/EEC meetings and perform much better than other countries in the Caribbean and elsewhere carrying delegations from 70 people up, and sometimes 140 and 150.

I have seen a small Barbadian delegation at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference, consisting of the Cabinet Secretary, the Director of Finance and Planning, the Permanent Secretary, (Ministry of External Affairs), and I believe one other officer, sit through the night and work until early in the morning, and yet Barbados' performance at that conference was outstanding as compared with a country like Britain that probably took along about 150 civil servants to do the same work. We were able to participate completely, no doubt at great physical sacrifice to the persons involved, but the standard of their performance was such that no one could fault us for how we were able to perform on that occasion.
3.35 p.m.

So while I will not recommend that we go through another Royal Commission or Commission on the Civil Service, I think we have to have the ongoing process within certain guidelines of the Service itself, recognising that if their wages are to increase, as increase they must, there has to be a limit on the number of people that the public purse can take, and that we must expect to increase productivity in all aspects of the Government Service.

I believe that politeness in the service has improved considerably. I know people run down civil servants and say when you telephone they are almost lackadaisical in responding to your request. I really cannot say that in my dealings, either in or out of Government, with people at the switchboard or officers from whom you ask questions, whether it be the Immigration Department, the Police Department or Government Headquarters. They are always willing to help and they are polite in dealing with you. I hope that this goes right throughout the Service as a whole.

I have not been in all of the departments and I do not deal with all of the departments, but I think that by and large we are fortunate that we can get a change of Government in this country smoothly executed. There will be changes of Government from time to time and I have no doubt that the bulk of the Civil Service will ensure that while these changes take place, the Government's business is carried on without any allegations of sabotage of the political directorate which is in charge of running the public affairs of this country.

Obviously civil servants have their own political views. Some are more adept at concealing their views than others; but I think that it is generally recognised in the Service that regardless of what political persuasion you are, when you come to work for a Government, regardless of the complexion of the Government, your duty is to carry out the directions of the Government of the day.

There may or may not be one or two exceptions – some people get misguided at times – but I think the Civil Service, having seen two changes of Government since self-government – the change that took place in 1961 and the change that took place in 1976 – can now be satisfied that both political parties are anxious to have an impartial and efficient Civil Service, and that both political parties, and I think this is generally true, respect the independence of civil servants as a whole. I hope that this will continue as a good feature of Barbados' public life.

I am not one of those, Mr. Chairman, who subscribe to the view that the day a Government changes, all the top people in the Civil Service, and sometimes right down to the secretaries, could move. In Costa Rica the moment that you have a change of Government, you could find a secretary right up to the top person having to pack up and go and wait until the next time the particular political party comes into power. That is very unfair, completely undesirable, and I hope that I would not see that become part and parcel of the public life of Barbados.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments. Sir, I believe that the stability of this country has been significantly enhanced over the years by the level of public administration, and I also believe that anything that one perceives as an assault on the standards of public administration should be dealt with at a very early stage.

It is particularly in times when the political directorate is in a state of chaos that we, the ordinary citizens of this country, have to rely more heavily on the authority of the people who function within the public administration. It is in times of social and economic stress, when the morale of the political directorate has clearly been severely undermined by their internecine quarrelling by the dismissals and rehirings and by the kinds of bickering between the front bench, and between the back bench and the front bench, which we witness here in Parliament almost every day, that we have to say to ourselves, "thank God, we have a well organised public administration in this country". Otherwise, the country would certainly be in even greater trouble!

It is for this reason that you will notice that I am always more than careful to direct criticisms on the Floor of this House towards the political directorate rather than

towards the administration, whereas it seems to be the policy of Government, whenever they come under fire, to try to deflect such criticisms on to those who are required to carry out political directives, rather than those who were primarily the authors of the policy position and who issued the directives.

It is in this context, Sir, that I should warn the Government that it is precisely in these times when nothing should be done to weaken the morale of public officers. The wage policy pursued by the Government, the numerous layoffs that have taken place over the years, the delays in the paying of pensions and gratuities of officers when they have reached the age of retirement, the failure to make reasonable and swift adjustment in the pensions of retired public officers, the failure to follow accepted guidelines within the society to reward those who have been laid off with some form of payment, the discrimination shown in the selection of persons who have been laid off, abandoning the principle that the last employed being the first to go, but in many instances people who have been employed for nine or ten years have been laid off while others who have been more recently employed have been allowed to continue to work and those people who have been laid off after seven, eight or nine years have not received the usual compensation for those years, some going into 12 and 15 months now, these are all factors which have contributed to the low morale in the Public Service. As a matter of fact, I got a telephone call from a young man, representing probably about the fifteenth call I have had from him over the past four to five months, distraught because he has been anticipating some kind of severance reward and indeed nothing has been forthcoming.

Now when you take all these factors and you superimpose on them the concept of victimisation, which was introduced in dealing with public servants by this Administration after it came to power, then one can understand why the tensions that we see emerging in the Public Service today are of a nature which never existed before.

Civil servants are like any other workers. You can legislate how much you will pay them but you cannot legislate how much work you will get from them. And I believe that it is most important when one takes action like legislating the salaries of public servants, because you have the authority to do so, at the same time you must recognise that you are taking an important step in undermining the cohesiveness of the Public Service, and that this inevitably results in the kind of complaints you hear made by Ministers from time to time in this Chamber.
3.45 p.m.

It is my suspicion, judging from the high priority given at the time of the introduction of the Estimates by the Prime Minister, when he indicated that he would have some words to say about the Public Service, that you have a situation where the Government has undermined the stability of the Public Service and is now responding in a paranoid fashion by believing that the Public Service is in some way affecting their ability to have their policies, or lack of policies, executed.

At this stage certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I spent about nine years or thereabouts in the Public Service, and I can well remember the morning I decided to leave the Service. Having reviewed files until about 3 o'clock in the morning, and then all of a sudden reflected that these were files that I had initially made certain recommendations on, probably going back three years, and they have gone through almost every department in Government and eventually have come back to you, and you have spent from 7 p.m. to 3 o'clock in the morning writing the same recommendations that you have made three or four times, I decided that at that point in time that I had to finish with that. I just could not spend anymore time in that way; and when I make decisions, they are pretty decisive.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is not true. I resigned from the Service long before the Dems lost. I resigned from the Public Service in 1975 or in the early months of 1976. That is nonsense. How can you enter the campaign as a public servant? It has got to be nonsense, Mr. Chairman. You could not possibly campaign as a public servant.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order: The honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) used to campaign in St. James as a magistrate, not as a civil servant; a man administering justice. So do not worry to tell me that you never used to campaign.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, no point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the trouble is that the Member for St. James South was rather too lenient with you when he was a magistrate. To continue Mr. Chairman.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He would have to be lenient with his brother, not with me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, the point I was trying to make is that that incident has impressed on my mind that

there is a need in Barbados for technical and administrative strings in the Public Service. I have always held this view, it is not a party view.

One of the big problems we have is that it is so difficult to attract people who have specific skills in particular areas because you run into a bureaucratic situation where the Minister is now introducing in the picture that if he gets X amount, the Permanent Secretary gets X – Y and, therefore, no other person within that Ministry can get more than a certain amount.

Let us say that you wanted to get a top-class actuary employed in the Public Service today, I doubt if you would be able to get a top class actuary, unless he has special reasons for coming to Barbados, at probably less than $120 000 a year. It is a highly developed skill. Such people are rare and we need them. Similarly, we need good accountants in the Public Service. There is a shortage of top level accountants throughout the Public Service, and sitting on the Public Accounts Committee again and again every month, when we meet the same story comes up again and again– the lack of accounting skills within the various Ministries. The only way you are going to get top class accountants is if you are in a position to pay salaries to people who are specialised in those areas, and you will probably find that you will get a much more effective accounting system within the Public Service than by paying a lot of people smaller salaries.

This came to my mind most forcefully in relation to the medical field. For example, how in the world are you going to attract, let us say, a full time neurosurgeon in Barbados? What are you going to pay him? You are going to pay him the salary of a Permanent Secretary? That is what you do not understand. A neurosurgeon does not only do neurosurgery; he is a neurologist, he does back surgery, he does all kinds of work. He does not have to do brain surgery at all! If you wanted to attract people of that class in Barbados, then you will find that one of the reasons why you cannot attract them is because you cannot afford to pay – not that the country cannot afford it – because when they have to be put in that kind of administrative structure, you cannot find a salary grade to accommodate them. I am only dealing with three areas, and the fact is that you have to recognise, sooner or later, that being a Minister does not entitle you to any given level of salary within the administrative system of this Government; nor being a Permanent Secretary. There is no reason at all why the Permanent Secretary in a particular department should be paid a higher salary than a highly skilled person within that department, whose skills are rare. The fact is that in the market out there, you can probably replace a Permanent Secretary with another 50 persons in Barbados who could perform that same job, but you can have only one person who can perform a particular job.

You may have a situation where the kind of salary that a person can command may be because he had to forego probably 15 years of his working life in order to be trained to reach that particular level of competence, and that is why he will attract that kind of salary, whereas the civil servant would have been working his way up during that 15 year period. So we have to abandon that kind of bureaucratic mentality and take a new kind of approach when you are dealing with a technical string within the Public Service.

I think we have to address ourselves to this for a very important reason. Government, not only the main Civil Services, but all through the statutory boards and so on, are involved in a wide range of activity in Barbados. A considerable amount of money is spent in this country through Government and its agencies and Government activity contributes significantly to the economy of this country. To handle that efficiently, you must have people who would be able to appreciate all the scientific and technological inputs, and be in a position to assist the administrators in coming to certain policy decisions and so on. You are not going to attract them if you continue along the present lines. You are not going to attract them unless you can somehow or other forget the framework in which you are functioning, project yourself into the future and recognise what will be the needs of the Public Service in 1985, in 1990, in the year 2000, and what kind of role would it be performing.

If you take any Ministry, if you take a Ministry like the Ministry of Transport and Works, and you really think down the road and see the kind of role that can play in Barbados in 20 years, quite clearly there is going to be a massive shift away from the administrative content towards the technological content in that particular Ministry, and unless you have a financial reward structure to shift into the area of technical expertise, then you will continue over the years not only to fail to recruit people of ability, but at the same time dampen the morale of all within the Ministry.

There are fundamental decisions that have to be taken. I believe that the Standing Orders relating to the Public Service in many instances are completely irrelevant, and, quite frankly, I believe that the only people who should be deprived of the opportunity to participate in political life in Barbados may be the top civil servants. That view was canvassed very heavily during the debate on the British Public Service. I am not sure what was the final decision, but the Civil Service itself was divided as to whether or not officers below a certain level should be relieved of that obligation, or, since they only function as clerks and so on, whether they should not be free to participate in political life.

I think we have a ridiculous situation here where if you are an employee of a statutory board you can participate in public life. I think that must be true, because I

recall the Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Sisnett) campaigning with a CBC van in the City by-election in 1976.....

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I saw you in Nelson Street in a CBC van.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I indicated to my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that we would take a break around 5.00, but I believe that the Chairman would rather have a break at this point in time.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for 20 minutes for a tea break. We will not have the break at 5 o'clock, we will have it now, Sir.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
4.00 p.m.

On Resumption:–

Mr. DEPUTY 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. DEPUTY 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.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) indicated at the closing of his speech that while I was a member of the staff of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation some years ago I was involved in campaigning for the Barbados Labour Party in one of the company's vehicles. I just want to set the record straight, Mr. Chairman. There is absolutely no truth in that statement whatsoever. I would not want to go into some of the infelicities that took place at the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation when I was a member of that staff seeking public office, and I will advise the kind honourable gentleman to refrain from such untruths.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I want just to make a few remarks in connection with the Public Service of Barbados and also to advert to comments which were made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central with respect to victimisation within the Public Service.

I am not here to give a blanket approval to all the practices of the Civil Service. It is my view that we in Barbados have got a comparatively good Civil Service. It is, in the main, an uncorruptible Service, but in any area where there is a large number of people you will get a reflection, as you get a reflection throughout the society.

The people, even in the Church, reflect the society in which they live and operate. Therefore, it is not impossible to find even within the Church bandits and all types of wild men, as was recently discovered in England, when a man who was in the priesthood was discovered committing a number of rapes. Therefore, to say that your Civil Service is without fault or blemish is certainly to expect or believe in a Utopian society. I do not so believe, and therefore I will not say that the Civil Service is entirely beyond reproach.

A person might not indulge in a correct practice by way of seeking to position himself in a form where he can receive a bribe for promises made or concessions granted, but he may be committing a dishonest act when he goes on a go-slow and seeks to deprive the country of its resources by rendering little work for the money which is paid. In that regard, the person is as much culpable as one who might be charged for a felony of some kind or another.

While a civil servant might perform his functions reasonably well in certain areas, he might not be a person that you can regard as a model civil servant, and, of course, it is expecting too much to believe that, with the frailty of human nature, you can get people who are perfect, and therefore I am not looking for that.

There are many civil servants whom we can trust, and, I believe, feel free to accept the advice which they give, and unquestioning sometimes about that advice. But there are a number of them who still have their political axes to grind and seek at every turn not to advise properly, but to try in some way to prevent the wheels of the good running of Government to function well and smoothly. In other words, they tend to mix up the gears with a view to confusing their Ministers in terms

of passing knowledge unto them. Sometimes we are only made aware of things within our Ministries when somebody far down the line, or not even at all in the line, but somebody from outside who has to do with the Ministry, is involved in a particular matter and they draw it to your attention. I believe that holds true for both parties, not only of this party.
4.30 p.m.

The system operates in a way to give you what, in their considered view, you should know. For example, you have to go to a meeting tomorrow. They are aware you are going to a meeting, but you never get the information for that meeting; but when you turn up at the meeting, the large amount of information which is brought before you makes it impossible for you even to look at the first few lines, let alone digest the massive documentation which is put up before you just seconds before the meeting, or while the meeting is in progress.

It is not to say that that information is not available to them; they have had it and that information has been going the rounds – but you are never aware until the last moment that this information is around. So I want it to be clearly understood that when the civil servants want to make it difficult for you, they can make it extremely difficult for you; and when they want to give you the information, they will pass it on to you without much difficulty.

I do not know for any of my colleagues; I believe that I can speak for most of them, but I am going to speak this afternoon for myself. I have never told a single person who came to me to ask me for a job, or to assist them with a job, that the prerequisite to my assisting them with the job is membership in the Barbados Labour Party.

If there is one thing I believe that we cannot be accused of being guilty of is that we have never tried to force membership of a party down any person's throat. For a party which has been in office as long as we have been, certainly it could well have doubled or tripled our membership roll if we were the type who were just going out there and saying that you must become a member of the party.

I know in the constituency of St. Andrew, there are many people, including civil servants, who get invitations to attend meetings of the other side, and unless they are telling lies, they have all said to me, "We do not know how this has happened, because we have never joined that party". But nonetheless, invitations come for party meetings and unless they are ashamed of their party, they are never willing to attend those meetings; they stay away. Probably, it might be a question of smartness; they might be committed to the party but do not want to be seen out there.

But in the case of the Barbados Labour Party, we have never sought to influence anybody to become a member of the Barbados Labour Party with a view of getting a job or a position. I know of many .....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order: I think the honourable Member (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) seems to have forgotten, rather than misleading the House, that very early in the life of the Barbados Labour Party Government they tried to insist that Permanent Secretaries attend their first Annual Conference, and held it as a threat over them, and it was Sir Carlisle Burton who exercised his authority in that situation and told Senior Permanent Secretaries that they should not attend.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There has been no breach of a Standing Order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I think I was involved in that exercise. When the party came into power, it was the view of the Government that since there was going to be policy statements made that they should attend – not specifically to attend the party conference.

I have warned you already. I am going to speak in this debate. I have always tried to treat the right honourable Member for St. John (Hon. E. W. Barrow) with a degree of respect, because he has made his contribution, but I will have to remind him that he has condemned civil servants as "an army of occupation".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is making a speech. Please let the honourable Member for St. Andrew continue.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that Sir Carlisle Burton's name was dragged into this, but Sir Carlisle Burton would certainly have no influence over a Permanent Secretary attending any meeting that he chooses to go to, absolutely none. He was the Head of the Civil Service, but he could not exercise any authority to tell a man that he cannot democratically attend a meeting. Who would dare him to do that? A person is free to support the political party of his choice. This is quite distinct from a person going out there and advocating a policy on behalf of a political party. That is what one would not expect.

On the question of people holding permanent positions in Government and then resigning to go and hold jobs with certain companies or foreign establishments, we have to be very careful lest we allow a situation to develop where the country can be destabilized by having officers who serve in very sensitive positions taking up other posts in certain areas. This is a very serious situation and one that we should look at very carefully.

I do not know what is the position, but I think that the Attorney General can advise on this. I do not think that judges are allowed to hold certain positions after they have retired from their offices, and I do not think that public servants who are highly placed should be allowed to hold certain positions outside the service. For example, if you deny a person like a Cabinet Secretary holding a position of a certain nature when he retires from office, I do not see why that does not similarly apply to civil servants at that level. We are not saying that they should not have the opportunity to go out into the private domain and to get work if they can, but there are certain sensitive areas, in my considered view, that they should not be allowed to enter. I feel that the time has come when Government should look at a code of ethics for retired civil servants who are placed in positions where they acquire tremendous amount of public knowledge which can be dangerous if allowed to go into the hands of certain foreign Governments. You cannot say that a person can go and work with the Canadian High Commission or the American Embassy and at the same time, if a Cuban Embassy is set up here, say he cannot work there. There have got to be one rule for all people, and we must lay down those rules very clearly. I think that we need to look at these situations in order to arrive at a proper conclusion in this regard.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central also spoke about accounting and accountancy skills. This is an area that to me is very much lacking within the public sector and there is also managerial skills which are very vital.

4.40 p.m.

While I do not like to use the term "cross fertilisation," I think the time has well come when we should look in this direction and actually graft certain expertise in the Civil Service in order to bring a different thinking to bear within the Civil Service structure. For example, in most of the statutory corporations we were having people who were seconded from Government posts, and, largely, they have been round pegs in square holes. They have not been performing, they have not been behaving like people who are operating a type of business enterprise. They have still brought within the enterprise, because a statutory corporation is actually such an area, the Civil Service approach, and I think the time has come when we must look very carefully in this direction with a view to strengthening those areas that are not directly under the umbrella of the Civil Service, but to some extent part of the overall Government structure. Therefore we must look at this with a view to making them more efficient in terms of managerial and accounting skills, as was put forward by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

I think it is fair to say that, whatever might be the faults and shortcomings of the Civil Service in Barbados, we are still fortunate to have the type of service we have today in a world beset by tremendous corruption, undermining and the most unpleasant things. Even though you might consider that we do not have the very best at all times, but we still have a reasonably well structured Civil Service.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a very small contribution in relation to this Head, with reference to the Public Service. I believe that Barbados can again proudly boast about having the finest public officers in the Caribbean. I do not know if this is because of the old system and training which they had received during the time of our colonial masters, but I would be failing in my duty today if I did not say that I am proud of the Civil Service in Barbados.

It is true that in every organisation you are going to meet a weak link and you are going to meet a strong link. However, Mr. Chairman, I believe it was an unfortunate day when civil servants were encouraged to appear in the domain of politicians to a point where, as the Constitution of Barbados makes it clear, they are free to join a political party or union, free to worship at the church of their choice, etc. But I understood all along that for many years civil servants were not allowed to join political parties. I believe that in the changing years around 1960 or 1961 you found civil servants getting themselves involved in political parties; and if they get involve with the actual politics that when one party goes out of power, you must expect that individual to feel a little despondent. This is human nature.

In the meantime, there are some civil servants who are career civil servants, that is the point I would like to make, for whom it does not matter which political party is in power. They are dedicated civil servants, career civil servants and they look forward to going to work and doing a job as a public officer to the best of their ability. Then you have the other fellow checking on the 25th and 26th. You go in some of the offices and you see a circle around the 25th, 26th and 27th where he is waiting for pay day, because he is not really a career man.

That happens in all organisations, in the Police Force, the Nursing profession, the Civil Service, journalism, all of these; so I am not going to condemn the Civil Service of Barbados as the Leader of the Opposition condemned them in 1974, or whenever it was, when he referred to them as "an army of occupation", neither would I condone the behaviour of the civil servant who may be seeking office as a politician, such as my colleague and friend for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) displayed in 1976 I think it was. He was actively campaigning, morning, noon and night, along with Mr. Glasgow and Mr. Horatio Cooke, I can call these people, and no doubt some on my side, because

the flood gate was opened by the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow). He opened the flood gates and gave the civil servants the right to join political parties, hobnob with them and so on, maybe to get his programmes go through.

I remember the honourable Member for St. Philip North campaigning. I saw him at the dances buying drinks at St. Martins. You don't remember I used to be up there with you, battling for a seat, but you were Chief Valuation Officer in the mean time.

I have said it publicly, and I say it again, I thought it was nothing short of a disgrace then for the honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons). Let me forget about his winning a seat. The Prime Minister of Barbados gave him a seat. The honourable Member for St. James South I know as a fact of life – and I will go to any law court and give evidence – canvassed people for a seat in St. James while being a presiding officer in the Magistrate's Court.
4.50 p.m.

At this point certain remarks made by Hon. L. S. CRAIG were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The flood gates I believe were opened during those years, which I thought was unfortunate, and today we find civil servants, some of them not all, have their political beliefs. I go to public meetings sometimes and I stand up behind them, and I hear them, and they come up to me and tell me how they like me and who they dislike in the Dems and so on. It is unfortunate for the Public Service that when you have this type of behaviour, you find obstructionists somewhere along the road.

But I will say that I am proud to know that I can go into any Ministry that I have worked in and be sure that I have still the confidence of those officers that I worked with. There is not a single Ministry about which I can say that I did not get along well with my officers, and they gave me the fullest cooperation. However, there are problems in some Ministries simply because some civil servants find themselves politically involved.

The other point I would like to raise about the Civil Service is that there is a little lackadaisical approach to some things within the Civil Service, and I would like to laud the head of the Civil Service and the Training Department of the Civil Service for producing the calibre of civil servants that we have in this very crucial period in our history. There is no doubt in my mind that this is a different age we are operating in, and I am quite happy to see the calibre of civil servants that are coming out of the Training Division and the way they are conducting themselves.

No doubt, Sir, the wheels that turn today are much swifter than they were yesterday. It is a very technological age we live in, and training is important today, and I will impress upon the Government that, wherever possible, it should give civil servants training in Barbados so that they can carry out their duties much more efficiently.

I beg to move that Head 13 stand part.

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

HEAD 14 – ESTABLISHMENTS AS AMENDED, $4 614 553

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 14, as amended, stand part.

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

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Before I get to Head 14, I would just like to set the record straight for the Member of St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig). The by-election in St. Philip was held in April 1976. I went on pre-retirement leave in October, 1975, and in my letter to the Head of the Civil Service, I notified him that it was my intention to contest a seat and sought permission to campaign. It is as simple as that.

Head 14 – Establishments. I think that there is some error in Head 14, because if you look under Personal Emoluments, you will see that, under Item 2, there is provision made for four Permanent Secretaries. But if you check the Estimates opposite the four Permanent Secretaries, you will see that there is a mistake in the calculation of the salary attached. It says $68 784 and four Permanent Secretaries at S-4 would certainly be doubled that amount. That error is carried over into the summary column on Page 6 of the Personal Emoluments.
5.00 p.m.

Under this particular subhead, I would like to find out from the Minister responsible if these four Permanent Secretaries are the ones who are now on special assignment, and if they are, what assignments they are presently engaged in, and what is the relationship between the four Permanent Secretaries and the Chief Establishments Officer, if there is any accountability by these Permanent Secretaries to the Chief Establishments Officer.

I also note at the bottom of that Personal Emoluments column that the post of Director of the Organisation and Methods Division has been abandoned, and I am wondering why the Ministry found it appropriate at this particular time to abandon the office of Organisation

and Methods. We have discussed this at length, and it is agreed that with the Civil Service growing at the rate it is growing, and the fact that it is now so diversified, you need to bring modern management techniques to a lot of these offices.

It was my understanding, when I was in the Service that the aims and objects of the Organisation and Methods Section was supposed to go into any department and do a management study with the object and aims of recommending to the appropriate Ministry any changes in the structure that were necessary. So I find it extremely difficult to assimilate the fact that this whole division of the Ministry of Finance has now been abandoned, and I see no way for the job of this division to be carried out in any other section of the Establishments Division.

Under this Head, I would like to get back to the topic of training. The honourable Prime Minister said there was a cut down in overseas training, but this is a very fundamental thing as far as Barbados is concerned, and I would invite the honourable Prime Minister to re-examine the situation in Barbados.

The Civil Service in Barbados has some specialised skills that you do not find in certain parts of the private sector. We have just passed legislation for exempt insurance, we have offshore banking, we have the International Companies Act, and these are areas where you need specialists inside the Civil Service. I am aware of the fact that this section of training was always scrutinised very closely, and you are only allowed to proceed on overseas training leave if a case could be made out by your Head of Department that there is immediate need in the Service for this specialty, or the need is seen somewhere down the road. So the fact that you have cut out this overseas training leave would mean, in my opinion, that you are now at the stage where you are no longer training the specialists that are needed inside the Civil Service.

There has always been a complaint that when some of these people returned to Barbados, highly trained, they are taken up by private enterprise. Personally, I see nothing wrong if that happens, because the moment you have trained manpower, even if they go into private enterprise, it will always redound, in the final analysis, to the benefit of Barbados and the Treasury as a whole. So even if we lose any of this specialised training to private enterprise, I do not think that this is anything Government should be too alarmed about.

The problem here will be seen five, six, seven, eight years down the road when the shortfall in the specialists that you are now not training begin to show themselves up in the Civil Service that is expanding every day, and you should again examine it.

Training is fundamental in Barbados. When you are moving your economy into a service economy, you can only move into a service economy if you have the trained personnel to make use of that service economy that you are going towards, and it is a known fact that people have always looked at the Civil Service as a way of providing training that is needed. I would not like to see, for the sake of a few dollars saved, that we interfere with our overseas training.

The Barbados Civil Service has been able to establish itself as one of the best in the Caribbean and in the Commonwealth, because of the calibre of its intermediate and senior civil servants, most of them who have benefited at some time from overseas training, and you can never overtrain a person in Barbados for our Civil Service – it is too diversified a Civil Service for it.

I can only invite the Minister to look at it again. You cannot have too much training in the Civil Service of Barbados, and, as I said, the training on overseas leave was so well researched that I hardly think you could make a case to show where there was any wastage on overseas training. I would therefore invite the appropriate Ministry to have a look at the earliest possible time and return the training position to where it is.

If you look under the subhead for the provision under the Training Fund, you will see that the Training Fund has now been reduced to $412 000 as against some $1.03 million in 1981–82. There, again, this Training Fund, as you know, was there whereby people, who were not recipients of Government scholarships and wanted to go and study, got the necessary guarantees from their parents or otherwise, and were able to borrow against the Training Fund and go into the specialised fields of their choice.

I think we should top back up that Training Fund so we can make sure the civil servants in Barbados remain as highly trained as they are now, better trained even for the future, since the Civil Service is becoming so diversified. When you have the situation where a civil servant has to speak on par with his colleague in private enterprise – the private enterprise people are becoming very highly trained – it would not be right to have a civil servant at a disadvantage in his discourse on behalf of the Government in any situation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In reply to the point made by the honourable Member (Mr. W. O. Franklin) relating to the four posts of Permanent Secretary, I cannot immediately recall who they are, but these are the supernumerary posts to which Permanent Secretaries are appointed when they are seconded to other approved service. You probably will find that the Executive Director of the National Petroleum Cor-

poration is one. I am not sure the other three are not all ambassadors, but this is the purpose of the posts.

Now, in the case of the Executive Director, there will only be a token salary assigned to him, and indeed the whole amount may only be a token, because if they are being paid from other votes, we no longer charge the supernumerary posts of the Establishment with the statutory expenditure, because we have discovered that this is an unnecessary form of double accounting, which is very common indeed in the Estimates. In a sense it does not matter, because it is all statutory expenditure, but as far as we can now, we do not even include far less vote the money for public officers in the posts where they have been seconded from posts and the posts are not vacant. In other words, they do not like the idea of double accounting. This was a bane of earlier Estimates and I am very glad we have been able to get rid of it.

The point about training is, of course, a deeper point. When you get down to it, it is really a matter of opinion and judgment. It is our view that both economic circumstances and the development of the Service no longer require the extensive volume of overseas training previously necessary.
5.10 p.m.

In Barbados today, it is possible, and has been now for 20 years, to get a free university education. We think 20 years is quite long enough for all those persons who wanted a university education, but who were not able to get it because the opportunity did not exist when they left school, to have got it, either by part-time attendance at the university or, if they showed sufficient talent, by full-time attendance on secondment from the Service.

We, like many Third World countries, and I must say like the developed countries also, are more and more moving towards longer periods of tertiary education. People do like to go to university for long times. The old English tradition by which you were taught very intensively at school, went immediately to the university where you were taught, again very intensively, for three years, seems to be dying out.

When I visited my old college to sit among the fellows, I was surprised to see how many doctors of non-scientific subjects there are among the staff. In the History Department there are virtually no people with first degrees except those who have been there for a very long time as senior members. This seems to have overtaken the Barbados Civil Service as well.

In the Ministry of Finance, successive Ministers have perhaps hardly even been aware that a system, that you must have two degrees for appointment to the higher ranks on the Planning side, is in existence. There may be other Ministries where this is also considered desirable. It is these training opportunities that we think are a luxury rather than a necessity.

I do not want to deal with any individuals, but there is one Ministry where an Administrative Officer is working in Personnel; he just works in the ordinary administrative section of the Ministry – and it is not the Ministry of Transport and Works – and he was given training leave to get a first degree in some kind of Civil Engineering. I have just had to refuse him training leave to go and get a second degree in some kind of Environmental Health, because it is not relevant to his position, and there is no post in the Public Service to which this training would immediately be directed.

I regret that it is no longer possible for the Civil Service to set aside a larger number of its places for persons who are going through education at a higher educational process, but I think that there has to be a point when you graduate. The Ministry of Finance, for example, must have, according to my calculation, a much higher proportion of persons in it with degrees and post graduate qualifications than the British Treasury.

Now, this is a good thing for the Ministry of Finance. I am proud to have a Ministry of Finance and Planning that is so well qualified. There are a lot of very able people, but it is possible that they would be just as able of doing their work if they had only one degree. I put it no higher than that! I do not think that adding to a man's degrees necessarily increases his capacity to do his work.

I think that the number of diplomas in Public Administration that exist in the Public Service are so many that we would be hard put to create enough posts in which they can be of use. Indeed, while he was still the Head of the Civil Service, Sir Carlisle Burton indicated to me that we had in training and in existence more persons seeking that diploma than the then existing posts. Yet, people still apply for it, and that is not even a matter of overseas training!

There are also a number of very elaborate training schemes evolved by the University of the West Indies for teachers. They cost a very great deal of money. If my memory serves me correct – I would not be surprised if the University programme for further education for the teachers actually costs more than the training for all the rest of the Civil Service. Certainly, the amounts are comparable!

Now, I myself wonder if it is necessary for persons teaching in comprehensive schools, in secondary modern schools without a Sixth Form, and in ordinary secondary

schools to have a plethora of second degrees. I really wonder if it is necessary.

The University of the West Indies aims to teach people to the standards of European Universities. Without being invidious, Mr. Chairman, I imagine that the University teachers would not deny too strenuously that they seek to set higher standards than, for example, the general standards of State Universities in the United States. I do not know that they could really set any higher standard than UCLA or the University of Illinois or whatever. But in general that would be their belief, that a man should be able to leave the University of the West Indies with one degree and be capable of teaching in a secondary school. I think it is geared to that.

I therefore do not think it is necessary to offer the same further educational opportunities to existing teachers as might have been necessary in the older days when it was a first degree that they were trying to get. A first degree, a Diploma in Education or a first degree and training at Erdiston, I think, is what our desiderata should be for secondary school teachers.

It is not my impression that the reduction of training opportunities has caused any fall in the efficiency of the Service. Indeed, in the earlier days after Major Headley was appointed to be the Chief Training Officer, my impression was that the efficiency of middle management in the Service went up as a result of the very extensive and intensive training programmes for the middle level of civil servants that he instituted and carried on so very capably.

With regards to overseas training now, I personally would seek to confine that to subjects which have some application in the Service and which cannot be offered at the University of the West Indies. The tradition die-hard, the honourable Member for St. Philip North, a former civil servant, would no doubt recall in the service when the perks in the overseas training were perhaps an important form of discipline, but it is significant that overseas training in Australia is much more popular than overseas training in Guyana or Trinidad, or even Jamaica.

Overseas training in North America seems to be not so popular, because I believe it is much more accessible to persons generally. But distant parts, especially English speaking parts of the world, seem to exercise a powerful magnetism. When I think of the number of persons, Land Valuers, Agricultural Officers, in a wide variety of disciplines, who have been trained in Australia, I wonder what the educational qualities in that country – splendid place though it may be for cricketers – can be to make its universities so much more compelling than universities rather nearer home.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that the reduction in training is really causing very serious problems. I fully accept that there is a need for Barbadians to go abroad to be educated. That is a different matter. I, myself, am quite prepared to support some abrogation of the rule that all Barbados Scholars must go to the University of the West Indies, because, as objectively as I am capable of assessing them, I think that if this rule is carried to its logical extreme, we will become too inward looking and we will have people whose education is confined to book learning, and who have not had the opportunity of looking at life outside Barbados.

5.20 p.m.

I also believe that the Barbados Scholarship will have more meaning if people are competing for something they cannot get free, because, after all, a Barbados Scholar now gets no greater opportunity of education in an Arts subject than a non-Barbadian Scholar. If he goes to the University of the West Indies he need not bother at school; he need not strive for excellence if he is going to go there whether he wins a scholarship or not. I believe that to stimulate the qualities of our school boys and girls and the efforts they have shown in the past, it may very well be necessary to offer some incentive over and above a local education, and I mean a local education at first degree level.

I do not believe that the generation of the honourable Members for St. Michael South, (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) and St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), is any more intelligent than the generation which is rising today; yet I believe that that generation customarily enjoyed better results in overseas exams than have been enjoyed since. I was very distressed to hear recently that not often does a Barbados Scholar get such results in the Advanced Level Papers as would qualify him for entrance now to the University of Oxford or Cambridge. There perhaps have only been one or two Barbados Scholars in the last eight or nine years who would qualify for automatic entrance into Cambridge University.

I think that if we are looking at overseas education and overseas training, we should look at that level rather than the civil servant level. I just toss this out. These are opinions rather than positive statements of policy, although I believe the Minister of Education shared my view to some extent, and the House will have a chance to pronounce on them in the future.

But where training is concerned, I believe this must be directed towards efficiency rather than towards raising the educational level of the population and, more specifically, the Civil Service part of the population. The training guidelines have been communicated to the Civil Service through its representatives. There has been some

friction, but I must say that there is also some acceptance of it. We will however bear what the honourable Member said in mind in examining future applications.

The office of Organisation and Management has been abolished in name, but the functions of the office are still carried out from within this vote within the Establishments Department. The former Head has been promoted to service with another Ministry, but there is some reason to believe that a former Deputy Head will soon be returning to this department on promotion from his substantive post, and I have no doubt that that will give a fillip to the O and M work throughout the Service once again.

But there are a number of capable O and M officers in the department who do carry out studies of other Government departments from the O and M angle. I am certainly very grateful to them and to the experience which they bring to the office in advising me on dealing with such matters as are now before that department, such as the changes at the Rates and Taxes Division, which involves studies of the efficiency of MTW and the Land Valuation Division. All these matters will be coming up in a Bill fairly soon.

We have recently gone through major organisational exercises relating to the devolutions of the functioning of the Waterworks and the Port Department and in which a general O and M leavening in Establishments has also been a great assistance, and I think that the honourable Member will agree that, to use the words of the right honourable Member for St. John, an element of cross fertilisation between Establishments and the department, which was originally hived off from Establishments, will probably be very useful in the Establishments work in general in the Service. I hope I have answered all his questions.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: My contribution will be very brief. On the question of the supernumerary Permanent Secretaries, there is a structural problem which I would like the Minister of Finance to bear in mind. These are established posts, they are not sort of casual posts. You cannot, because there is a certain amount of double counting in that their salaries are there, if you call it double counting, and may not be drawn, remove their salaries. If you remove their salaries from the Estimates, you are disestablishing their posts. You cannot have a token vote for salaries which are fixed by law. I had four supernumerary Permanent Secretaries for the same reason that the posts are still on the establishment.

On the other point relating to training, what has happened to training is that it is not a question of training overseas. The honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) did go to Australia. More recently, one of my constituents, a young married lady, went to Australia as well. But it is not fair to criticise people going to Australia because, invariably, under one of the Commonwealth Technical Corporation schemes, these are scholarships which are offered, and I think Barbados has benefitted considerably from the kind of training which some of our officers have had in those overseas places.

Mr. Chairman, one cannot approbate and reprobate. You cannot say it might be a good idea to let Barbados Scholars go overseas and do not want civil servants, who have talent, to go to the University because you have enough people with general degrees, science degrees and maths degrees.

In conclusion, I think we can sum up the whole attitude of the Minister of Finance, who unfortunately just left his place, in the words of the well known poet, dramatist and everything else, who said "it is a common truth that loneliness is young, ambition its ladder, whereto the climber upward turn his face, but once attains the upmost rung, he then unto the ladder turns his back, looks in the clouds scorning the base degrees by which he did ascend."

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a brief intervention, and I wish first of all to indicate that it is my feeling that it is a very short-sighted policy on the part of any Government to restrict the training opportunities for members of the Public Service, either within the country or outside of the country. If because of financial stringency it is not possible at the moment to have a more open form of training for the Public Service, then I believe that such a policy might be framed within the context of the financial stringencies affecting the Government.

But I think that, as a rule, we should always try as far as possible in fashioning a training programme, to consult the interest both of the Public Service as a public institution and the officers who constitute that Public Service, in order that they may find a satisfying career within the Public Service, and that they may be given a degree of flexibility to ascend whatever ladders the Leader of the Opposition may have been referring to, bearing in mind also that they should not scorn the rungs by which they did ascend.

5.30 p.m.

That is a general position and I would hope that what I have heard so far in this debate from the Government benches is not an indication of a policy that has been frozen into position, and that, generally speaking, the opportunities for persons who may not have been able to benefit from training to date even though it may be said that 20 years may be enough, will be made available.

I have my doubts about that thought about 20 years being enough when you are discussing the concept of life-long education. This is the modern concept we are talking about! We are talking about life-long education. We are not talking about any kind of concept which says that education and training is limited only to the years of adolescence or early adulthood. We have the concept of life-long education, and I think we should be more open, more flexible and more accommodating in policies as far as the Public Service is concerned, both in respect of the needs in the Public Service and also the need for developing a satisfying career structure for the public servants.

I would say very little more on that particular subject, except to add that I also believe that not only does the Training Division of the Government has to develop the necessary training programmes for the provision of specific skills within the Public Service, largely on the basis of short term courses, but also to work in collaboration with other institutions, within the country. I believe there are opportunities and areas for creating within Barbados itself, both at the University of the West Indies as well as the Barbados Community College, useful training in the area of Public Administration and related subjects.

The other question which I wish to raise is more of an Establishment matter. I believe that a couple of years ago there was some severance of certain workers in the Public Service, particularly within the School Meals Department, and I would like to know what is the position in relation to that matter. Has it been sorted out and settled with the unions representing those particular workers? Have they been given their severance pay or any comparable compensation for the years service that they had given to the Public Service of this country? I wonder if I could get some information on that particular matter.

Lastly – I am not certain if it comes under this Head – but sometimes there are public officers who are entitled to leave and who cannot afford to go on their overseas journey to which they are entitled. And because of how the Regulations or the Orders, or whatever relating to these matters, may be concerned, there seems to be some difficulty in that area, that you have to spend it outside of the country, or you get nothing at all, or you lose your entitlement. I wonder if this particular matter could be addressed and if a little flexibility or some change in the procedures could not be introduced to deal with this particular matter.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, as acting Minister of Education, I believe that I might be able to answer one or two questions in relation to the whole question of training and education as I see it. For a long time, a debate has been going on as to the utility of training in the Public Service, and I am one of those who feel very strongly that, if there is to be efficiency and good management in the Public Service, there must be continuous training for officers in the Public Service.

I also believe, unlike the honourable Member for St. Philip North, (Mr. W. O. Franklin) that there is no intrinsic value in overseas training. I stuck my neck out on this on quite a few occasions, and I am prepared to do so again. To me those who advocate this intrinsic value in training overseas are really missing the mark.

I think what is important and necessary at this stage is not to look at training in quantifying how much money is spent on training, but rather the value that you are getting for the money spent, and therefore, it is necessary to, in my view, train the trainers. If we in Barbados spent a lot more of our energies on training the people who would train the public officers, then we would be able to do a greater localisation of training, and put to the end once and for all this continuing belief that there is something magical about being trained overseas.

As one who has been trained overseas myself, I am well aware that, more often than not, a lot of extraneous knowledge, which bears very little reality to the situation that obtains in this country, is spewed out. That is not to say that one does not pick up an enormous amount of useful knowledge. But I believe that there must be a consistent thread running through the rationalisation of training at all levels in this society, and at a time when the Government has committed itself to a Caribbean Examinations Council, premised on the understanding that we in the Caribbean are better able to determine what we would want to keep and what emphasis there should be, I think that, if we are going to be consistent, we must apply this at all levels of training. Those of us who think that we do not have the expertise and the abilities in this country to apply training at all levels to people in the Public Service, and that they must go to Australia, or wherever they pick these things up. I think they are short-changing the people we have in our own services.

If I may quickly answer the other point raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), on the question of School Meals people, I understand that the answer to your question is, "yes". Adequate provision will be made for these people in consonance with the established practice of Government in these matters.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I think that first of all one has to recognise that there seems to be a difference of opinion at the highest level in the Government on the issue. And bearing in mind that the substantive Minister has on more than one occasion demonstrated a variance with the views of the honourable Member who just spoke (Hon. L. R. Tull) and the Prime Minister on, for example, the restructuring of the university, one is left to wonder if there is,

in fact, a coherent policy on the Government on training and education.
5.40 p.m.

I think that there is a fundamental error, which continues to manifest itself every time the Prime Minister speaks on this issue, in that he continues to equate training with education, or rather, to put it the other way, he makes a distinct separation between training and education, which I do not believe is possible. Every time someone is trained into something, that person is being educated as well. But I suspect that he was talking about the broader education which one experiences from going into a new culture, and to that extent I wish to disagree with the honourable Member who just sat down. He, himself, is a good example of the kind of broad.....

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: My colleague seems to be suggesting that he is not a good example, but I will take him as an example of a person who has been trained and educated outside of Barbados. He has had the benefit of living among the Canadians for a substantial amount of time, after which he was able, through, I believe, a scholarship, to go to Oxford and Cambridge, and he was able to determine what of the education at Oxford he would reject in the context of Barbados. He also had a lot of training in the United States – not formal training, because be was extremely lucky, he was able to go into a number of occupations in the United States at a fairly high level – which allowed hiin to see a number of things operating in a different culture quite differently. As a result, I would offer the suggestion that he brings to problems, when he is serious, a breadth of knowledge and experience which allows him to take other than a very narrow view of very serious issues. It is for that reason that his view sometimes can commend itself to a broad spectrum of the society.

I think that it is necessary that persons, when they reach a certain stage be able to get wider experience. And I am not here speaking of Barbados Scholars. The incentive for a Barbados Scholarship would seem to me to be in the scholarship itself. It would seem to me that the possibility of being a gold medallist or being number one does provide enough incentive. I do not agree with the Prime Minister that the standard is lower. I think that the youngsters who win Barbados Scholarships, and their colleagues of this generation, have a wider grasp of what they are learning than those who went before. But that is a point which is arguable.

The point I wish to make is that when a person reaches a certain level, that person, if he is in a career situation, ought to be able through a sabbatical, if you will, to have the opportunity to pit his own knowledge and his experience against that of other persons in other cultures, who may have been in the same field. It is for that reason that people who teach in universities are given a year's sabbatical so they may go and broaden their experience, or sharpen their tools. It is designed for that purpose so that they can pit them against other persons of similar mien.

This is not an easy area, it is one that borders within the philosophical as well as the practical. It is necessary for a Government to bear in mind its financial resources and to act accordingly, but the point which I think the Prime Minister missed – and certainly in my earlier intervention I made the point, and I believe that my colleague for St. Philip North was making the point – is that we might be all right now. I do not believe there is a problem at the moment in terms of the quality and quantity of available people. What we are concerned about is what is going to happen five or ten years from now. There is a cadre of persons coming up in the Service who are being denied this particular opportunity, which persons like my colleague got when he was in the Service, and which a number of people, who are now at the executive level in the Service, had five or ten years ago.

It is necessary to leave a continuing avenue for persons to expand and develop themselves. I think that if it is recognised that training is not only equipping oneself for the particular task, but it is related to the growth and development of the person, if that is recognised as an inherent part of the productivity quotient, if you will, then it will be recognised as well that it is necessary for individuals, not all, but certain individuals to be able to avail themselves of different opportunities.

Let me make one last point arising out of what the Prime Minister said. He talked about degrees, and I would like to suggest to him that he should disabuse his mind of the relationship between training and degrees, executive training or advanced training and degrees and diplomas.

If one has done a first degree in General Arts or some similar subject, that person may be equipped for a generalist position, but in order to have a real acquaintanceship with business administration, I would submit, for example, that it is necessary to go on to that level called graduate level in order to get the full benefit of training which usually results in a Master of Business Administration Degree. The same thing applies to Public Administration, in my view, and a number of other disciplines which are related to management services, for example, where they do not begin to teach certain rudiments until you get to the graduate level.

The honourable Member for St. Michael East (Hon. D. G. Blackman) ought to be in a position to bring his considerable experience in the North American arena to his Cabinet colleagues in this respect. In many United

States institutions the real training, as opposed to general education, does not begin until one reaches the graduate level.

In the context of public administration in Barbados, Mr. Chairman, it is still true that there are only four persons in this community, in the whole population, who hold a Master's Degree in Public Administration. And one is the former Head of the Civil Service, Sir Carlisle Burton, who had his in Public Health, so really, there are only three persons in Barbados who holds a Master's Degree, what is called the professional degree in Public Administration.

That does not mean that there is no one else who knows anything about public administration. The diploma course given at the University of the West Indies does bring persons up to a level that is adequate, perhaps. But, generally speaking, part of the difficulty which we are suffering in the Caribbean now in attempting regional programmes, is the dearth of trained personnel in this very peculiar area of public administration. Throughout the whole region it is almost impossible to find, apart from Dr. Nunez and old Professor Mills, who has been going on *ad infinitum* for the last 25 years, and a few others whose names does not necessarily come to mind, there are very few persons from the public sector who are available to put together a curriculum based on Caribbean experience, and develop a proper training course that would suit the region.

That is one of the difficulties for which we have to call in agencies like USAID and such other anomalous agencies to come to the Caribbean and tell persons how to train. We should be doing it the other way round. We should be developing from within the Caribbean a cadre of persons – five, or ten, or twenty persons – who would be able to develop training courses peculiar to the Caribbean experience, but which would lack none of the finesse or the quality of those to be found in other places.

I think that there is something to be said for both views, but I should not like to think that the Prime Minister would close his mind to the view which suggests that we have got to leave an aperture. If you cannot open the whole window, leave an aperture through which a few persons every year will be able to go and benefit from what I choose to call "a different experience" in their field.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I just want to say that the matter of severance pay to the former School Meals workers is receiving very urgent consideration. One of them has been ringing my office all day today. I did not know this, but I did answer the phone and he explained to me who he was and asked if it was true they are getting their money this month, and I told him then that I hope they will get the money next month, but that I could not promise before the middle. That is the Government's position. We hope soon to meet and decide on it.

The question that Head 14 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

5.50 p.m.

Head 15 – Cabinet Office – $1 580 910

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there have been skirmishes, but there has been no real debate concerning Cabinet Office, and I think we should take this opportunity to raise a few questions.

I wish to say from the outset that neither I nor anyone from this side of the House questions the right of a Prime Minister to allocate his portfolios, to decide on the number within the Constitution, or to do any of the things connected with being Chairman of the Cabinet once he has been asked by the Governor-General to form the Government.

What we can question, however, is the public information which a Prime Minister, having made his decision, seeks to put before the public which has a vested interest in these matters, if for no other reason than that they pay the piper and, therefore, feel they ought to be able to call the tune, however periodic their ability to blow the trumpet may be.

When the Prime Minister reshuffles his Cabinet, one ought to be able to see some rhyme or reason for the reshuffle. But, again, that may be quite subjective. I, for one, might have a lot of difficulty understanding the last reshuffle. I find difficulty in understanding how he indicated that there was going to be a big thrust in the area of transportation and that for those reasons he was going to be bringing the full experience of a particular Cabinet Minister, who had demonstrated in these other Ministries this capacity, and therefore he was going to be making a thrust in the area of transportation. That was said from New York, but nonetheless we understood that it was meant for us, because most of the pronouncements from the Prime Minister and his colleagues come to us from outside Barbados! So we took what he said in New York that he was bringing the professor into the area of transportation in order to give us that thrust.

One well remembers the great fanfare with which this was announced, and for that reason we in this House gave the Minister all the assistance we could, even when his colleagues seem not to be giving him assistance, generally speaking, and we accepted that he would need some time to bring his policies into effect. Lo and behold, one year later, the exact time when we were told that we would be in a position to start to assess this new thrust, the Prime Minister, apparently, through whim and fancy – but I will grant him that as his right – changes! He has a reshuffle, and he moves that Minister – and no one in his Cabinet or outside can understand the nature for the reshuffle, the reason for the reshuffle or the objective of the reshuffle. But that is a small point, Sir.

We do not expect him to tell us why he reshuffled the Cabinet – that is his prerogative. When, however, he dismisses a Minister of any rank, the people of Barbados expect to be told what the position is. This is not a bread and fish operation. This is not a person who comes in as a labourer and you look out the window and you say, "I do not need you this morning" and you send him off; then, two weeks later, he comes back and he says "Skipper, things hard", and you pick him on.

This is at the level of people's business and we in this country feel that the reason given by the Prime Minister – well I do not even say given by the Prime Minister – the reason put out by the Government that the gentleman had left the country without permission – is he a schoolboy begging for a step-out? – he left the country without permission! – I submit that that is specious and not in keeping with the levels at which we should be operating. If you do not wish to give us a reason, do not give us one. Do not tell us that he left the country without permission and then two weeks later he is reappointed. He must have come back into the country with permission!

But it is worse than that, Sir! We were told by the Barbados Labour Party that the Democratic Labour Party Administration had too many Ministers and too many Parliamentary Secretaries, and it was the sworn conviction and commitment of the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party to reduce the cost of Government and to reduce a number of the ills connected with the public administration of Barbados by the simple task of reducing the number of Ministers.

We demonstrated during the election campaign that he had in fact raised them to 12 by then, but he has now done it himself up-front and above board. He has now gone beyond his own expectations and the expectations of the people. He has appointed a Minister of State. He now has two Ministers of State. If he wants an Executive Assistant he should say so – change the Constitution, let us have an executive system and let him appoint the Ministers as he sees fit.

But he has two Ministers of State within his office, and there is a Parliamentary Secretary now going into his office. His work is extended. I am not surprised his work is extended, because he spends more time doing the work of the Ministry of Tourism than the Minister himself. The Minister of Tourism had 11 portfolios. The Prime Minister spends more time directing the officials in the Ministry of Tourism, apparently, than the Minister. But that is a matter which we have to deal with substantively.

I want to know when he dismisses a Senator, or when a Senator resigns, if he feels, or the Government feels, again, that the people of Barbados are so stupid that he can say that a man is so ill that he cannot attend a Senate meeting periodically – but he is not too ill to be Chairman of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board.

How can a Prime Minister do that to the people of this country? If Senator Rouse is not good enough to be a Senator, he is not well enough to be a Chairman of a very important Board, one of the most important Boards in this country. Every time you look around in the newspaper, you see that he and the new Minister, who has gone to give his thrust to Health, can be seen in the newspapers. From Speightstown to Licorish Village, from St. Peter to Blades Hill, all over the place you can see the Chairman of the Sanitation Board – and they tell me that he has resigned on account of ill-health!

There are some in our party who say he is suffering from "Greavitis" – Senator Greaves drive him out of the Senate. But the people on the street are not saying that, and the Prime Minister ought not to leave his Junior Ministers and the Senators at the mercies of the mouths of the people. He owes it to the population to clarify these issues.

I am told that there is another Senator who is going to be afflicted shortly with the same illness which Senator Rouse was afflicted with.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The resignation has to be in by 3.00 p.m. today, I thought it was tomorrow. By three o'clock tomorrow his resignation will be in. I do not understand it and the people of Barbados do not understand it. I think you had better talk about that; we must have information. And when you look at the Cabinet vote and when you look at the pattern of Cabinet behaviour, these are questions which must be brought to the fore.

6.00 p.m.

The honourable Deputy Prime Minister said he had about eleven portfolios.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Twelve? I beg your pardon. He was overworked, and we have some other Ministers, one is in charge of Energy only, the other one is in charge of what my colleague calls "the work permit industry" – $2 million from work permits must be an industry – and we have a whole Ministry for that – we have a Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, but we have dealt with that already, and we ask ourselves this question: you have a Minister of Tourism, Minister of Trade, Minister of Industry, of Civil Aviation, they say he is good, but if he is that good, why does the Prime Minister have to meddle in his affairs?

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have just about come to the end of your time for this time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Every time I start to bite the clock has a way of being very fast.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I too can see that the Prime Minister of any country has a right to change around his Ministers. I think it is now a matter of common general knowledge that we now have the largest number of Ministries that we have ever had in the history of the island, despite the promise of the Government. But, you see, it only proves that you should not make promises that you do not have any intention of fulfilling, or which show that you do not really understand the machinery of Government.

What I do not understand is why an important industry like tourism, which was on the verge of bringing perhaps $4 million to $5 million to the Gross Domestic Product of this island, should have a piece of Minister or piece of a Ministry. I am not being derogatory or pejorative; I am only saying it does not have the undivided attention of the honourable Deputy Prime Minister, who has several other portfolios to look after, and the work permit industry, with a Minister with a full ministerial salary, has a total revenue of, as far as I can remember from the Estimates, approximately $3 million; $2.8 million or something like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the work permit industry? Please inform us.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The work permit industry is the industry under the Minister who is responsible for Immigration and matters of that kind, because it is something which the Government regards as important enough to have a single Minister allocated to it, and which brings government revenue. I favour the Larousse Dictionary, and not the Oxford Concise, to give you the precise definition.

The other thing that distresses us is that the only person, we have heard, who has made a serious attempt to reduce the cost of living in Barbados – it is true that it is only in the liquid refreshment area of Scotch, by reducing it from $28 and $32 to $8 a bottle – is peremptorily relieved of his post; the only person that I know since 1981 who has made a serious attempt to reduce things in this island. Now he should be put in charge of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, not the "Minister of Snowcones."

I must join with the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) and say one can change around Ministries and so on, but you are dealing with public affairs, and people must have confidence in the affairs of this country. The honourable Member (Mr. L. L. Sisnett) who was recently relieved of his post as a Parliamentary Secretary and then reinstated, is a fairly harmless innocuous kind of person. He is popularly known as the "Minister of Snowcones", but that is nothing to do with his parliamentary functions or his official role in Government. He is an entrepreneur and he has a following, like anybody who has come in here, and therefore his constituents also deserve some kind of explanation as to how their representative can be treated in this manner.

We are completely at sea, and the only way you are going to put an end to and dispel the kind of rumours which are rampant from time to time on the slightest matter – if you go to the dentist to get a tooth you are getting your jawbone removed and that kind of thing in Barbados – is to come out frankly and say what the position is. Is it that the Government is embarrassed or the Government does not want to embarrass the particular individual? That would be very laudable, but you must not tinker with the Constitution and tinker with people, and the status of people, in the way in which we have seen it going on in recent days. We are very concerned about this.

A promise was made that they were going to reduce the Ministries. We never asked the Government to reduce the number of Ministers, but at the same time that the Government had been professing they were going to do this, we now see that parliamentarians, without asking for it – certainly on this side – are given Constituency Secretaries. Parliamentarians are now going to be allowed, I think, something like $400 a month for contribution to political parties. This is the way taxpayers' money is being spent. We never asked for it. Parliamentarians, in addition to that, in these Estimates, without any warning whatsoever, have an amount inserted under Loans and Advances. Did you know that, Sir? What are these loans

going to be for? To buy cane carts and buses, legally this time? The taxpayers' money is giving parliamentarians constituency secretaries.

I want to say that I do not think we will abolish it, because we would not want to put all these young men and young women who now assist the parliamentarians in their duties out of work, but we never would have introduced it, not with the state of the economy! But it having been introduced, I want to be truthful. I do not see how we can honestly go and put all of those 27 young people, or whoever they are, out of work.

We have to be concerned not only with the increases in salaries to Ministers and Parliamentarians, but the very cost of running Parliament. I have got an old water-stained carpet in the office of the Leader of the Opposition. I have ambassadors and people of that ilk, even the Leader of the House, coming into my office. Must I have a water-stained carpet? But I do not agree in spending $500 000 on Parliament. When you spend $5 000 on my office, you can spend a little $2 000 up here and "call it Wally", but not $500 000 – not with the state of the economy of Barbados!

And now to add insult to injury, to show how much you hold the people of Barbados in contempt, you are coming in these Estimates and asking for loans. What are these loans for? We have not got to the Head yet, but I am only speaking in a general kind of way, and I am sure that when we come to Loans and Advances, some explanation will have to be given. Why is it necessary in view of the salary revisions and all that kind of thing?

Now you are going to make loans, so a Parliamentarian now wants to get a complete monopoly on the snowcone industry in Barbados. Are you going to loan him money on the grounds that he is employing people selling snowcones, which are perishable commodities? You cannot have any collateral on a snowcone, so are you going to lend parliamentarians money for that kind of activity?
6.10 p.m.

We have to be serious in our approach, and we have to be above suspicion, and I think when it comes to spending money on parliamentarians, either by making us more comfortable in our offices, including me, in the House of Assembly and Parliament and that kind of thing, or by letting us have access to public funds that the ordinary man in the streets does not have access to, we should be very, very careful. I will deal with that matter when I come to it because it is not, strictly speaking, under Head 15.

There is a very large sum of money under Head 15, for Conferences. Again, we find that Ministers are travelling first class. I remember that when a former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom came down to Barbados, he travelled economy class, I commented on it, and one of his assistants – I cannot remember what rank he was – told me that the British Cabinet does not encourage Ministers to travel first class. England at that time was a much wealthier country than Barbados, and it probably still has more resources and more industrial potential than many other developed countries in the world.

Now if the British Parliament is satisfied that their representatives should live in a modest kind of way which is not far above the standards which prevail in the rest of the society, there is nothing wrong in Barbados by our setting an example. I always try to impress on my Ministers that you should not be ostentatious. We have had an ostentatious Minister, but he did not last too long.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, that was the wrong Resolution, for the wrong reason, at the wrong time by the wrong people for the wrong purpose. When we are in Opposition, as my colleague has pointed out, we do not have the prerogative that is vested in the Prime Minister. I am not bringing a Resolution against the Prime Minister to re-fire the Parliamentary Secretary or anything like that, like you all were trying to do. That would be a constitutionally and juridically inept Resolution. You do not bring that kind of Resolution but you can give advice. But unless we know why you are relieving people of their post, we cannot even advise you to take them back. The point which I am making is not a cheap political point. The point which I am making is that you have a responsibility to the people of Barbados not to run the Government in a capricious way.

Under Subhead 3 there is $1 million for Conferences and Delegations. Last year it was $1 120 000 in the revised Estimates. We are now proposing to spend $140 000 less than we spent a year before and $120 000 less than we spent last year. As far as I am concerned, if the Government was serious about that I would welcome a reduction. But I think the reduction is not due to any earnest desire and intention of the Government to confine their expenditure on Conferences and Delegations within the ambit of $1 million, which we are now being called upon to vote.

I think that this reduction was due to keeping the deficit on current account, and you have to go out and look for places where precise arithmetic cannot be entertained at this particular time, and say let us drop $120 000 off the vote for Conferences and Delegations.

I welcome the reduction in the vote, but knowing at the same time that later on this year, with the kind of travelling that is going on, with the urge always at hotels that are costing more and the arguments that we have heard from the other side, that we are going to have a supplementary for that. I would wish that we would try and contain the travel within the figure which has been set out under Subhead 3 in this end.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am always struck by the ability of the honourable Leader of the Opposition to speak in one way in respect of these matters, and act in another way. This is well known as one of his essential characteristics.

It is really amazing to me that the honourable Leader comes in here and castigates the Government for its attempt to improve the lot of parliamentarians when his colleagues on the other side are always criticising the Government for not making adequate provisions for parliamentarians so that they can look after their constituents properly.

Earlier today when the Head for Parliament was called, we heard a tremendous amount of talk about the need for research assistants, the need for better library facilities, the need for more implements for parliamentarians to do their job more properly. How does one square that with the kind of speech made by the Leader of the Opposition? Of course, he always claims that he speaks singularly on these matters. But I know this, when drawing time comes at the end of the month, he is always the first to draw.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, I do not draw; they send it to me – with all the deductions. I was not in the fortunate position to draw trice in one year.

The basic position is that the Government is very conscious of the need for continuing expenditure on Parliament, like all other services. But many of us recognise that there is a tremendous sacrifice which everyone who comes into Parliament is called upon to bear. It is one of the most exacting jobs that anyone can be called upon to perform and from the time we were in the Opposition we recognised that it was necessary for Members of Parliament to have certain minimum aids, in the form of personnel help and physical conditions. That is why we introduce the question of parliamentary assistant.

As a matter of fact, many of us have been advocating that, for the money that is given, you cannot get a person of requisite type that many of us would like. The money is too small! I know the Deputy Leader of the Opposition shares this view, because I have heard him express it in Parliament, and we agreed with him. But we constantly say that in these matters, in view of the fact that we have some of the old fogy types in politics who believe that this is a political issue, that they can make capital out of this, this is one of the areas in which you have to gently try, by persuasion, to reach a national consensus.

As far as the national consensus is concerned, we have 26 Members in Parliament who are in favour of it now and we have one person now who is against it, but that may be a generation gap. That is the problem. It is a generation gap.

6.20 p.m.

We on this side believe that you should honestly pay your parliamentarians, that you should fire those who steal immediately, and do not talk about the wrong Resolution at the wrong place at the wrong time, and you should not talk what you do not mean and you should not say things that you do not carry out in fact. That is my answer on that to the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

As far as the distribution of Ministries and Parliamentary Secretaries is concerned, that is the prerogative of the Prime Minister of a country under the Westminster system of Government, and the only limitation of the power of the Prime Minister is a revoke within his party. It is one of those non-legal checks, as the constitutionalist, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, will tell you, that Parliament has the power to make a man a woman for the purposes of the law, but that does not mean that there will not be women, because God ordained that there should be men and women.

Similarly, the Constitution vests the power in the Prime Minister, but you cannot be a Prime Minister without a Government, so therefore there are constitutional limitations upon the exercise of the power, and it is not for the Opposition to say how the non-constitutional limitations are to function. So the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) should give himself advice. You should go back and remember your constitutional law, which you learnt at the London School of Economics, and you will learn that there are limitations upon the legal powers, political limitations.

Now, Sir, I always hear this talk about how much work this person has to do and how much the other person does not have to do. It always amuses me, Sir, particularly when they talk about a separate Ministry of Tourism. I have made a very careful study of this. Barbados has never had a separate Minister of Tourism, never, even in your time there was a Minister of Information and Tourism. You never had a separate Minister,

and more time was spent by your Minister of Information then directing CBC to publish positively than dealing with tourism.

The basic position is this – and CTRC has done research on this, and it is a question that all Governments have to face – once you have a structure in tourism industry in which you have a Tourist Board, which is broadly representative of the various sectoral interests involved, you cannot have that with a separate Ministry.

(Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Why not?)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, the honourable Member should ask the former Minister of Housing how it was possible to have a Minister of Housing during his time – and I mean the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) – and the Housing Board, or the problem the honourable Member had with one of his Ministers of Housing – the one on whom the Resolution failed – and the Housing Board. If you have a Board and the only work the Minister responsible for the Board has is the administration of that particular subject, he is going to give directions to the Board lock, stock and barrel every morning, every noon and every night, because he has no other work to do.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Specious).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is factual, though.

If you look at the Bahamas, you will see that the Bahamas have created a Ministry of Tourism, but they have abolished the Tourist Board.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: You could as well abolish yours).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The decision as to the governmental structure resides in the Prime Minister after consultation. You know that too. If you look at Jamaica, you will see that that has happened, so therefore it is a question of deciding in your mind which form of structure you will have.

Why do people not criticise the British Government? Tourism is a function within Britain of the Board of Trade. It is one of the subjects that is allocated to the Board of Trade in England, which is allocated to the Secretary of State for Trade.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Never mind the revenue. When you had your half Minister...., but we will come on to the tourism debate. I am waiting for you. Let us deal with that under that. You have not studied the thing properly.

The other point they made in respect of Conferences and Delegations. This is very important. We have not expended all of the vote that we have voted this year, because this is one subject. We have the figures for it, we anticipated this. The number of overseas conferences up to the 24th February was 140. The number of conferences held in Barbados was 10. We have conferences that are being held also, particularly CARICOM conferences. It is a well known fact that Barbados is in great demand for the holding of conferences. If you tell anybody in CARICOM you are having a conference in Guyana, people "schupse" their mouths, because they do not wish to go there. If you ask the Guyanese themselves where they prefer to go to have their conferences, whether Guyana or Barbados, they unanimously tell you let us get out.

That is why we have a conference centre. You have to pay at the hotels. The actual expenditure at 9.3.83 was $1 054 827, the commitments – because that is very important, I am not trying to trick anybody, I will give you the commitments too – were $58 510.73, so that we have $1 113 388, and the original provision is $1 120 000, so therefore you see that we have tried to tighten.

We have not abolished the Committee called the Standing Conferences Committee. One sure thing is that every year you know from the start that there are certain conferences, that, before the Estimates are passed, there are certain people planning to go to certain conferences. They are like a recurring decimal. We have the problems to deal with, some of the problems that the honourable Member in his time had been ducking for a long period of time, problems as to whether you would attend two of the largest conferences. One is the WHO, whether you go to that every year, or PAHO, and the other one is ILO. Then you have the argument as to whether you will pay for the union or you are going to pay for the employers. Those are the two difficult ones, and we have settled that. You pay for one union adviser and you pay for one employer's adviser.

The honourable Member quarrels about first class. What are you going to do when you have a conference like that and the adviser to the Union says that he travels only first class? Tell me what you are going to do; let him stay home? In a Question here only last week the Reply was given. The rates of subsistence have not been changed since 1979, so the Government is trying its best in this area to contain expenditure, and the rule in relation to first class is that, I think it is over a thousand miles you are entitled to first class, if it is within a thousand miles you are not entitled to first class. We also have the rule that if you are going to Europe you must travel by Caribbean Airways, and you do not have a first class on that, so we have attempted to bring some rationality to this.

In any event, we can demonstrate that the Civil servants have gone to more of these conferences than the Ministers. That can be easily demonstrated.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It was so when you were over here too.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: So what is the big thing then? We have not changed it, we have done our best to contain it.

The cost of Government in all countries is a matter for some concern, but really and truly when we get down to it, I do not believe that the electorate really feel in their minds that it is possible to run the organisation of Government on a shoe string. I do not believe that they think so, because they know that a vast majority of people in here can really do better outside than coming in here. The people in Barbados are not fools, they know that the vast majority of Members of Parliament come in here at considerable personal and financial sacrifice. The Public out there knows that, so do not think that there is any major political capital to be made in talking about these matters. I have been in Parliament for 20-odd years. I go through my constituency and I well know this.
6.30 p.m.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, to me it seems quite obvious that the Prime Minister and leader of the country is entitled to use his judgement to determine the most efficient and effective way to run a country.

Now, according to the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, June 18, 1981, if you were to go through the main areas of managerial portfolios you will see nothing less than 19 areas – Trade and Industry – I would not list them all – Economic Policy and Taxation, Machinery of Government, Agriculture, Tourism and Aviation. They are all set out as subheads – Physical Development and the Environment in terms of Communications which, of course,would include Utilities, Social Services, Education, Culture and the Arts, Health, Housing, Labour which includes Community Centres, Law and Order, Immigration and Citizenship, Defence and Security, Information, External Affairs and so on.

The point is that we have a situation where certain Ministers are holding 2, 3 and even 4 portfolios. It is true that certain Ministers hold only one, but that is also the prerogative of the Prime Minister. The point is that the productive sectors of the economy have expanded. The per capita income has doubled since 1975 – from $700 million in 1975 to $1.461 billion in 1980 to $1.9 billion in 1982. Tourism has expanded from $165 million in 1975 to $550 million in 1981. Manufacturing has expanded from $172.5 million in 1975 to $455.7 million in 1982. Agriculture has expanded. Government revenue has expanded. The supervision of capital expansion has to be properly supervised if the taxpayers money is to be properly spent. The public sector has expanded. In effect, the machinery of Government has expanded.

Now, it makes nonsense to say that, because the Democratic Labour Party had 12 Ministers in 1976, in 1981, or 1983, the Barbados Labour Party should be committed to the same 12. The fact is that the Democratic Labour Party in 1961 did not need 12 Ministers. They perhaps needed no more than 6, or 7, or 8 or 9. But I would not argue the point, because that was the privilege afforded the right honourable Leader of the Opposition, then the Prime Minister, the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow). He charted a course that he thought best for Barbadians and he appointed Ministers to do jobs. I am sure he has experienced, in very much the same way as the present Prime Minister has experienced, that there are Ministers who just would not work and so from time to time you will have to reshuffle them, shuffle them about, force them to work.

Clearly, my attitude is quite different because I would shove them out, not shove them from one Ministry to another, because if they cannot produce in one Ministry they certainly cannot produce in another. And if you are spending the taxpayers money, you spend it prudently and efficiently, you work hard or you get out.

In my view, the people of Barbados respect a strong and determined leader, and when the Duffus Commission said that all roads led to the honourable Member for St. John, I applauded him, because that is the way it should be. He is the captain of the team, all roads must lead to him, and I am saying that all roads must lead to the right honourable Prime Minister, the Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams).

I am a policy man, Sir, and if the Prime Minister tells me to jump, on the way up I am going to ask, "How high". And if he tells me "out", out I go, and I would still tow the party line, because I trust his judgement. That is why I am in here and they are over there; I trusted his judgement!

Mr. Chairman, the Government agencies have expanded. The Barbados National Bank was created. Offshore Banking was created. An energy policy for the first time was created, and not only that, but an alternative energy policy. The creation of the Export Promotion Corporation, Export Credit and Insurance Guarantee System, the expansion of the Barbados National Standards Institute to cover industrial designs, patents, copyright laws, trademarks and so on. You cannot expand a Government without expanding the public sector or without expanding the ministerial portfolios, because then you are overworking Ministers; and when you do that, you become counter-productive.

There are only 24 hours in a day, seven days in a week. We are all human. We can only produce so much for our country. Some of us are blessed with being able to work harder than others. Some of us are stronger than others, so therefore some of us can produce more than others, and this is where the discretion of the Prime Minister comes in. If they begin to get old and feeble and there are close party affiliations – this is politics – you will find a very nice little nest-bed for him and you leave him there.

Laughter.

Mr. A. TRUSS: On the other hand, if you have a young, dynamic, energetic individual who is willing and capable and able to handle 4, 5, 6 or 7 portfolios, let him do it.

I would hate to remind you, Sir, because I do not want to reduce the debate to comparison between one Party and the next, but if we are in agreement on this side and on that side that the Prime Minister has the right to adjust his Cabinet, to reshuffle or to change, to add or to subtract as he sees fit, because he alone is in the driver's seat of this vehicle, he is the captain of the team, and he knows the direction that he would like to see this country go in, then he has that privilege.

I would not like to remind the honourable Member for St. John, for whom I have the greatest respect, a man who has laboured his life for this country, that no final Appropriation Bill was laid in Parliament in 1974, in 1975, or in 1976. They were laid in Parliament in 1977 after we came into power. This is not meant as a criticism of the honourable Leader of the Opposition, but perhaps if he had expanded his Ministries then, and got his Ministers to work, the people's business would have been done.

6.40 p.m.

The Auditor General's Report for the year ending March 31st, 1981 .....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member, but if he would give way, I should just like to point out to him that when I came into office I had to do Appropriation Bills for eleven years. They had not been done for ten years. Now it could not be a question of a Minister; it would have to be the Minister of Finance. I would have to be responsible for getting those Final Appropriation Bills before the House and I did not get them before the House because the people who were to prepare them could not get them ready for me. It is as simple as that, and appointing another Minister would not have solved that problem.

Mr. A. TRUSS: I accept that, but perhaps firing the person who was supposed to do it might have solved the problem.

The Auditor General's Report for March 31, 1981, if I may quote page 19, Customs Department, Item 11A, says "No accounts have so far been received in respect of the Financial Year 1974–75 and 1975–76" and this is 1983 and still the reports have not been filed. So we are both responsible, you in your time and we in our time. The point is that the Ministries must be expanded because work has to be done, and there are too few people to supervise the work that has to be done.

The Auditor General's Report for 1966–67 was laid in 1968; the Report for 1967–68 was laid in 1969; the Report for 1968–69 was laid in 1970 – running a year late each time. The report for 1969–70 was laid in 1971, the Report for 1970–71 – this is when the Democratic Labour Party was in power – was laid in 1973; the Report for 1971–72 was laid in 1973 and the Report for 1974–75 was laid on 21st January, 1976. The Accountant General's Report was late for most years.

The right honourable Member for St. John would know that I would not misquote these figures, and it is not meant as a reflection on him or anyone on that side. The point I am trying to make is that it is foolishness to say that the circumstances of 1976 can be related to the circumstances of 1983; so therefore if you had twelve Ministers in 1976, you are not entitled to have more than twelve Ministers in 1983. That, in my view is nonsense.

The 1969–70 Report of the Accountant General was laid in this House in 1973; the 1970–71 Report of the Accountant General – I was dealing before with the Auditor General, now I am dealing with the Accountant General – was laid in 1974; the 1971–72 Report and the 1972–73 Report was laid in 1975 and the Report for 1973–74 was laid in 1975.

Economic Reports: under the Democratic Labour Party no reports were laid in Parliament for 1974, 1975 and 1976. I would not even mention that there was no Budget in 1975 and that there was a fireside chat in 1976. I do not know why. Perhaps the right honourable Member for St. John could not get sufficient people to give him the information which he required to bring a Budget to this Parliament for the people of Barbados! So that is my point.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, there is no statutory provision about Budgets. In 1975 we did not need any tax, so I did not have any Budget. The whole purpose of a Budget is to demonstrate, as I understand it, how you intend to deal primarily with the discrepancies between your expenditure and your revenue; so you do not have to have a Budget.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is when you went to to get your batteries recharged.)

Mr. A. TRUSS: I am not getting into that. I have too much respect for the right honourable Member for St. John to get involved in that. He is quite entitled to go wherever he wants to go, whenever he wants to go, and do whatever he wants to do. The people of Barbados judged the Democratic Labour Party in 1976 and so they will judge us in 1986.

The trouble with politicians – and I have to come to grips with this, because I do not think I am a real real politician because I do not seem to think like a politician – is that politicians on both sides seem to think that when something comes from the other side it is bad, and when something comes from this side it is good. That is foolishness. The time has come when both sides must put their heads together in the interest of the country on fundamental issues.

Asides

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I crave your indulgence. If the honourable member would stop trying to push a little fire on this side.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I am sure the Hansard Reporters are having a problem. Please continue.

Mr. A. TRUSS: I think, Sir, that I have made the point which I wanted to make.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Wind up please.

Mr. A. TRUSS: I realise my time is finished, and in closing let me re-emphasise that, as a measuring stick, the Opposition should not fall into this trick of trying to capture the headlines of the media by saying they had twelve Ministers and we now have thirteen. Times have changed. Eight years have passed, Government has expanded its services and people are more prosperous. If you must supervise your Government agencies, you need people; so whether you have a Cabinet of 10, 12, 14 or 15, in the final analysis if they do an efficient job for the people of Barbados, they will be rewarded at the next elections. On the other hand, if the Prime Minister abuses the privilege handed to him by the people, it will be taken away from him, because the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, I made a comment that there was clear evidence of serious political disruption in the Barbados Labour Party. What is clearly being demonstrated here today is that that problem is at the top, in the middle and at the bottom. We all heard how the honourable Deputy Prime Minister was very careful to point out the limitation of powers and to send a clear message to the Prime Minister that his power is limited to the extent that he can command the support of his colleagues.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with Cabinet Office, not the Barbados Labour Party.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is right, and if we are going to spend $1 million, we have to spend $1 million on people who are functioning as a Cabinet. I am saying that they are not functioning as a Cabinet. The honourable Deputy Prime Minister is reminding the Prime Minister, because there is a major break between them.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Now the honourable Member (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is entitled to his own opinions, but he cannot impute conduct to me. The honourable Member is incapable of imputing conduct or opinions to me; so he cannot distort anything that I say. In his attempt to make political capital, I am entitled on a point of order to say that he cannot distort my speech. He cannot make a speech for me. You cannot say what I did not say. I object to that. You cannot do it. You heard my speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is clearly attempting to put words in the mouth of other honourable Members, and there is definitely a distortion. I will ask the honourable Member to desist, cease this approach. It is not the first time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I state as a matter of fact, not as a matter of interpretation, that there is clear evidence that there is a serious breach between the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of this country.
6.50 p.m.

The dismissal of the honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Sisnett) was a clear signal to the Deputy Prime Minister by the Prime Minister that he is the Prime Minister and not the Deputy Prime Minister. That is the point I am trying to make, and the reason why I am making that point is because when the honourable Member for St. Michael North East, travelled to London, he travelled with the approval and the knowledge of the Deputy Prime Minister. That is a matter of fact. Yet he was fired from the office that he held on the grounds – and I can only go on the grounds that were reported by the Government Information Service – that he was fired because he travelled to London without permission – but that permission was given by the Deputy Prime Minister, of this country!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This matter has been averted to quite often, and it is my feeling that it has nothing to do with the debate about Cabinet Office.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order Sir: the honourable Member (Dr. R. C. Haynes) would

perhaps be inviting a dissention between the Prime Minister and the Government Information Service, if the Government Information Service had made any such statement such as is alluded to by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I did not intend to speak, but I must say that I will have a word or two to say when the honourable Member is finished.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To continue, he was re-appointed to the same Ministry because the Deputy Prime Minister recognised that he was being slapped in his face and was able to muster up enough support among his colleagues to force the hand of the Prime Minister, not only to re-appoint him, but to re-appoint him to the same office which he held – clear evidence of division at the top.

At this point certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The honourable Member for St. Michael Central, (Mr. A. Truss), a loyal, dedicated and vocal supporter of the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) clearly articulated the position of the honourable Member for St. Thomas, and he gave notice to the other Members if they do not tow the line as indicated by the Prime Minister what should happen to them. That was perfectly clear. Quite clearly the honourable Deputy Prime Minister was speaking on behalf of one section of the Cabinet and the honourable Member for St. Michael Central was speaking on behalf of the Prime Minister.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let it be recorded that I enunciated any policy or have spoken on behalf of anybody. I speak as an individual representing the people of St. Michael Central. I have my views. I give you my word of honour, I did not even discuss my speech with the Prime Minister before I came into this Honourable Chamber. I cannot allow the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) to say that I have made a speech for the Prime Minister. It is just not fair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure there is no other honourable Member who feels so.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, in support of the Prime Minister's position, emphasising his authority. I have pointed out before quite clearly that not only has he lost his authority within the party, but he has clearly lost it within the Cabinet. This is very important when you are dealing with the Cabinet, apart from the fact that the public out there no longer have any confidence in the Prime Minister of this country. This is a very serious matter.

Now, take the elements of a reshuffle. You can reshuffle and you do not have to give any reasons; but we have a situation where the Prime Minister of this country is collecting the loyals around him, from within this Parliament and outside of this Parliament, those whom he believes will support him in case there is a vote. That is what is happening and you will find that there are certain people who are gradually being side-lined; and some are being moved to do a hatchet job. Understand clearly what this reshuffle is all about. The honourable Member for St. Michael East (Hon. D. G. Blackman) was moved because he did not agree with the policy of increasing bus fares, sending home people at the Transport Board, and further cut-backs. That is why he was moved!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind discussing all this. I would like to hear an elegant lie well told. It is very, very unfair to the honourable Member for St. Michael East (Hon. D. G. Blackman) I stand before God and before this House that I have never discussed the question of raising the bus fares in 1983 with him. You can absolutely and confidently assume that what the honourable Member (Dr. R. C. Haynes) has just said is false. If it were true, I would find a way of saying so. But you can be assured that it is false.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable Member please stay with the Cabinet Office and I must not allow you.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am dealing with the problems in the Cabinet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When I am speaking, the honourable Member will please take his seat. The honourable Member's speech is provocative and it is highly irrelevant to the matter before this Committee; very much so. It is highly speculative, twisted, highly imaginative, and it is certainly not dealing with the matter which is before this Committee. It is at times entertaining and we may have a bit of that, but I cannot permit it to continue in that vein.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I function in a political environment. I believe that I happen to know what is going on in this country, and anything that I say in this House is not speculative. It is based on what I believe to be the true situation. And if you are seeing a Cabinet that is torn apart by all sorts of personal and other considerations, and we are spending over $1 million on that Cabinet, I consider it extremely pertinent to deal with these matters; otherwise, they will be unable to function and will waste $1 million.

7.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member's time is up. This sitting has ten minutes more to go.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I object to being interrupted in that manner, being curtailed in that manner. I did not speak for 15 minutes, I started at about ten minutes to seven, or thereabouts, I was interrupted about six times so far, and I am sure I did not speak for more than seven minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has spoken.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Chairman cannot speak irrationally.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You cannot do that, you cannot be irrational.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I want to reserve my right to continue speaking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am advised.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will take your point.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the Clerks at the Table instruct you as to the time honourable Members start to speak, and I have seen on several occasions that they also hint to you when the time of the Member speaking is up. If you say to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) that his time is up, he cannot look at you and call you a blatant liar.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member did not use those words.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is the innuendo, Sir. You are saying that his time is up and he is telling you, "No," it is not up, that he started at X time and it is now X time, so that means that you are lying. I will ask you to call on the honourable Member to withdraw such a statement. He cannot treat the Chair in that manner.

You are accustomed to chucking him about in St. George North. He should know his place where you are concerned. You chucked him out of St. George North and he must conduct himself in a better manner. He spent almost half million dollars and you chucked him out. He was born in St. George and buried in St. George, by you, Sir. He should behave himself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have just about.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just let me check with the Clerk. I will entertain the Prime Minister.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But I got up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. My eye did not catch you.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If your eye caught him, your eye caught him.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I had cause to leave the House during this debate, and therefore, to some extent, I am unfamiliar with all that was said in the course of the discussion, therefore my remarks on the powers of a Prime Minister, and perhaps the exercise of those powers by Prime Ministers over the periods that Barbados has had independence, will tend to be general rather than specific.

The words of the Deputy Prime Minister are obviously a truism. It is obvious that the powers of any Prime Minister, however untrammelled they may appear to be, are in fact limited by considerations of his interest in his party, which inferentially means that they will necessarily be limited by the need to command the confidence and support of his colleagues.

We have a Constitution which is unduly generous to Prime Ministers. In effect in Barbados, any Prime Minister can play the part of a Samson and drag the temple down with him, since even if he loses a vote of confidence, the Prime Minister is not obliged to resign and be replaced by another member who can command a majority. He may, if he chooses, dissolve the House of Assembly and therefore place the seat of every Member of Parliament at risk.

This is a very powerful power to give to a Prime Minister, and, left to myself, it is not a power which I think it is always in the best interest of Parliaments in small countries to have. There are very few examples of the results of the exercise of this power in the Commonwealth to guide us, but one may recall that, generally speaking, such examples as exist do show that the Prime Minister's powers given by the Constitution very often correspond to the power which the people also give to the Prime Minister. In the example of Dominica in Mr. Le Blanc's time, when his party revolted against him, he dissolved Parliament and effectively got rid of the rebels. They have never returned to politics since.

I do not say these words in any spirit other than the most general because the situation simply does not apply to the more developed political structures of Caribbean countries such as, particularly, Jamaica and Barbados.

It is popular to represent political parties as being in disunity. Their opponents invariably so represent them. I recall, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps the moment which distressed me more than any other in my political life was when I sat over there and the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) stood here, and in answer to some criticism I had offered, he said to me, 'Nobody is minding you, I am not answering your criticism, your colleagues are not taking you on, why should I?'

These accusations of party disunity are among the most telling blows that one political party can strike against another. We have had examples in Barbados in the election of 1961, and we are going to have an example in Barbados in the election of 1986, because there is no doubt that the ambitions of the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) and of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) will over the next three years develop to the stage where there is bound to be public perception of the depth of disharmony and disunity that in fact exists in the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member will give way, on a point of elucidation, Sir. That is in keeping with the spirit that he is describing, that he will try to counter attack, but nothing you say will destroy the knowledge that we have that the gap this time is worse than it was when you helped to get rid of "Bree" the first time. When you got rid of him the first time, that was then, but now you gone!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I thought this was a point of order, I am sorry, if not I would not have given way. The honourable Member well knows that the only conspiracy that exists in the politics of the House of Assembly today is the purported conspiracy into which he wishes to enter with certain Members on this side to destroy the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. Say that is not true.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I am going to get up and say, "It is not true". And no attempt on your part will make it true. I do not trust anybody over there enough to go into a conspiracy with them.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will tell the honourable Member this. He must not trust me, because if he comes to me again with any underhand poke at the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I will reserve the right to talk about it on any political platform.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I give him the right to talk about it before, now and after. Any time I come to him he should be able to talk about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There can be no further points of order. Our time for today's debate is over. I shall report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman left the Chair, and Mr. Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
7.10 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am going to seek the leave of the House, to extend this debate until 7.30 p.m.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Well, if that is the case I can move to suspend the rule now until 7.30.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: A matter of 20 minutes? Remember that we have always had a good thing going. Please do not allow us to weaken that good thing. Always remember that I like to give and I like to take.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

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

On Resumption.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that further consideration of Head 15, the Head that we are now on, Sir, be postponed.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Just let me explain.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a motion.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Prime Minister wishes to speak under the Head. He will give you all the information that you are seeking, which I believe that Members here at this point in time will be unable to give you. Hence, I am postponing this Head for further consideration until later in the day. In the meantime, if you want to talk on it until he comes, it is quite alright with me. I have no objection to this, but before you would allow me to explain this both of you are jumping up. You have not got one thing to say on this Head.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We are going to talk now and when he comes.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You are talking?

Sir, I beg to withdraw the motion for further consideration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Head 15, Cabinet Office.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the question was raised yesterday concerning the appointment of Cabinet Ministers and the disappointment of Cabinet Ministers, but since it is indicated that the Prime Minister is going to be giving us information, perhaps we could deal with another aspect of the Cabinet Office until such time.

Subhead 4 under Cabinet Office says "Electoral Office". I wish to reiterate that I consider it a travesty on the system which we have, which could see us in these Estimates today, March 16, 1983, discussing an appropriation for an Electoral Office still under the aegis of the Prime Minister. In this Honourable Chamber, according to the Laws of Barbados, we passed a constitutional amendment. All of the appropriate measures for that constitutional amendment to come into play have been completed and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this procedure we are adopting is itself constitutional.

It is unconstitutional for us not to implement the Constitution of Barbados, and the Constitution of Barbados says that elections in Barbados shall be held under the aegis of an independent Boundaries Commission made up of five members – two appointed by the Governor-General on the advice of the Leader of the Opposition, and three appointed on the advice of the Prime Minister.

That is a constitutional requirement. That is no longer at the whim and fancy of the Prime Minister. It is not a matter in which the Prime Minister is vested with any discretion. As the executive, he has a responsibility, the Government has a responsibility, the Cabinet has a responsibility to implement the laws of this land, and especially where those laws form part of the basic law of this country, the supreme law, the Constitution.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN), when this matter was raised some time ago, indicated that they would appoint the Electoral Commission when they were "good and ready". It is my contention that they do not have that discretion to do it when they are good and ready.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN) is saying *sotto voce* that the Law Courts should decide those things. But there is a higher Law which the honourable member seems to be totally ignorant of – the moral law, my friend!

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS), is in a good mood today. I hope he has the answers.

It is immoral, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, for the people of Barbados to have the prospect of the Government doing what it did on the last occasion we had an election in Barbados. It is immoral for the people of Barbados to have as part of their Constitution this requirement, and for the Prime Minister, in his capacity as Minister responsible for Elections, to be able to gerrymander the constituencies. It would be immoral if the Prime Minister was able to put into effect his own personal view that there should be 30 seats in Barbados.

It would be immoral if the Prime Minister was able, through the concept of a majority in a Select Committee, as happened on the Select Committee where I sat – the Select Committee which allowed this country to go into an election, and which saw a disenfranchisement of a number of persons, 1 864 to be exact – 1 864 Mr. Chairman, these are facts – who found themselves with everything that was necessary for them to participate in the greatest aspect of democracy in any country, on elections. They had their format, they had their I.D. cards, and, so far as everyone in Barbados was concerned, the holding of an identification card was the final phase in the capacity and the ability to vote, to exercise a sacred and fundamental right.

We had nearly 2 000 people in this country who were unable to vote because their names did not appear on the final Electoral Roll. We had total confusion during the election, and it is my contention that the speedy

appointment of an Electoral Commission, as required by the Constitution, would ensure that all of the machinery which has to go into play can be put in place, so that the next election in Barbados could be held in circumstances where every citizen could feel that it was a fair election, and that it was an election in which he could participate and make a choice according to the dictates of his own conscience.

I submit that it is contemptuous of the people of Barbados to pass a constitutional amendment allowing for the appointment of such a Boundaries Commission and for that Commission not to come into force some substantial time after the passing of that constitutional amendment. Let the Prime Minister indicate to the country either that he has not got the will or the means to appoint this Commission. There is nothing required but the appointment of the persons and the finding of office space, and since the passage of the legislation, we have seen the appointment of a number of persons in a number of institutions and the finding of office space.

Mr. Chairman, the Government itself is in such difficulty that an election may not be held in 1986 – it may be held before. Bearing in mind the dislocation within the Cabinet itself, bearing in mind the difficulties through which this Government is passing, and the clear and obvious disparity which is becoming manifest, even on the Floor of this House, between Cabinet Ministers, it is entirely possible that the need for an election will be earlier than 1986.
10.15 a.m.

In those circumstances, it would be a serious matter in this country, and I issue for what it is worth a friendly warning to the honourable Members on that side, that there are people in this country who are not going to take very lightly the possibility of their not being able to exercise their constitutional right to vote. I give a friendly warning to the honourable Members on that side if the utterances which one hears from the citizenry from time to time are any indication of the mood of the people of this country today, they would not play around with the electoral system.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) is able to be capricious and to discuss such matters as a Hospital Board. He puts the Hospital Board *pari passu* with an Electoral Commission. It indicates the frivolity with which the honourable Member perceives this whole question.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Prime Minister, who is not a man of whom it can be said he is immune to constitutional niceties, or that he is a man who does not like Parliament, is sitting over there making statements which are unworthy of a Prime Minister. He is suggesting.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order: the point I am making is that the honourable Member is repeating himself. He has spoken now for fifteen minutes and you have a chronicle: the Constitution Commission, Government is immoral, the Constitution Commission, Government is immoral; that is all he is saying. He is repeating himself. He is not allowed to repeat himself. Of course, if the Democratic Labour Party really do not want to discuss any other Head, it is a matter for them. They can indulge in this time wasting repetition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has three minutes in which to come to a close.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, this House did not start at 10 o'clock. This House was waiting and they rang the bell twice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable Member challenging the Chair?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir; I am just making a statement of fact. I am saying that this House started at ten minutes past 10 o'clock or thereabouts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All of this is time, you know.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. Every time the honourable Members over there get up when we are making a speech, that is no reason for decisions to be made which would seem, in the minds of the people over here, to be contrary to fact.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable Member have anything more to say?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can do it in exactly two minutes.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will say it the next fifteen minutes I get up to speak. I have a lot of fifteen minutes to speak today.

The point is that the honourable Members over there seem to feel that this is a matter for joking. They feel that they can exercise themselves – they have the power, and therefore they can be frivolous about this matter. But this is a fundamental issue in this country, and that is why I will continue, at the cost of repetition,

if the honourable Member (Hon. H. B. St. John) sees it that way, to insist that the Prime Minister has a moral responsibility to the people of Barbados to carry out a constitutional amendment. And that the argument about our having voted against it is specious, because, in the first instance, if there is a vote in here, the majority carries, and if the majority carries and there is a vote in here, is he saying that it is any less law because it was by a majority and not unanimous? Secondly, when he says that we should say why the Opposition voted against a particular motion, we voted against it on principle and we explained our position, and unless he is going to explain that position to say that we voted against it and leave it at that, is intellectually dishonest.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) has to answer to the people, because he has been giving impressions, even out of his own mouth, that he does not feel that the current twenty-seven seats satisfy the requirements in Barbados. And he probably does not wish the Electoral Commission to be appointed, because he believes now that the Former Attorney General made an error when he allowed two persons to be appointed directly by the Leader of the Opposition. That is the problem. If they could find a way to overturn that particular decision, they would do it, but the fact is that the Governor-General will take advice from the Leader of the Opposition for two out of five, and they know that, whereas on a Select Committee our minority report was obfuscated and reduced, they cannot do that with the Boundaries Commission. I have some more to say on that, and later we will come back to those people in the Cabinet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Prime Minister I think should reply to some of the remarks at this stage.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I really did not expect to hear anything about the Boundaries Commission. There are some issues in the political life of a country where all independent and objective observers realise have been resolved in a manner that reflects nothing other but credit on one side and nothing but discredit on the other. It therefore astonishes me to have to sit down and listen to the gall of an honourable Member, who voted against the establishment of a Boundaries Commission, chiding the Government for absolutely nothing; chiding the Government because at a particular point in time the Boundaries Commission, which he strenuously opposed, is not yet in operation.

The finest comment of all on the Boundaries Commission and the position of the political parties in Barbados came in the Daily Telegraph of London shortly after the debate on the Boundaries Commission. The Telegraph said that Barbados seemed to have a unique Opposition in the entire world; it was the only Opposition that had ever voted against free and fair elections. That was the Telegraph's comment on the Opposition opposing the Boundaries Commission that removed the power of running elections from the hands of a Government and put it into the hands of an independent body, on which the Opposition itself would be represented. Well, the Opposition, having voted against free and fair elections to my mind, now has to be disqualified from telling the Government when it will bring the Boundaries Commission Act into force.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of explanation: why does the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) not recognise that the former Attorney General joins in the call? Forget the Opposition! The former Attorney General joined in here in the call for you; he said it was about time that you should bring it in. Let me hear you deal with that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will hear it from the former Attorney General, but I will not hear it from the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt). I will hear it from the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), but I will not hear it from those people over there. When you vote against free and fair elections you must have a little shame in your conversation about the matter later.

I cannot think why honourable Members are raising this point. The Boundaries Commission Act will be brought into force at a suitable stage. It is not going to be like the Teachers Service Commission Act. The Constitution was amended in 1974 to provide for a Teaching Service Commission Act. Was it immoral of the Government then not to bring it into force? We do not agree with it – I can tell you that – and we say we do not agree with it; and when we vote against something, we do not reprobate and then approbate.

If we vote against something, we are not going to come back and quarrel with the Government for not doing it, because that is what you have done. You voted against it and now you are quarrelling with the Government because we did not do it. You should be glad we have not brought it into force. You were against it, but it will be brought into force in good time. You can be absolutely sure that it will be brought into force before the next general election.

I heard the honourable Member talking about gerrymandering. Did the change in the boundaries in any way hamper the Democratic Labour Party? The honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) said he nearly had a heart attack when he saw the new boundaries. He got up at Welchman Hall and said how bad he felt and how his friends had to come and comfort him. I think he said he had to drink a liquor when he saw that Brereton had been taken away. But look at him there!

Honourable Members must just be patient. I said I will hear it from the honourable Member for Christ Church West that the Boundaries Commission must be brought into force, but not from honourable Members over there.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what is the genesis of this. In the luncheon room one day, the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) was put into a state of great alarm because he heard a discussion between certain honourable Members on this side about the size of the constituencies in Christ Church. 10.25 a.m.

He heard me say that we should have taken the Chief Electoral Officer's advice and had 28 seats and not 27, because Christ Church was not possible to divide up into four seats within the numbers and that the constituencies in Christ Church are too large. We then made some sport of the honourable Member and the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) told him that the seat he holds is a seat that changes hands at every election.

He began to get a little alarmed and he asked if that is what we have in mind, and he said to me that he knew the reason why I did not appear very much in Christ Church West Central was because I thought that he had no chance of winning, otherwise I would have been out there putting some fire on him. I said, "Anyhow, next time it will not be like that. You will see me out there and you will be very lucky to get back again, because I am going to put some pressure on you – and, who knows, there may be some boundary changes as well." So he got fairly worried.

Now the honourable Member for St. Michael West wants some support from his colleagues against the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), and he is therefore putting the case of the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. He has probably promised him that he will try to get the Boundaries Commission in force before I can change the boundaries, and he is enlisting his support against the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. That is exactly what has happened! You see, the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central is in the St. Michael West camp, and therefore you have to give him a little lift, you have to carry your men with you. That is all that has happened.

I will give the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central a little pledge. The Government has no intention, as at present advised, of making any changes to the boundaries before the Boundaries Commission is established. I cannot predict that the Boundaries Commission will add a seat or will not add a seat. But it is a fact that the Christ Church seats are too big. Out of the four biggest seats three are in Christ Church, and by the next election you can be quite sure that the four biggest seats – will all be in Christ Church, because Christ Church East Central is the fastest growing area in Barbados today. There are some seats which at the last election were bigger than Christ Church East Central, but Christ Church East Central has had 800 residential lots sub-divided and they are being filled up. The new prosperity we have brought to Barbados is producing a new class of landowner in the centre of Christ Church East Central. It is a perfectly simple matter.

Honourable Members must not think that we cannot see through them when they talk about morality and high principles, free and fair elections, and the constitution being the highest law of the land. I can hear the honourable Member, for he has dramatic talents which are as yet denied to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has the better gestures. He walks in a more insincere way. His expression carries a studied insincerity which the Honourable Member of St. Michael West long ago learnt to master. The Broadway stage, perhaps, is the tutor for the honourable Member of St. Michael West, where the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has spent more time looking at the speeches of Hitler than at the art of stage performances.

But all of this melodrama, all of this style, all of these gestures, do not hide the fact that the honourable Members are afraid and are probably trying to push the Government into giving some assurances that we are not going to do anything in boundaries that may disadvantage all or any of them. Honourable Members really need not worry about that.

I cannot even remember how the Boundaries Commission is structured, but I am really quite sure that any possible Boundaries Commission in Barbados will not conduct its business in the interest of one political party or another. I believe that the Chief Electoral Officer's opinion is that Christ Church needs another seat. Whether he will convince the Boundaries Commission or not, I do not know, but I place the facts before Parliament. The seats in Christ Church are very large seats. One of them is twice the size, I believe, of St. James South. That would be Christ Church West. I believe that actually has twice as many voters as St. James South, which is probably an unacceptable proportion at this time.

I did promise the House that I would discuss the matter of the prerogatives of the Prime Minister. I really do not want to dwell on it, because that is not my style, but there are one or two salient matters which have arisen both in the Press and in the debate in relation to the recent ministerial changes.

It is always going to be the case when there is a ministerial change that the opposing political party would seek to make capital out of it. The recent *Advocate* editorial, in pointing out that dismissals from ministerial and Government Service are very rare in Barbados, is correct and I believe the reasons they adduced for it are also correct.

Ex-Ministers in Barbados are not immediately employable in the way Ex-Ministers are in most of the other democracies of the world, certainly the large democracies.

A man cannot leave a ministerial office today and expect tomorrow to be on a large number of Corporation Boards and have other lucrative employment. There has therefore been a hesitation on the part of the Prime Ministers in Barbados to be too free with the power of dismissal. Part of it, I suppose, is humanitarian, part of it is political, part of it is realistic, and part of it is the recognition that, however authoritarian a structure the Constitution may provide for the Prime Minister and his Cabinet, there are limitations, which a wise and prudent Prime Minister should exercise, using his discretion, before he seeks to wield a guillotine on members of his own political party and his Cabinet.

In the previous Parliament there were no dismissals. In the Parliament before that, as far as I recall, there were no dismissals, but a number of Ministers were relieved of their portfolios although they were retained in the Cabinet. A part of the reason may very well be that when a Minister in Barbados resigns, or is removed from office in Barbados, he falls into the condition of a back bencher. He is not allowed to draw a ministerial pension on resignation from his ministerial office in the same way that the Prime Minister may draw the Prime Minister's pension if he resigns, but yet remains in Parliament. Maybe this is something that the Pensions Act should look at. In the case of a Minister who wants to resign, but do not want to place the party in the position of having to fight a by-election, it may very well be that you should allow him to resign and be pensioned as a Minister even if he wishes to remain in Parliament.
10.35 a.m.

These are practical matters. If it is brought in, it might very well assist honourable Members on the other side rather than honourable Members on this side, because, as I look, I can see three resigned Ministers, or removed Ministers, who have not had access to their retiring emoluments in the same way as the former Prime Minister has had access to his retiring emoluments.

That is really a side issue. Perhaps we should go back to the occasion when Mr. DaCosta Edwards was dismissed as Minister. On that occasion, the reasons for his dismissal as a Minister seemed capricious. I happened to be with Mr. Edwards at the moment when he learnt of his dismissal. We were together in his house. The television was on, and the face of the honourable Member for St. John came on, and the honourable Member for St. John indicated that he had dismissed the honourable Member for St. Andrew from the Cabinet because he had been conspiring.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Just on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am merely pointing out that, as far as I am aware, the Prime Minister has now been speaking for more than 15 minutes and that particular rule is not in abeyance. I believe he can speak more than once, again but I would like to draw to your attention that that particular rule, as far as I understand it, needs to be put into operation at this time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair thanks the honourable Member. The Prime Minister may speak again.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Not until after I have finished, Sir. My contribution is going to be short.

I do not think that the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) should be allowed to create this legal heresy and have it go unanswered. It cannot be constitutionally improper for the Government if the law which amends the Constitution states that it is to come into force by proclamation. When the proclamation is issued, then the Constitution is amended, and we have repeatedly given the honourable Member the assurance that the constitutional provisions will be enforced in good time before the next election.

The honourable Member knows full well that there is only one person who can determine when there is another election, so I do not think he should be allowed today to give the public, who are not versed in the niceties of these matters, the impression that we are acting unconstitutionally.

That is why I invited the honourable Member to bring a constitutional case, because constitutional cases are to be brought when you can in fact, prove that the Constitution is being broken. The honourable Member knows full well that he has no legal leg to stand on when he alleges that we are breaking the Constitution, because the law amending the Constitution says that it can only come into force by proclamation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Before the Prime Minister resumes .....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am here, Sir. The honourable Member will have his chance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Everybody will have a chance.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If you are playing it that way, it should be the honourable Member who catches your eye, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member for St. Michael West has a lot of mouth when the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is not in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I did not hear on the occasion of that television broadcast, to which I referred in my speech, which was terminated by time a few moments ago, any reason that seemed a good reason for dismissing Mr. Edwards from the Cabinet. On occasions like these, one has to understand that the Head of a Government sometimes thinks it necessary to exercise his authority, perhaps based on a series of incidents which have given him dissatisfaction. I just mention that, I am not saying that this is specifically the case at any subsequent point, but these are things to remember.

Mr. Boxill was never dismissed from office, but it was noticeable that he was not appointed to the Senate in 1971 when he was defeated, the only Minister up to

that time of the Democratic Labour Party ever to lose his seat by only 64 votes. These are matters into which you can read some elements of the sort of discipline that has to be exercised by a head of Government in the country. I speak in general terms and I do not intend to be any more particular, except to deal with two point that were raised, one specifically by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) and the other, more generally, in relation to new appointments.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central specifically stated that a particular Minister had been moved from office because he disagreed with certain policies of the Prime Minister. I am addressing the whole House. The Prime Minister is *primus inter pares*, he is the head of the Government.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not know if the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) is criticising my Latin pronounciations, but the honourable Member should be aware that the many years I spent at the Bar have eroded the Latin I may have been taught at Harrison College and substituted therefore the legal pronounciation of Latin.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Not the pronounciation, I am saying you are more *primus* than *pares).*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If therefore disagreements arise on policy matters between the Prime Minister and a Minister, ultimately some authority will have to settle those disagreements.

Now, I do not know how other people deal with this, I will tell you how I deal with it. First of all, I examine my own views, I give them considerable examination. I think about what is said between the Minister and myself, what is said at Cabinet, I reflect on the balance that has to be achieved in so many of these decisions between taking an unpopular decision and doing what is right, and if in the end I have come to the conclusion that there is some diametrical divergence of views between a Minister and myself, but that the Minister is able, capable, intelligent, sincere, honest, I am not going to say because a Minister and I disagree over a matter that the Minister must not remain in Cabinet. Nor do I think that the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) would ever have conducted Government in Barbados on that basis.

I do not believe, indeed, that a situation such as I have outlined has ever arisen in the form in which I set it out. I really am giving a hypothetical example, but in such a case I might very well come to the conclusion that it is a more desirable way of handling that particular problem of Government to change a portfolio than to take any other course of action. Therefore, although the circumstances which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central outlined did not arise, and have never arisen, one should not rule out on the part of any honourable Member of this House who might come to be Prime Minister that some day he might very well decide that a Minister's view of his department and the Prime Minister's view do not coincide, and therefore give a Minister another department.
10.45 a.m.

It has never arisen – I repeat – precisely in that form. I do not know if it has ever happened to the right honourable Member for St. John, but I think that honourable Members would readily recognise that it could not possibly be immoral, unconstitutional, improper, inappropriate, or anything else, for a disagreement between a Prime Minister and a Minister to be settled in that way. And that is a very general and indeed, fortunately, hypothetical point, because there is one characteristic of the Cabinets which have ruled Barbados since 1976 that I am assured did not prevail to the same extent previously.

There is a constant long discussion and exchange of views at Cabinet on the important problems that affect every department. Every Thursday we have long discussions, not about, perhaps, the items numbered (e) on the Cabinet Papers, the matters specifically for decision, but about the general problems of the country and we hammer out a consensus, department by department, issue by issue, every week before we reach the stage of any major disagreement, people discuss things that would not come up for months so as to prepare the minds of other Ministers for policy decisions that may have to be taken.

This is perhaps why Cabinet meetings, under the present dispensation, go on every Thursday until 3.00 p.m., 3.30 p.m., sometimes 4 o'clock, although the actual matters for decision may have occupied no more than an hour in time, very often less. Perhaps 16, 19 matters will be decided in an hour and the remainder of the Cabinet meeting is given over to discussing the problems of the country.

That is why also, perhaps – although you may hear a lot of things from me when I am in here – I think every member of the Cabinet can get up and talk about the IMF, knowing what Government policy is, knowing what the problems are, on the basis of full and complete information. They can talk about the Transport Board. They can talk about the problems in the Labour Department, the Defence Force – any matter – because these problems are fully discussed in Cabinet. No Minister has to hide anything from any other Minister and we are all partners there in our discussions.

I would not comment on the particular matter, which is the suspension of the honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Sisnett) for a fortnight, were it not that a number of unkind and untrue things have been said. I must say that more has been said about me than the honourable Member, and I welcome that. I am really very glad that it has not been a one-way traffic.

I just want to repudiate a few of the untruths without going into the matter at any length. The honourable Member's period of suspension was always known. It was settled from the word "go", and if honourable Members, indeed if the Press, had listened to CBC, which was the only organ of the media that sought to find out any of the details in an unsational way, they would have known the matter from the beginning.

The *Advocate* Newspaper, which has not been malicious recently, entered into the realms of outright malice when it spoke of his restoration following pressure from Cabinet Ministers. No Cabinet Minister spoke to me about the matter except the Minister for Information, who said he had received a request from CBC, and I told him what could be said.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) came to my office on the afternoon I was speaking to the honourable Member for St. Michael East. The three of us discussed it, he outlined exactly what had happened relating to a visit to London, circumstances which neither he nor I considered would constitute approval of the visit – notification "Yes", approval "No". That was an end to the matter and all the rest has been in the Press.

On this occasion, I cannot truthfully accuse the Opposition of stirring up things or of being malicious. The Press did it all by itself, saw circumstances that did not exist, invented stories that had no basis of reality, spoke of pressures and discussions that had no grounding in fact.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, in response to all this talk about dissentions, differences, I really do not believe that there is any power on earth that could create dissentions and differences between the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, (Hon. H. B. St. John) and me. I can say that freely! I am yet to concede what nuclear holocaust could put a barrier between the two of us. As far as I am concerned, it does not exist in the realm of possibility and honourable Members are wasting their time if they pursue such speculations.

I do not know of any dissentions of any substance – I emphasize "substance" – within the Barbados Labour Party. I see two men who I know much admired each other; as far as I know, they used to be in a mutual admiration society once. Something has arisen – one has taken a side that the other deems he should not have taken, so you hear an accusation – one speaks of "refugee", the other speaks of "part-time Minister." I deplore all of that, foolishness! I have heard those men say such good things about each other in the past that, for some little political frivolity that is going about, to exchange these little oblique remarks is foolishness.

I will say something else to honourable Members on my side. Some of them talk too much. I have to take a leaf out of the book of the honourable Member for St. John. He, of course, is incapable of taking a leaf out of a book or turning pages one at a time. He will take the whole book and rip out the pages and throw them in the fire. When he thought that honourable Members on his side were talking to us, he said they were not to eat with us in the Dining Room. He carried them up in the President's Ante-Chamber to eat and made poor Mr. Boxill run with a plate of food, and he and my father nearly came to blows in the presence of Sergeant Herbert. Maybe I should say that each of them was telling Sergeant Herbert to do something, and Sergeant Herbert looked at the two of them and said "Excuse me, gentlemen" and walked away, and stayed away until the commotion had subsided.

I do not go in for that. I do not believe that I have behaved towards any of my Ministers in the way that he did on the several occasions that he made Cameron Tudor cry. Cameron Tudor stood over there where that air-conditioning unit is now and cried like a child the day he was dealt with by the honourable Member for St. John over the visit of the Canadian Governor-General. He cried like a child and said "I have never been so humiliated in my life", with tears running down his face.

I would tell honourable Members on my side, in my way, that some of them talk too much. We live well on the two sides of Parliament – don't mind all the noise on the platform – but if an honourable Member or if a person does not wish to suffer embarrassment, he should not repeat the contents of a conversation known only to two people. As soon as somebody can come in here and say that a certain document had to be in place by 3 o'clock on Monday afternoon, where there are only two people who are party to that discussion and one of them has never told it to anybody – not even the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central – it is obvious that somebody has talked.

When a member of the Cabinet, perhaps trying to explain to his close supporters and followers certain things, comments about how he handles the Prime Minister in Cabinet and what he says and how the Prime Minister is afraid of him, what honourable Members

should understand is that all of this is going to be repeated in the political atmosphere of this country.

There is no secret that is shared by more than one person, and a secret shared by two will cease to be a secret if either of them tries to give an account more favourable to himself than the facts of the case. They are the only two points I would mention.

The honourable Member for St. John counselled his members in here, very brutally, not to talk with members of the Opposition, keep away from them, do not go down in the Union Club and play cards with them. Well, I am not counselling my members to that effect, but I am counselling members to be very careful indeed what they say. They have no case against each other. The public does not want to hear any case that any member of the Barbados Labour Party has against another member of the Barbados Labour Party. The public is not interested in who is right or who is wrong in an internal argument in the Barbados Labour Party.

The Democratic Labour Party members of the public are interested. They want to destroy us, and it is up to us not to give them the ammunition. Let the honourable Members for St. Michael West and St. Michael South Central talk out each other's business to their hearts' content. Let the honourable Member for St. Michael West explain how he had to deal with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in the by-election and teach him how to talk and teach him what to say on a platform, and that when the general election came and he did not have the whole party behind him.

Senator June Clarke was able to knock 1 000 votes off his majority.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You leave that to all of them. We do not have to get into all that. Let them exult in how Senator McClean made the honourable Member look foolish over the electric rates; that he got at the PUB and said that the Electric Company should get the increase rates and leave the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central like the boy who stood on the burning deck. Let them say that. We do not have to get into that.

Mr. M. A. KING and Hon. V. L. JOHNSON rose.

Mr. M. A. KING: The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central has given way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member I am told has given way to the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. Will you so indicate by sitting? But before you catch my eye, and you will shortly, I want to say only that, in the view of the Chair, this matter has had a full ventilation and I believe that there has been some stretching of the Rules, because the truth of the matter is that Estimates, in my view, do not really afford a proper opportunity for a discussion of the matters which have just been discussed, matters relating to choice of Ministers and whether they should be in the Cabinet or not, and I have support for this in May's Parliamentary Procedure. I say this because I want to indicate to honourable Members that we have stretched enough, so please do not let us have to get back into a restart of this whole affair.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I take it that since you have allowed the right honourable Member for St. Thomas such excessive latitude, as you yourself indicated, that you would want to give me some latitude in responding to some of the comments he made, particularly in the area where he sought to involve me.

Now his speech was true to form. He began with political propaganda and ended with political propaganda! I do not know what led him, as the right honourable Member for St. John would say, to hallucinate so early this morning in coming to any conclusion that I was in any state of alarm about any discussion they may have had about boundaries. Because irrespective of what the right honourable Member or any Commission does about boundaries in Christ Church, let him be assured that I do not run from a fight. The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) can tell you that once I am in a fight I do not run from it. He was the first man I fought in politics, and I did not run from him; and if I did not run from him, I would not run from anybody else.

The right honourable Member can do what he likes with Christ Church, as I said. He would have to emaciate Christ Church in such a way as he did with St. Michael North Central in the old regime, where that constituency was so dismembered that nobody could recognise the existence of that constituency in any new form. But irrespective of what happens, I will choose where I run in Christ Church, irrespective of how the boundaries are.

I want to deal with a few of the points made by the honourable Member for St. Thomas and the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John). I would like to underscore the call made by the honourable Member for Christ Church West for the proclamation of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission Act. It is a hollow, shallow and specious argument to say that the Opposition voted against the establishment of an Electoral and Boundaries Commission and therefore we have no right calling for that. Objectively, one has to decide whether an Electoral and Boundaries Commission is a useful institution in the interest of preserving democracy in this country, and once you come to that con-

clusion – and I do not believe that anybody can dispute that – you have to explain why it is that the law has been passed and it received the assent of the Governor-General on the 7th May, 1981 is not yet proclaimed. What circumstances are there which inhibit the proclamation and the bringing into force of a law which is so fundamental to the preservation of democracy in our country?

The right honourable Member for St. Thomas seeks to compare the setting up of an Electoral and Boundaries Commission with the setting up of a Teachers Service Commission. There is no comparison in that. There is no comparison in determining the proclaiming of a law relating to the setting up of a Teachers Service Commission when compared with the setting up of a Boundaries Commission, which is so fundamental to democracy, and if we all talk about democracy and all the various freedoms which we enjoy, it rings hollow to say that you are listening to no call from anyone else. What are the circumstances? The right honourable Member for St. Thomas should tell this Honourable House the circumstances which at this time inhibit the setting up of a Boundaries Commission.

When one looks, Mr. Chairman, at the terms of the constitutional amendment and the functions which the Commission is required to perform, it says that the registration of voters, the conduct of elections in every constituency and any matters that appear to the Commission to be incidental to and consequential upon either, shall be the subject of direction and supervision of the Commission.

In the exercise of its functions under this section the Commission shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other person or authority. And the law goes on to make it clear that once you are a Member of Parliament, you cannot participate as a member of the Commission.
11.05 a.m.

So in view of the very important injunction which is required by the law, that the Commission has to do with the freeness and fairness of elections – and there cannot be any doubt about that – what are the circumstances? It is not all right for the honourable Member on the other side to say that we will proclaim it when we like. What are the circumstances which prevent them from bringing it into existence at the earliest possible opportunity? Until we can have some answer to that, we say that the Government has to stand condemned for not bringing this law into force.

When one consider the statements which were made by the right honourable Member for St. Thomas in this Honourable Chamber about boundaries, when one considers his whole approach, one sees how necessary it is for this Electoral and boundaries Commission to be established. He seeks to put me in some camp on this side. He talks about political divisions in the Democratic Labour Party. But he is running true to form.

The right honourable Member for St. Thomas started his speech by saying that one of the things that Opposition parties are famous for doing, and what is very exciting to the public, is to seek to create strife on the other side. That is precisely how he has operated today. He has ignored any reference at all to the issues, the fundamental issues, and seeks to create strife on this side by seeking to place us in various political camps on this side. Let him deal with his own problems. We will deal with our own problems.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central indulges in one of his usual debating techniques by saying that there is nothing unconstitutional about not promulgating the law at this time, and saying it in such a way as to make one believe that the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) was challenging the Government's position on the gounds that they were acting unconstitutionally.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West never alleged neither by definite statement nor by any conclusion which you could draw from anything he said – he never made the point – that the Government was acting unconstitutionally. So there was no question ever about any challenge in the courts. That is a red herring which the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central is always wanting to drag across the trail. Set up the argument which you want and then try to knock that argument down.

What we are saying is that, morally, the Government has an obligation to bring the Electoral and Boundaries Commission into existence at the earliest possible opportunity, irrespective of whether the call is from the Opposition or from the honourable Member for Christ Church West. It does not matter. In principle, it is right, it is essential to the maintenance of the existence of free and fair elections, and if you feel that is so, you have an obligation to bring it in – and you can only fail to do that if, for some reason, you feel that the Electoral and Boundaries Commission will not be free and fair in its operations.

The right honourable Member for St. Thomas in dealing with the question under the Head we were discussing yesterday, made the point – and this point has been made by a number of other honourable Members – that the Prime Minister has an absolute prerogative, but subject to certain constraints as to how he would dispose of ministerial appointments – when the present Government was in Opposition, it made a lot of play about the number of Ministries which the Democratic

Labour Party had, and, in fact, it pledged the electorate, that, once elected to office, it would reduce the number of Ministers.

I am not getting into any arguments about the size of Cabinets, because development takes place. Cabinets grow and sometimes they reduce in numbers, so I am not getting into any argument about any optimum size of what Cabinet should be. But the point I want to make is that what is happening now shows the hollowness and the shallowness of the arguments of the present Government, then in Opposition, on an issue of this kind. And not only on this issue but on so many other issues which, once they come into Government, they recognise how shallow the arguments which they were advancing when they were in Opposition are.

Now what is the state of affairs today? There are no less than 13 Ministries. The Prime Minister himself has a number of Ministries under his own direction – Immigration, Energy and Planning, and now there is appointed to his office a new Parliamentary Secretary. Energy and Planning and Immigration are full Ministries, and there is a new Parliamentary Secretary now assigned to the Prime Minister.

I think the right honourable Member for St. Thomas has an obligation to this House and to the community at large to state what are the duties and what specific assignments would be given to the new Parliamentary Secretary. Because, after all, if we are spending public funds, we have to know whether expenditure of funds in the creation of the new Parliamentary Secretary's position in the Prime Minister' Office is justified.

We also have to be concerned to know whether Immigration by itself is such a full-time occupation to demand the undivided attention of one full-fledged Minister; not even a Parliamentary Secretary. What other assignments does he have? The same arguments could be adduced in relation to Energy and Planning and also in relation to Information and Culture.

You may say that the Minister of Information and Culture has the duties of Leader of the Senate and to that extent he has obligations in that regard. But the arguments of the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, in seeking to defend the fact that Tourism was not given a separate Ministry, made the point that if you have the Minister of Tourism and you have a Board of Tourism, the likelihood of the Minister interferring is very great; that he has nothing to do but sit on his Board of Tourism.
11.15 a.m.

The argument of the Member for Christ Church East Central can destroy the argument for the establishment of a separate Ministry of Information and Culture. We have just set up a Cultural Foundation by law in this Honourable House. We have set up a Cultural Foundation, Board of Information, CBC.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: What is the Board of Information?)

Mr. M. A. KING: CBC.

You are creating a situation for the Minister of Information and Culture to do nothing else but spend his time involving himself in the activities of CBC, and, also in relation to the Ministry of Culture, he will dominate the Ministry of Culture. He will be the be all and end all of all cultural exposition in this country.

In relation to Energy and Planning, you have a Member of this Honourable House who is in charge of the National Petroleum Corporation, which, as I understand it, is largely responsible for energy matters in this country. You have a Minister who is responsible for Energy. You tacked on Planning to make it good. Let us admit that. Planning is tacked on to make it look good.

The Prime Minister is essentially the man in this country who is responsible for Planning – Planning is under his direction and control – and the Minister for Energy and Planning will really not have much say in the overall planning of this economy. He will be involved in planning only to the extent where energy is involved, so that we have to be convinced, and the people of this country have a right to know, that the many ministerial positions – and when I say ministerial, I include Parliamentary Secretaries – which exist in this country are justified by the work which is required of them.

The honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss) in his presentation yesterday attempted to give one the impression – and I forgot the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, I will come back to him – that there were a number of Ministers, perhaps, who never had much to do. I think his comments were barbed and pointed directly to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, and I was a little shocked yesterday that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, who is usually so aggressive when anybody attacks him, was so subdued in his comments yesterday in response to the barbed attacks of the Member for St. Michael Central. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is maturity).

Mr. M. A. KING: Maybe he was acting on instructions. You may call it maturity or what you like. During the course of debate, I saw you look across at the Prime Minister, though, and discussed one other matter with him.

I see the time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Wind up, wind up.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, just another point before I sit at this time. Yesterday we were talking about information. Honourable Members talked about change in ministerial portfolios. I have not got time to go into the doctrine of collective responsibility of Cabinet Ministers, but just let me give you an example of what can happen. The former Minister of Transport and Works has been moved. There is now a new Minister of Transport and Works. The former Minister of Transport and Works had promised this House, for instance, a full disclosure, a full statement, on matters connected with the movement of bus bodies from the Transport Board. Wee have not got that statement yet.

If the Cabinet is collectively responsible, one would assume that the new Minister of Transport and Works is going to make a statement on this matter, but the ridiculous situation exists where the new Minister of Transport and Works is the one who, by his own admission in this Honourable House, was involved in acquiring bus bodies. It rings hollow again to get the statement from that new Minister on this issue. Why did we not have a statement on the matter before the former Minister of Transport and Works vacated his position?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I have to join my colleagues on this side in the debate initiated by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) and the call for the setting up of the Boundaries Commission.

The Act was passed in 1981, but the Members on the other side had a conviction that there was need for a Boundaries Commission, not in 1981 or in 1976, it was part of their submissions to the Independence Constitution debate in 1966. We are now in 1983. From 1966, and probably even before, they were convinced of the need for a Boundaries Commission. In 1966, I think three of the Members on the other side were part of the delegation to the London Conference. They made the point at the London Conference in 1966 that Barbados should have entrenched in its Constitution a Boundaries Commission. At the time the then Premier, now Leader of the Opposition, and members of the Democratic Labour Party felt, and put forward the view, that Barbados was a country with a long tradition of democracy – over 300 years of parliamentary democracy – and we have had a tradition of the House of Assembly regulating its own affairs. There was no need, it was said at the time, why we should change that and now entrench in the Constitution a Boundaries Commission merely because we were going independent, because at the time we had been running fair and free elections, and had done it through the years without a Boundaries Commission.

We had no intention of gerrymandering any boundaries. I heard the honourable Member for Christ Church East making some *sotto voce* reference this morning to my rule in the 1971 elections. I was the Minister responsible for Elections in 1971. I spent a number of years trying to get a new Representation of the People Act. I had a running battle with a legal officer in the Attorney General's Chambers. We were pushing, pushing, pushing and could not get it, but when in 1971 a new Act was presented to Cabinet, it was a completely different Act from the instructions that went from Cabinet for drafting. I rejected it out of hand. One section of it was completely rejected, and I sat down and re-wrote that section, because they were rejecting a permanent register.

The Attorney General's Office rejected a permanent register. They had no right to do this, and I sat down and I drafted a section relating to the permanent register, and I still then had difficulty with that particular draughtsman who had drafted it, and that draughtsman only relented when the head of the drafting section then, Mr. Neville Nicholls, said, "Yes, this is okay, this is what they want, this is what they can have." It is only because of that that we got the system of a permanent register.

I want to join with those persons who have called for the Boundaries Commission, and I do not want to hear about our voting against it. The Boundaries Commission Act came to this Parliament at a time when I was not a member of this House and had no opportunity to express my opinion one way or the other for the Record on the Boundaries Commission Act, but it is very likely that I would have voted with my colleagues. They explained why they voted against it, but I do not want to hear that, because at the time they did not vote for the Boundaries Commission Act, it was a vote against fair and free elections.

Asides.

11.25 a.m.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: You, the right honourable Prime Minister said it here this morning. Do not tell me that you are saying "not me." You cannot now disclaim it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Am I to believe that the reason for the election confusion in 1981 is because we did not vote for the Boundaries Commission? We are now getting the reason! We voted against free and fair elections so you are going to give us what we voted against in 1981. Am I to understand this?

Sir, I heard it said in here not so long ago when we had a debate in here that involved the Boundaries Commission that we are going to get it in our time. Those were the words used, in our time and in good time.

(Asides)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I am now hearing that those were the words not used then. They are now again redrafting or rephrasing what was said earlier because I was about to welcome what they said earlier, that we are going to get it before the next general elections. It was said this morning that we will get it good and ready before the next General Election, but now we are merely hearing that it will be done in their time. Is that a contradiction of what was said here? I would like to know. We would like to know. It is not for me to know only, it is not the Opposition who wants to know, the people of this country want to know. It is they who have to cast the votes. They have many hundred times more votes than the combined membership of the House of Assembly.

The people of this country want to know when we are going to have this Boundaries Commission, when we are going to eliminate or reduce, if you like, some of the confusion that reigned in the last General Election. I believe that a Boundaries Commission appointed in good time, and long before the next elections are due, should be able to get down to work and grapple with the problems that existed then, have a look and see what they were and see how they can be eliminated.

I am not saying that there will be no problems. We would be living in a Utopian state if there were no problems.

(Asides)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I would never tell the people that there are no problems, because elections are run by human beings, and, as long as they are run by human beings, there are bound to be problems. But let us get the Commission set up in good time! Two years have almost gone, which means, perhaps, that we are almost halfway towards the next general elections but the Prime Minister has it in his power to call it any time, even in the next four weeks.

(Asides)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: It is no longer with you to bring your members into line by telling them of a General Election? That is my interpretation of what I heard last night, that the Prime Minister has the power to put everybody in jeopardy and that is one way of bringing the members in line. But you are not going to have it as early as that time so it does not matter me, but let us have the Boundaries Commission.

Before I sit I still want to make a point about some discussions here this morning, because there is no other Head under which we can discuss it. This is the Head that deals with the function of the Cabinet Office, and it says that the principal function include the "administration of provisions made for the payment of emoluments to Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and certain ministerial staff appointments".

All I had wanted to, when I was about to speak earlier, was to speak about a release from the Government Information Service as regards the termination of the services of a Parliamentary Secretary. It was referred to by the Government Information Service as a suspension, but I came in here this morning and I was very surprised to hear the right honourable Prime Minister also refer to it as a suspension.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Prime Minister has a right to tamper with the intelligence of the people of this country. It was gazetted on March 7, 1983 that L. L. Sisnett was relieved of his parliamentary duties as a Parliamentary Secretary. It was in the Gazette of March 7.

Furthermore, there was a picture of the same honourable Member for St. Michael North East being sworn in as a Parliamentary Secretary at Government House. If you are suspended, why do you have to take the Oath of Allegiance all over again? I do not think it is right for the right honourable Prime Minister, the Member for St. Thomas, to treat honourable Members in this way, far less the people of this country.

Nobody is challenging the rights of the Prime Minister to appoint who he wants to appoint and in his own judgement relieve those people whom he appoints of their duties and responsibilities. He has that right. It is his sole discretion. Nobody queries that, but when the right honourable Prime Minister relieves persons of their duties and responsibilities, the people of this country have a right to know why, and the right honourable Prime Minister has a duty to tell them why. It goes two ways – they have a right to know and the right honourable Prime Minister has a duty to tell. If he does not do this, Mr. Chairman, it leaves the people open to apply their own interpretation, including the interpretation that it could be embarrassing to the Prime Minister to divulge the true reason.

Now, if it is embarrassing to the Prime Minister – I am not saying that it is – then, perhaps, he will say why he was relieved of his duties. I am not telling them, but should the embarrassment to the Prime Minister override the people's right to know – and I cannot see that the answer to that is "yes" – the people have a right to know and the only reason I can see for terming it a suspension is not to tell the people why the honourable

Member was relieved of his ministerial duties. I think they should know, and know the whole truth.

There was a time when Mr. DaCosta Edwards was relieved of his duties. He was fired, if you like. The honourable Prime Minister at the time went on television the same night and told the country why he was being fired. The present Prime Minister now calls it specious, but I do not think it is as specious as the reasons put forward here. But, be that as it may, I still think that the Prime Minister owes not only the House of Assembly, he owes it to the country, to tell the people why, in his judgement, he had to relieve a Member of this Chamber of his parliamentary duties as Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few brief comments on the matter of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, and I am very glad to see that my colleague on my left has brought some measure of commonsense to this debate on the Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

Like him, I was not in here before 1981 either, so as far as I am concerned, I did not take part in that debate. But I believe that the point that my colleague made, and which has to be stressed, is that even if the Democratic Labour Party at the time voted against that Act for the setting up of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, I think that people should realise that this was done before the 1981 General Election. This was done when elections in Barbados were free of a lot of the confusion that took place in 1981.
11.35 a.m.

I am trying to make out a case for the setting up of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, Mr. Chairman, because I am in agreement with anything that is done to take the matter of elections out of the hands of politicians. I believe that free and fair elections are fundamental to our system of Government in Barbados.

I will give an example, Mr. Chairman. I believe that one of the problems in Guyana is the fact that it is difficult to get rid of the Government that is in power. When I say get rid of, I mean by the ballot box. I believe that in Guyana, or in any other country, if people are free to change Governments when the right time comes along, there will be more progress than if they are unable to change the Government, because the Government that follows the one that was in would know that if it does not perform, then they will be got rid of at the next elections.

What has happened in Barbados since 1976 is that the first thing the Barbados Labour Party Government did was to relieve 14 returning officers of their jobs. These were 14 out of 24. No reason was given. The second thing that was done in Barbados since 1976 was that the monthly list was stopped. Mr. Chairman, I am saying here today that if there is one thing that I would like to see reinstated, it is that monthly list. I find it very difficult that you get a list at the end of January and then you do not see another list to know who is coming into your constituency before the following January.

Now you can see where this is going to cause confusion, Mr. Chairman. If I went last month or the month before, and saw the list, it means that there can be 1 000 people coming into the St. Philip South constituency between that time and next January. Suppose an election is called, let us say, for December, I have then to search around for those thousand people. If a list was being printed every month, it would mean that I can go and check and see who comes on to the list, six or eight or ten as the case may be, and I can go around on Saturday or Sunday mornings and see these people and talk to them.

The third thing, Mr. Chairman, is that there was a new registration carried out in Barbados — and then the boundaries were changed.

What was the result of those three things that were done between 1976 and 1981? There was total confusion at the elections in 1981 where hundreds of people found it difficult to find where they had to vote. So I am saying that when you look at what took place between 1976 and 1981, even if the Democratic Labour Party had voted against the setting up of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission up until that time, since 1981 we would have had a change of heart, because we do not want that sort of confusion to exist again in any coming election, and we are not going to sit in here and do nothing.

Between 1976 and 1981, there were a lot of persons who were telling us to keep our eyes on that and keep our eyes on this, and this is likely to happen, and I believe — and this is my personal view — that we should have been more careful. We have been looking at the trends that were taking place between 1976 and 1981 and I believe that we would have done a greater job, as far as the electoral list and what happened in that last election in 1981 were concerned, had we taken the advice of a lot of people and spotted what was happening from very early.

I am saying therefore, Mr. Chairman, that I am in favour of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, because I feel that elections should be taken completely out of the hands of politicians and should be under an independent authority.

Thank you very much.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the last statement made by the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman). It represents a *volte face* by the Democratic Labour Party. Back in 1964–65, at the time of the Under Forties when the debate was raging in this country as to whether we should go into independence alone or independence with the other Eastern Caribbean countries, one of the strong arguments on the proposed Constitution was that there should be an independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The view of the Democratic Labour Party was that this was unnecessary.

I think the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) quite correctly gave the reason why the Democratic Labour Party did not favour it. They contended that Barbados had had a history of elections in which they had been no large or significant interference with the electoral machinery, and it saw no reason therefore why this position should be changed. The argument of the Barbados Labour Party, the Barbados National Party and the Under-Forties at the time, was that it was better that the conduct of elections should be as far removed as possible from the people who were the main contestants for power, and whilst we concede that there had to be general policy directions, the actual execution of the policy should be removed from politicians. I very much regret that that very sound argument was not won because at the Conference in London the British Government overruled the submissions of the two Opposition parties and said that the issue would be determined by an election.

The Democratic Labour Party won the election in 1966 using the same system; it won the election of 1971 using the same system, it lost the election of 1976 using the same system, but the Barbados Labour Party has always strongly felt that such a commission was a necessity in order to bolster parliamentary democracy.

I agree with the honourable Member for St. Michael North when he said that he did not believe that even under such an independent commission there will not be certain allegations and errors. I do not think that you will ever get, even in the United Kingdom or in the United States, an ideal system where some problems do not occur in elections. But what I am saying is that such a system is perhaps, in the light of the experience of countries which hold genuinely free and fair elections, the better system.

Now the Government honoured its electoral promise as contained in the 1976 Manifesto and passed the necessary amendment to the Constitution. Regardless of whether the Democratic Labour Party voted for that change at the time, I seriously contend that the Government must take the next logical step and implement the legislation. If you look at the Head of the Estimates, there is really no significant change in the amount of money being provided for the Electoral Office. The Electoral Office is still not properly staffed to deal with the problems which concern us in an election, or which may even confront us in a by-election.

11.45 a.m.

I witnessed the Electoral Office in the last election and I really must congratulate Mr. Smith and members of his staff for the manner in which they worked, given the crowded, almost physically stultifying conditions of the office, and also the part-time staff which were made available to them at the time.

I believe that this country should spend a reasonable amount of money to safeguard parliamentary democracy. One of the ways of doing this is to ensure that the electoral machinery functions properly, and to minimise the allegations from both sides of the political fence about rigging, make the roll open to anybody at all, not only the elector but contestants, all the time. There is no reason why such rolls should be hidden, why any honourable Member or any contestant should not have the access to it so that we would know who are the people on the roll, or who should be on the roll, or who are left on the roll in order to have the maximum turn out of voters.

I do not agree with the point made by the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) in relation to the register and how it should be managed. I believe that we should publish Electoral Registers more often than we have been doing recently. Before the change in the law under the Representation of the People Act, of which the honourable Member for St. Michael North spoke, a supplementary register was published on a monthly basis.

I myself have looked at that register in Police Stations and realised that sometimes there was no names on the register. Sometimes there were three or four names and it seemed to me that the time period was too short and it was causing the Electoral Office to undertake work that was not strictly necessary. However, I believe that there must be a reasonable period – I would suggest a period of three months for there should be an updated roll of the new people, who have either reached the age of 18 and are qualified to vote or who by residing for the necessary period provided under the Representation of the People Act, or who have changed from one constituency to another, or from one polling district to another.

But there is also a duty on political contestants to ensure that the Electoral Roll is kept up-to-date. Registering officers should be made on a continual basis to keep tags on people moving in and out of constituencies and to

up-date the list from time to time. It should not be too difficult for us to have from the Register of Births and Deaths, a regular list of the persons who have attained the age of 18 and a list of those persons who have died, so that corrections, deletions, and additions can be made to the list from time to time.

Aside

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am told that this is done at the moment and I am glad to hear that this is done. I am told that automatically when someone is 18 his name goes on the register, and that is how it should be.

I believe that Members of Parliament should from time to time be supplied with the current list of people in their constituency who have qualified to come on the roll. Let me give you one of the areas that I think could simplify the position. In my constituency, Christ Church West, new people have moved into the Bonnetts area. Some of them have now been there for three months and they, therefore, satisfy the resident qualifications for a change from one electoral district to another. I took it on myself to telephone the registering officer for the area and I told him that I believe he ought to go into the area and carry out this function.

I believe if you are serious about an election and you want to be elected, you have got to be always conscious of the new people moving into your constituency and monitor them in your own interest. My campaign begins the moment that the supervisor has said that I have won the election. I start campaigning from that very night for the next election....

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not stopping campaigning, because as usual, I want to get the most votes and the highest percentage, and I want to give the people proper representation. I think you can give it once you pay an interest. I do not even mind it if my opponent does likewise and get into the constituency and try to get people registered.

I think that both sides of the political fence, no matter what the difference is – sometimes the difference between these two parties are minimal – I genuinely believe in parliamentary democracy. I also believe that we both want to get the best system. We differ on form of details, but it should not be too difficult for us to come to a consensus to ensure that the parliamentary machinery functions properly.

Mr. Chairman, there are complaints from both sides of the fence, both from winners and losers, about the Electoral Roll in the last election. I do not think that a lot of people were left off the roll. Many of them were in the wrong polling district. Some of them were in the wrong constituency areas. I was at the Electoral Office on election day to find people, for instance, who were in Upper Clapham having to go and vote in St. Michael West Central, whereas they really were in Christ Church West Central but living in Christ Church West. My opponent and I found ourselves sending two different circulars to the same person, giving them two different voting areas because of this sort of error which was occurring. One of the strong things I recommend is that a copy of the master Electoral Roll be put in every polling district. So if you go to your particular polling district it should be possible for them to tell you: "I am sorry, you have made a change of address. You are not voting in this polling district. You are voting in the additional polling district."

I think we must try to up-date the Electoral Roll. We must try to get rid of all the problems of which we are hearing continual complaints because I think that democracy in Barbados is old enough and mature enough that the two political parties do not have to present their case to the electorate on the basis that A or B is rigging the election or keeping somebody off the Electoral Roll.

I said it before, Mr. Chairman, everybody loses power. We lost power in 1961, the Democratic Labour Party lost power in 1976. I am sure that, as democracy goes, and if both of us are intent on preserving democracy, from time to time Governments will change. But we should make sure that that change is as fair and as free as possible.

I disagree violently with those people who believe that democracy is by getting a few people to come and listen to you deliver what is called the Budget Speech and that is the end of the matter, and that they cannot tell you that you must be thrown out of power. And that is one of the reasons why I have strongly objected to the systems of Government that you find in countries such as Grenada, and I have said it openly, because I believe that it comes nowhere near giving the electorate an opportunity to change their political masters from time to time because they feel that they are not performing properly. That is why I have consistently attacked the form of elections in Guyana where you have a series of overseas voters – sometimes you do not even know if they exist, if they have died or not. I believe that Caribbean people should speak out on this.

11.55 a.m.

I have said that if Barbados is to be the model, both political parties, and particularly the Government now as we have the responsibility, must ensure that we so organise the Representation of the People Act that there

can be no legitimate criticism of rigging or interference or keeping people off the roll. That does not do this country any good if it is so.

I believe that the best politician is the one who makes up his mind that some day he knows that he has to move. I do not believe you have to hold on to power willy nilly at any cost, by rigging elections and that sort of thing. I do not believe in that at all, and if it happens in my party I will condemn it. If it happens in the Democratic Labour Party, I will condemn it.

It is a pity we cannot on a bi-partisan basis publish a Representation of the People Act and take ideas from both sides. The former honourable Member for St. Michael North West, Dr. Caddle, when he spoke on this subject before he lost the elections, in my view made some very useful and telling points which ought to be looked at by the Government. I believe if there are ideas coming from that side and they are useful to improve democracy, we should take them and we should not hesitate at all to do all in our power to make the electorate vote.

I want to say something about the electorate too, Sir. The electorate has a duty in their own interest, and to preserve democracy, to see that they are registered. Too many people are not wanting to go to register. Sometimes the registering officers go to them and they say: "Man, I can't be bothered about that, come back some other time," and then at the last moment there is a rush at the station and you cannot get people registered on time. I believe that the electorate must understand that the preservation of democracy is in their hands and that they have to ensure that they are on the roll.

I also am not satisfied with the percentage of voting in this country. I do not believe that percentages of 73 — sometimes they range from as low as 60, and I think the highest we have had was about 82 or 83 percent — is satisfactory. There is no reason why we should not be aiming at percentage turnout of voters in the region of 90 per cent, so that we will have a true picture of how the people feel on a particular issue at any time. If it means an education in civics, both sides of the House have a duty to do this.

I know the honourable Deputy Prime Minister has said the Electoral and Boundaries Commission will come in good time. I do not believe that sort of statement is really intended to be facetious, but at the same time it can lead to misunderstanding. I do not think that this Bill is one on which there can be any mystery. We have deliberately built into this Bill that where the Governor-General is appointing people on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, that there must be consultation between the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister. And where the Leader of the Opposition is nominating someone, there must be consultation with the Prime Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I believe that the leaders of the two major political parties in this country, the Leader of the Opposition who has made an outstanding contribution to this island, and the present Leader of the Government who, regardless of whether or not he is going to be attacked to lose power as it is necessary, has made and continues to make an outstanding contribution to this country, should be mature enough to be able to sit down in this area and talk about the matters, settle the issues, get three people who are genuinely independent and who would not want to do anything to favour one party over another, and who is interested in preserving this country.

If the two of them cannot do that, then I suggest that neither of them is entitled to lead this country at all. That is the minimum you can ask of them as an electorate. I believe both of them have the intellectual capacity and the basic intention and honesty to do so. I hope that if there are any little personal differences or foolishness, they will forget that, and in the interest of Barbados let us get rid of this idea of rigging elections and what not. Have a fair election, and if the Democratic Labour Party wins one time, good for them; when we throw them out, good for us; but we will ensure that the people have proper representation for all time.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise to make my contribution on this particular Head 15, Cabinet Office. Let me say at the start that we are spending this amount of time on this Head because the Cabinet Office and the Cabinet are at the centre of the political power structure in this country, and it is right that at times we should stop in this country amidst all of the flow of the passing of legislation, amidst all of the talk about different Ministries and departments and so on, and study what is happening to the political power structure of the country. At the centre of it all is the Cabinet, and the Cabinet Office has to do with the structure of Government and how power is distributed in this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have got to take at least two political institutions in the country into consideration when we are looking at this matter. There is the Cabinet itself and the Cabinet Office, and there is the Legislature, because the Cabinet itself sits in the Legislature and there is a very close linkage between the two, the Cabinet Office being that department of Government which has communication as far as the different Government Departments may be concerned.

When we are talking about power, we have got to ask ourselves what exactly do we mean when we are talking about power and when we are talking about politics. The definition of politics which I use in these circumstances, which I believe is most appropriate, is the definition which looks at politics as power, and the distribution of power, and to use a phrase made famous by Professor Laswell, I believe it was, politics is "who gets what, when, how and why", and it is within that context that we have to view what is happening in this country.

If we follow that particular definition of politics, we must also try to realise that we have to do something about power, we have got to ensure that power is controlled, whoever may be holding the power, because the aphorism of Lord Acton still stands – "power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely." It is therefore necessary to ensure that when power is placed in the hands of any person or any body of persons, that within the democratic framework the necessary controls must be in place in order to ensure that power does not go to the head of any person or body, and that there are effective controls to make sure that the country remains democratic.

That is why we are in here as a Legislature, to hold the Ministers of Cabinet responsible to the people of this country through the elected body in order to ensure that they will do things which are in accordance with the wishes of the people of this country, and that they are accountable therefor.

What we have been seeing about the distribution of power in this country recently may be fairly alarming. People do not stop to study what is happening, and it is said that we can have a democracy today and, through changes which we do not even realise are having the kind of impact that they are having, we can lose that democracy tomorrow.

12.05 p.m.

It has happened in other countries and it can happen again and, Mr. Chairman, I detect in this country a gradual moving of power away from the elected body in this country to other centers of power, and when I hear the definition of the Office of Prime Minister as being *primus inter pares,* first among equals, there is no way in this country that the Prime Minister is any *primus inter pares,* any first among equals.

That must have been so when the office first emerged, but today the Prime Minister is so far ahead of the other members of the Cabinet, especially because of his control over the Cabinet Office and through the Cabinet Office in terms of the co-ordination of power that that old Latin phrase – I do not mind how it is pronounced – is not really applicable today. He is more than No. 1, he is it; so much so that what we have in this country, I am positive about it, is not Cabinet Government. We have Prime Ministerial Government in this country, and we had better understand it, and what we are trying to do is to ensure that Prime Ministerial Government in this country does not run riot, that it has to be controlled by different centers in the Government.

I want to see the members in the Cabinet have a greater say in what goes on in this country. I want to ensure that if they do not speak up for themselves, if they allow themselves to be sidelined –

Asides

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I said Cabinet. I had better say the elected members of Cabinet, because I am talking about this gradual slide away of power in this country and they had better understand what is happening, because I will spell it out for them.

Asides

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am in the House of Assembly now, a full time politician. I am not only a practical politician but I have the academic politics as well and I am using the two of them. I am not only a part of it but I can stand back and understand what is going on. I can observe, I am a participant observer.

Mr. Chairman, what is happening? If you ask any impartial observer about the power structure in this country today, I would think they would have to say that the right honourable Member for St. Thomas, is No. 1. He is the Prime Minister. It is very difficult to say who is No. 2 – I am not talking about the formal positions of power – but I believe that Senator Nigel Barrow would come high up, No. 2. I believe that Senator O'Brien Trotman will be No. 3, Senator Clyde Griffith will be No. 4. I think that is the kind of power structure. Then, the Deputy Prime Minister is a rugged independent person.

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Not the member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss), oh, no. He has a direct pipeline to the Prime Minister. He operates in a one-to-one position with the Prime Minister. The Member for Christ Church East (Hon. H. B. St. John) has been keeping very quiet, but I do not have him in that kind of line-up.

What does this mean, Mr. Chairman? It means that those persons who have independent power bases in this country are being by-passed, and persons who are created into position, they are the ones who are exercising most power in this country. That is the kind of development and it is that kind of situation in which I view the appointment of the new Parliamentary Secretary. I would not spend much time on that, but it is the elevation of the persons as Assistant Ministers, and that is what Parlia-

mentary Secretaries are. They are appointed, in the words of the Constitution, "to assist the Ministers." Also in relation to the creation of the other posts in between there, Ministers of State, they are really assisting the Prime Minister.

But the Prime Minister feels that he needs these people whom be can rely on, whom he can trust, who are dependent upon him, and when you get those who have their independent power bases and have their independent outlook also – and I will admit that there are members on the front bench and some on the back bench as well who are independent in their viewpoint – there will be problems.

I know the Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson) has an independent mind. He is very quiet, but he has an independent mind, and he speaks up – and I know who he speaks up for. He lets his mind be known. The Member who was just the Parliamentary Secretary, moved from Parliamentary Secretary one day, and now we are told disciplined for a fortnight, that is not important. The member is more sinned against than sinning. He has not really committed any grave offence that I am worried about.

I think the Prime Minister understands these matters. If he is looking around for some person to appoint as a temporary Minister, to say that he cannot find him, I think is a commentary on the Prime Minister, not on the Member, because before he sends out any Instrument or whatever it is, he has a duty to find out if the person is really available or what.

Aside.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You were in the Cabinet Office. I do not know. If you want to say that the Cabinet Office did not do their job in this regard, who can say that? I do not know. I am putting it in here. I talk about you. That is your responsibility.

Aside.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You have a responsibility to find out. You cannot put it on the Office of the Governor-General and talk about the Governor-General being embarrassed.

Aside.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We are getting a lot of embarrassment in the country now, both local and external, but I would not pay any more attention to that. I think the whole matter was bungled from the start. And the Prime Minister was bound to know that the Member was leaving the country because if it was through Caribbean Airways, the Chairman of Caribbean Airways, Mr. Herbie Yearwood is your alto ego, and he would have told you. And if you get that kind of situation happening, I think the most elegant thing would have been to get up and say, "Well, look, this matter has really been bungled. It was not handled properly. It is very embarrassing, I recognise that and I am therefore sorry about it and hope that it will not happen again."

Tell the people of the country! Take them openly into your confidence! Do not let us have to bribe this information out and now you issue instructions that the Ministers and the other members of your party must not talk to other people, they must be very careful and things like that.

12.15 p.m.

I was just outside talking to your Attorney General. I do not know if he was in here and heard these kinds of instructions: so I warned him not to come too close to me, because the law has been laid down about the communication. Mr. Chairman, this shift of power makes the whole matter quite a very important one as far as the distribution of power in this country is concerned, and we must watch these things carefully.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. I would say that I do not believe there is any other Member in this place who suffered more at the hands of the Electoral Office than I did. First of all, I would like to commend the Government of the Democratic Labour Party for selecting Mr. Smith as the Chief Electoral Officer. I believe he is one of the most hard-working, dedicated and honest men that we can find in this country. The only thing that worried my mind a little is that right up to 1971, with Mr. Smith still being the Electoral Officer, he was a nice man for the members of the Democratic Labour Party, but from the time 1976 came and the Democratic Labour Party lost the election, we heard that we had more problems with the Electoral Office than anything else. I really wonder how the Democratic Labour Party will face the civil servants of this country to ask them again for their support.

I remember that during the last Estimates they were on Courtenay Blackman, they were on the Chief Electoral Officer, they were on all the leading people in the island of Barbados. As soon as they found themselves in trouble and refused to represent the people and do the people's business, and the people had to change them, they tried to put the blame on everybody. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. Chairman, I remember that in the 1981 Election we had some people who used to support the

Democratic Labour Party for years. I do not know for what reason those people turned to me, but when the people went to the polls to look for their names, their names were on the St. Joseph list. I would not blame the Electoral Officer for that because I know he was dealing with a computer, and I am sure that everybody has a tendency to make mistakes at times. I heard the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN), speak about the changing of 15 electoral officers, but I would like to ask him if he does not know that I had an electoral officer who used to tell my supporters that, even if you beat us out there, when I bring you to the polls I am going to beat you at the count. I did not know the reason because I believe that if I beat you out there with the people's votes, when it comes to the count I should beat you also. I do not know what he used to do. I am not trying to blame anyone.

I know friends who used to be surprised to know that in the parish of St. Lucy, with over 7 000 people, they used to import people from St. Michael and St. James to count votes against me. I wonder why you had to bring people from St. Michael and St. James to count votes against a little humble person like me. So I got to realise what really went on. From 1976, when we had the change in the parish of St. Lucy, I was nothing to do with it, but I think it made history that my name appeared in the first Sunday Sun with "Family Row" and things like that.

However, Sir, I would like to commend the registration officer now. He is a christian gentleman. I would say he is somebody responsible, somebody that we can respect, and he went around and looked around in all the churches and took people from the Wesleyan Holiness, some from the Anglican, some from the Seventh Day Adventist, some from the Penticost, to make them enumerating officers, people whom they believed they could trust, people who would not go around preaching politics all day long when they should be trying to do a job. He looked for honest, decent people, and I will tell you that if we did not have an officer like him, I do not think that I would be in here yet.

But I had something on my mind for the people of St. Lucy, and I did not care what the electoral officer did, I intended to fight until the Lord came to see that the people of St. Lucy got representation. And if more of us would do our homework and try to work to help our constituents, we would not have to worry about registration officers, electoral officers, or anybody like that, we would stand up and we would know that when the flag was lowered that we are sure of winning, because our people are not so ungrateful. Our people know goodness, and I am sure I am one of those who would tell the Prime Minister to call the elections tomorrow because I am ready, since I am trying with God's help to be honest to my people and not try to promise things I am unable to deliver.

I will tell you that, as we look around and we see the movement and the cries from day to day, the people in this country are very happy and satisfied with the movement of the Barbados Labour Party. I am so proud to know that I am a member of the Barbados Labour Party! Last week we had a debate in here on Communications and Works and people whom I would not expect to comment said, "Brathwaite, you all keep the good work up". When we listen to the debating of the Democratic Labour Party, they really cannot find anything to say; they are only trying to find something to say. I am very proud to say that this is a real turn around as far as the Barbados Labour Party is concerned.

I am sure that a parish like St. Peter in 1976 had as many as nine sisters working as enumerating officers. You did not hear our speakers cry out about that. The Barbados Labour Party does not believe in crying "foul". There were nine sisters from one home working as enumerating officers. Week after week as you come in here you can hear the members of the Democratic Labour Party trying to discredit people; they are always trying to blame people for their folly.

Mr. Chairman, I will say that there is one thing forever. I believe the time will come when we will not have to wait, we will know, and I do not believe in trying to blame people for mistakes. You all know without a shadow of a doubt that in 1971 it was only a mistake, and I will say that it was a blessing in disguise, because I would say that from 1971 to 1976 and we had won the election, we would not be in the position that we are in today, but I am very happy and satisfied, and I am sure that the nice people of Barbados, all that you cry and complain about, intend to do their duty. As soon as this party falls into the same state as the members of the Democratic Labour Party, I am sure that the same thing that happened to the Democratic Labour Party will happen to the Barbados Labour Party. I would not agree with any Member on this side getting up and blaming everybody in Barbados for their mistakes. I am therefore appealing to Members to put less blame on innocent people.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that every civil servant in this country would like to see the country go ahead, and I believe they are nice, honest, hard-working people and I should like to think that we would try our best always to give them a fair share. They are human beings just like us, but as soon as we find ourselves in a spot, we try to use pressure on the poor civil servants because they cannot come into the House of Assembly and speak for themselves. I believe that a party that was in power fifteen years would have a lot of friends in the Civil Service and they should be kinder to them.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the sterling speech of the honourable Member (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) who has just sat down. As for the academic exercise that the other side has indulged in the whole of this morning, the other side knows and understands the constitutional provisions of Barbados. I am very glad to see that the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) is in his place today, because I am sure that he will be able to tell me that they talk nothing but a bunch of nonsense, that it is only when they have the power of a Prime Minister that they will know the limitations thereof.

Sir, I want to start with the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King). It is quite surprising to me that the honourable Member does not know today the extent of the portfolio of the Minister of Information and Culture. I will presume that he had a glance at the Gazette. I will presume that, in the interest of his constituents, he would like to know when they come to him – because they cannot find him, so they cannot go to him – that in the event of them finding him in the future and they want postal problems dealt with, he would know that he will have to deal with the Minister of Information and Culture. The Post Office, the whole administration of it, comes under the administration of the Minister of Information and Culture.

12.25 p.m.

You see, Sir, in his attempt to contradict himself, because all he did for the whole morning is contradict himself in relation to the replies and the validness of the arguments that we put forward over here, he has disclosed that he is not quite up to date with the present distribution of the Ministries of Barbados.

I am equally surprised to hear him, a lawyer of all people, who has had some exposure to constitutional form, say that he includes Parliamentary Secretaries as Ministers. The honourable Member sat down here and confessed that! I advise the honourable Member for St. Michael South to hold a class in "constitutional niceties" for your members at the Academy of Politics in the future, and issue the first invitation to the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. Hold a class for them, lecture to them, instead of coming in here trying to lecture Parliament.

A Parliamentary Secretary cannot be classified as a Minister in any country that follows the Westminster system of Government. I pity the honourable Members on the other side. You must not expose your limitations. You must not do it like that.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: But look who is talking about get on with something, a person who repeated himself all day long in here. We are still only at Cabinet – Government and today is Wednesday, and they have made absolutely no progress. They thought they had an issue to highlight!

Aside

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You can talk about anything you would like to talk about.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: This is where they have reached! They thought they had a political issue! Let us get down to the meat of it. Let us get down to the economy. That is what the people are interested in. Let us get down to those Heads of the Estimates relating to the economy. Do not let us come in here and talk about how to receive a lecture from a lecturer at the Community College, a part-time politician.

It pleases me when the honourable Member shows himself in the true light and, really, today I was astounded to hear the honourable Member say that a Parliamentary Secretary is a Minister.

As far as the honourable Member for St. Philip South is concerned, the honourable Member for St. Philip South now says that he was not a Member of the House in the past and that he would have voted for the Bill.....

Aside

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I do not mind the honourable Member for St. Philip North, because the honourable Member for St. Philip North participated in the greatest constitutional rape in relation to election that has ever taken place in Barbados, in 1979, and the honourable Member for St. Michael North was the Minister responsible.

Aside

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please!

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, quite seriously, we had a lot of jokes today, but I do not really feel that anybody would regard the honourable Member as being competent to say that I am talking rubbish, because the honourable Member was Minister responsible for Home Affairs when, six weeks before the election in 1971, they brought down the whole change of boundaries. He will never be able to get away from that.

At this point certain remarks made by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, if he has been drinking before he came in here, he cannot behave like that. He has to behave himself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will now entertain the Leader of the House on Government Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress to His Honour the Deputy Speaker 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. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 1.30 p.m. today.

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

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

On Resumption:–

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

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I rise firstly to make it clear that the Democratic Labour Party has never at any time made any criticism of the Chief Electoral Officer. We have always found him to be a man of the highest integrity, and I think it is very unfortunate that an individual, steeped in those disciplines which we all who come from St. George share, on the Floor of this House should seek to suggest that the integrity of the Chief Electoral Officer could ever by called in question by the Democratic Labour Party. Therefore, I think the speech made by the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) was very much out of place in that respect.

Our concern is with the whole question of democracy in Barbados. This country, as I perceive it, is gradually drifting in the direction of a dictatorship. There is concern about the undermining of the electoral process, concern about the building up of the military in Barbados, concern over the distinct shift of power away from Parliament to other places, one must seek on this occasion to reinforce one's commitment to the democratic process and to ensure that Members on both sides of this House feel committed to the same extent.

I am extremely happy to be a parliamentarian, and if the people of Barbados by free and fair elections return the Barbados Labour Party to power for the next hundred years, my peace of mind would not be disturbed. But all of us in here must be concerned, those on the winning side and those on the losing side, over the problems which occurred at the last elections in Barbados.

Now is the time to ensure that those mistakes are not made again. Now is the time to set up the Boundaries Commission. Now is the time to ensure that there is a full and complete registration of all eligible persons in Barbados. Now is the time to make sure that all the errors on the list are removed so that as both sides get geared for the next election, we start off with a relatively clean sheet.

I spent about ten minutes looking at the last electoral list in relation to my constituency that was sent to me earlier this year, and it contains more errors than the one that was used at election time. It is almost a complete waste of time to begin to organise a campaign on the basis of the names appearing on that list, so, I am calling now from the Floor of this House for a reaffirmation by each and every Member that we are committed to the principles of democracy, that we recognise that the question of free and fair elections must be dealt with at this time.

Before the last election, Mr. Chairman, I recall that on many occasions I expressed my concern over problems relating to the list. I expressed my concern over a registration that was taking place under the Statistics Act. We had many a reassurance from the Minister responsible, that is, the honourable Member for St. Thomas, (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams), that that registration had nothing whatsoever to do with elections. We had a reassurance that the new ID card had nothing whatsoever to do with elections. As a matter of fact, Sir, in response to a Parliamentary Question by the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), he was informed that it had nothing to do with elections, but a few months before the elections the Representation of the People Act was amended to make sure that the registration exercise

carried out under the Statistics Act was eligible for the purposes of an election. That was one of the major problems relating to the electoral lists last election.

The second problem was that the Government attempted to deal with several things at the same time. First of all, there was extensive gerrymandering of the constituency boundaries. Secondly, they attempted to compute a list of electors by a negative method, so to speak, that is, you used the Statistics Act in order to register persons over a given age, whether they were eligible to vote or not under the Representation of the People Act, and then to use the computer for the purpose of rejecting those names that were not eligible to vote. The net result of this was that there were many people who were eligible to vote, their names were rejected by the computer, and many persons who were not eligible, their names were included on the list. Persons who were not citizens of Barbados, persons who were not eligible because of their age, for example, a few children's names, and so on appeared on the last register.

The gerrymandering of the boundaries added to the confusion, so the net result was that there was a functional disenfranchisement of thousands of Barbadians on that particular day, and it was really begging the question to say that two or three people throughout the whole country were disenfranchised. You are effectively disenfranchised if you know that you have been living in a particular area for the past 20 years, that you have always voted at a particular place or in a particular constituency, and when you go to the polls your name cannot be found anywhere on any register in your constituency, nor is there a master register at any of the polling stations, and when you go down to the Registration Office in Bridgetown there are thousands of people around that office and inside that office, so that nobody can help you, and then a week after the elections you discover that your name was on a list in St. Lucy.

Now, that is not fair. That kind of confusion should never have taken place, and if the matter was approached with straightforwardness, and with the kind of honesty which is required when you are dealing with electoral matters, it would never have happened. I have said this before.

There are just one or two things that concern me in relation to that election. If I see this process continuing, I will review my position in relation to public life in Barbados. I do not wish to be involved in any dictatorship, I do not wish to be party to it, and therefore I would like to re-emphasise again and again that where you have a situation where many elected Members in this Honourable Chamber cannot be absolutely sure whether they won their seats or not.....

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There are many people who would have won by a very small number of votes, and in their consciences they must know that there were a sufficient number of people in their own constituencies who could not vote on that day, and that if they had been able to vote, then the result could have been different. It is as simple as that. If you win an election by 40, 50 and 70 votes, and two or three hundred people in that constituency could not have voted on that day because of errors, you will never be sure in your mind whether you really won that seat. And that feeling of disquiet must always rest with you.

Now, Sir, there are other important areas. I believe that the time has come when we should introduce in the process of enumeration the concept of the use of scrutineers. We should start using scrutineers. I think that if, for example, you are going to enumerate an electoral district, that it is quite important that someone who lives in that area and who knows the people in that area should be there along with the registering officer to look after the interest of one political party, with another person representing the interest of another political party.
1.45 p.m.

This is a system that obtains in many countries and I see no reason why it should not obtain in Barbados. In other words, if the district is RA1 or RA2, and my constituency was being enumerated or registration was going on, I should be entitled to nominate someone of the Democratic Labour Party to go along with the registering officer, and at the same time the Barbados Labour Party would be entitled to nominate someone because they are the people who really know.

We also have to look at the whole question of returning officers, and this is something that we must face. You will see people in your constituency appearing on the list, people who have died for many years. Now, that is the responsibility of the returning officer. All he has to do in probably listen to the announcements on Rediffusion on mornings and that would probably take care of 90 percent of the problem. All he has to do is to look at the Register of Births and Deaths and find out what deaths have taken place in the district for which he holds responsibility, and for which he is receiving a salary, and find out who is dead and remove them from the list.

From time to time my attention has been drawn to instances where people living on the same street as the electoral officer may have passed away and their names still continue on the list. That is the kind of situation that is taking place, so we have to get out of this whole business and look at the whole question of registration and the preparation of an electoral list with much more seriousness.

I took the trouble some time ago, while in another country to look and see how the whole administration of the electoral system takes place at an election and in between election time. It is an active process, on-going process and a process that goes on in depth. And it is so because people should be sure and have confidence in the electoral process of any country if you really believe in democracy.

It springs from there. The moment you have lost confidence in the whole electoral process, sooner or later problems are going to develop in the society and it is really begging the question to get up here now and make all kinds of political statements rather than dealing with the issues as they stand today, and the first issue is that the machinery is not working.

The system whereby they have returning officers, many of whom are really non-functional, or functional for only short periods of time within a five-year period, that system is not working! The lists are appalling. I would say that probably a good 30 per cent to 40 per cent of the names of persons on my list should not be there at all.

Since the gerrymandering of the boundaries of my constituency, you will find many people from the City and St. Michael South Central and a lot of people from St. Michael South on my list. You will find people who should be in St. Michael East on my list. In fact, I have a few persons from St. Lucy on my list. I have a person from Lears on my list and, as a matter of fact, the address appears as Lears, St. Michael. Then you have a whole section of Britton's Hill, the section between Dean's Gap and Warner's Gap, which would probably be in my constituency according to the boundaries as passed by that Parliament, and that section is still in St. Michael South.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you have any from St.George North, send them up to me.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There are one or two from St. George North there as well and I would be happy to send them up to you. There is no question about it. There are some serious errors on the list and I do not think that my list is worst than other people's lists. There are many people who have gone away longer than the statutory period when their names should be removed from the Register, where there is abundant evidence that the names should be removed under the Laws of Barbados. And that has not been done, so that it makes it very difficult.

I know what I am talking about because I run a very thorough campaign. When I organise my constituency, I go or somebody goes to every house and make a list of every single person living in that constituency who is eligible to vote. Then we tick those names off and make the appropriate deductions, so it is not a guessing operation. With the kind of exercise I have in my constituency I could tell you almost to the man who is living in my constituency today, because it is done on an extremely thorough basis. And when I say as much as 30 per cent, I know what I am talking about.

When you see 6 000 or 7 000 people appearing on the register for St. Michael South Central, I doubt whether more than 5 000 of those people have been in that constituency or anywhere near there for probably 20 or 30 years. That is the kind of situation you have, so we can never have proper elections in Barbados unless we deal with that problem. And it cannot be a problem to be dealt with in an election year, it has to be done now; and if it is not done now, we are going to end up with the same confusion again at the next elections as we had in the past elections.

I do not think it is helpful to you or it is helpful to me. The fact that I have won makes no difference. Of much greater importance is that I would like to feel that we are so committed to the democratic process that we would give elections the highest possible priority in this country. That is my attitude towards it.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member who has just sat down started out on a premise that Barbados is gradually becoming a dictatorship, and went on in support of that thesis to advance a line of what I regard as spurious reasoning. I do not believe that anybody in his right mind, who has watched the evolution of democratic Government in this country, would be able, in good conscience, to give voice to a feeling that Barbados is fast becoming a dictatorship.
1.55 p.m.

If you were to look at Barbados and the way it conducts its elections, I believe that even those candidates who lost would quickly concede that, even though there may have been some small problems, or even some big ones, all in all the electoral process was administered in a way that could give confidence not only to those of us who put up a deposit at election time, but those who are observers on the fringes, rooting for one political party or the next. So it does not help anybody for one of us to stand up in here and say that the electoral process is in such a disgraceful shambles that it cannot be possible for anybody to know whether or not he won or loss.

I believe, Sir, that everybody knows by now that I was the candidate who perhaps had the most gruelling battle in the last elections, because so confident were the Democratic Labour Party that I had gone through the eddoes simply by the announcement of the name of their candidate, that they did not even bother to look about in the constituency. But, Sir, Vic Johnson is not an easy

candidate to beat, not then, not now and not in the future!

I believe, Sir, that I have one of the most sophisticated methods of monitoring my constituency. I would not say the most sophisticated because I understand that some Members are toying around with computers. Some Members have some of these miniature computers upon which you can put all sorts of demographic variables and other kinds for the purpose of being able to fairly precisely mark the movement within a constituency. The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) says he is prepared to tell the House what model he has.

I do not have a computer, but I do not believe there is anybody in this House who can advance a more sophisticated model for monitoring election chambers within his constituency boundaries than I have, and I believe it is accurate to plus or minus 5 per cent. That is how sophisticated it is. The honourable Member for St. Michael South does not believe that a manual method can be that precise, but it is. That is why when the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) sits down or stands up, whatever posture he was assuming when he was talking, and says that his list has 30 per cent to 40 per cent errors, I know that he knows within his mind and conscience that that statement is false and misleading. There can be no honourable Member in this Chamber who can say with a clear mind and conscience that his electoral list is 30 percentage points off.

In the last election, I had the unhappy experience of having people who went to the polls pretending to vote for me who were not able to find their names on the electoral list. I believe if they had found their names I would have had a few more votes, but whether or not those few votes would have made a substantial difference I am not prepared to say. I do not think they would have made a lot of difference because when you are thinking in terms of a constituency with 7 000 voters, the fact that five people cannot find their names – and the majority for the winning candidate is anywhere from ten and up – is not a crisis. It is only when you have a very close margin of one or two votes that you begin to worry over the fact that Tom Jones could not find his name on the list.

Members on both sides had some difficulty. This was not something peculiar to the Members on the other side. Some of us over here had instances where voters could not find their names, and – I will tell you more, Sir – some of us over here had problems where voters went into the booth and were not allowed to vote. I can recall the experience of a little old lady who went in, naively told Mr. Belle from Third Avenue at the Church of Christ that she had come to vote for Johnson, and he ripped her to pieces inside the voting booth and told her to get out of there because she is not supposed to call out any candidate's name. That old lady went home in tears because she was not permitted to vote. That is a positive fact.

(A VOICE: Was he right or wrong?)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: He was correct, but the point about Mr. Belle was that he should not have handled the old lady in such a callous way, because old people are not as sophisticated as we might expect or might like them to be in these matters. They are fairly vulnerable to these kinds of hostile attacks, and she only wanted to vote; she just did not know what the procedure was.

Electors go in and announce whom they are voting for, drop their names in the box and then tap the box and say, "Beat this if you can". I have seen it happen over and over again, so this is not anything that is peculiar to one side and not the next. I have had to go in there and make a lot of noise to put people out of the polling station who have no business in there, not only standing up and observing, but influencing people in the process of voting. So what are you trying to tell me?

These are things that happen in any electoral system. The point about the matter is that we have been able to assure all persons concerned that whatever irregularities may occur – and I am confident that they are minimal – are not designed to prevent one side or the other from achieving victory.

Barbados has long been recognised as a place in which elections are conducted in a fair manner. Even when you all were in power and even when you gave yourselves the liberty to gerrymander in the most vicious and callous form, cutting off all of Orange Hill to put the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. CRAIG) in trouble – it was St. James then – even when in the face of the election morning you cut that off and left people stranded not knowing where to turn to vote, I do not believe it can in general be said that the Democratic Labour Party conducted what would be regarded as a wholesale rape of the electoral process.

Aside.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: You gerrymandered it! We would have appreciated a little more time and we would also have appreciated if you had allowed St. James to remain St. James and if you had allowed the stronghold of the Barbados Labour Party to remain the stronghold of the Barbados Labour Party so that the Member for St. James could benefit.

We do not need to gerrymander the electoral boundaries in order to win. I ran in a new constituency against the best candidate that the Democratic Labour Party could find in 1981 and beat him, and he is out there canvassing every Sunday with five people all like now – as if the election is tomorrow. Let me tell you something. I can send a message to him by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. He can canvass from now until the cows come home and all he will ever be in political life in Barbados is a Senator.

You can take that from me, because elections are not won in a ballot box per se. As the honourable Member for St. Lucy so ably put it, it is a man's relationship with his constituency that determines whether he continues in office. You can steal one or two by doing all sorts of things, putting people like that mad fellow from down in the Farm that got killed in the Globe Cinema, Foster, criminals like that to go out there and intimidate the public, threaten to cut them up with a cutlass and that sort of business, but when the people are determined to vote for a candidate, they are going to vote for the candidate, and when they are prepared to put you out, they are going to put you out.

Aside.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: You guys do not remember the dynamite that you let go in Belleplaine in 1971! Your memory is bad. You are a doctor and you should do something about your memory, clean out your ears and your head. You had dynamite to blow candidates on a political platform. The Democratic Labour Party should not be in here today being heard on the subject of gerrymandering and on the subject of rigging elections. You rigged them in a most callous and criminal way trying to kill the candidates that were running.
2.05 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central says that he does not want to be any part of a dictatorship in this island. Now I do not know what evidence he has to support his contention that we are becoming a dictatorship! The electoral processes are still conducted with all the institutions that are supposed to guarantee the integrity of the outcome of elections in place. We have not done anything to eliminate any of them. As a matter of fact, this Government has gone out of its way to bring back integrity to the electoral process.

I hear people walking about and some of the Members in here as well, talking about people stealing votes, as if they do not have two or three people, or four to five, standing up around the ballot box when it is taken from the polling station – and it goes by armoured car sometimes – down to the counting station. They stand around it and participate in the count. In the case of St. Michael West Central, there was Girwood Springer, the ex-Commissioner of Police, counting for the Dems, Levere Richards, Percy Brathwaite, and the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt). You had all of those people and yet you are prepared to come here and tell me about rigging an election!

Now tell me the truth! Do you believe in your good conscience and your mind that Girwood Springer, an ex-Commissioner of Police, is going to sit down in a counting station and watch votes being stolen? Do you believe "Goalie" Taitt would do it? Do you believe that Levere Richards would do it?

Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of supervision one gets in a counting station. I was not even at my counting station for most of the time. To be perfectly honest with you, I was a little nervous. I am not going to play big fashion, I was a little tense, so I decided to go home and take a shower. And in the process of putting on my clothes to come back to the counting station, I heard the television saying that we are announcing that the seat for St. Michael West Central has been won by the Democratic Labour Party, Vic Johnson for the Barbados Labour Party has lost his seat. That is what the computer said.

Mr. Chairman, I sat down and watched areas in which I knew I should have won very comfortably only giving me marginal support, so I had to be a little nervous. But the good people always prevail. Spooner's Hill came in like a tyrant and the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central is here again.

I won by 552 votes in 1976, beating the mightiest man you had to put forward, Frank Walcott, and in 1981 I beat Wes Hall, the fiercest of the fast bowlers. I won by 52 votes, five hundred votes went through the eddoes. I believe that if anybody should talk about stealing votes, it should be me, because 500 votes went.

The point is that whenever all is finished, those of us who barely scratch through, can go home confidently. After the initial disappointment, we perhaps in order to help sway what may be regarded as a public disgrace, we begin to find fault. But within the quiet of our minds, I believe that every Member of this Chamber can be satisfied that in Barbados we have a fair and honest electoral process. I believe that it is on that that you on that side can sit down over there confidently waiting one day for the tide to turn. But it is the people that turn the tide, and they are not quite ready yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The right honourable member for St. Thomas.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central has stirred the memories of all in respect of the elections fought and

won. I have not been able to understand how it is that the Democratic Labour Party can believe, or try to persuade the public that it believes, that the election of 1981 was in any way an election that did not reflect the will of the people.

If you want to know what was remarkable about the election of 1981, it was that the Barbados Labour Party lost any seats at all. It is possible that, for local reasons, the seat of St. Michael North might have been lost. But it is phenomenal at elections in Barbados for a party that wins the election to lose any seats. The only time that I can ever recall it happening previously was when I defeated Mr. Boxill in 1971 and that was the case of two men fighting for the same seat and the man who was in the minority before continuing in the minority afterwards.

That is the real significance of the 1981 election, and honourable Members, in the light of that, should really ask themselves why they are wasting the time of the House of Assembly. We had the most number of people ever to vote in the history of Barbados, the best registration ever in the history of Barbados, and, this is widely accepted on all sides.

You can get a higher percentage vote by having an inferior registration. The registration of 1966 registered less than 100 000 people and, therefore, you have an 80 per cent turn out. The registration of 1981 registered the absolute minimum number. There were 13 000 people who were overseas on election day. Subtract those 13 000 people – it was probably more – and you will also get a very large turnout, a much larger turnout, although the population was no larger than in 1976.

People forget that the population in Barbados has not increased. The population in Barbados is fairly stationary. The number of adults has increased slightly, but the percentage increase in the electoral register was at a record level in 1981. There were people who had not voted since before 1966, principally old people, who were registered to vote.

2.15 p.m.

In connection with my wish to see the accounts of the National Insurance computerised, I recently asked for a report from the National Insurance as to how far they have got with computerising and with recording people by their national registration number in the National Insurance records. They wrote back to me to tell me that only 8 000 pensioners had national registration numbers in their records, and that they could not improve this number until the Chief Electoral Officer sent photographers around to old people's homes to take their pictures and so on.

That is the only time since I have been in power that I believe there was any shortfall in the number of old people registered in Barbados. In fact, the National Insurance Office is quite mistaken. It is their fault, because I had a check made on the number of people over 65 who are registered under the national registration system, which automatically means registered to vote, and it is something like nearly 26 000 out of 28 000, and you can safely believe that the 2 000 who are not registered are really those persons who are bed-ridden in institutions, perhaps a few religious people, people who are too infirm to go out.

I would even like them to be registered, because, if they were able to vote, I doubt they would cast a vote against a party that is giving them a $40 a week pension next year. I doubt that! I believe that if those 2 000 voters were the physically able, who could leave the nursing homes, the Mental Hospital and the infirmaries to go out, and were physically and mentally capable of grasping the issues, they would vote for us.

But we have reached the stage of practical blanket coverage for old people. I challenge any country in the world, even Australia and the Soviet Union, which have compulsory voting, to show any better registration than we show in Barbados. There may be compulsory voting in the Soviet Union, but I would doubt that the Estimos and the Yakutsk could be as well registered as the people of Barbados.

We even registered the 17 Namibian students who were here on a technical exchange in our institutions. When I got the computer printout I was surprised to see these names.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please, please, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) said that I told the House I was planning to rig the elections. I am not going to comment on that, I only know I would never like to ask him for medical treatment, because I could not believe what he said. If he could say that I told the House I was planning to rig the elections, he could say anything. Why bother with that?

Sir, all elections have fun and games and so on. Obviously what honourable Members call the gerrymandering did not harm the Democratic Labour Party; obviously it did not. I give grave leave to doubt that Maurice Ward could have lost his seat if the boundaries had not changed. I totally entirely doubt that his seat would have been lost on the original boundaries, and in fact, you can add up the votes the Labour Party got on the original boundaries and you will observe that we did get the majority.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) could not have won by 260 votes if we had not made boundary adjustments in the Deighton Road and King's Village areas, which, as it turned out, looking at the figures, appeared to have helped him.

What is all this nonsense about boundary adjustments? Even with the little minor boundary adjustments in St. Thomas, I would have had no trouble whatsoever absorbing the very small adverse majority that went over to St. James South from St. Thomas. But in the end it would have helped the other side in St. James South.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) has long said that he wants a piece of St. Thomas' action when there is another boundary adjustment. Enough unto the day shall be the evil thereof.

The boundary adjustment that caused the most contention was the adding of Brereton to St. John. I wonder how many honourable Members in here realise that, in fact, our candidate did better in Brereton than he did in the rest of St. John? That he did better in Brereton than the Labour Party has ever done before? I am sure the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) would recognise that. I wonder how many honourable Members recall that perhaps the parts of St. Philip South that were added to St. Philip North in the end helped the honourable Member for St. Philip North and hampered the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman).

People talk about the boundary adjustments and they assume that the adjustments were made – you cannot make adjustments in Barbados in such a fashion – to hamper one side or the other. There were one or two little mistakes made in the adjustments. Nobody intended that any part of Pine Hill should go into St. Michael East. It was intended that Government Hill would be the boundary, but a part went over by mischance really, by being overlooked.

Does the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, convincingly beaten in the portions of his constituency where, perhaps, middle class people live, think that I would have deliberately taken a part of Pine Hill out of his constituency and put it somewhere else if I was out for doing damage to the Democratic Labour Party? What is all this? We suddenly come in the House and we cannot take blows?

In 1971 there was more evidence of election misbehaviour than there was in 1981. The electorate in 1971 was not adequately registered. Anybody would have to know that! There was infinitely more pressure put on the Barbados Labour Party on Polling Day in 1971 than any party has ever had to suffer before or since.

Honourable Members made a tremendous joke in here when I described how somebody went to the presiding officer at Redmans Village and asked for a vote as a blind person. Apparently she could see a little bit, but her son must have fixed it up. She asked to vote for me, the presiding officer marked the vote for Boxill, the woman made a noise, the son snatched the ballot, I went there and the presiding officer threatened to call the police to arrest me. A big noise was made there and I had to warn the presiding officer that the penalty for such an offence was two years without the option of a fine. She was a woman, a terrible woman, a dangerous, wicked thief when it came to votes. All of that we had to put up with.

In relation to the voting at what used to be the labourers' camp at Proute in St. Thomas in 1971, I happened to go there to deliver lunch to my polling agent, and the Democratic Labour Party had a van there which delivered lunch to the presiding officer, the deputy presiding officer, the poll clerk and the DLP agent, and the four of them were eating from the same table, from the presiding officers' table, all Dems together, and the whole polling station turned out to be Dems.

But they made a little mistake at that same polling station in the next election, and many people had changed, because when I went in there at the next election, the presiding officer got up out of his seat, there was no voter in the station at the time, and he came to me and he said, "Mr. Adams, you know a lot of people come in here. They want to vote for Tom and I have to hold up the paper and say to them, you mean you want to vote for Mr. J. M. G. M. Adams", and I formed the impression that the Democratic Labour Party had made a mistake as to the political allegiance of the presiding officer when they were picking him for that station in that election.

2.25 p.m.

I think that certainly in 1981 we began to get some kind of picture of elections as they can be in the future in Barbados. Because barring one or two little incidences, I really have not heard any complaint from members of the opposite side except that particular individuals could not find their names. I have not heard any member of the opposite side say that he was mistreated at a polling station, that a presiding officer cast a vote for his opponent when he was instructed to cast it for him or anything like that and I believe the Chief Electoral Officer would investigate these instances.

Even in 1976 there were some instances. It was reported to me just after the election that a presiding

officer had carried away a whole book of ballot papers, that the book of ballot papers were missing and so on in a particular constituency. I discovered that this presiding officer, although he and the candidate had not much to say to each other for many, many years, since they were together at Harrison's College, he was going mad at the thought that that candidate for the Opposition might lose his seat, even though the then Government had appointed him. Apparently, he had done something a little irregular which, fortunately, did not have to be fully investigated.

That was something which a man did against the Government which appointed him, and I have not heard of an irregularity comparable to that, so why are Members trying to drag down Barbados now? Why are you trying to drag down the whole country by suggesting that it is a country with electoral irregularities. We do not have any more of the old City irregularities where the rule is, "Vote early, vote often." We do not have people casting votes for the dead, as they used to once upon a time.

We do not have people like a gentleman who worked in my office. He was a Guyanese, and he was one of the Guyanese voting agents in Barbados, and he went into Westbury Cemetery, copied down the names of the dead Guyanese off the headstones, registered them all and sent them back to Guyana as voters. The names appeared on the Guyana's voters' roll and ballot papers came to him at my office for all those dead people to vote, dead people in the Westbury Cemetery.

I am speaking of something I know, not something that I had seen on Granada Television or something or read in Jagan's newspaper. I took the ballot papers from him and tore them up. He got the money for registering them, but they did not vote. I believe they are voting now though. All accounts suggest that they are voting now.

Clearly we are a country where electoral irregularity is minimal. For one thing, in every polling station both parties get votes, even at Society Mixed School. I believe that Senator Williams is very proud of the fact that he got 27 out of the 600 votes cast last time where previous candidates are accustomed to getting 14 and 17.

Senator Greaves, I believe, reached double figures at the Bromesfield box at the last General Elections. He was accustomed to getting 8. I think once he got 6, but the last time he got either 11 or 14. Therefore, at every polling station a party is able to maintain somebody to watch the count, and all parties got some votes.

It is not, again, like Guyana. I have had a document here in this House where Dr. Jagan complained that somewhere in the Pomeroon, when he sent people to watch the count for him that they were waylaid in some bamboo grove and taken to the Police Station. And when the votes were eventually counted, they opened the box, emptied them out, cut the string that tied up the ballot papers and counted them – and they were all PNC. Needless to say, in theory the votes should have been loose in the box.

We have never had anything like that. I have never heard of anybody saying that intimidation to prevent an agent going to the poll existed. While I was in Jamaica, a voter told me of going to a particular polling station and as she went through the door the polling clerk, who admitted people to the station said, "You have come to vote for Portia Simpson, right?" and stood up while she marked the paper for Portia Simpson, the PNP candidate, who got 98 per cent or 99 per cent of the vote. When I mentioned this to another Jamaican, the comment was to ask how many votes Seaga got in Kingston West. I believe he got 99 per cent of the votes in Kingston West.

We do not have that in Barbados and, just as I said in Second Reading, it is time we stop selling ourselves short. I am absolutely confident that, as in all General Elections in Great Britain, there is going to be electoral fraud in Northern Ireland. There is at every election, and yet nobody ever says that British elections are unfair or are rigged. Virtually at every election you get a prosecution for some kind of electoral fraud, in Belfast, in County Down and so on.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) has made, without realising it, an admirable comment which should inform all of our views in this country. We are so fair-minded that we expect the best, and I believe that even when he was responsible for elections, we got good. He was inefficient, of course. That may be the reason why the elections were fairly conducted, but even while he was there we had reasonably fair elections.

Do you think that I believe that it was electoral intimidation alone that caused us to lose in 1971? Maybe the honourable Member, the Deputy Prime Minister, might not have lost his seat if there had been a better registration. Maybe, I cannot really tell, but do you think that I believe, when I was seeing my support in St. Thomas slip away every day, that you had to steal my votes in order for me to win by only 64?

I knew who was going to vote for me and who was not going to vote for me. Nobody had to rob me in Rockhall for me to be beaten by 110 votes? My canvasser told me that I would be beaten by 110 votes in Rockhall. My canvassers told me that in Bridgefield I would get 45 votes, and when I told him, "But how can you tell me that and I only got 43" he said, "Miss 'so and so' cannot see too well and did not want to tell the officer anything,

so she went and marked and made a mistake, and I believe Miss 'so and so' let me down at the last minute."

People who know politics know that results come from careful canvassing and knowledge of the election, and that in Barbados, rigging, stealing, false registrations and so on play a negligible part in the results of the elections. If the result of the last election was in any way a freak, or unusual, or calls for comment, it calls for comment in that Maurice Ward and David Simmons lost their seats, or that Senator Wes Hall could get so near to the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central.

I think it is time that we abandon this nonsense about gerrymandering and so on, because these are big words that get into overseas newspapers. If honourable Members want Barbados to be represented as a place where elections are rigged, go on and talk your talk.

I do not think that honourable Members over there knew that when they voted against the Boundaries Commission that they were going to be made ridiculous by having a major English newspaper saying that that is the only Opposition in the world that has ever voted against free and fair elections. I do not think honourable Members appreciated that, but I think that they should take it to heart and recognise that foreigners are looking for Third World countries inhabited by black people to rig elections, falsify registers, intimidate voters and so on.
2.35 p.m.

People do not understand that elections are more fairly conducted here than they are in Europe or the United States, that participating democracy is more alive and well in Barbados than it is in New York or California, that the voters in Barbados are better educated and better able to grasp political issues than they are in the United States of America. And if they do not realise it abroad, it is because of the statements that are made by people in the present Opposition, men whose egos are so tremendous that they cannot understand that they were licked fair and square by an electorate that chose the achievements of the Barbados Labour Party during 1976–81.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I rise to make my contribution under this Head. We are accustomed to hearing honourable Members make statements on the floor of this Honourable Chamber in such a manner as would mislead the person who does not know better and those who come to this Chamber to listen to parliamentary debates.

I have heard honourable Members from the other side rise and seek to convey the impression that there was some law, regulation or convention governing the actions of a Prime Minister, especially a Prime Minister who operates under the Westminster system of Government. I think it is my duty to point out, since I have had the privilege of studying the British system of Government as a teacher as well, that under the Westminster system a Prime Minister has the sole prerogative to appoint Ministers. He does not have to consult with anybody at all. A Prime Minister does not have to consult with anybody when he seeks to revoke the instrument of a senior Minister or a junior Minister. That is his sole prerogative.

It also follows, Mr. Chairman, that there is no convention which says that a Prime Minister has got to give any reason for revoking the instrument of any Minister, whether he is senior or junior. I want to make that abundantly clear. So all this talk coming from the Opposition benches and from persons outside, who do not know any better, asking the Prime Minister to give an explanation is bare foolishness. There is no precedent, and when such an incident occurred, the explanation given was mere foolishness as well. We have seen the case of a former Prime Minister when he dismissed a Parliamentary Secretary not having to give the public any explanation, and I will contend that it was within his right.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member is misleading the Chamber. The only former Prime Minister who had a Parliamentary Secretary was the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) and the right honourable Member for St. John never dismissed a Parliamentary Secretary. The honourable Member is misleading the Chamber. The only person that was dismissed was a Minister, and an explanation was given on the television the same evening.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that whether an explanation was given or not, one is not required by any law or under the Constitution. It is the sole prerogative of the Prime Minister, and to seek to convey the impression in this Chamber that the right honourable Prime Minister has done something wrong or has breached some convention is totally misleading. We have got to make these points, and make them abundantly clear, less the public have the wrong impression.

I wish to deal with the Electoral Office and matters pertaining to that department. If there is a Member of this Honourable Chamber who had reason to complain about elections, I feel that I have a good enough reason. The Opposition knows very well that they did everything, and sometimes they went out of their way to breach even the law, to try to get me out of the House. I am sure that honourable Members on that side have supported political activists to abuse me and tell lies on me, causing me not only mental and physical stress but all sorts of distress.

But I made it back here in 1981 and I know why I was returned, and not for the reasons that are advanced

by honourable Members on that side. I was returned because the electorate of Barbados trusted the Barbados Labour Party. They recognised the integrity of the leader and his Government, they recognised that the Government was an honest Government and they also recognised that the Opposition was not ready to govern this country again. They also recognised that the Opposition did not present any alternate policies to run this country, and they decided to remain with us to charge us with the responsibility of administering the affairs of Barbados for at least five more years.

There cannot be any excuses if the Opposition are licking their wounds. They must say what is the reason for their defeat. Rather than going to the public and telling the public what the issues were and how they were going to solve their problems, they went out there with a smear campaign. That is all they did. The last night when both parties were windng up their debates, what were they discussing, what did they rally people in Independence square to tell them? All day the loudspeakers were around the place announcing to people to come and hear something about some disclosure about Pele. That is all they were telling the people, and the electorate of Barbados found them wanting, and that is why they did not return to power in 1981.

I suppose if they had addressed themselves to the issues of the day that the people would have noticed them, or that they might have been a little more favourable – not that you would have been able to defeat this Government.

We have to understand what happened. You found within their ranks three candidates who took to the platform, with one fellow by the name of Vernon Smith saying that he was the chief spokesman, the guess speaker on the Pele affair. At every political meeting during the election campaign of 1981 they had a main theme, the Pele theme, and they had as a guess speaker one Vernon Smith. He was the expert, he knew everything, and they thought that particular matter would have brought the Government to its knees. That is how they conducted their campaign. No wonder they have got to sit down there now and put the blame on the Electoral Office!

There is nothing wrong with the Electoral Office. All of us understand and recognise that in any new system you have to allow for some degree of error or discrepancy. The Electoral Office information would never be 100 percent perfect. There has never been any 100 percent electoral list anywhere at all in the world as far as I know.

I will concede that there are minor discrepancies, but none to worry about. Honourable Members on that side had enough time to look at the list, check the list, and notify the Chief Electoral Officer about the discrepancies or errors. Had I not done my homework in looking at my list and identifying some of the problems and errors that appeared on the list, maybe I would not have been returned to this Honourable Chamber.
2.45 p.m.

This Government made it possible for each elected Member of this Chamber to have a constituency secretary. This Government recognised that parliamentarians cannot do all the work and that it is necessary for them to have some assistance and hence we provided constituency secretaries, who, as part of their functions and duties, would be able to take the list when it is published yearly and go through it and see whether mistakes are made or discrepancies appear on the electoral list.

I will throw this out as a word of advice to the Opposition, and even some of my colleagues, because I know elections are lost and won when candidates ignore some of these fundamental rules. The first rule is to look at the list and check to see whether there are any discrepancies. Some people won by single digit numbers. But, Mr. Chairman, one must also know that if you do not check your list, you could lose by the same single digits. Those who are not in, I hope that they will understand that they, too, must check the Electoral List, because in my case I found the names of several people, who were not living in my constituency, appearing on my electoral list. There were some 200 and I went – through the list, recorded the names, got the appropriate forms, submitted them to the Chief Electoral Officer and the necessary adjustments to the Electoral List were made.

There were cases where people had moved into my constituency and had lived there for three months or so. According to the law, those persons, once they were registered, were eligible to appear on the Register and to vote. It was in my interest, when I found out that they would have voted for me, to see that their registration was transferred.

If I had found that those persons were not going to support me, there was no way that I was prepared to go and put them on my list. This is the game you are in; you must see the advantage to yourself and not to your opponent. It would not have made sense for me to register an ardent supporter of the opposing side who came in my constituency, with at least four or five votes in his house, to go and vote against me. But it was sense to make sure that persons who were sympathetic to my cause and to the party's cause, who moved in within those three months, were on the electoral list. These are the little things that matter.

There is no sense grumbling or quarrelling about the Electoral List and say that it is wrong. I have been in this Chamber for over six years, and time and time again, whenever we come to the subject of Electoral Office, we hear the same arguments and criticisms being rehashed.

Do not put the blame on the Chief Electoral Officer any more. Do your homework. You have got supporters in here listening to you. Tell them exactly why you lost and why you cannot get a majority of seats to form a Government. It is because you will not sit down and do your homework.

Doing your homework is very fundamental when you are involved in the political business. Now that is how I win. I do not have a BLP–oriented seat in St. Michael South East, but I do my homework, and I intend to continue to do that homework with a view to returning here in 1986. I have no doubt in my mind that I am going to make it, because I know how to do my thing. And no amount of pressure, rumour, lies or intimidation by the opposite side will prevent me from doing my homework and following a clean, honest and trustworthy party.

I know that the Barbados Labour Party has been doing a good job. There is no sense telling the people out there about free and fair elections; that is cold soup being warmed up. They want to see you address yourself to the problems of the day. I am sure that when you will have done that, the electorate will look at you more favourably in the forthcoming elections.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, Head 15 – Cabinet Office – Subhead 4 deals specifically with the Electoral Office. I will deal with the points raised by the members on the other side in a minute. But my colleague raised a very important point, that the Democratic Labour Party really should look at itself and do some self-examination as to why they lost the last election and stopped trying to find scapegoats, stop trying to blame the Electoral Office, and stop trying to blame the lost on the difficulties which we have all experienced. We have all discussed this before, and I am sure that each and every one of us who are in here experienced some difficulty on June 18, 1981.

When a party is presenting itself to a population of a country it must determine a strategy. It must be able to identify with the people and project an image of confidence, stability and intelligence. A party must be able to go to the electorate with ideas. We did that, Sir. We were proud of the achievements of the Barbados Labour Party between the years of 1976–81. So proud, in fact, that we produced a document called *'Promises and Performances,* and we distributed 40 000 copies of that document so that the public of Barbados could see for themselves an analysis of what we promised in our Manifesto of 1976, and what we were able to accomplish out of those promises between 1976 and June 1981.

Our whole presentation, in my view, Mr. Chairman, was one of professionalism, and we were able to confidently put this across to the public of Barbados. On the other hand our opponent the Democratic Labour Party, lacked a theme, they lacked presentation, they offered no alternatives at all to the problems that the country was facing. They offered criticisms, but they offered no alternative solutions. The politics of confrontation, hate, division, and race were introduced by the Democratic Labour Party.

We have enjoyed 350 years of parliamentary democracy in this country. We are the third oldest Parliament in the Commonwealth. The people of Barbados are very intelligent and sensitive about their democratic rights. Early in 1976, when as a matter of public record a sitting Member in this honourable House, one Patsy Springer, called for a one party state, neither the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), then the Prime Minister, nor his colleagues, who were then leading the country, made no attempt to say that this was not their view at all. So, by remaining silent on the issue of the one-party state, the public of Barbados got the impression that this was the way in which the Democratic Labour Party was heading.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) made a statement about removing and depressurising the Opposition, when we were in the Opposition, because we attacked certain policies. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) talks of dictatorship, but the history of Barbados politics has indicated that any Government which is headed for dictatorship has no chance in an election as far as Barbados is concerned. It is not in our interest to pursue a dictatorship. We are quite pleased with a two party system. If the public of Barbados decides that the present Opposition can run the country better than the Barbados Labour Party, then, I am sure they would be elected to Government.

But we must really and truly try to be very sensible about this issue of elections. Mr. Smith, the Chief Electoral Officer, was appointed by the Democratic Labour Party. The Democratic Labour Party lost the elections when Mr. Smith was there. The Barbados Labour Party came into power and we left Mr. Smith doing the very same job that he was doing for the Democratic Labour Party, which is a testimony of the man's integrity.

2.55 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is slightly inconsistent in his arguments. He says that the integrity of Mr. Smith cannot be challenged, and in the same breath talks about gerrymandering of boundaries, when Mr. Smith was part and parcel of the realignment of the boundaries. And that was discussed because many of the constituencies – St. James, St. Michael North East had swelled.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: The realignment of those boundaries was done by an Act of Parliament. Mr. Smith purely carried out the administrative framework of that Act, but he did not rearrange the boundaries.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Point taken, Sir. If Mr. Smith, the man of integrity that he is, was convinced that this Government had gerrymandered, he would have resigned. The fact that he did not resign his position in my view endorsed that there was a realignment, a readjustment, and not a gerrymandering of the boundaries.

I believe that the problems which we have always experienced in the electoral lists, as far as people who are listed there and do not live in the area, or people who are out of the area that are listed there, and so on and so forth, will be problems until such time as we approach them in a different manner.

There is very little movement in the country districts, because in the country, people have been living in the various districts for 20 and 25 and 30 years. But in the areas of St. Michael and Christ Church particularly, between one general election and the next 30 per cent of the people may have moved, so if you are not in touch with your constituency on a day to day basis, or on a month to month basis, when the bell rings you may be faced with a situation where 30 per cent of your constituents have never met you – and that is when you have gone through the eddoes.

The other point raised about people who are non-Barbadians voting can be tied in with the ID card. If employers were forced to examine the ID cards of people applying for jobs, before granting them the jobs, it would mean that foreigners coming here – stowaways – would not have ID cards, would not be able to produce ID cards to employers and therefore would not be able to take away the jobs from Barbadians, so you will eliminate that problem.

In another sense, if you make it the responsibility of the Electoral Office, the presiding officer of the area, to co-ordinate as much as is possible, must be employed on a full-time basis. This is no part time job. Right now it is a part time job and this is why we are having these problems. The presiding officers for constituencies must be employed full-time, and they must have staff to periodically go around from house to house, check the people who are living in the houses and make the necessary transfers. If you know a person has moved from a house, you take him off the list. If you know a person has moved into the house, you add them on to the list. You make out your weekly, monthly, quarterly report, whatever, and submit it to the Electoral Office. It is a full time job, Sir.

Secondly, the Electoral Office must be mandated to check out the deaths of people and make sure that their names are removed from the list.

All of us, on both sides, strive to achieve the same thing through democracy. I do not believe that Members on that side or on this side would like to see a situation in Barbados as we have seen in other Caribbean territories. I do not wish to mention any Caribbean territory in particular, because that is not the point, but we are well aware that elections are rigged.

We must not lose our self-respect, we must not want to lose the fact that for 350 years we have survived as a parliamentary democracy. That is a tradition which we would like to maintain for another 350 years, so it is in our own interest to come up with some constructive programmes to ensure that when a candidate goes to face an election, as few mistakes on the lists that are there are better for all, because when you lose the election, you have no one else to blame but yourself.

Whereas now there are fairly wide gaps, accusations are being made which does the country no good. As mentioned by the Prime Minister, when there is speculation of rigging elections, countries pick these things up and ask what is happening to Barbados, what is happening to the freest country in the world? Are they changing direction? They ask such questions in fact, none of that could be true.

I, like everyone else in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, experienced difficulties in 1981, and in fact I experienced difficulties in 1976. Sir, we sometimes have situations where enthusiastic supporters of both parties who perform the duties and functions of presiding officers, or people who are supposed to check the lists at the polling stations, linesmen and so on, break the rules in their enthusiasm to fight for the candidate of their choice. The candidate sometimes cannot control them. If you have eight, ten or twelve polling stations and these have to be manned by two linesmen, two people on the inside who are your own people, it is sometimes very difficult to control them, because you are moving from polling station to polling station. At the same time, you have the people out there with the cars bringing your people to vote. Sometimes you bring the people and they vote against you, as you well know, because they want a free ride to the polling station.

You get policemen over enthusiastic, getting themselves involved on election day, as has happened to me with a policeman in Carrington Village refusing to allow me to go into the polling station at Carrington's Village School. I had to leave and go to the house next door and call the Commissioner of Police, who sent a van and instructed the officer that he could not stop me from going

into the polling station, but that was my right as a candidate.

In 1981, the law stated that 24 hours before you had to have the names of the people who will be sitting on your behalf in each and every polling station. On the very morning of June 18 the Returning Officer came to me and told me that my opponent did not have four people to represent two of his polling stations because they just did not turn up, and this was about 8.15 in the morning. He asked me if I would object if he swore in four more. I did not object. That was in breach of the rules, but it was in my interest to ensure that my opponent understood that democracy must prevail. I allowed him that leeway, he was entitled to it, because it was unfortunate for him that the four people whom he selected for one reason or another did not turn up.

I did that because I felt that had he lost those areas, he would have been able to make the charge that he had no representation inside the polling station, therefore anything could have happened in there and he would not have been able to know what was going on.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Already?

Sir, in winding up, I see the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) is in his seat. He would recall that in the City bye-election of March 1976, he was a linesman for Carmichael and I was a linesman for the honourable Member for the City (Hon. B. A. Miller), and we were not supposed to cross the line. We were supposed to stand by the line and ensure that no one canvassed within 100 yards of the polling station.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Was there a linesman for the Cabinet Office?

Mr. A. TRUSS: There was a linesman for the BLP and there was a linesman for the DLP.

The linesman for the DLP, the honourable Member for St. Michael North, kept walking past the line and on occasion he was speaking to people inside the line. I am not accusing him of canvassing – they may very well have been his friends, he might have been talking about something completely different other than politics, – but I made sure that if he was going to be walking with the person to the polling station in breach of the law, I would be walking alongside of him, which is what I did.

The policeman approached us, came to me and said; "You have to leave and go outside of the line", and I said, "I will leave when this honourable gentleman leaves". The policeman turned to him and said; "You will have to leave, too", and the honourable Minister at the time, the honourable Member for St. Michael North said, "I am not leaving". The policeman turned to me and I said, "I will leave, but if he is not leaving, I am not leaving either. You know who left, Sir? The policeman!

Now, that is the point and I still would not say that he might have thought what he was doing was correct. My job was to ensure that my candidate received fair treatment. These things do happen. The policeman was wrong, though, because he had the authority to make sure that both of us were outside of the line.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It was two to one.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, just a few brief points; I will be no more than five minutes. I think that I have heard this type of approach by the other side to the problems facing elections in Barbados before the last election, and what it tends to do is to deflect one's mind from what needs to be done to prevent a repeat of a whole history of past incidents.

What I am discussing here are not circumstances that would lead to victory of one side or the other. What I am discussing would be the circumstances that would lead to a permanent victory for the people of Barbados in their right to exercise their vote in the manner in which they would wish to do so.

Many, many mistakes have been made in the speeches that I heard from the other side, particularly the view that the individual candidate can influence transfers in and out of his constituency to any significant extent. At election time, you will find that you can only get about 50 per cent of the transfers in your constituency done, because so much pressure is brought on the Electoral Office in an election year that they will tell you that they cannot check them all.

The question of getting people's names, which should not be on the list, off the list is an almost unsurmountable problem, because you have to complete a Form of Objection. When you have filed two or three hundred of those objections, before the Electoral Officer can take action on those objections, he has to send people out into the field. Unless you can state that that person is no longer living here but is living in another place, and identify the address where the person is living, then the electoral officer cannot remove his name from the list. So, if you are doing that, no matter how careful you are, you will find that over the years, an increasing percentage of the names of persons on your register will be persons who no longer live in your constituency.

There is one particular district in my constituency where there are more people on the list who no longer live there than people who live there. All these objections have been submitted. I have even made a point of submitting a list of objections, with about 300 to 400 names, for the Britton's Hill area, because I could not write out 400 names. I sent the list with a covering letter and, to this day, nothing has been done about it. I have at least 1 000 names in the Electoral Department of persons who should not be on the St. Michael South Central list – and those names are still there.

Now, it is true that my constituency is one which has quite a high percentage in terms of turnover of people, and it is also one that has been clearly neglected in relation to the question of registration, particularly in respect of transfers. But we are really again not facing the question. The problem is that we have to recognise that there are serious problems with the Electoral List, they accumulated over the years, and they have been exacerbated by the many changes that took place just prior to the last election, because there was not the administrative support to deal with the number of changes that took place all at one time.

What I am calling for, and I would not be deflected from this, is that it is necessary now in the interest of this country to have a comprehensive registration done, almost like a new registration, constituency by constituency.

It is not your responsibility and it is not my responsibility to compile electoral registers, and there is only so much we can do. I have just told you that I have dealt with at least 1 000 names and I know that those names have not been changed. There is very little that the Electoral Office can do, because if you send in 400 names and say that they are no longer there, and you cannot say where they are now living, then you are in trouble – the names remain on the list and that is that.

We have to recognise that we have a problem. All I am asking this Honourable House is, instead of getting into long diatribes or in the alternate soporific statements relating to an important issue, to recognise that it is a serious problem, to recognise that this is 1983 and elections are constitutionally due in 1986. It is going to take at least a year to get those lists in order. We are now into 1983; if you were to start now, it will probably take you only until about August 1984 to get those lists in order so that the candidates for the 1986 elections would only be faced with the problems of dealing with such changes that would have taken place between say, August 1984 and Election Day.

3.15 p.m.

It is really a depressing situation that you find yourself in when you know that you have done what is an accurate tally of the number of people living in every house in your constituency, the number of people who are eligible to vote in your constituency, and you arrive at a figure of 4 500, but you have a list of 6 200 or something like that. That is what is happening! These lists are way out of date.

I do not know whether the rural areas are quite the same as in Bridgetown and in the corporate areas, but there are problems. And I am not only asking honourable Members, but I am asking the Government to recognise that the problem exists and that it is important, if you are really committed to the principle of fair elections and to the principle that people should have the right to exercise their vote, that you start work on it now.

Even 1984, in my view, would be far too late to start. In other words, by next year each and everyone of us should be able to have a list where the margin of error would be about 2 percent or 3 percent so that we can start work on that list. And when the election comes around, during the 18 months before election, we can have continual dialogue with the Electoral Office to make sure that 2 percent or 1 percent slip does not deteriorate in any way. As it stands now, when you are starting off with a 20 percent error on your list, what do you do?

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You do not seem to understand what is going on. Let me give you another example. In relation to the same part of the Pine to which the honourable Prime Minister referred, I would say that for a half of the Pine that was constitutionally removed from my constituency, the names remained on my list. The same thing happened in Brittons Hill area; so you just do not know. I am telling you that I have well over 1 000 names that I had personally submitted to the Chief Electoral Officer before the last election and they are still on the list.

Asides

Mr. CHAIRMAN: These asides are interrupting the reporter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There is a whole area between Fields Gap and Warners. There is the whole area of Ellis Village that is really in the City, and I had to personally intervene and take the names in, and it is only because the honourable Member for the City (Hon. B. A. Miller) co-operated with me in that exercise that you were able to deal with it from my end and the City end and get many of these corrections made in relation to Ellis Village. I am talking about big areas; I am not talking about individual names in relation to St. Michael South Central.

I am not saying it is only me. I am saying that these are errors that have accumulated over the years, and any responsible person on the other side would take the point. I am not criticising anybody at this point in time; all I am asking you to do is to recognise that the errors are there and that I am not exaggerating on the extent of the errors.

I am calling on the Government to take early action in this regard, even if it means increasing the amount of money spent under this Head during this year and get that process started this year. I also made a suggestion, that I want to repeat with your permission, that this time should be done with the assistance of scrutineers in the particular area representing both parties. All these suggestions I am making would tend to strengthen the democratic process in Barbados.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Having made the statement, what concerns me is the fact that speeches on the other side turn into party political exercises and tended to dismiss this as a major problem in relation to elections in Barbados. I sincerely hope that those with responsibility would act in a much more responsible manner than the kind of mouthings which I hear coming from the honourable gentleman, the Minister for Transport and Works (Hon. V. L. Johnson). That is a quite irresponsible attitude you are taking to this whole problem.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is this a dialogue with the honourable Member?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am finishing now, but I just have to remind him that the reason why he wants the list to remain as it is, is that he knows he will not win the next time if the list is properly brought up to date, and that is why he is already seen canvassing down in Boscobelle. That is where he is canvassing these days.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Wind up this debate, please.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I am not winding up the debate; I am speaking on behalf of myself and the constituency of St. Andrew. Mr. Chairman, this debate has ranged far and wide, a lot of unnecessary irrelevancies have crept into it, and I would hope to some extent to try to bring it back on course.

We started off by dealing with the question of the Electoral Commission and what the Government is going to do with that. I suppose that it is public knowledge now that the Government has already taken steps to put such an Electoral Commission in place, although the Opposition did not see its way to support it when it came before this Parliament and to give it the necessary endorsement which we had hoped they would have given.

Mr. Chairman, we were committed, as stated in our 1976 Manifesto, to parliamentary democracy and, therefore, we set about to implement as quickly as we could those aspects of the manifesto which we thought should have been implemented. We have heard a lot of talk today about the introduction of dictatorship in the country, and a lot of frightening things which I was hoping we would not hear during this debate.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) who was the chief spokesman on behalf of the Opposition, said that he would not like to be around, and would want to give consideration as to whether he would want to be in public life, if he sees these things continuing. My view is that if you are a true Democrat – and I will go on to demonstrate my own position – and you want to see democracy alive, that, despite any attempt by any person or group of persons to defy the democratic process and seek to introduce a dictatorship, the people's view would be to remain within the system of democracy and fight to ensure that it exists, not to run away.

I recall very vividly, Mr. Chairman, that between 1963 and 1965, when I was under very great pressure for having taken certain lines which were then unpopular with the Government of the day, the Democratic Labour Party Government, that I was the butt of a very serious attack and certainly of great persecution by certain elements, including the police, in this country.

I have lived to recognise that, it does not matter how badly you are treated, you must learn to forgive those who injure you and only remember the lessons gained thereby, and therefore I bear no malice towards anybody who tried to hurt me at that time for exercising what I considered them to be my democratic right.

At the time I was fighting the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government of the day with respect to the disbursement of a large sum of money which came to the sugar workers in this country in connection with what was known then as the windfall money. My home was searched and a number of things were done to me. I was virtually under police arrest for three months without the actual declaration of a state of emergency in the country, but I never became bitter with that party nor with the Police Force, nor anybody for that matter. I thought I had a duty to do and I decided that I would remain in the democratic process and try to keep it alive.

The other side should be the last people to be hankering on the question of democracy and what somebody will do or will not do. I do not think that they handled the process very well. It is on record that the

Leader of the Democratic Labour Party said that he prefers to be in certain places of Bridgetown rather than to be in this Parliament. We saw him quite often as the Leader of the Opposition, and within recent months since the last election we have seen that the Democratic Labour Party have been visiting the House quite often and we appreciate your coming to dwell among us. I believe that a new idea has dawned upon you and therefore you have decided to come. But, before that, you hardly stayed in here with us. You were quick to run off and we hardly saw you at all. We are happy to see that you are with us and you want to see the process of democracy work. But you cannot get it working by running away from it. If you see seeds of dictatorship rearing their ugly heads, the only way to fight it is to remain within the stream and fight it from there.
3.25 p.m.

It is not very easy to have full-scale enumeration of voters all through the years. You cannot do it. I believe the best you can do is to have one good registration in five years. The honourable Member advanced the question of having the vigilantes, people who will come from both sides to ensure that the people who are involved in the process do what is right. If you are going to reach that stage, you are soon going to tell me that you want people to watch and see what the judges are doing, you want people to come into the Ministries and to see what the Permanent Secretaries are doing and what .....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is not the object. You select two people, let us say in the Hall's Road area, who live in the area, who will assist the person who may not necessarily live in the area, so that they would know who lives in each house and so on. It is assistance, a scrutineer– it is not vigilantes. The object is one of assistance.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Even the question of scrutineers would not even lend itself very well to me. I would like to know that people are totally involved. What we saw in the last electoral registration system was a positive attempt on the part of the Opposition to tell people not to become registered. I saw that. They were not in favour of the registration at the time, and there was nothing that caused more harm to the system than that. Let me go further to make the point. Let us assume that a person did not vote in St. Michael North, but voted in St. Lucy. The fact that the person was not disenfranchised is all, in my view, that matters. In 1971, I saw a situation in Christ Church East and Christ Church South and in St. Andrew as well, where in Christ Church East and South the people were terribly disenfranchised.

We hear a lot about gerrymandering today. The late Governor Gerry must be turning in his grave over the constant mention of his name in relation to gerrymandering because it is not gerrymandering that is known to the American system. It is a question that Barbadians are not willing to register until the last moment of registration and, since the country is so sharply politically divided, if one political party says do not register, their supporters are always unwilling to register.

I made an appeal in this Honourable House yesterday, and I am going to make the appeal again: it is time for us to come together on certain vital issues in the country. The country is greater than all of us. Long after we are dead the country will remain, and, no matter how mighty and powerful you are, you will not carry the country to the grave with you. You will go in the grave and the country will remain, because the grave is part of that country.

There are certain issues that are vital to the maintenance of democracy. I am a proud man to know that I am standing today in the third oldest Parliament in the Commonwealth. It is a tribute to us, and we should do all in our power to ensure that this is adequately passed on. But it cannot be passed on by fighting the type of wars and battles that we continue to fight. It cannot be passed on when we try to drag the institution down and paint the picture of great doom, sorrow, and horror. A factual position must be put.

In 1971, I was chosen by the Barbados Labour Party to contest the election in St. Andrew. In that election Zion Hill was part of the constituency of St. Andrew, but within a matter of days before the election, the area of Zion Hill was taken off and put back on St. James. That happened just a few days before the election of 1971.

Another thing that you have to bear in mind, and which will give the lie to any argument to the contrary, is that the electoral registers remained open for up to a short period before the last election in 1981. People who were able to be registered would not have been able to get on the register during the old dispensation, at least the period before that, and that is a fact.

If you are computerizing your whole election apparatus, you will of necessity have problems and you have to develop to some extent by trial and error. That might not be the best way to put it, but I put it that way. The computer can only give in what you feed into it. The computers are made by men, and if you put in garbage, as I am told, garbage will come out. When you are training people to work with a new system and you put a junior person on it to work, the person may not be best able to handle the apparatus and obviously you are going to get problems.

But it does not mean that somebody has deliberately set about to create a problem with the election. I would suggest that we clearly focus our attention towards the problems that we will face for the future and much

as we have had problems in 1971, and 1981, as you are now telling me – and you are making sure you are telling me that it was large scale in 1981 – my view is that we can now put our heads together. In this case of election and electoral reforms, it is not, in my respectful submission, a case for one or the other party. It is a case for a consensus arrived at by an honest approach to the matter which confronts the nation.
3.35 p.m.

We cannot get that approach by trying to drag down each other. When you attack the Government for being unfaithful to its promise, or being unwilling to do something which it should do, and you reach the stage where it becomes so bitter that each side wants to prove its point, the problem will continue. I am suggesting that we look very carefully at the whole process, and wherever there are problems that give cause for concern, that we probably address the issues in terms of making proper representation.

I note with interest that the Opposition was careful to priase the Chief Electoral Officer. I know for some good reason they like to praise some people in public life. I do not know if this is to satisfy them that if in the very far-off future they come around again, and those officers are still around, that they will not be threatened.

I am not particularly anxious to be always handing out praises and bouquets, but I have known the officer myself for a very long time while I was with the Government in the wilderness, and I have always found him to be a very upright man and a man who is not unwilling to share his knowledge and experiences with people when they seek to get advice from him. I do not feel it is fair for anybody to remotely give the impression that there is anything within that department which will reflect on him.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that whatever is done by way of the changes of boundaries must come from this Parliament and not from the Chief Electoral Officer. Now, this Parliament and the Government can only act on statistics, and I believe that what was arrived at in the last election was primarily based upon a system where you hoped to get a balance in terms of numbers and in relation to the topography of the areas in which people live. For example, in a place like St. Andrew, difficult in its terrain, you will find that you may have to make certain adjustments. It might not be a question of numbers, but it might be a question of the distances that you have to cover within a constituency.

The Prime Minister adverted to the fact that in St. Michael and Christ Church, particularly in Christ Church, there might be a question of the actual increase in the number or voters in that area. That is because people are gravitating towards Christ Church to live, and obviously you will find that there might be need in Christ Church to make adjustments, and those adjustments might very well have their effects in areas as far afield as St. James, or St. Andrew.

These are matters that the Government will have to be advised on by the Electoral Office. It is not that they make the decision, because we are not making any excuses on that. If the Government decides that it is going to have electoral reforms and look at boundary changes, we will accept responsibility for any changes. This is now happening in the United Kingdom where Ministers are fighting to find places to run because their constituencies have now virtually been wiped out by the new division within Great Britain.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks, I beg to support this subhead. If time permits I will have to come back, because I have not even got a quarter of the way in what I wanted to say.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I believe that we are coming to the end of this Head. I have some comments to make at the end of the Estimates. I am a bit pushed to make them now, but I think I am going to try to make them at the end, probably on Friday.

I believe that after 16 years in Parliament I can be as *au fait* with the electoral system in this country as most Members, and probably more *au fait* than some. It is really sad, very very sad, to hear the statements trotted out from time to time by Members on the other side about the rigging of an election.

I would like to go on record as saying that I am proud to be a citizen of a country that can boast of the freest and fairest elections in any part of the world. I believe that if you were take a poll in this country asking any Barbadian a simple question – if they believed that an election was ever rigged in Barbados, in the days of the Conservatives, in the days of the Democratic Labour Party when they were in power, or in the days of the last administration of the former BLP Government and of this administration – the old timers of yesteryear, and even the young people of today would agree that it is not within the policy of a Barbadian to think ever about rigging an election.

I believe it is a phrase coined by people who are power seekers. I do not go around shouting about any problems I had during 1966, 1971 and 1976. As a matter of fact, I may be a bit careless in this respect. I cannot even remember checking a voters list. My way of campaigning, as my colleagues have said on more than one occasion, is a unique one. I win seats for my

colleagues and they help me win seats from the platform. That is my approach. Other people knock on people's doors, *et cetera.*

When you examine places like Haiti, a number of South American states, a number of European countries, even the world's most powerful country, the United States of America, and some of our Caribbean territories, I do not believe that there is as intelligent an electorate any part of the world as there is in Barbados.

I will go further. There are people who come into the Gallery to hear the debates. In one day there are more in the Gallery of the Barbados House of Assembly than there are in Trinidad, Antigua, St. Vincent, Grenada and Jamaica to listen to the debates. People are not really interested in hearing the debating skills of the parties of those countries in Parliament. I think it is in Antigua, Sir, that Parliament meets sometimes once every four months, and the Order Paper is handed to the Member of Parliament the same day that he enters Parliament for the debate.

Our whole democracy in Barbados is one of which we can be justly proud, one based on the Westminster model. And when they say that Barbados in some respects is more English than the English themselves, if there is one area that we can be justly proud of in relation to England it is this Parliament in Barbados.

I do not believe that the Democratic Labour Party ever set out to rig an election. Had it been so, we would not have won the Government of 1976. Had it been so in 1981, the additional three seats, which you can say the Opposition won, they could not have won them if there was any tampering with the electoral system in the country. But what do we hear every single time that we come into Parliament to discuss something where the electoral system of Barbados is concerned? You have heaps of arguments, and the Government is forced to defend the Electoral Office and its stature in Parliament over a lot of trotted out statements about rigging of an election.

What would you say about Guyana if you talk about rigging an election in Barbados? Although there were about 135 000 voters on the electoral list in 1981, I do not believe that we would have had at least 500 spoilt votes. So intelligent is the electorate in Barbados that you can go to a booth, collect your slip, walk into the booth, mark an X against the candidate of your choice, come back and put it into the box yourself, with the presiding officer, members of the Police Force, members of the Civil Service and members of your choice sitting down in there. Then, the box is sealed and the name is written across the box by the presiding officer, taken to the Police Station or to the place where they are going to do the count, and the boxes are opened there in front of the candidates and the people who are going to count the votes.

What tampering of the electoral system could you be talking about or rigging of an election in Barbados? I believe that Members on the other side should be joining with me today in saying that they are proud to be in a country that cannot be accused of rigging an election. The only persons who have ever accused anyone at all of electoral fraud are members of the Opposition.

If you go into Trinidad people have to vote by symbols. In St. Lucia, in St. Vincent, in Grenada and in other countries in the world people vote by a horse, a cow, a boat or a bell, whatever is the symbol of their party. I recall that in Jamaica the symbol for the late Sir Alexander Bustamante's party was a big sow pig with ten young ones, showing that if they continued under the Federation, all ten piglets would pull all the milk from the breast of the big sow. They had looked at Jamaica as the big sow.

In Barbados it is not like that. And if you are going to argue that because a handful of people, let us say 1 000 people, out of 137 000 did not have the option to exercise their vote on Voting Day because of a discrepancy within the print-out, how can you really look at a Government in 1983 and say that they tried to rig an election?

Do you know, Sir, the amount of people who came to me and said, "Mr. Craig, I went to vote. You sent me this to vote at Mr. Johnson's residence, Station X or Y as the case may be, and when I got there I did not see my name?" You know what I tell them? "Do not worry your head, Craig will still win." It is as simple as that, because I do not see how 10 or 12 votes out of 27 constituencies could have made a difference. Let us assume that 50 persons could not vote in one constituency, what big difference does that make in reducing the seats on this side or that side?

It is utter nonsense, and I hope that we will not hear this argument come up again in here about rigging an election. All they are doing is trying to pull down the country, which they say they love so much, the country which they have the whim, the fancy, the courage and the zeal to lead. All they are trying to do is to pull down the country in the eyes of the world.

Barbadians can be proud, under their jurisdiction and now under ours, to hear that we are the freest country; not necessarily black, but the freest country in the world or was the freest. I am proud when I go abroad to hear these things. Where are you from? I am from Barbados. What do you have there? A good democracy, a stable

Government, a good infrastructure, friendly people. That is how I sell my country. I cannot say we have any casinos, do not have any dog-racing at night, so this is how I have to sell it.

What do you hear coming from the other side? A lot of nonsense trotted out by power-hungry people. Would I have to rig an election to beat them? I beat them in 1976 when they were in control and I do not believe they rigged the election in 1976. I do not believe they rigged the election in 1971 when the Deputy Prime Minister was beaten. I believe that was a matter of history, a matter of fate; that had to be so.

What do you hear now? You talk about gerrymandering? I am sick of that word. The first time I heard about changing of boundaries was from that side. Back in 1969, I think the former Chief Valuation Officer was one of the architects in that, he and Senator Barrow and Eric St. John. But we have all of this nonsense for the whole day, for almost two days!

This morning when I came in to lead the House, I got up and moved that further consideration should be postponed. One of the reasons for that was I felt within myself that we had spent enough time on just $1 million or thereabouts under a Head, $1 million out of the Estimates of Expenditure of, I think $483 million. On $1 million, from 10 o'clock yesterday morning until 3:55 o'clock this evening, they are out there talking utter nonsense when you have so many important Heads here with $28 million, $35 million – Transport, Health, Education, Finance, Defence!

They talk about filibustering! If I were in the Opposition I would by-pass this Head and look for the real substance in the Estimates to discuss. But you are hearing a lot of talk all day in here, from lunch yesterday to 3:55 p.m. today about rigging an election. Do you really believe that if this Government had ever set out to rig an election that the member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) could be in here? I would be the architect in rigging it, because I do not like him and he does not like me, and that is a mutual feeling. He would not be here, nor the Member for St. Michael South Central. I have a different feeling about the Member for St. Michael South Central. I think he is an overgrown political joke and therefore I am sympathetic towards him. Then, we have some parliamentary invalids like the Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves). I would not have to rig against them.

Ezra Alleyne is a complete nuisance, and because of the nuisance Ezra Alleyne is, we are saddled with the Member for St. Michael North. Now, really, tell me, what would you have to rig an election for? Alleyne rigged one against himself. Alleyne is too cheap. He would not service his constituency and all he did was to walk about all day like a peacock in tall heels shoes playing he is Perry Mason, and now you are saddled with what – a man who had applied for his pension. He was so sure he was not coming back in here, he said "Give me my pension", and he is talking now about rigging an election. Sir, we have not got to rig an election!
3.55 p.m.

I was on the Committee, along with the Prime Minister and members from the other side, which worked with Mr. Smith, and on his advice we agreed to a number of matters for the re-alignment of the boundaries for the simple reason that there are several constituencies that are much more populated than the others. St. Andrew is one which I would not consider a growing constituency. I do not believe that St. James North is a growing constituency from the figures, but St. James South is a growing constituency and constituencies in Christ Church, so from time to time you make a shift in the boundaries to give them a balance. This may cause a problem in the print out. Some people, for example, registered but did not take their pictures. But I really believe that Barbadians as a whole should be proud to know how educated they are in the politics of the day and the parliamentary life of this country.

Mr. Chairman, you can see people lined up outside on Budget Day. They are the people who are going to turn up outside there – and not businessmen. Businessmen would have their ears on to the television and radio to find out if there is going to be an imposition of taxes, but you see the folk in the street, whom I refer to as the party apostles, lined up out there to get into the Gallery.

You can tell any time that the Dems have a big measure to come down with. I know the side the Dems sit on, and I know the side that the Barbados Labour Party supporters sit on; but I also put some of my supporters among the Dems to hear what the Dems are saying too. I was around long enough to know where I am going and what I am about politically; so you may see one side of the Gallery looking heavy, but it is a mixture. I tell some of my supporters where to go out and sit down. You would be the most amazed man, Mr. Chairman, to know the amount of things I am told that people say in the Gallery, like, my belly is too big, my hair is grey, 'ignorant Craig, why doesn't he sit down'; all these things; and "look St. John's face." I put my supporters to sit down among them to hear what is going on, not for that cheap talk though, but to hear what saboteur plans they may have, because they can't help using the small man to do their wicked deeds.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Since you do not know how to conduct your side, and since you have not got anything to say about the Estimates, I am going to assist you. In 1976 we gave you an opportunity to call the Heads. You said "no", that we wanted to trick you. This morning we came in again and we indicated that we wanted to get on, but, Sir, they almost pulled you out of the Chair. We are going to support you in your stupid action not knowing how to conduct yourself and deal with the Estimates, and you should hang your heads in shame that you spent almost two days dealing with Heads 10 to 15, something that just cost $1 million of the taxpayers' money.

If I were in the Opposition I would be digging into Defence and Security, Health and Transport. That is why we came to power, you know, doing our homework, not playing cheap politics. But they are talking about a Minister getting fired and a Parliamentary Secretary got the vote, a lot of cheap nay-nay politics.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that this Head has led to a lot of debate, and perhaps quite a lot of speculation, and indeed at some times some very hot exchange of words between both sides of the House. Let me begin by saying that the cost of Government.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if my colleague would give way, I was watching the time and I really started moving, but it is 4 o'clock and I beg to move that Your Honour 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. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for 20 minutes, until 4.20 p.m.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
4.05 p.m.

Resumption:—

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 15 stands part.

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

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I will be very, very brief on this matter, because I believe that we really and truly have exhausted this Head. I think that one or two statements should be made. I will have to start by saying that the Members on the other side have been in Government for seven years but there is still a certain amount of sensitivity connected with criticisms. When one voices criticism, it is usually taken in a personal way, in a way in which it is really and truly not intended.

It is a fact, Sir, that there were a tremendous amount of discrepancies in the last election. But I would be the last person to say, and I do not think we can say, that if there were no such discrepancies the results would have been different. We may have won more seats, they may have won more seats; we may have won the Government, but I cannot say that we would have won the Government. I do not know. I cannot say that it would have been different. But the fact is that we have sat here and voiced criticisms. I think the criticisms we have voiced should be taken seriously, because we believe that it can only strengthen the electoral system.

For instance, Sir, I believe that the register for elections is published too late. It is published about two or three days before the actual day of elections.

Taking 1981 as an example, when the register for elections was published, that is usually the final word as far as the register is concerned. But the register that was published before that was a more complete document than the register for elections, the reason being that the computer print-out omitted a number of names.

The Government can look at this aspect of it. Have an earlier register for elections and if, of course, there are any discrepancies as such, we can have a supplementary register immediately prior to elections to take care of those persons who should be validly on the roll and should be validly casting their votes but are unable to do so because the register for elections, published three days before elections; omitted their names. These are some of the criticisms that we have been voicing in here from time to time.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) spoke of scrutineers. He would

like to see a review done with scrutineers. I would like these matters to be taken seriously and not be taken as an excuse on our part for our losing the election, because we are not offering this as an excuse. We want to see things done properly.

Before I take my seat, and I will do that shortly, I want to say that we on this side believe that the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Dennis Smith, is a very competent and honest officer. He worked with me and I know his capabilities, and we on this side honestly believe that he is a very honest officer. So when we have to voice criticism about the roll, we are doing so in order to improve it, not to criticize him and to drag him down, because we believe he is a competent person.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the Prime Minister is winding up this debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Sir, the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon L. S. Craig) wound it up, but is very open. Mr. Chairman, Sir, obviously the most important event that has happened in the last ten years is the 1981 General Election. Nothing has happened in the road system. Nothing has happened in Health. Nothing has happened in Education. There is no public officer of any importance except the Chief Electoral Officer. No houses have been built or should be built. The only thing is that, in a country which is progressing, and where people are improving the standards of housing every day, and therefore, move from one location to another, the Government must spend two days debating discrepancies in the last electoral register.

There are 247 000 out of 248 000 inhabitants in Barbados embraced in the national registration system. I doubt that Britain, in a war-time economy with rationing, had any better record of providing the population with identity cards. I doubt that the Soviet Union, and I have said so already, has got over 99 percent of its population registered. But apparently, there are discrepancies, and the House is to be kept a whole day discussing whether an electoral register should be published three days after or five days before.

There are excellent reasons for publishing the register late. The law provides that if you are 18 years on Polling Day, you are to vote. How do you achieve that by publishing the electoral register a long way in advance? Theoretically, all you have to do is to print in all the names of everybody who is going to be eighteen up to Polling Day. But what if they have left the country? What if they have not been in the country? All of these are last minute things. What about the people whose names are on the register, but not qualified by residence, because they may be non-Barbadians or Barbadians who have lived outside of the country, but whose three years come – whatever it is; three years or one – close to the date. All of these things we are being hammered with – discrepancies!

In every progressive country such as Barbados, where people go and build their house and live in it, there are going to be population movements. I do not know about the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves). Since he came down from the country, I wonder how many addresses he has lived at. I do not think he has lived in one or two addresses. I reckon I must be as stable a person in the way of Barbados as most people, but I have changed addresses in Barbados twice in the last 15 years. The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) born on a plantation which his family owns, has probably changed addresses twice in the last 20 or 25 years, and we are persons who, as I say, are fairly stable.

So much so are the great mass of the population, born on a plantation tenantry, come to school in town. live with a relative perhaps in town somewhere, go from one part of town to another, get a girlfriend or boyfriend, move to another address, rented accommodation, moved from renting a chattel house to renting a bungalow, move from renting a bungalow to building a house – five or six changes in 10 or 15 years; each time a change, generally for the better. How can any system on earth fail to have registration difficulties where there is this kind of movement within the population? You must have, especially in the suburban areas, substantial movements of population and people who live in one place and registered in another.

I have not even dealt with the mode of life. A man lives in St. Philip, he meets a young lady from St. Peter, and he leaves his registration at his mother's house in St. Philip and he moves to St. Peter to live with the young lady. The census officer comes around and they find him in St. Peter, but the national registration has him in St. Philip. Perhaps, then, he joins the Army and moves into one of the barracks and he is in the political constituency of the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford). How can you possibly hope not to have discrepancies on Election Day, especially when your aim is to give everybody a chance to vote. If we did not set such high standards, we would not have what so many of the people call discrepancies.

I remember Mr. Justice Hanschell and his wife spending until 5 p.m. on Election Day 1966 trying to find out where to vote. They always lived, as long as I knew them, at Two Mile Hill, and eventually they found themselves voting in St. Hill's Road, Carrington Village. At one stage, in fact, I believe they have been registered in St. Philip by some extraordinary fluke, and when it was transferred to town, it was transferred to the wrong place. Do you think that I said the 1966 election was rigged because Mr. Justice Hanschell was nearly unable to vote?

The 1966 Election had the maximum number of discrepancies, I am confident of that, and the 1971 Election had the maximum number of disenfranchised persons who could not vote at all. But those elections were not rigged; those elections were inefficient; they were run by the honourable Member for St. Michael North. They were not rigged merely because they were discrepancies and infelicities.
4.35 p.m.

What is this to keep the House of Assembly for two days on? I am quite happy, because I really do not believe the general public will appreciate a political party whose only interest is in why it lost the last election. You lost the last election because you did not get as many votes as the Barbados Labour Party; that is why. You lost the last election because we were more popular. That is all there is to it. We scarcely lost a vote between 1976 and 1981, it just happened that the votes were redistributed a little bit. Some people changed their minds one way, other people changed their minds another.

Certain remarks made by Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS were ordered to be expunged from the record by the Chairman at this stage.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will just say that Dr. Caddle lost his seat and Senator Greaves lost his seat in St. Lucy because, I believe, there was a change of spirit. Mr. Alleyne lost his seat in a Labour Party constituency, as the honourable Member for St. Michael North himself has told me. He says he knows he sits for a Labour Party constituency, but he won it because I think the perception of the candidate against him was not satisfactory. By some extra-ordinary fluke Mr. Alleyne managed to persuade the electorate that he was a less suitable candidate than the present honourable Member. I remember somebody, very unkindly saying about an earlier contest in that constituency that both men would lose their deposits, but Greaves would lose his by less. It just happens to be one of these things.

People lose their seats in Christ Church. You win a seat by nine votes, and then you lose it by 110 or whatever it was. You win a seat by seven votes and then you lose it. Those were the results in Christ Church and St. Philip.

What is all of this about discrepancy? Why can people fool themselves and confuse themselves with foolishness? We won the election fair and square, Sir, nobody doubts it.

I beg to move the Head stand part.

The question that Head 15 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 16 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE – $338 366

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Subhead 1, Item 8. There has come up in London a number of publications of great importance in Barbadian history, books and some reports of this House, Sir, and pursuant to the Government's policy of buying historical documents of interest to the country, as we have in the past, we are seeking a small increase in the vote in order to accommodate this.

The publications will include the Report by the Select Committee of this House on the insurrection of the slaves in 1816. That will cost £250. For the first time in some years we have seen advertised Ligon's True and Exact History of Barbados. That is the first history of Barbados, Sir. It will cost £715. There are a number of much smaller reports of this House, different Commissions of Enquiry. There is a book relating to the conditions of free labour, and a report of the West Indian Royal Commission Enquiry of 1897.

It is intended that some of these publications will be added to the Library of the House of Assembly. In addition, there may be one or two others of the same name that may exist in other quarters. But the vote, as is customary, is carried under the Head of the Prime Minister's Office, they are normally bought through the Prime Minister's Office.

In case the House is interested, I may mention that we were able to buy a book that I do not know exists otherwise in Barbados, a really major work, for a very reasonable price, out of this vote during the last Session, Griffiths Hughes' *Natural History of Barbados*, with many hundreds of drawings of plants that existed in Barbados in the middle of the 18th century, indicating many of the things that are household names today that did exist even then under the particular names.

We have also bought one or two maps, which now hang at Ilaro Court, and I must say that I think for modest sums we are improving our historical records. I will therefore have to move in to this item, which was underspent last year anyhow, Subhead 1 Item 8, an additional $4 000 in which will make the vote $5 500. The total of Subhead 1 would go to $139 820, and the overall total will go to $317 366.

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

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, just to regularise the records, I would like to draw the Prime

Minister's attention to Subhead 3 – Prime Minister's Official Residence, and there are two questions I would like to pose.

We see Other Personal Emoluments $26 832 and the footnote in the Estimates says: "See pages 11 – 12 for the breakdown of the Personal Emoluments". If you go to the Personal Emoluments, pages 11 – 12, there is no such breakdown, they are just lobbed under Other Personal Emoluments. I wonder if the Prime Minister is in a position to give some indication of the staff being accommodated in that Personal Emoluments Head, because there is no breakdown under this particular one.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I suppose it is a vote for a butler and maids. The actual expenditure has not been coming up to the total amount voted. When the Prime Minister occupies the residence, it is normal for some of this vote to be recoverable. This is a vote for personal staff for the Prime Minister. There is no breakdown, because no appointment has been made. The Permanent Secretary has been asking that a butler be appointed. I think there is a maid, or maybe two maids, but I think that it is wished that there be a butler, because there is insufficient control of the house even now as it is, and, of course, functions are held at the house, which involve the house's own staff.
4.45 p.m.

I would imagine the reason why there is no breakdown because it is flexible to allow for a part-time maid or whatever. What I will do is to give an undertaking that if a full-time butler is appointed and so on, next year it will show the appointments. I think that is what I will do next time.

The question that Head 16, as amended, stand part and put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 71 – CAPITAL – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE – $25 000

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Very little was spent on Ilaro Court this year. It is not yet fully habitable. The only money that has been spent is on what is meant to be the flat upstairs was spent on preparing two sitting rooms, two bathrooms and a bedroom for President Reagan. The bedroom for Prime Minister Adams, and his study have been somewhat neglected, so we have to repeat the Capital Vote. We may be able to spend some money in the last two weeks of the year.

I sometimes wish that the determination that some honourable Members of the House show not to enter Ilaro Court was not so pronounced, because the object of the Government is that the ground floor of Ilaro Court remain a place of public resort, a place to which the public can be admitted.

The dining room is a room of first class proportions and decorations. We have sold the old dining table at Culloden Farm and bought a slightly bigger one, a better one, and we may even have added one or two chairs. The dining room is decorated in watercolours, with portraits drawn by a Royal Engineer Officer, who subsequently became the Professor of Draughtsmanship at Willage Military Academy. The portraits are of Barbadians of the 19th century, many of them of great historical interest. Old Rev. Norville from St. Leonard's feature in three or four of them. Sir John Sealy, the former honourable Member for St. John and Attorney General, is featured. There is a quite well known drawing of Sir Conrad Reeves as a young man, described as Mr. Reeves, whom the Blacks called Lawyer Reeves wearing a top hat, evidently on his way to the courts. There are also many watercolour scenes of Barbados.

There are two large public rooms, one of which contains a collection of maps, most of which, indeed, are my property. I have put a little sticker on the back of them saying "Property of J. M. G. M. ADAMS", so that there will be no difficulty at that time in the future when I relinquish, voluntarily or otherwise, any right to have my furniture at Ilaro Court. We have a collection of a few books which, unfortunately, we cannot as yet show, but which ultimately will be kept at Ilaro Court.

The work on the grounds is going quite well, but I think it will never be entirely satisfactory until somebody is living in the house. There really is no way that you can stir up Parks and Beaches gardeners, who are gardening with hoes, forks and baskets, to do the sort of maintenance work unless you are actually present and dealing with it.

I have had to cut out some of the items of extravagance, which, through no fault on anybody's part managed to creep into the Estimates. That is one of the reasons why a lot of the work has not been done during the past year. For example, MTW, I think, with the best intentions, wanted to install a system to haul the food up from the main kitchen on the ground floor up to the family apartment above. That system would have cost about $37 000 or $38 000 to install. It turns out that you can actually build a kitchen above, put in another stove and another fridge for less than $20 000 – without all the apparatus of hauling the things up. In fact, nothing has been done in that regard.

What is ultimately intended is that the ground floor of the house will be open to Barbadians and visitors. Within reasonable use, people will be able to go around the grounds and look at the ground floor for its historical interest, and the upper part will be a family apartment.

This is the ultimate aim, Sir, but Ilaro Court is not a bungalow at West Terrace that can be constructed and furnished in a matter of one year or one and a half years. The roof work, which needed doing when we took it, was estimated at $30 000 or $40 000. In the end, it cost well over $120 000 to repair the roof. The car parks have necessitated the spending of $200 000 or $300 000. For whatever purpose you are going to use the house, these are the essential repairs that had to be done, and at a time of financial restraint it has not been possible to spend the money at the speed that would have been necessary to provide, so to speak, an instant residence.

In the coming financial year, honourable Members may see some road and pavement work being done. At the moment we are deciding whether to cut down the stone bluff at Ilaro Court to provide a pavement – a wall will have to be set in from the new road – or whether to cut it down from the other side of the road. But it is considered that a pavement will have to run from the area of the new roundabout and Haggatt Hall, where the new Ministry of Housing will be setting out 60 house spots, right down to Howell's Cross Road, pass Hallelujah Bottom, to facilitate the increase in population that we expect up there.

There is also permission for an executive house development at The Valley on the opposite side of the road, in the back of Stratford Lodge and Walmer Cottage, so that will be another set of expenditure, not related to the Prime Minister's residence, but which probably will come out of the vote. It is related to road works, but road works done on the road next to Ilaro Court.

When it is opened to the public, it is not intended to open it to the public free. People pay money to go and see houses all over Barbados that the National Trust opens, and if the Government is spending $30 000 or $40 000 in beautifying Ilaro Court, beautiful flower gardens and hanging pictures and so on, you must expect that tour coaches and the like will have to pay $5 per passenger to go through the residence and go around the grounds.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I think the general public is a bit concerned, whether we are putting up a museum, an art gallery or a mausoleum, about the expenditure of money on Ilaro Court.

Ilaro Court was acquired some years ago from a lady called Mrs. Belknap, whose husband had died who decided she did not want to come back to Barbados. It was next door to Sherbourne, which was owned by the Government – the Government acquired some seven acres – from Mr. D. V. Scott and the firm of John F. Bladon and Co. Ltd. had plans approved for the cutting up of Ilaro Court.

4.55 p.m.

I asked the then Governor of Barbados, Sir John Stow, who was acquainted with the people, to approach Mrs. Belknap and find out whether she would sell the place to the Government as a cultural centre. Mrs. Belknap not only agreed to sell it to the Government, but agreed to sell it at a price of, I believe $310 000 and also to allow the Government to pay for it in three instalments over a three year period.

Plans were drawn up for a cultural Barbadian-Hispano Centre. Then in 1976, when the Government changed hands, we saw some of the trees being cut down – it had a beautiful stand of mahogany trees – to make car parks. The now Attorney General, who I believe was in Education, came for a fairly large sum of money, $330 000, and gave the House the assurance that the original design – not meaning the architectural design, but the original objective for the use of Ilaro Court – was not going to be changed. He gave us, as much as anything with him could be solemn, a solemn undertaking that it was being fixed by the Ministry of Education for cultural purposes.

In this year's Estimates the sum of $500 000 has been allocated for Ilaro Court, despite the fact that it is now going back to culture, apparently as a museum, from what the right honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) is trying to tell us. It has not been occupied by the incumbent in the office of Prime Minister, and this is now some six or seven years. Some $500 000 was voted last year, which the honourable Member tells us has not been spent, so I would like to know why we are going on continuing to vote. This is not a re-vote, and in no way have we been shown a comprehensive plan for the development of Ilaro Court, nor has the House been vouchsafed information on the total amount of money which was spent to date!

Now the Prime Minister can live where he likes. I tend to live where I like, wherever the spirit moves me from one part of the year to the other part of the year. This is the way that I function, so I am not going to tell him where to live.

The Government paid $101 000 for Culloden Farm and eight and a half acres of land. I do not think that for the full period I was there, from December 1964 to 1976, that another $100 000 was spent on the place. As a matter of fact, when it was proposed – I do not want to call any names – that the carpets were very dingy and receptions were being held there all the time, the then Financial Secretary, Mr. Neville Osborne, demured at spending $4 000 to put new carpets in Culloden Farm.

I want you to understand that when Culloden Farm was bought, it was bought complete with all the furniture. The only thing it did not have was bed linen. Some work was carried out on the roof in the kitchen,

because the staff complained it was very hot, but all the carpets, all the antique furniture, was included in that $101 000, with eight and a half acres of land.

It seems to me that, as I have frequently said, here in Barbados we have some nice historic buildings and so on which need restoration, but we tend to have champagne tastes – we always like to show off – with a mauby pocket. We always want to be extravagant not at our own expense, but at the expense of the taxpayers of Barbados.

Ilaro Court was acquired from the Belknap Estate by the Government and the administration over which I had the honour to preside. I am not saying you must not spend any kind of money on it. Obviously, even for the purpose for which it was originally acquired, a cultural centre, some money would have had to be spent, but I think it is time that the House was told how much money has been spent from the time they started work on it and how much more money is likely to be spent.

I can see in front of me here in the Estimates $1 million in two years. The Prime Minister has assured us that the money for the last year was not wholly spent. I would like to know how much money has been spent from the beginning of this project. The reason why I say that is this: in a country where you have a shortage of housing, you cannot spend $2 million on one dwelling place and expect to get away with it.

Right behind Ilaro Court, right behind Sherbourne, we have places that were moved from Delamere Land, 16 x 9 houses, shedroof; some of them do not have a kitchen up to now. I believe that the Minister of Health was making some inroads into trying to get a decent communication system up in there, as he has been doing throughout his constituency, which I believe is on the borderline. If you want to take a drive with me, I will drive through there. He has done a fantastic job of road rehabilitation when the rest of us in the rest of the island, including St. John, do not have roads of the standard that he has managed to put into his constituency in a short time.

The point I was making is that I am not personally criticising the honourable Minister of Finance, I am criticising the whole attitude. In a country where you are short of housing, we must have our priorities right. If the Prime Minister does not live in Ilaro Court, then Ilaro Court can go on what the Americans call "the slow back burner". In other words, you can have him put on the roof and ensure that no dilapidations, in the technical Latin sense of the term – the breaking down of the stones – will take place. You can put on the slow back burner, make up your mind whether you want it for an official residence in truth or whether you want it as a show place to display the antiquities acquired, and which we already have in our posssession.

But can we really afford this in a country where there must be, the last time I knew about 8 000 genuine applications for housing with the Housing Corporation? They probably have more like 28 000 applications on their books, but I would say that there would be approximately 8 000 people who are looking for accommodations which would be congenial for their children.

There are children going to our so-called first grade schools ..... I do not believe in the distinction. I would have like to abolish the whole distinction between elitist Harrison College, which we attended, the members on my left and the members opposite and the St. George Secondary School, Ellerslie and so on. I do not believe in that. That was all right in my day. One of our members tells a story of three boys from St. George winning scholarships for Harrison College and only one could afford to go, although it was only $8. We put all those days behind us when we had free secondary education.

The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that you have some children going to school at some of our first grade schools who are going to be future leaders of this nation, whose habitations are below any acknowledged, civilised standard. Their parents apply year after year, month after month for proper accommodation. Sometimes five or six children, father and mother live in a house. I know a case of a lady who works with me who has got ten of her family living in a house. They have now bought their own piece of land, and they are starting from the back and going forward, struggling to make ends meet. You find father and mother working, about five or six little children, grandmother, sister and their children in one house; all that kind of thing.

This is now a common thing in Barbados, and what people are looking forward to is decent accommodation. Therefore, when you are spending $2 million on Ilaro Court, do not think that the man in the street is not looking at that and questioning whether you really have the interest of the people at heart. It is all right to say that $2 million could only put up 20 houses or something like that, but 20 houses are 20 houses.

In Singapore, a country which I greatly admire, whose Prime Minister, as the Honourable Prime Minister knows, is a personal friend of mine, there are two million people plus living in an area only 40 square miles bigger than Barbados, and over 65 per cent of these people are in Government houses. I am saying that the requirements in Barbados for proper housing are so great that about 75 per cent of our people should be provided with government housing, with subsidised rents and all.

The IMF is not going to like that, because they are against any idea that whatever you get, you do not have to pay for it. They are not socialist-minded, but we are socialist-minded. Not only that, we are people-orientated.

5.05 p.m.

We can look at the expenditure on the Ilaro Court as only something that the nation will be proud of. Are you proud of the conditions in Cats Castle? I know that is far from your constituency, but if you go down behind Chapel Street, where McEnearney used to be, behind where what is called Milk Market, you will see conditions there which any right thinking person or concerned person would be ashamed to let any visitor see.

When His Royal Highness, Prince Charles was here, I took him down to Emmerton. I do not think that visitors, royal or otherwise, should drive along Belleville and the sequestered confines of Pine Hill and places like that, and up by Jordans and Workmans in St. George only to see the magnificent houses up there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Did you say you did not take him up there?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that we could not only take him there. But the point I am making is that you cannot only show them the pretty places. They would feel that you are doing something fraudulent if you give them the idea that Barbados is all glossy, therefore, I took Prince Charles into a lady's kitchen in Emmerton Lane.

I, myself, was surprised when I went in the house. The lady had no warning, it was an unscheduled stop; we were not even suppose to go through Emmerton. He said, "let us go into this place." The lady had on her food on a gas stove, she had her bottle gas and had had her little refrigerator. Of course, they are no more fashion, as they say in Barbados, since the restrictions that the Central Bank has put on. The lady had her little fridge and stove, and she showed Prince Charles what she was cooking, but I do not know if I can do that today. I cannot take a chance and go into any sort of working-class area. The gentleman might break his foot or something. It is true that Prince Andrew is a little more athletic and he may be able to circumvent the potholes and so on.

The point I am making is that a country cannot have two standards. And I do not want to hear that it is only $2 million. First of all, I want to know how much it is altogether. Then, I want to remind the honourable gentleman that, in a country where people are still queuing up for housing, we cannot afford this kind of luxury. If he does not want it as a residence, put it on a slow back burner and leave it there for a little while until we have happier days.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, it is only fair to say that Ilaro Court has been pretty well on a slow back burner. Nothing like $2 million has been spent on it. I have not got the overall figures, but last year the amount was $79 000 for structures and approximately $71 000 for plant, equipment and furniture. So, clearly, the $½ million.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Just on a point of explanation: I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams). Why are all these public officers coming in here day after day? They are not coming for lunch, because normally when you have a Head the officer who deals with that Head brings all the information. I am very concerned that we cannot know even today in deliberating the Estimates, when we are being asked for $500 000, what was spent year before and the year before that. I will say that it has to be $2 million unless I get better information.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I cannot say anything to that. What the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) has said is, perhaps, more than what I might have said if I was in his place. But that is what has been spent. The honourable Member is not really fair to the Government when he said that we do not care about housing. I have declared that housing is Government's chief interest. If I wanted a luxurious apartment to live in, clearly I would have spent a $½ million this year and furnish the apartment. I am, in fact, doing what the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) says that I am continuously guilty of, perhaps trying to do it cheap. I am trying to get the prisoners into the carpentry school at Glendairy to make bedroom furniture.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I just want to say that I gave them a mahogany tree. I will be very glad to know that the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) is going to move in.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I must say that I thank the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) very much. I also gave them a mahogany tree some years ago. I hope the honourable Member will do what I did. I said, "you can use it generously, but I would be glad if you would make a desk for me out of the tree", and they very kindly made a desk to my specifications out of the tree. They are now negotiating to get some other old mahogany. I believe that they are planning to buy the old mahogany from the gentleman, now deceased, from Welches, who has been the source of mahogany whenever it is needed. Indeed, I believe he was the source for a lot of mahogany that was used in the House, and I am hoping that if they get that, the complaint made by the honourable Members for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) and St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) that we should not really be sitting in a ply wood house will go, because you will be able to make some furniture in a vernacular style, from a vernacular wood, for use in here.

But the honourable Member is a little unkind when he speaks on housing, with the implication that we have no interest in it. Housing, of course, costs money. When the honourable Member for St. James North was Minister of Housing, he commissioned a study of clearing Chapman Lane and Cats Castle and so on, and when it

came before us in the Planning and Priorities Committee – and this was a time when the Government was contemplating the spending of $200 million a year in capital, when in fact we had it to spend, in 1970 and 1980 – we could not see our way to spending $24 million that it was estimated the clearing of the lower parts of the Orleans and rebuilding would have cost. We are trying to improve Housing without, at the moment, expending these enormous sums of direct Government funds for the purpose.

Singapore has housed 65 per cent of its population in high-rise apartments, financed by a housing levy that makes our Transport and Health levies, the lot, look like quarters that you put in a one-armed bandit – something like 4 per cent of their GDP. Twenty per cent of people's salaries go towards the Singapore Housing Levy. It is one of the major housing investment funds of Asia. The funds that they have raised from their Housing Levy by themselves have helped to make Singapore the financial centre of the Far East, because they are so large that people queue up to borrow them and provide the monies for continued investment in the area of housing. If we are prepared to live under those conditions – high-rise flats, no gardens – and remember, too, that in Singapore, to get a Government apartment it is compulsory to have at least two retired persons to live in the house. You must have two out of four grandparents, and if you have not got that number you have to try to find two old aunts and so on. Old age pensioners must be accommodated in the apartments in Singapore, and it is a social system which, like the honourable Member, I much admire, but I wonder if Barbadians are ready for that. It is a system based on Confucianism and ancestral worship, which is taught in schools, and a certain amount of compulsion.
5.15 p.m.

Remember that in Singapore a motor car cannot be driven in the city during the hours of daylight unless there are four people in it. That is the way they cut down on the number of cars coming into the city. If you spit on the road – gaol. You cannot drop a cigarette butt, or a match, or a nut in the street of Singapore, because with two million people crowded on to an island not much bigger than Barbados, you will understand that as people begin to drop nuts in the street you would be doing nothing else but sweeping up nutshells.

Whether we are ready for that, I do not know. I can see that if it should ever come about that Barbados has two million people, they would not just be building roads at the back of Ilaro Court; they would be building 20 storey blocks of apartments on the rocks out there. But we are doing what we can.

When the honourable Member for St. Michael East (Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman), was Minister of Transport, he sneaked a road at the back of Ilaro Court. I only knew about it when I went one day to see how the work at Ilaro Court was proceeding and I saw the machine cutting the track down in the back, and he said; "How do you expect the people in the Two Mile Hill Housing Area to get in and out comfortably if you do not give them a road?" The Minister of Housing then was the honourable member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw), and he gladly concurred and organised a housing programme just up the road from Ilaro Court, to which I made allusion in my speech.

I well remember how it arose at Cabinet. We were discussing planning permission for the executive house development on the other side of Two Mile Hill, and the honourable Member for St. Michael East said that we are here giving these people the opportunity to develop these open lands with some pleasant housing, how do you think the people who live in 1st and 2nd Avenue, Haggatt Hall, are going to feel when they see these big mansions going up in the valley and nothing is being done for them?

It was there and then that I said that we must close that part of Haggatt Hall altogether, buy up all the land in the vicinity of Wonder Bakery and the new road, and lay out a sights and services scheme, properly planned, with landscaping, trees and the like, to indicate to the long-standing residents of the area that we have an interest in them that transcends our interest in the private developers. I think that, not even in four years' time, in two years' time honourable Members will be surprised to see how the face of Two Mile Hill has been transformed.

The crowded housing in Hallelujah Bottom is intended to be resettled nearby; the housing by the roundabout will be a planned development. Wonder Bakery is co-operating with us. I believe they are planning to exchange some land in return for us giving them the old road in front of their property, which they will plough, grass over and move the boundary forward to the new highway, and so on.

It is precisely because I am hesitant about spending a lavish amount of money on the Prime Minister's residence while many persons in Barbados are badly housed, that the work on Ilaro Court has been going on for six years now. Honourable Members will remember that it was in 1977, at the very end, that the decision was taken to make it the Prime Minister's official residence. It is not one or two years over which the $900 000 or $1 000 000 has been spent; it is over a number of years.

As far as the staff is concerned, I am now informed that the staff provided for in the Estimates is one butler, one cook and two maids. Perhaps, the two maids are already full-time, I am not sure. Much of the furniture from Culloden Farm has naturally been sent to Ilaro

Court. Culloden Farm was quite well provided with beautiful Barbadian furniture in the public rooms, but it was not so well provided with accommodation in the bedrooms; in particular, the bed population at Culloden Farm seemed very low. I recall that we had to buy a bed for Sir Herbert Duffus, and I think that probably only one pair of beds had survived from the old regime.

Culloden Farm had eight and a half acres, Sir, quite true, but it was not a particularly convenient Culloden Farm. The honourable Member for St. John, acting, I think, on the same principles that he has enunciated, had perhaps been hesitant to ask the House for a lot of money to make Culloden Farm more comfortable, just as I am hesitant to try to ask for enormous amounts of expenditure to turn Ilaro Court into a palace to live in. It may very well be, Sir, that if Culloden Farm had been retained as the Prime Minister's residence, we would have been looking to spend $250 000 to $300 000 on Culloden Farm to make it more comfortable.

I know the public does not always give politicians the protection that we deserve, but I do not think that Prime Ministers of Barbados – not any of us, not any of the four Premiers and Prime Ministers – had been people that have sought self-aggrandisement or personal luxury and glory at the expense of the taxpayers. Perhaps we should do something now for Ilaro Court, make it a place where certainly the Government can house a Head of State as a guest in some comfort, and some effort has been made to do that.

But I have been hesitant because of the other calls on the funds of the taxpayers. If it is to be a revenue earner, of course we will have to spend money on it anyhow to put it into that state, so perhaps in the forthcoming financial year we will take those steps that will make it possible to open Ilaro Court to the public, and also make it possible for the Prime Minister to take up residence there.

The question that Head 71, as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 17 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY – $14 430 890

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17 stand part.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I just have a few observations to make, Mr. Chairman. I am a bit surprised that, in moving this Head, we have had no word from the Government at all. It may be that they are quite satisfied with how things are going and that they are not concerned in any way about defence and security matters in this country, but I note that the figure for Defence and Security was the sum of $1.9 million for the financial year 1977–78, and that for this coming financial year that figure has increased to some $16.8 million.

5.25 p.m.

Now, this is a very substantial increase in expenditure for defence and security. It must be in the region of almost 800 per cent, a fantastic increase, percentage wise, in the amount of money being spent on defence and security since the financial year 1977–78! I believe that increase for this Head is a bigger increase than you can find in almost any sector of the economy, and indeed when you take any of the other indicators in the economy itself, it is really a whopping increase.

Needless to say, of course, if you are to provide for the defence and security of a country, the costs in that particular area are great, and we have got to find out what kind of security and defence arrangements we need for this country and how we are going to provide it. But we cannot continue in this country to make this kind of outlay, however necessary you say it may be in terms of the defence and security arrangements for the country, in the kind of economic situation that we are having.

I think that, as in most areas, we are going to have to think through this whole matter very carefully. I do not know that we can continue to expend money at this rate, and for these purposes, in the way that we have been doing since the financial year 1977–78.

I spoke at length when I moved a Private Member's Resolution on the matter of the Defence and Security pact. I would just like to say again that that whole matter is one which causes me very deep concern, but not so much in terms of the area of defence policies as such, or the concept necessarily. What I am saying is that no Government of this country must get into those kinds of arrangements without taking the people of this country and this Parliament into its confidence as to exactly what is planned. And this cloak and dagger attitude that, so long as something is in the area of defence or in the area of security, you cannot say anything about it – you cannot say how many men are enlisted, how many jeeps you have, how many weapon systems, you cannot talk about your procurement policies – I reject that entirely!

A democracy, which is coming to terms in these areas, must find ways and means of giving information to the public, because the defence and security arrangements are as much part of the democratic system as, let us say, housing or the other areas. When the information is not forthcoming, you have to try and ferret it out from other sources, and that is not very desirable.

I am not going to speak on Immigration. No doubt, others may wish to do so. I am not going to say very much on the immigration aspect of this Head at this stage, but I merely wish to limit myself, in this first intervention to those particular points.

I am calling for a Committee of this Honourable House to be set up to consider matters relating to defence and security, because I think we have now got to put in place the kinds of democratic controls which can monitor what is taking place.

I believe that the Minister of Defence and I were at a luncheon together, and I think it was the Admiral who said that when he left Barbados he was going to appear before one of the sub-committees of the American Congress, to testify before that committee on matters relating to the areas of his command. Now, here you have in the United States a system where the legislators themselves, the congressmen, can question not only the Secretary of State, or the Defence Secretary, but also the very persons who hold command. But here in this House, we do not even know what is going on; and when information comes, we do not know who is in command!

It is no wonder that sometimes when some people go on courses – sometimes courses arranged by the Parliament of Great Britain, I believe you, Mr. Chairman, went on one of those courses – some of our members from down here go up there and ask if the Commander of one of the Forces in the Navy or Army is a member of the Cabinet. Those are the kinds of questions people from down here go up there to ask when they go on these kinds of conferences.

I would like to get a breakdown of this item, "Operating Expenses". A sum of some $30 000 is being requested.

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am at Head 17, Item 12, Operating Expenses.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member, I am not quarrelling with him, but if he turns to page 20 of the appendices, he will see that Classification Code No. 12 covers postage, uniforms, refreshments, jurors, witnesses, Government hospitality, rewards, prizes, advertising, publications, traffic signs and so on.

This is the largest Head in the Estimates. It has nothing to do with the Regiment in this case, it has to do with the Ministry, and it occupies almost a full page in Appendix E in explaining what operating expenses are. Dental treatment, recreation and handicraft, public relations, corpses and all that is under operating expenses. 5.35 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am talking about those operating expenses, and I am also going to Subhead 2– Object, Classification, 16 – Grants to Public Institutions – where the sum of $12 million is being asked for the Barbados Defence Force, I am asking for some kind of breakdown of that particular Head. For instance, how much of this is going towards the Regional Military and Security Pact. I am serious about it. I want to get that kind of information.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The operating expense the honourable Member (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) has referred to is $30 000. Some $28 300 of that is the uniforms for the security guards. It is not what the honourable Member thinks it is. He forgets this vote includes the security guards as well.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have asked also about Item 16 – Grants to Public Institutions – and apparently this public institution is the Barbados Defence Force. It is a peculiar use of the words "public institution".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you mean Subhead 2, Item 1.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Object Classification, 16, Subhead 2. Can I speak about that now? In relation to page 12, Grants to Public Institutions, just as the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence has been very forthcoming on the question of operating expenses in relation to the security guards, can he give us some kind of breakdown for that particular item? How much of this is going towards the Regional Security Pact, what is the total cost of that pact in one year and what is the state of all that? We must be given some information in that particular area. I am not making any long speech; I will pause, but I will be up on a number of occasions.

Rt. Hon. J. M G. M. ADAMS: Honourable Members, perhaps, seem to forget that the Defence Force employs people, several hundred people. I believe the total number in the books of the Defence Force is 700. That is seven hundred jobs. A man in the Defence Force has a job. That is a job you are providing for somebody. Do not confuse yourself with thinking that the Defence Force has expenditure on bullets only. Those people absorb $6 million in personal emoluments, $380 000 in National Insurance, $30 000, Health Service; Transport Levy, $15 000; $2 200 in travel, $230 000 in utilities, $8 000 in rental of property, $1 403 for purchase of books, supplies and materials, and maintenance of property. I would like to lump those together for various

reasons, that is the operating cost of the Coast Guard vessels and so on and so forth, and they come to about $4 million.

I do not know how much of it is for the Trident, but I know I was much impressed by the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, the right honourable gallant and learned Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), when he said there is no point buying vessels and just tying them up in the Careenage if you cannot afford to buy the fuel to put them to sea. I was much impressed by that! It was the same argument that the Commander of the Coast Guard and the Chief of Staff were putting forward, and I accordingly decided that there is no point having a Coast Guard and having, as the Commander of the Coast Guard put forward, $2 million in technical assistance from Britain, if you cannot make use of the technical assistance, which was free. Do not forget that the officers come here through the British to train our boys to go to sea. I was much impressed by that argument!.

The Commander of the Coast Guard pointed out that a lot of expensive, British technical personnel had come down here and you could not make use of them because there was no fuel to put in the boat to carry them to sea to teach people to sail and teach people to repair the engine. And I am satisfied that there was no point building a workshop, which was completely funded by British assistance, down to the watchman's wages – all local costs, all overseas costs, were funded by the British – there was no point spending $1 million, even if it came from overseas, and then you cannot teach the mechanics how to repair an engine, you cannot teach the sailors how to sail, you cannot teach the officers, navigation.

To tell the truth, Sir, we still cannot teach them gunnery, because I am not prepared to put out the kind of money that would be needed to fire the weapons on any day to day basis. The Argentine Navy had only in its life, I understand, fired two Exocets before the war, because they could not afford to train men in firing them, and even the British could not afford to give the men adequate training in operating some of their weapons. So I am not going in for that. They have to train on the job.

When I heard the Leader of the Opposition making the point that the boats were tied up in the Careenage all day, I told my colleagues we have got this equipment and you either have to come to a decision that you do not have a Coast Guard or you give the Coast Guard a minimal amount of money to allow for the sailors to be trained. The training of the sailors will be of general use to Barbados, because they are learning to fix marine engines that go into military vessels and they will also be able to fix engines that go into other vessels. We now have an excellent little workshop there on the Pierhead.

To continue, the subsidy to the Regional Defence Force is $520 000, the Youth Training Scheme appears to be $552 000, and there is contingencies, plant, equipment and furniture; together they are less than $100 000. We are not buying plant, equipment and furniture this year. That is only $40 000 in all.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Regional Security Pact is $520 000. It is either $520 000 or $552 000. There are two sums here, I am not sure which applies to which, but it is not more than $552 000. It is one of the two. It is not $553 000; it is not as much as $553 000.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You are saying the entire cost of the pact for a year is less than $1 million then?
5.45 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) has pushed me into something that I really had no particular intention of talking about. The fact is that there is really a very small amount of money being spent on it. I hope the honourable Member and the Press are not going to push and push on this issue, because, clearly, it may not be desirable for people to draw deductions since virtually no money is being spent on it. I do not mean that it is only a paper organization. It is backed by something.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to ask the Prime Minister something. The Prime Minister is talking about being pushed. The Nation published a release from the Prime Minister of St. Vincent. Speaking purely from my recollection, he was protesting over the high cost of this pact, of which Barbados is to pay 49 per cent. As far as I can remember, the St. Vincent contribution, which is not like 20 per cent or even 10 per cent, is over $330 000. Now by extrapolation, or whatever mathematical device the honourable Member chooses to use – he has a lot of them at his disposal – how can 49 per cent be only $550 000 when, let us say, 10 or 15 per cent is $330 000. This was published. I do not have the newspaper in front of me, but this is what was released from St. Vincent.

It may be that Barbados would pay all the cost for running their vessels and this is only a sort of additional expenditure which you will incur over and above the fuel, the payment of crews on the Coast Guard vessels and all that kind of thing. I understand the headquarters are being placed here, so the $550 000 may be Barbados' contribution to the cost of staff in Barbados. But it certainly could not, in any real defence operation,

be anything like 49 per cent when you have an area from Dominica, let us say, down to the Grenadines, at least that you want to cover, with one vessel burning, on one engine, probably 6 000 gallons per hour or something fantastic like that.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Aeroplanes burn off on each jet engine 6 000 pounds of fuel, or 6 000 pounds on four engines, or 24 000 pounds of JT 1A power. But maybe I am getting a bit confused about the engines on the Trident. It may be $6 000 worth of fuel.

I understand that the sort of regimental song of the Coast Guard is John Maysfield's famous poem "When I put out to Sea". That is what they sing in hope all the time "When I put out to sea". But the point I was making is that we do not have any like with them at all. If you are going to buy them and you cannot afford to run them, and you tie alongside, then I think you should sell them.

Nobody has satisfied me that Barbados is under threat of invasion from any other Caribbean territory, any Latin American territory or otherwise. I am not satisfied, and the majority of people in this country are not satisfied. It is the kind of paraphernalia that this Government is going in for. Ilaro Court and the Trident are the same kind of ostentation that this Government is exhibiting all the time. It has nothing to do with what I would call the facts of life in Barbados, how people should live, what people's expectations are, what the people are looking forward to.

The people are looking forward to jobs and housing. After that, the National Stadium, sports, Cricket in South Africa and all that is peripheral. They have nothing basically to do with what the people expect from their political system, and what they expect from their political system has nothing to do with the Trident. So I was not urging the Prime Minister to spend money to put fuel in the Trident and go out to sea. The boat should be out to sea, but you cannot afford to sent it out to sea, therefore, you have no right having it at all. It is as simple as that.

After the boats were acquired, I am coming to another point now, it was then seen as ludicrous for a small country like Barbados to have these vessels. Incidentally, the Navy always resents they being referred to as boats. The Prime Minister was telling us that it was funded by the British, but he did not tell the House what he told me, that it was being funded by the British on a loan to Barbados. "Funded by the British" has the connotation that the British are giving you a gift. The British has made no gift to Barbados of anything to do with the Coast Guard. What the British Government has done is to arrange for a loan which would cover the cost of construction at Fort Willoughby, which should have been done by our Barbadian contractors here.

The cost of the Trident, the oost of artillery which is on the Trident, the cost of the conversion of the shrimp trawlers, which should be shrimping, these are what we call opportunity costs in economics. Has not anybody seriously examine the opportunity costs of running that Coast Guard Service? The opportunity costs of converting the shrimp trawlers, which put people out of work in the same Emmerton that I referred to just now. These are the things we have to take into consideration.

The devil can always put scriptures to his own advantage. Whenever the Prime Minister wants to justify anything, he says that I recommended it. Why does he not give up and let me run the whole show if he has to base everything on my recommendation all the time. He tells the public that the Leader of the Opposition has recommended so and so.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the honourable Member (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) give way: If he is applying for the position of Minister of Defence, I will be very glad if he puts his application in writing.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: From my general approach to militarism, although I am the only Member of the House that I know about who has had exposure to active military service for several years,....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Oh, no; Vic Johnson, too.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He went to Fort Dix. I apologise. I understand that there is a gentleman, who was not unassociated with the Minister of "Chicken Backs", who went to Fort Dix.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order on both sides of the House!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not a militarist. If I thought that Barbados was under any danger at all, I would be backing the Government 100 per cent in even spending more money. But nobody has convinced me! Do you know why you have not convinced me, Sir? They had to go and look for something to do; that is, they had to have a pact with the other people to patrol all the way up to Dominica and all the way down to Cariacou, Bequia, Mustique and the Union Island.

In other words, they did like a certain Member on this side. I am not being unkind. They asked me to come and open a business and I was very surprised to hear the gentleman say that we had a property, so then we looked

for something to put on the property, a business to carry your property, I told them that the business is bound to be a failure, because you should have had an idea about the need to carry on this business, that there is a requirement for the business in Barbados, and then look for the property. I said you do say you have a property, let us find something to put on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You decide that you require, this is what the people in Barbados demand, and then you look for the property. The Coast Guard is the same thing. You find some vessels and then you look around and say, "Let us find something for the vessels to do." That is what convinced me that Barbados does not really need this.

In relation to the point I made about being funded by the British, the Prime Minister knows that the British did not make any gift. The British do not give away anything. Dominica got $50 000 000, but when Barbados got independence, we got a silver bowl that you could put roses in. They must have had a good reason for giving Dominica that money. They probably felt that we were well off and did not need anything, but they do not give away anything. They always tell you about the economic stress and what not in England, so when you say it was funded, it was a loan which was lent to the Government.
5.55 p.m.

When we come now to Object Classification, 16, and when you turn to Appendix E, page 21, the $12 million under Subhead 2, they say that this is for Grants to Public Institutions. Now, listen to me carefully, as you always do, Mr. Chairman, it says Grants to Public Institutions. When you turn to Appendix E on page 21, this is the information you are going to get there, which is worse than the Government Information Service, Grants to Public Institutions, self-explanatory, $12 million. The honourable Prime Minister says it is in the Appendix, and when you look in the Appendix for the information they tell you it is self-explanatory.

What we want to know is, what public institutions? What used to be called the almshouses? Certainly not the children's home in Newcastle, because the Minister of Health just closed it down. The best run, the most beautiful, the most scenic, as you know, Sir, children's home in the whole island, they decided to close that down. Why? Just because it is in St. John? And they sent the children all the way to St. Philip to another institution that is sited among some geriatric patients and so on, when we have the most beautiful, well run home in the whole island.

So, to what institution now are we going to give this $12 million? And we must know, because the total of Subhead 1 is $393 000 and then Subhead 2 is the $12 million, and if you go over to the margin, the explanatory note, it says: "The functions of this subhead includes....." I would have thought it would have been"the functions of the Defence Force". You cannot have a function of a subhead. The purpose of a vote would be to do so and so, but they have "The function of the subhead includes:

(a) defending the country from foreign invasion and attacks;

(b) patrolling the coastline for smugglers and other illicit activities.

That merits $12 million?

The point I am making is that if in order to carry out the functions of the Barbados Defence Force you need to spend $3 million on diesel, let us know you are spending $3 million on diesel. If you are spending $5 million on going up to Roseau in Dominica, or down to Mustique, Union Island, St. Vincent, Martinique, Mayaro, Tobago Cays, let us know that $5 million is for that, for the cost of sending the Coast Guard vessels outside of Barbados, and the other $4 million is ammunition, we want to know that too. What are you going to do with the $4 million in ammunition? Do not tell us that Grants to Public Institutions is self-explanatory.

The Defence Force is not what Mr. David Seale calls "a largesse organisation."

(Asides)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I know you told me that he does not understand the term, but he should not be in the Senate if he does not understand a word like largesse, it is part of the English language.

(Aside)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Oh, I am sorry, I thought he was telling me that Mr. David Seale did not understand the word. He told me that before. It will be more largesse like how the small shopkeepers now are being pre-empted by selling wholesale/retail in Eagle Hall. Anyhow, I am not going into that now.

I am dealing with how come the Defence Force fell into the category of a public institution. This is the Head of Defence and Security, so if you say that is for the Defence Force, you are still not telling us anything. If the Defence Force is a public institution, you still have not told us what the $12 million is for. That is why we are in Committee of Supply, to find out what we are voting money for. In the present state of confusion, where an explanatory note says it is self-explanatory, then you are really at sea without anchor; completely at sea.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the honourable Member will give way, on a point of elucidation of what I said earlier, I am really enjoying the honourable Member's speech so much that I hesitate to interrupt him. I have heard the speech often before, but it is nonetheless enjoyable; it is like the soliloquy from Hamlet, Sir.

Throughout the Estimates, the expression 'Grants to Public Institutions' occurs, and in all of them it is not further explained. There is a grant to public institutions for the IDC, the Tourist Board, a whole set of them. The Defence Force happens to be treated for this purpose as that because it is run by a Board called the Defence Board, which is responsible to the Cabinet for the spending of the funds through the Minister of Defence. That is why it comes in this form.

I read out a summary of the expenditure, which is more than I have ever heard the IDC or the Tourist Board ask for anyhow. I did say it was around $6.5 million for personal emoluments, $230 000 for utilities, I joined supplies, maintenance and operating expenses together at around $4 million, I mentioned the training scheme and I mentioned the $550 000 for the regional force. I have said what it is, and that is unusual in here. We do not usually ask for these breakdowns.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would feel happy with a little more open approach to these matters, because it is quite possible for any Member to find out a great deal of information about the United States Defence Department, the resources that are allocated, and the areas in which they are allocated in respect of either the Marines, the Navy, the Army or the Air Force. It is quite easy; you can read the testimonies before the Houses of Congress. There is a whole area of defence literature and so on that is published, and not only by the Government itself.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We only have one Defence Force, the United States has four, so I cannot give you a breakdown).

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We can read a lot, whether it is about the Rapid Deployment Force or whether it is about the capabilities of the military in the United States. In any country of the world you can find out what is the structure of the military, how much resources are allocated in Zaire, or in Zambia, or in Tanzania or any of those countries. But here, when we come to deal with our own country, there seems to be this reluctance to say what it is all about. And we are going to run into trouble in these areas unless we realize that when we are talking about the defence of a country, we are talking about the people of the country, and the people themselves must understand. We will find it extremely difficult to say, "Yes, this will happen," when we do not know what the money is being asked for or to what purposes it is being put.

6.05 p.m.

I think we have to get an entirely different approach to military matters in this country. I am not talking about militarism either, because I believe that a great deal of harm is being done by such programmes. I believe I listen to Rediffusion sometimes, and I think it is on Rediffusion that you hear about a Defence Force Half Hour; and you have some young soldier there telling you how you must be prepared, the Army means business and that kind of thing.

I do not think that has anything to do with public relations at all, and I would advise from the floor of the House that it would be better if that kind of approach is scrapped, because it is not doing anything to bring about any kind of understanding about the role of the military in this country. Most of it seems more like scaremongering than anything else, and I do not think that particular programme is very helpful as presently structured.

We are going to talk about the National Youth Service, because I heard reference that some of this money under Recurrent Expenditure is going to that. As I understand it, this is a new programme, and there is absolutely no reference in these Estimates that we are looking at now, the particular Head that we are dealing with, to that programme, although it is supposed to be a new service. We see something under Capital, but here, where you are getting this new service coming in, there is no reference at all to it in this particular Head although there is a sum of money allocated to it.

We have to get an entirely new approach to this matter. You cannot play it under your arm or close to your chest. We cannot handle the public affairs of this country in this way. It is better if we come and say, "this is what the programme is...." There are no big secrets in here, or there should not be any big secrets, on these matters.

We have to rely on information coming out of other countries to find out how that money is to be spent; by a process of some kind of osmosis or something like that. We have to get it via St. Vincent, via Dominica or via St. Lucia, when we are putting in almost half of the money.

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Oh, sorry. The Prime Minister has just said that the St. Vincent figures were wrong.

I must ask another question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Prime Minister could tell us about the

foreign personnel within the Barbados Defence Force; How many are they? I have already asked about that structure, pointing out that it is very weak, but I would like to get some information about the foreign personnel in the employment of the Defence Force.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Before the honourable Member responds to that, let me raise a few questions concerning this Defence Force.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister is very soft and sweet this evening on the Defence Force, and comes before us with a piece of paper in his hand, which he got from an official, telling us how he is going to be spending this $12 million. I do not accept that.

Mr. Chairman, in the United States where the most secret agents in the world, the CIA operates, it is supervised by a Committee of Parliament. And while that Committee might not tell the CIA who to eliminate specifically and what weapons to use, it knows how much money is going to be spent on the elimination of whoever it is that is going to be eliminated. In relation to the KGB in Russia, there is a committee of the Politburro that oversees the spending.

When we move from a 700 percent increase from 1977–83 – I know you curse and said I was a liar; you said I was a liar when I started to talk about this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is spending $12 million on a Defence Force and $2 million on Housing, according to these Estimates. Two million dollars on Housing and $12 million on a Defence Force, and the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Hon. H. B. St. John) come talking about jobs, 700 jobs!

Well, at least we were lucky. We are now *pari passu* with the British because we now know how many people they have in the Defence Force. This is the first time that the Minister of Defence and Security ever came in here and told us how large the Defence Force is. We at least know they have 700 people on the roll. That is 700 jobs.

Now, I want before I go any further, to deal with a matter which the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) said when he was sitting in his seat about being afraid of the Colonel. It seems that all of them over there have this strange concept that you have to speak softly about the Defence Force so that you can get into the Colonel's good books, because when the Colonel is ready to do his thing, he will think of you kindly. I have news for you. When the Colonel, or any Colonel, is ready, he does not have friend nor foe. So if you have anything to say, you might as well say it, because when he is taking, he is taking everybody. You may be the first. You wait and see.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand this concept which the Prime Minister, in particular, has about the Defence Force in Barbados. It needs $12 million to defend us from Sidney Burnett-Alleyne coming in a row boat; that is what it comes down to! The rationale for the Defence Force, which he has always given us, is threats from Sidney Alleyne. He is a genius, this Sidney Alleyne! Why do you not bring him into Barbados and let him help to increase the GNP. Because any man that could induce a Government to spend $12 million of taxpayers' money on a defence force, is a genius. That is, according to the Estimates, Sir, not what I say. It says here in the Estimates that that is what the money is voted for, to defend us from armed invasion, not to help us with the building of bridges down in St. Andrew, not to help us in getting some of the things that need to be done in Barbados done.

6.15 p.m.

I have no objection to paying 700 young men, teaching them a little ceremonial drill, teaching them how to use weapons. If the High Commander had been taught how to use weapons, he would have more respect for weapons; he would not allow, willy-nilly, the Colonel or anybody else to come and tell him what to do and when to do it, and tell him that no price is too high for the defence of the country. That is what you learn at Sandhurst, and it is true, but when you come down to Barbados bringing these hifalutin concepts, and we are going out to buy, not only aeroplanes, but we buy an aeroplane and a whole company, and we will soon buy the ancillary services, all of this in the name of defence from armed invasion, something is wrong. The only invasion we have had is the Barbados Labour Party, and we do not need an army to defend us from them. We use words.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You prefer us to use guns? Why don't you let us use the words even if we are unsuccessful? You are going to force us to go looking for guns to use against you?

Mr. Chairman, there is another concept which I wish to draw to your attention. If you hear the Minister of Defence, you would believe, first, that we were the richest country in the Caribbean and that we needed to be defended from all of our enemies, and he is always holding big secrets to his chest.

We had to read in the *Advocate* newspaper today the plain truth, as the man who is telling the truth for tomorrow likes to say, about why the warships are in Barbados. Now you will hear the Government Informa-

tion Service, on the direction of the Minister of Information and/or the Prime Minister, putting out how this is rest and recuperation, how it is a goodwill visit and how all of these ships are only coming into Barbados out of love and affection between President Reagan and the Prime Minister of Barbados, and because of the good facilities.

All of that is true, but the real truth is never told. It is a military operation, and we have to read it in the *Advocate* newspaper, a Cana-Reuter report from Washington, where they are accustomed to telling their people the truth about defence and security, or at least part of the truth. And so we learnt that there is a gigantic operation by the friendly forces of the West which are coming into the Caribbean as a show of force against the Russians, Grenada and Cuba.

I wish to say this to the Prime Minister: if you are going into a defence pact with the United States and the other Western powers, go into the defence pact; say to the people of Barbados that we live in the western hemisphere, we follow a certain way of life, we want to have as part of our defence in this region an understanding with the Americans. Put it up front. The radicals, the Opposition, or whoever, will discuss it up front; they will either agree with you or disagree; but do not come in here and try to fool the people of Barbados that these vessels and the aeroplanes flying across are all part of some friendly arrangement. Let us call a spade a spade. We are firmly in the camp of the Americans against the Russians; say so!

(A VOICE: Non-aligned.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: What non-aligned! Do you mind him with that foolishness? How could he be non-aligned when he is getting his instructions and directions. You are not non-aligned, but you have joined the movement, too. If the movement say that it is non-aligned, you say so too! Whatever me monkey do, me do too!

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is there asking about a green card. He seems to have misunderstood. What he does not understand is that Americans in America are able to criticise America. You on that side seem to feel that if you say something negative about America, they will send two big people to give you a slap round your head. In America, they go to Washington and they protest and they tell the President in the White House what they have to tell him, and what the Prime Minister and the Barbados Labour Party Government must understand is that criticising America is not something they must be embarrassed about. They feel so! Criticising America is nothing new. So do not tell me about a green card. If I had a green card that would not stop me from criticising America, and I never had a green card. I worked for the United Nations. With that kind of second rate, cheap propaganda, which you will try to put out to suggest that I benefited from the U.S. and now come down here biting the hand that fed me, you are trying to give the people in this country the impression that when once you set your foot on the United States soil you should be forever begging and saying "please Massa". The honourable Member behind you had a green card too. I believe he became a citizen. I do not know if he became a citizen, but he must have given it up in order to become a Member of this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Defence and Security.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: My time will be up, of course. I talk very fast, you know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not asking the honourable Member to discontinue his speech. I am just saying that the debate is drifting and a whole lot of irrelevancies are creeping in. But if you want to know, you have about four minutes left.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will be back again. All I have to say about defence and security is this: in the Soviet Union, in China, in the United States, in Britain, everywhere that money is spent on defence and security, it is the duty, which is exercised by the Parliament and by the people, to ask if it is spending money to tell us what they are spending it on. President Carter wanted to have a B–I bomber and the Congress said let me hear what you are spending it on and then said to him, "No".

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You don't even know what is a bomber, so don't confuse me when I am speaking.

President Reagan wanted the MX missile, and he has been defeated by his own people. When they asked him for details, they got details down to the very first drawings of the MX missiles, the deployment of the missiles and all of these matters.

When you come to Barbados, because we are small, it does not mean that the principle does not apply. We want you to come to this House and do not tell us about a Defence Board and try to equate it with a Tourist Board. We know how we deal with the Tourist Board. When it suits you, you deal with the Tourist Board, and we know how you deal with that. We know about the IDC.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation the honourable Member (Mr. B. M. Taitt)

really must give way. This is the second speech that I have had to interrupt. I have come and said how it is being spent. Honourable Members have come with set-piece speeches. I have said how it is being spent. I have said how much is personal emoluments, how much is operating expenses and supplies and I have even said what the travel was, $2 200. So why are honourable Members going on and trying to give the Press the impression that I have concealed it? I would not have to: it is here. It could be voted as $12 million. I could sit down and say nothing.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do not let him talk about the Press to confuse the issue. We are criticising your attitude, the fact that you come in and get a piece of paper from the back and read it out. The public should be able to pick up the Estimates and know. We are not discussing your telling us anymore. We are talking about the attitude. You come here with a piece of paper. You think that you can just walk in and then say this is $12 million? Twelve million dollars is a lot of money in Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. Time is up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, since I entered this Chamber in 1978, I do not think there is any area of Government commitment in terms of expenditure that has been cloaked with such secrecy as the area of defence and security. Every effort has been made over the years to avoid debate. At one point in time a solemn promise was made to the Leader of the Opposition to provide time for debate, and then that promise was abandoned on the last day of the Estimates.

We have heard that the Defence Force now employs some 700 young people and that seems to be one justification for establishing that particular area of activity in Barbados. But, Mr. Chairman, do you know that the shrimp boats that we had here for a few million dollars employed over 600 people, and that the Minister of Finance of this country has taken up over $85 million of the public's money over the past five years, between 1977 and now, and allocated it to defence and security? 6.25 p.m.

That does not include the massive debts to which he has committed this country over these years. It does not speak of the debts in relation to Aero Services, where the basic reason for buying that related to the needs of defense and security. It does not speak for the loan for the ship. As a matter of fact, we do not know today how much the ship cost, whether it was $20 million, $25 million, $40 million or $50 million. It does not speak of the amount of money involved in the purchase of the airplane.

Certain remarks made at this stage by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We will entertain the honourable Member.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, I would just like to draw to your attention the fact that you just had something struck from the Record. I would like to draw to your attention, the fact that at yesterday's sitting something which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) said was deemed to have been struck from the Record, but was repeated in the Nation, which then said it was struck from the Record. So the point, really, is that the Standing Orders should state that when something is struck from the Record, the Press should not repeat it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I suggest that you draw this to His Honour, the Deputy Speaker. Will the honourable Member please press on.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, you can be assured that I would never come into this Honourable House and mention anything about two sophisticated helicopters unless I was satisfied that this Government was entering into negotiations to borrow money for the purchase of those helicopters, and that a local bank, Barclays Bank, was involved in the negotiation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I note what the honourable Member has said and we have heard from the Prime Minister. There is no point in proceeding along that line. You have said one thing. The Prime Minister has explained another. Please do not let us waste time in the debate. Do not continue in that vein.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have to have on the Record that I object to any further expenditures of this kind on helicopters or anything else because it has serious implications for the future. I have done my arithmetic, and on Current and Capital Expenditure as they appear in these Estimates, between 1977 and 1983–84, we will have spent $85 million. There is no question about that, according to my arithmetic. I would have had to make an error in adding up the Capital Expenditure and the Current Expenditure.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has given way.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Before we go any further, I have made an enquiry on this matter of helicopters. It seems that a British firm contacted Barclays Bank and asked Barclays Bank if it could finance the supply of British helicopters to the Regional Defence Pact if it was asked to quote for the job. Somebody in Barclays Bank has obviously spoken to the honourable

Member. I will remember it in the future when dealing with that bank. That is exactly how this business of the helicopters has got into the consciousness of the Democratic Labour Party. I say, as a fact, that the Defence Board and the Regional Security Pact have never authorised or sought the purchase of any helicopters.

I have no idea if information was asked by the technical office about how much a helicopter costs, because you have to compare the cost of a helicopter with the cost of providing other services to do the same thing. I have no idea. But it does seem that a British company producing helicopters made a request at Barclays Bank to know if they could sell helicopters – I do not know if it is the Regional Defence Force or who – in or through Barbados if Barclays Bank could finance them. If the officers in Barclays Bank consider it their duty to inform members of the Opposition on these points, I will have something to say to Mr. Morris and others.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He can threaten Barclays Bank, but he cannot threaten me. My information came from the United Kingdom and the inquiry came from Barbados. In the same way, when I was in the United Kingdom I found out about the Trident, and I think it is wrong for him to assume that somebody in Barclays Bank tells the Opposition something. As a matter of fact, if there is any collusion, it is between Barclays Bank and the Government. I just want to assure the honourable Member that my information came from the United Kingdom and there was a direct inquiry from Barbados. I can tell you the cost of the helicopters, and I also know from the French agent that they were a bit concerned that they were not consulted over the Alouette. I can tell you who the French agent is. I will tell the Prime Minister outside, because he is an ex-senior captain of BWIA.
6.35 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central .....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I can go further.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you going to tell the Committee where you got your information from?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: My information came from the United States. I got mine because the IMF was not happy with that kind of commitment to further foreign borrowing. That is how I got my information, from different sources, and all added up to the same thing.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: I am very concerned about what is happening, because the Prime Minister got up and said there was absolutely no discussion, and yet Barbados is supplying 50 per cent of the cost of this regional pact. The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Barbados, the Minister of Defence, does not know what is happening in that pact and can come and give that kind of assurance to the House, and then in two or three minutes after comes back and says: "Something has been happening, but I did not know anything about it." We need some democratic control in here, because we might be able to assist you. You do not know anything about it. Something is wrong, we need some democratic control. Do you mean we are right again?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, Sir: if I say that the Defence Board is not contracted to buy any helicopter, nor is the Regional Security Pact, and somebody said a direct enquiry was made, what am I to do with this? In the course of obtaining the information to reject the idea of the helicopter, a technical official asked what helicopters cost. I asked Malcolm Fraser what a particular Ford motor car would cost, because we were dissatisfied with the condition of the official cars in Australia, do you mean I have entered into negotiations with the Government of Australia for the purchase of an official car? I asked how he liked driving a particular Australian car. Is that negotiation? If somebody asks a firm – I have no idea – what is the cost of a helicopter so as to be able to advise that it is something you cannot afford, is that a negotiation that I do not know anything about?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I wonder if the honourable Prime Minister can tell me where he asked the price, because I can tell him the price. It is £7.5 million, about $33 million.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two honourable Members are on their feet.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am being pushed into talking more and more. I am very surprised to hear the price which the honourable Member has quoted. I have never heard that before. I only know that when it was decided that one of the other territories was buying a vessel, we were told the vessel would cost less than a helicopter. That is the limit of my knowledge of the matter. That is all the technical officer said, the vessel would cost less than a helicopter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I must protest. I have only managed to get through three minutes of my speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You may wind up now, there have been a lot of interruptions. I will let you wind up. I am sure you would like to wind up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it was very interesting. I knew that, having made that statement about the helicopters, I would have drawn him to his feet

on a point of order, and honourable Members in this House, Sir, including you, would now be in a position to judge whether or not my statement was that outrageous, or whether or not it was not really dealing with something that was very important.

What I know is that he has now been totally exposed, and if we had had the opportunity before to expose him in the same way when he was setting about to purchase that ship, we might not have been landed with this massive current expenditure from year to year.

You have to understand that it not only represents a misallocation of resources when you pick up $85 million and you put it into bullets and hardware and that kind of thing. The honourable Member for St. Thomas has stated in this House that he believes, as an article of faith, that bullets make you strong, but butter makes you fat. He has stated that in this House, but I do not think the vast majority of Barbadians would subscribe to that same belief.

Certain remarks made by Dr. R C. HAYNES were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman at this stage.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member is not objecting, he just got up and gave the impression that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was accusing him of breaking the law, that is, incurring Government expenditure. That is exactly what he did in respect of the Trident, and he told me he did not come to the House because the British Government was lending him the money for it. I said it was still a commitment, and that is what the honourable Member is saying. You told me that behind the Chair there and then you went into the House and you said the British Government was not going to lend you the money to build houses and that is why you did not come to the House. Now you say he is accusing you of breaking the law!

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

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please, I cannot have that. The honourable Member and Minister of Trade. I hear asides. The honourable Member's time has expired. You have had a long span, you had extra time for several interruptions.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I find this debate on expenditure for the military very interesting. I am fairly confident that if, while the honourable Member for St. Michael West or St. Michael South Central were on their feet talking, four or five fire crackers went off outside this building, they would be asking the Government how come they did not allocate $24 million for defence and security. I just want to illustrate what it would take to frighten the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) into his senses or out of his wits, to the point now where he would be castigating the Government for refusing to spend a larger sum of money in defence and security.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the honourable Member is ready, he will have a chance to speak, please! The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, please address the Chair.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that this discussion that we are having this afternoon here in this Honourable Chamber is not at all peculiar to Barbados. The debate about how much money should be allocated to military spending is a debate that continues and rages incessantly even in the United States of America. Year in and year out people mount marches to the White House. They go into all forms of demonstrations. They chain themselves to the White House fence, they punish themselves and do all sorts of strange acts to convince the Government that the money allocated to military purposes is money which is wasted.

It is also interesting to note that those very people in a time of national emergency recognise that this question of security is not a matter upon which a convenient price package can be put. It is always possible to say that too much money is being allocated to the military, but when national security is threatened, people begin to recognize the reality inherent in being an independent state living in a relatively hostile environment.

I can remember not too long ago hearing an interview with some residents from down in Cheyenne and other parts of the mid-West. When the silos in which the rockets are put, the silos from which the rockets are launched, were being located in the backyards of some people down in Arizona, they made a big howl and screamed to the top of their voices for the rest of the world to hear. They had objected to the extension of the military state down in their own backyards, and they said, in effect, that no silo had any business being put in a residential community.

An analysis after the fact. Those people have been living with those silos now for many years, and the interesting phenomenon is that, when the silos were being considered for resiting, those same people, including the Clergy who had been so vociferous in condemning the placing of silos in their communities were equally vociferous in condemning the movement of those silos from their communities. They had come to recognise that a

sense of security grows up around some form of military establishment when you are dealing with today's realities.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West talked about the fact that the Colonel is going to be coming for the Prime Minister first. I know that he likes to talk about the Colonel. I do not know what the Colonel has done him, but he spends a lot of his time dealing with the Colonel. In last year's Estimates, he said the Colonel should go back to Jamaica and shoot down the people in that country. He has been very restrained in his utterances.

Asides

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Was it the year before that he said that? He is saying proudly he did not say it last year, he said it the year before.

Asides.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Yes, he said so!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Crosstalk, please!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of explanation: They make me say it every year. I am going to repeat it. I am going to say it, because they seem to feel that one has to be afraid. In Jamaica the Army shot down people innocently at Tiger Bay, and I said that if we are going to be in a situation like that, then he could go back to Jamaica.

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The same thing, only different.

Asides

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. Please take your seat. Order on the Government Benches, please, and over here. The honourable Member may continue.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Year before last, you did not say "he". You said, "Let Colonel Lewis go back to Jamaica and shoot down people."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please leave this out of the debate.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: It is relevant. And he said it again this year, only he was milder.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member (Hon. V. L. Johnson) got read out of the church once and he begged back, but he is still telling lies.

Laughter

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, honourable Members.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I must.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not entertain the honourable Member at this stage.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I must protest, Sir, because the honourable Member who was read out was only read down to the back, Sir.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is no point of order. I am a member in good and regular standing in my church and I have always been. And in due course, I will convert the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) and that other heathen there for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour report progress to Mr. Deputy Speaker and ask for leave to sit again because this, to me, is a raspy type of debate; nothing really worthwhile. Please report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I shall do that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In seconding that, Sir, I would only say that it would be very dangerous if you allowed Barbadians to go asleep tonight under the impact of the untruths of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) about the $85 million, not counting the loans and so on, and I would really ask the Press to give me a break with that, Sir.

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

Mr. Chairman left the Chair and Mr. Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
6.55 p.m.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to draw your attention to today's *Daily Nation*, dated Wednesday, March 16, 1983. On the front page, under the headline "Haynes Stopped on Point of Freedom", there are a couple of paragraphs which I would like to read to you. It says:

"Opposition MP Dr. Richie Haynes found himself stumped by parliamentary privilege yesterday when he attempted to raise a question relating to freedom of speech in the House of Assembly.

It goes on to say:

"He suggested that he had greater freedom of speech outside than inside the Chamber, but was immediately interrupted by the Leader of the House, Lionel Craig, who said the suggestion reflected on the Presiding Officers of the House, the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees.

Before ordering the remarks to be withdrawn and struck from the record, the Chairman of Committees, Jack Odle called for a transcript of what was said."

It further goes on:

"After the Chairman had verified what remarks Haynes had made, he ordered the statement to be withdrawn and the words struck from the record and the debate continued."

It is my contention that if in this Honourable Chamber an honourable Member is asked to withdraw a statement which he has made, that statement should not find itself publicised in the Press. Tonight the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) made, to my mind, some serious statements. He made certain statements to the effect that we had bought helicopters to shoot down Barbadians and it was struck from the Record, and I would hate to see the Press report that after it had been struck from the Record. That is my point. I await your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member moving a Resolution on a breach of privilege by a newspaper? Are you moving a Resolution or are you reporting a breach of privilege.

Mr. A. TRUSS: I am reporting a breach of privilege, Sir, and I am offering something for your consideration, because the very same thing has happened tonight.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the Clerk collect the copy of the relevant document which the honourable Member has read? I will have a look at it and make my decision tomorrow morning.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Apart from the Standing Orders, Your Honour is armed with May's. As I understand the procedure – I am not quite sure if the honourable Member (Mr. A. Truss) is sure what he wants to do – if a breach of privilege is considered to have been committed, it is for Your Honour, after due deliberation, which does not mean tonight necessarily, and having consulted the relevant authorities to come back and say that the matter would be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

What I am saying is that Your Honour, probably at the next sitting, will be able to say whether you consider it a breach after studying the document, and as the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon H. B. St. John) has agreed with me, then you will refer the matter to the Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are several ways of dealing with breaches of privilege of Parliament, and I believe I am entitled to take whatever position I feel will do justice to the situation, and also uphold the dignity of this Honourable Chamber.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House be now suspended until 8 o'clock for dinner.

We have ten more minutes, according to the allotted time to do Estimates. I am going to use the ten minutes for the Estimates, but when I return I propose to do the Land Tax Act. I sought the advice of the Clerk. Up until ten minutes after seven we would have had 7¾ hours if we go to dinner now. When we return from dinner, we only have ten minutes to do the Estimates, but that time in which we are going to do the Land Tax Act is outside the time for the Estimates.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It cannot work that way? Look, you have been protesting all day and you will have to protest again tonight. I have sought the advice of the Clerk and I accept his guidance on certain parliamentary matters.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Don't try to frighten me!)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am not trying to frighten you. Nothing can frighten you.

Listen, let me give you this assurance. Since you are going to have a talking battle, let me give the honourable Member on that side the assurance that I have from now until midnight tomorrow night in here. You know I am a part-time man; I have all the time on my hands. You come in and talk and I will talk with you all the time. I am just trying.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member must address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I started by addressing the Chair, but I am talking to the honourable gentleman on the other side through you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member has no right to talk to the other Member across the Chamber. You must make your address to the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I had the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) in a rum shop, I would really give him some rum shop language, but run from defence? I am going to speak on defence. I am just, out of courtesy, explaining to you what I plan to do – and you can protest!

I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for dinner until 8 o'clock.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Speaking on the motion for the adjournment.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no motion for adjournment.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Speaking on the motion for the suspension, the Standing Orders specifically provide that five days shall be set aside for discussion of the Estimates.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not believe that the honourable Member can discuss that on the motion for a suspension. The honourable Member will have to wait the proper time to make that discussion.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But the honourable Member indicated what he was going to do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member said he was giving an explanation about why the House would be suspended for one hour and why we are returning at 8 p.m. If the honourable Member wants to discuss anything further, he would have to wait the proper time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Meaning me, or the Leader of the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I mean the honourable Member who is now on his feet.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not want to discuss it. The honourable Leader of the House said he was going to discuss.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not arguing with the honourable Member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not discussing anything. It is he who said he was going to discuss something other than the Estimates. I just want to tell you it is not in accordance with the Standing Orders.

The question that the sitting be now suspended until 8 o'clock was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Mr. J. G. ODLE, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. A. A. TRUSS, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE and Mr. L. L. SISNETT – 13.

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

7.05 p.m.

On resumption:

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I indicated earlier, before the suspension, that I would like to do the Land Tax Bill. It is a relatively short Bill and I propose at this time, rather than going back into Committee, to move that Item 3 be the instant Order of the day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you then terminating the continuation of the Estimates at this point?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, until later in the evening.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are two points that I wish to make. The first one relates to what the Leader of the House, the Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) just said. He said he had indicated this to this colleagues on the other side, which would give the impression – and indeed it is an open statement – that he spoke to Members on this side about that. The only indication we had about this particular procedural matter is when he got up to move the suspension. There was no consultation with us on that matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member, but there is the question of time and the reporters. The Government is proposing that we take Item 3 at this time. I would therefore beg the

Opposition to allow us to continue to either debate the Estimates or to do Item 3 and not waste time on procedural matters at this stage. What we are really doing is that we are working the reporters harder than is absolutely necessary at this particular time. There was 10 minutes time left to debate the Estimates, and the Government wanted to do the Bill after that.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it was precisely because of that that I raised the question of the reporters in this House. The understanding that we had on the Estimates all along is that we would be dealing with the Estimates. Then, suddenly out of the blue, the Leader of the House introduces some kind of procedural tactic to depart from the Estimates and debate something else. That was never in the proceedings and not in the understanding at all, and we were trying to come to some kind of understanding that when these kind of changes are being suggested that there would be some kind of consultation between both sides of the House in order to get these matters sorted out. I do not understand how you can do this. We are already short of one reporter – I have said that already – and now you are proposing to go on this. Why can we not continue the debate on the Head that we were dealing with in the Estimates?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is now working the reporters harder than is absolutely necessary. We know that we are short of one reporter. I can assure that the reporters have agreed to work until a certain time in order to facilitate the House. The circumstances which have occasioned the shortage of one reporter were beyond the control of any of us in the Chamber.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Leader of the House should have been aware of all of that situation. Why are we going to mismanage the time of Parliament now? That is what is happening! You are mismanaging the time of Parliament!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It either has to be done Friday night or tonight. Every honourable Member here is aware.....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: But I want to do it tonight. Have a count. We are doing it tonight.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You can talk it out if you like. We always do extra work at the Estimates. If we choose to do it in the middle of the Estimate, we choose to do that!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 3.

BILL TO AMEND THE LAND TAX ACT, CAP. 78A

Order No. 3 was called – A Bill to amend the Land Tax Act, Cap. 78A.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before April 1, in order to carry out certain Government policies relating to the streamlining of the tax collection system, it is necessary to pass some amendments to the Land Tax Act, to combine the functions of the Collector of Taxes and the Commissioner for Land Valuation.

We are changing the name of the Commissioner for Land Valuation to "Commissioner of Land Tax", because the only statutory purpose that land valuation has in our laws is to provide a basis for land taxation. There is no other statutory function of the Land Valuation Department. That is the principal purpose of the Act.

We are taking the opportunity, at the same time, to make provisions for the service of Tax Notices, in the event of their being returned, by placing them in the newspapers and so on. We have a great deal of difficulty in serving Land Tax Notices on something like 4 000 owners, who either live overseas or whose address in the Tax Record is incorrect.

We are lengthening the time that the new Commissioner of Land Tax will have to allow him to sell land in respect of which tax is due payable, and we will be allowing service of Notice of Sale by posting the same on the land where personal service is impracticable or impossible. We are also making arrangements for parcels of land, conveyed to plantation tenants and other tenants, to be conveyed notwithstanding that it does not have a Tax Bill and, therefore, it may not have paid taxes for the current year. This is the most important reform to assist the implementation of the plantation Tenantries Scheme.

There is very little that I need to say. I think that having said those words, we will still have two Acts, the Land Tax Act and the Land Valuation Act, but they will be administered by one officer. The Relief Board will still exist. The provisions which are there now will still all exist.

There is only one point which I would make, for the information of the general public. I am going to make it again. The Government contemplates that, within a few

years, the mode of valuation under the Land Acquisition Act will be assimilated to valuation under the Land Valuation Act. We are not bringing it at once, but we think that the public should be given a couple of years' notice of this, because many people are paying taxes on a land value which is much less than they will be willing to accept if the land was compulsorily acquired by the Government.

The next land revaluation will therefore be very likely to look even more stringently at the values of land than has been the practice in the past. We will be looking now at the value that people themselves are going to put on the land, and we are advising the public to carefully consider this question when they get a Valuation Notice – "Would you sell your land for that price?" If the answer is, "no", appeal the valuation and get a proper valuation. I am seriously giving this advice.

The Government understands that any valuation of all the land in Barbados, at the value its owners put upon it, would result in a surge in Land Tax collections, the like of which we have never seen before. If we approach this matter with an understanding that most valuations are too low, most people would not settle for the valuation and, therefore, we would get a general understanding that people will have to accept that their land valuations are going up, the Government will be able to reduce the rate of Land Tax – I repeat that, the Government will be able to reduce the rate of Land Tax – so as not to impose this additional burden on Land Tax payers.

Some will get off, because some will take a chance that their land will never be acquired. Therefore, they will not raise the valuation and they will, perhaps, get the benefit of a lower tax rate. All those who live along Highways 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and, in fact, all those in Bridgetown who think there is any danger that the Government will ever buy their properties, will rush to get a new valuation because they do not want the properties acquired for nothing.

8.15 p.m.

The gentleman, he is well known, the former President of the Manufacturers' Association, who pays taxes on a land valuation of $4.00 per square foot but asks the Government for $20 per square foot for an industrial site, I predict, without a doubt, that the day after the Land Acquisition Act is amended, he will value his land at $20 per square foot, and long may he pay taxes on it.

No doubt there will be a lot of tactical manoeuvring, but it is incumbent on me to warn the public at the earliest opportunity that this is future policy. And this is not a small matter, it will affect every land owner in Barbados within the next couple of years and it will represent a radical shifting of the size of Land Tax charges. I am giving the public a couple of years to adjust to this so that we do not savage them at the appropriate time.

But there is too much dispute over the value of land, there is too much hostility when the Ministry of Housing goes out to negotiate land acquisitions. One man accepts 20 cents per square foot, the man next door says he is not taking 20 cents, he will take 40, and the Ministry of Housing always had a brief, perhaps, to take 50, and therefore it gladly takes the 40.

You come back two months later to a man you have not negotiated with and he says "I don't know how many square feet I have, I only know that I want $150 000 for this property," and you negotiate and you negotiate and you give him $140 000, which works out at 67 cents per square foot, and you get a dispute. I am speaking of something that has happened. You get resentment. The people who are quite willing to take, I think it was 27 cents in the first place, cease to be willing after they have accepted the money when they hear that somebody else by fighting harder got 60. All of this will come to an end.

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I commend the Act of the Government. It will streamline the land tax legislation of Barbados, and I advise the public of our general policy. It is not coming into force in 1983, probably not in 1984, but I cannot give any specific date.

All that I can say is that the Government will not be viewing the next valuation exercise as a tax raising measure, it will be viewing it as an exercise in consolidating the law and assimilating the law of acquisition to the law of valuation. The tax relief that I will be giving obviously will be given either in 1985 or 1986, so I will save the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) the task of sniffing about and smelling about to get a leak as to what is going to be in the Budget of those two years. I am happy to announce it a few years in advance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am grateful to the honourable Prime Minister for having signalled his intention of a change in the present system of land acquisition in the hope that the movement towards this change would do away with some of the problems presently being experienced by the Ministry of Housing in the decision on compensation.

I am not aware if the Minister of Finance has been discussing his proposals with his technocrats, and what is his technocrats' advice on this matter, but I would like to share with the Minister of Finance, for what it is worth, my feeling on this matter.

I am just as concerned as the honourable Minister of Finance, the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams), about the long delays that are being experienced in arriving at compensation for properties acquired under the Compulsory Acquisition Act, but I can assure you that the direction in which he proposes to go would only end up in a lot more disputes, long ramblings, more complications, and it will completely reverse the process that he is now hoping to achieve.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member, but I believe the honourable Member should be aware that what we are dealing with now is an amendment to the Land Tax Act. The Honourable Prime Minister made an announcement, which any Government Minister is privileged to do, in order to draw the attention of the public to proposed Government policy. I do not deem that this is the subject for debate at this time. We are dealing with an amendment to the Land Tax Act.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be guided by you.

This amendment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, proposes to amalgamate the functions of the Commissioner of Valuations and the Collector of Rates and Taxes in an effort to streamline the effectiveness of both of those divisions, so that the functions now being administered by the two of them would be supervised and overseen by a Commissioner of Land Tax and not as is presently done by a Commissioner of Valuations and a Collector of Rates and Taxes.

The office of the Commissioner of Valuations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should be examined. You can only do this by having a short look at the development of the office as it now stands, going back to the era of Local Government, and before that to the Vestry System. Under the Vestry System where rates and taxes was one of the revenue earning matters for the upkeep of roads in particular parishes, there was a custom then for a gentleman by the title of an Assessor, who was selected, I believe, at that time by the Vestry, to seek to place in a roll a couple of bits of information, namely, the name of the owner of a parcel of land, the size of that parcel of land, and in an effort to tax that parcel of land, some type of value which was then called the rental value was arrived at.

It was done by a type of complete numerical system. There were no maps attached to the system whatsoever, you had the rate books in which the Assessor walked down the street and listed all the parcels of land as he met them in a particular order, he took the area of the land and he ascribed a value to that. That system continued into the time when the Local Government took over, and a similar system was brought into the Local Government era.

Some time in the Seventies, the then Government of the day sought to approach this in a little more scientific manner, since you were having some problems with the updating of the value of the land in disputes, and it was decided that a department called the Commissioner of Valuations Office would be set up in an effort to introduce at that time the site value system.

With the assistance of the United Nations, there were two experts appointed to Barbados. There was a Mr. John Copes from Australia, who is an acknowledged urban valuation expert, and Mr. Chang, who was then Deputy Commissioner of Valuations in Jamaica, was co-opted and brought to Barbados to take care of the rural valuation section. The Barbados Government then sought, by the appointment of some twelve young men, to train a cadre of people to administer the department, and the first effort of this department was to compile a roll under the site value system.

This roll, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was compiled slightly different, because it became a fiscal cadastre, accompanied by the appropriate maps. These maps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, used as their base maps compiled from aerial photography done for the Barbados Government, and these were thoroughly checked. Some twelve young men were selected and trained in the rudiments of drafting, in the rudiments of chain surveying, and in the rudiments of plotting by a scale an. offset rule to provide these maps.
8.25 p.m.

Barbados was divided into a series of enclosures starting from the network of roads that we have, breaking that network of roads into small portions, in most cases surrounded by what is physical boundary, cane tracks, etc. and then these physical boundaries were then indexed parcel by parcel. In the case where they were existing to their plan, they were superimposed and plotted on to the index plan. In the case where there were no survey plans, a rough measurement was made in the field.

When these were then finished, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a physical cadastral map was then passed to the Valuation Section and the process of valuing this portion of land started. The honourable Prime Minister made mention of

the fact that the Government proposes to fix the value on the Valuation Roll from the tax year 1984 and use it as compensation for any land acquired by the Government. It is specifically for that reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I may want to spend a little time on the procedure of valuation.

Valuation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seems to be the easiest thing in the world to be done by anyone. Every single person in Barbados, at some time or the other, has decided that he or she is a valuer. It is very easy for them to say that they are real estate agents. And that is quite fair, because valuation is not an exact science; and when you express, you always use the opinion of value and everybody has a right to express an opinion of value. But like everything else, Mr. Deputy Speaker, opinion of value is arrived at after a process that has long been worked out.

There are numerous cases that have gone before the Privy Council and otherwise to determine the method that should be used to determine the value. Any process that would seek to have the valuation placed on the roll would have to meet those very stringent qualities that the law Courts of Barbados, or any place, would seek to find in the affixing of the value on a parcel of land.

There are three accepted methods of valuation throughout the western world. There is the replacement method, which is usually used on buildings that are relatively young and of a fairly thick structure not in any way outlandish in either finishes, design or shape; there is the economic method, which is used in property generating incomes, and there is the market data research method.

It is acknowledged practice that any valuation should seek to have a confirmation or a check on the original value by applying at least two of these methods of valuation. I am going to spend a little time on this in order that the honourable Prime Minister would appreciate the almost impossible task that he is going to place in the hands of the Valuation Department, and that the honourable Prime Minister will recognise that, far from stopping the problems relating to acquisition, he would only multiply the problems.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is the replacement method? The replacement method states, very simply that if you have a look at the property.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again, I would like to draw the honourable Member's attention to the Standing Orders, which state clearly that debate must be relevant to the matter before the House. I have indicated to the honourable Member that the Bill before the House is an amendment to the Land Tax Act. It does not deal with land valuation at this time. The honourable Member must not infringe the rules.

I have said before that every Minister of Government has the latitude of making announcements to draw to the public's attention matters which may affect the public, but that does not mean we are discussing that at this time.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am thankful to you for your ruling. This Act seeks to combine duties and the functions previously administered by two departments into one department. Of necessity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would have to satisfy myself that the combination of these two offices would allow the Commissioner of Land Tax to function effectively in both of them, and I can only do this by seeing what are the duties given to the Commissioner of Land Tax by this Act.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am ruling for the last time that the honourable Member will not be allowed to discuss land valuation at this time.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order: I am merely seeking guidance from the Chair since I would like to make a contribution. The Schedule to this Act, on page 10, does relate to amendments to the Land Valuation Act as well, and I am really seeking Your Honour's guidance, in light of the ruling you have made, to find out from Your Honour to what extent.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw the honourable Member's attention to Section 12 of the Land Valuation Act as it is set out in this Schedule.

The honourable Prime Minister said he was making an announcement which would affect land valuation in the future. The Bill deals with the amalgamation of two offices for a specific purpose and, as I said, every Government Minister is entitled to make an announcement to draw to the attention of the public proposed changes in legislation. We are not now discussing land valuation. Members are not allowed to discuss matters which are irrelevant to the matter before the Chamber.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am merely seeking to find out. If you look at page 5, Sir, where the land valuation officer will now be sending out Land Tax Notices, under the new title, it would seem to me, Sir, that, in seeking to find out exactly how these two roles are going to be combined, it will be necessary to point out what one role is and what the other is, and to see whether in fact they can be combined.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is a Land Tax Notice a Land Valuation Notice?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The land valuation precedes the Land Tax Notice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the Land Tax Notice the Land Valuation Notice?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: To some extent, yes, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I do not rule so. 8.35 p.m.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the position as it is now is that the Land Valuation Department, in order to assist the Collector of Taxes, sends out a Land Valuation Notice. A few bits of information are placed in the Land Valuation Notice: (1) the name of the person, (2) the address of that person, (3) the area of the land to the best of the knowledge of the valuation department, (4) the value so placed on this area of land, (5) the date of the valuation of that parcel of land.

In deciding on the information that should go on this notice, which is posted to every owner of land, the Commissioner of Valuations had by a process, be it called valuation or otherwise, to fix a date as placed on that notice affixing the particular value to every parcel of land in Barbados. And to allow the Commissioner of Valuations to do his duties by affixing a particular value at a particular date, he has a staff of valuers and assistant valuers. So I need to have a look, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the function of this department to see if there would be any conflict of interest in the amalgamation of the departments so that I would be able to give my opinion as to whether there is going to be any improvement in the efficiency of the two departments.

The valuation officers, or the valuers attached to the Commissioner of Valuations, have to be assured that they are advising the Collector of Taxes, to the best of their ability, that there is vertical and horizontal equity in the particular portions of land that they are going to tax.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the main problems that the Commissioner of Valuations has had in his office is the disputes between adjoining neighbours because of disparity in the values placed on properties that have been taxed, because a tax is fixed on the particular value as given by the Commissioner of Valuations. Therefore, the Commissioner of Valuations, in his role and in carrying out his duties in providing the tax base for the Collector of Taxes, has to be sure in his mind that when he sends out for a particular enclosure or portion of land, that parcels having the same physical characteristics, parcels having the same size, parcels having the same economic viability, are such that there is some type of equality in them in order for him to advise the Collector of Taxes.

When the Commissioner of Valuations is therefore satisfied that the roll is compiled to his best ability – noting some 60 000 parcels of land – he then advises the Data Processing Unit and sends the necessary instructions for the roll to be prepared. The roll is then prepared by the Data Processing Unit, it is then posted to land owners in Barbados, and a period for objection to the valuation is then allowed, or should be allowed, by the Commissioner of Valuations.

It is particularly for this reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Commissioner of Valuations, in an effort to have justice in his work and to make sure that at the second stage of his duties, adjudication of appeals, he would be well-informed, he spends some time on his first duty, the valuation of such parcels of land. When he has heard the appeals or when he is satisfied, the Collector of Taxes is then provided with a roll, and the Collector of Taxes, having been advised by the Minister of Finance on the rate that he is applying, instructs the computer section to prepare the Tax Roll. Tax bills are then sent out by the Collector of Taxes, and he seeks to get, by way of persuasion and otherwise, Barbadians to pay their taxes.

What we are doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to see whether when we amalgamate these two departments we are going to have more efficiency in the department. The two roles are (1) determining the tax base and (2) the collection of taxes based on that. It is now proposed under this legislation to amalgamate these two departments.

What are the merits and demerits of this proposal? Let us have a look at the merits first. The merits of such a proposal, as I see it, would be to bring under the overall supervision of one Head of Department all functions in which he plays very important roles at the present time. He is the chief person in deciding on the tax base and, secondly, he provides the Collector of Taxes with that base to do the rolls. But the Collector of Taxes now has a collecting agency responsibility.

I cannot see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, any economy in scale by way of any reduction in staff by the amalgamation of these two departments, because the functions of the former Commissioner of Valuations would still have to continue, and the functions of the Collector of Taxes would still have to continue. The only immediate saving I see is where you would only now have one departmental head, and maybe you would have to have

sectional heads, as you now have, with one particular responsibility for the Land Tax section as it is.

My personal feeling is that the bringing of these two departments under one could well improve the management and, as a result, the efficiency of the new department. But we must realise that just the bringing of them together would not immediately solve all of your problems in Barbados, because there is yet another agency that would still be outside the ambit of the Commissioner of Land Valuations, and that is the Data Processing Unit, which plays an integral role as well in the overall process. So we have to have a look to see if there can be any improvement in that section by examining the situation as it is.

My first reaction is an agreement to this proposal, for lots of reasons. It would place direct responsibility in the hands of one person for the entire function, and therefore the likelihood of apportioning blame in different departments would be removed. It would be easier now for you to pinpoint one section and say this department is responsible for the complete procedure. The second advantage that I see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have said before, is that it would allow for a cross-fertilisation of the staff in the particular section that would deal with the checking of the roll for errors, and that would deal with checking the roll at the appeal section. The third one I see is that you might be able to centralise your department more than it is at present. But I have not had the opportunity to peruse very carefully some of the things to see if some of the functions that are now carried out by the Collector of Taxes would be brought along as well, and I would like to hear the honourable Prime Minister on this at some time.
8.45 p.m.

For argument sake, the Collector of Taxes, I know up until recently, also issued no licenses and he is responsible for Dog Licences. I know that the Collector of Taxes, until recently, was responsible for the road tax and that type of stuff. It would be a good thing at this point – this might have been done – if in the study that was carried out for the amalgamation, those extraneous functions of the Collector of Taxes were completely researched and, if need be, removed from the amalgamation.

The aims and objects of this Bill, I think, can have advantages, and as a result I do not think that we on this side would have any difficulty in agreeing, subject to a closer perusal at Committee stage, to this Bill coming before the House.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I recognize the need to rationalize certain departments of Government and perhaps the areas of collection of Land Tax and valuation of land for preparing a roll are ideal parts of the Government's administration to amalgamate.

I think, however, one has to be reasonably cautious in approaching the matter, because, regardless of whether it is accepted or not, neither the Land Tax Act nor the Land Valuation Act have been operating in a way to convince me that Barbadians are completely familiar with their rights under this Act. Indeed, very frequently objections to the roll, like objections to tax, are never adjudicated. It takes a long time before you can get an answer, sometimes the taxpayer is asked to pay the tax whilst there is an outstanding objection for several years, and I am deeply conscious as well that at present there are several disputes involving Land Tax where persons, I think with justification, feel that they are not liable for the tax concerned.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am aware of your ruling that to go into the question of valuation *extenso* will not be permitted on this Bill. But I think that, for the purpose of arriving at the tax, there must be some proper system of valuation. It is a mistake to assume that land taxation can be based on the same system of valuation that applies for compulsory acquisition or indeed that applies for Death Duty purposes. And if this is part of the intention of the Government, I will counsel the Government to rethink this matter and take advice on it properly.

I can conceive of the position Mr. Deputy Speaker, where a person living on the West Coast or the South Coast can find a development taking place next to him that, obviously, immediately pushes up the value of that land tremendously, leading to a tremendous taxation. That person is a "small person" who has lived there for all of his or her life, and the result of this can be that you are going to get a complete landless class in this country who are not able to deal with this position; no matter even if the percentage of the tax is reduced.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind the honourable Member (Hon. H. deB. Forde) that the Honourable Minister of Finance made an announcement which he said would be dealt with in the future. If the honourable Member would like me to refer to May's Parliamentary Procedure.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not quarrelling with your ruling. All I am saying here is that, in arriving at land tax, one has to be careful as to how one arrives at the value of the taxation, far less the rate that is applied.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What I am saying to the honourable Member is that we are dealing with the amalgamation of two offices. We are not dealing with the

method of valuation, which honourable Members seem to want to raise at this time. I want to draw the honourable Member's attention to May's Parliamentary Procedure, 19th Edition, page 421. He must speak to the question under discussion or to the motion or the amendment he intends to move on a point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I accept your ruling, Sir. This new official will have, therefore, in his amalgamated duties, to deal with the question of not only collecting the tax but finding out the basis on which the tax is arrived at. And in those circumstances, one has to be very careful that, in collecting his tax, he may not find himself with a landless class of people because of the basis of the valuation being completely wrong. That is the point I want to make.

I am not going to develop the point further. I believe that the Minister has made a statement and obviously the Government's thoughts on this point are not clear. But I will find it very difficult to support a measure such as this, and I am stating my position on it because I have seen already the changes in the Land Tax Bill here forcing small people on the West Coast and the South Coast, and in my constituency, old widows who have been living on bits of land for a long time, who cannot afford to pay the Land Tax. And they are not getting any relief, because they are told that they are living on the South Coast and they are living on the seaside! So we must be careful with it. We cannot, in our anxiety to amalgamate functions,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member must not develop the very debate that he says he does not want to develop. The honourable Member must be true to his words. If we are sticking to the Bill before the House, please let us stick to that Bill.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to accept your ruling. But I am saying that it is impossible to collect tax from persons who are rendered landless because of the basis of the method of taxation. That is all I am trying to say.

Let me move on to another point in this Bill. The development of the law of persons who have a trust, and this goes as much to a mortgagee as indeed, in my view, it should go to the Crown, is that you have a residual responsibility when collecting an obligation due to you to ensure that at least the person who owes that obligation can share in the surplus. Let me put it this way, Sir. If under a mortgage you owe the mortgagee $90 000, and your land is genuinely worth, because of its potential, $200 000, and that mortgagee sells at price, or put it at an upset price, which is so low that the sale takes place, in my view it can be upset in court.

I am counseling the Government on this area. I feel that it is not fair that the upset should be limited only to the amount of tax due, penalties and interest, when the Government would have had both the improved value and the site value on the Land Tax bill that was sent out. It is but reasonable that that should be the upset price set. If there is no sale at that price, under the Judicial Sale Act, and other Acts, the Government can go back on the second or third occasion and get the best price available. But at least they should begin at a price higher than merely the exaction of a tax.

I find that that is a subject on which I really must point out these things. It is not enough to be anxious just to collect taxation and fail to realize that there is a certain equity in dealing with these matters. Land is a very serious thing in Barbados. I am not a racist, but it is well known that very few black people have ever owned land here. Black people are now beginning to own land, and we must be very careful with the measures that we bring in this House so that we do not create a landless class in this country.

8.55 p.m.

That is all I am saying on the Bill. I hope when it is in Committee the Government will think about it, or justify to me why they need that section. But the future policy is one that I will have a lot more to say on it, and I think the policy is wrong.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When that Bill is before the House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN rose.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD rose.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I got up before you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I got up before you.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Unless I am wrong, the honourable Member (Hon. H. B. St. John) seconded the motion and did not reserve his right to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am on a point of order.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. There must be no cross talk. Is the honourable Member for St. Michael South.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: To the best of my recollection – and I am drawing it to your attention – the honourable member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) seconded the motion and did not reserve his right to speak. Therefore, he would have lost his chance to speak on the Second Reading, and I am drawing this to your attention. I would be glad if you would call for the record from the reporters, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am advised that the honourable Member did reserve his right to speak.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am going to be very short on this, because I think that, in our anxiety at this particular period of time to carry on the contention which was started earlier, we are really getting ourselves into a lot of difficulty, which is unnecessary in this particular Bill.

This particular Bill deals with the Land Tax administration, it has nothing to do with a valuation. As a matter of fact, if you check the Land Tax bill, when it comes to collections the valuation cannot be challenged at that particular point in time. That is the whole point, so therefore it is very wrong to attempt in the course of this debate to deal with the principles of land valuation. It cannot be done.

Sir, we are now dealing with the question of the implementation of the new situation where you have tried to get away from the total confusion which has been in existence from the time that the honourable Member's party attempted to introduce the new system of land taxation and collection in Barbados.

In 1972, when Mr. Pearson Scott was the first Land Tax Collector, when the honourable Member was studying or was Commissioner of Valuations, there were more discrepancies between the Valuation Roll and the roll that was sent out by the computer. The mistakes were made then, because we were coming from a system in which the same person who was responsible for assessment was responsible for collection.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Oh my, my! Mr. Deputy Speaker, under the Vestry System the same person who sent out the tax bill was in charge of the assessment. Under the Local Government system, a similar situation arose, and it was then changed in 1969 or 1972 – I cannot remember which it was – when the valuation was separated and land tax collection was put in a different Department. From then on there was always a row between the Land Tax collector and the computer man at Data Processing, the bow tie man, Lewis, or his predecessor in office.

I hope now that we have come to this logical conclusion and we have brought them together, that we will also go further and separate completely, once and for all, the computerisation of this from that other department. Let them have their own mini computer and let them deal with it themselves, because the number of valuations that we have and the number of Land Tax bills are nothing more than are capable of going in an IBM 340 at the present moment! That is what we need to do. That is the point, it must go straight down.

I want to deal now with the point raised by my friend, the honourable member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde). This is a very important point. If a person is served with notice that he owes the Crown a given amount of money for taxes; he is given repeated time and he bluntly refuses to pay; I cannot see that there is any moral injustice in putting the land up as one of the alternative remedies for sale. The basic position is that if you reach this stage, you are under no obligation at this particular stage to go further and seek to protect him when he has proven himself to be very irresponsible. There is no legal obligation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the honourable Member (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN) will give way, on a point of explanation, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If both honourable Members will discuss that in Committee where it belongs, I believe it will be better.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is the principle, Sir. I have the greatest respect for the honourable Member's legal knowledge – in fact, I have worked very closely with him and I have learnt a lot from him – but I believe that he is a little rusty on this part of the law. If he has been following cases such as Cuckmere v. Mutual Finance Company and the Standard Bank Company, he would see that the old law, which did not place a duty even on mortgagees and others, has been altered considerably in the light of the development in a whole line of cases. Therefore, it is time that people update their thinking on this. That is why you have a residual duty, and I feel the Crown has a bigger duty than the normal citizen. That is the point I am making!

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am not worried about that. The basic position is that if you have an opportunity, when the assessment is made, to object – we are dealing with the morality of it – and you do not object; when the tax bill goes out you have an opportunity to pay your taxes, but you do not pay your taxes; you are written and you still do not pay your taxes; then the Crown is entitled to use the powers that the Constitution gives.

One of the exceptions to the rule that you cannot deprive a person of his property without adequate compensation, is if the law is a law which is enforcing the obligation to pay a tax and you have not paid it. So the Constitution envisaged that in default of the payment of a tax, you can put land up for sale, and the Constitution does not say that you have to ascribe a particular price for it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member has given way, Sir. The interpretation of the Constitution on that part of the law in the *Antigua Times* case in the Privy Council says that the taxing law must be reasonable and has a degree of fairness about it. The honourable Member must know that. It is not basically what it says, and that is why I will ask the Government, again, to look at the legal implications of that section.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I think, that one must really take into consideration that you are not going out there and selling out people's land, as is the impression that is created both by the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) and the honourable member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde).
9.05 p.m.

If we send you your tax bill you have a month to pay. Instead of writing letters after letters all the time, we say that you can get a judgement and then you can use the judicial sale procedure. But this method of collecting tax was enshrined in the existing law. The problem that you had with the administration of the existing law was that you had to give a multiplicity of notices, and the Collector of Taxes drew to our attention that he could not administer the existing law because of the defects in it and that is why the Bill adverts to those defects.

We now wish to interject new principles, which relate to an obligation in relation to a mortgagor/mortgagee relationship. There is no mortgagor/mortgagee relationship! It is a strict relationship between the Crown and the citizen. And from the time there was a human being, and you had society organized, you had to pay your tithe, taxes or your toes – and there was always a remedy. You must not encourage people in trying to evade their duty.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, when this law is passed, bring the case before the courts. You cannot anticipate the judicial thing. That is a matter for you. You have your opinion and I have mine. My principle is very clear that, provided you give the person an opportunity to pay and they do not pay, you must have remedies.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very interested in this Bill before this Honourable House because of its tax implications and its objects in so far as it makes changes in respect of the alteration in relation to the collection of taxes and the transfer of functions from the Collector of Taxes to the Commissioner of Land Tax. I would therefore wish to be confining myself to the Objects and Reasons.

Having said so, Sir, I wish to make it absolutely clear that as a legislator in this country one has to be guided by certain basic principles. This is a country, Sir, where the Land Tax Act, and therefore any amendment to the Land Tax Act as set out in the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, was so designed as to strike a delicate balance between the payers of taxes and those who Levy those taxes through a delicate administration machinery.

That administrative machinery was so designed and so structured as not to have tax administration in respect of properties which would be confiscatory of the capital of the citizens of this country. And without, Sir, the knowledge of the legal technicalities, and without getting into those areas, I can quite clearly understand the point which my fair-minded and learned friend, the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), defender of the faith, defender of the poor, defender of those small landholders in this country against a tax administration regime which could be disruptive. Further, Sir, when that is reinforced by the extensive knowledge of the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W.O. Franklin), who understands very clearly how tax administration can impinge on the capital security of the smaller people in our society.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member like to come to the Bill before the House?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir, tax administration. I am dealing specifically with the impact of tax administration on the community. Only in that area; nothing else!

This Bill, Sir, deals with the Land Tax Act, which deals with the collection of taxes. It deals with an administrative transfer, it deals with the method of serving notices, it deals with certain extensions of a statutory period, it makes provision for service of process in connection with the sale of land, and it makes special provision for the issue of certificates by the Commissioner of Land Tax. I am speaking to the principles!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But it does not deal with any confiscatory matters which the honourable Member seeks to introduce.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir! What I am saying is that the tax administration is an important matter in determining that element of fairness between the Government and the people of Barbados; and, therefore, when we look at an administrative process, we have to look and see what we are administering.

What are we administering? I will submit to you, Sir, that the principle behind any form of legislation dealing with tax administration must be guided by basic principles of equity that seem fair and just to the ordinary man in the street, and I am dealing with this legislation at the level of principle of administration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want you to deal with the principle of this Bill.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir, that is what I was trying to do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What you must deal with must be relevant to the matter before the Chamber. The Bill seeks to amend the Land Tax Act for certain reasons.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is my understanding, Sir, that 6(a) deals with confiscatory procedure. Anyhow, let us continue with the question of the amalgamation of the functions of the Collector of Taxes and the Commissioner of Land Tax.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I would like to hear you on that one.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is my view that the amalgamation of those functions, whereas it is easier to administer, makes it easier for inequities to develop in relation to the majority of our citizens in terms of levies for taxation.

Over the years, we have seen a situation where, because of the disparity or the separation of the two functions, severe problems developed in terms of identifying persons who genuinely owed taxes to the Government and persons who did not owe taxes to the Government. When you made a complaint to the Land Valuation Department, they assured you that the problem was rectified. Yet, you continued getting bills from the Collector of Taxes, and they would tell you that they did not receive the information from the Land Valuation Department.

It would seem to me that, provided there is a proper internal administrative machinery going, that particular difficulty may be overcome to some extent. At the same time, the separation of the functions of the two departments allowed some objectivity in relation to the two departments in looking at their specific functions, in that the Collector of Taxes had a responsibility to collect taxes – and he normally understood what were the problems relating to the collection of taxes – whereas the Land Valuation Department had a separate function. 9.15 p.m.

When you link these two together, in the context of a policy designed to extract every single cent from the people of this country, to make a bigger and vicious attack on the one capital asset that the majority of people in Barbados manage to acquire over the years, the one capital asset in which all Barbadians have some confidence, namely, a piece of land, I will submit to you, Sir, that the principles enunciated here in the introduction of this Bill must be regarded as totally antisocial. This could only have been introduced by someone ignorant of the Laws of Barbados and totally insensitive of the problems facing many small land owners in this country!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have often maintained that legislation dealing with the administration of taxes, and such a piece of legislation seeking to amalgamate the functions of the Collector of Taxes and the Commissioner of Land Tax, should recognise that there should be enough flexibility built into the legislation so that it would not present a serious challenge to that objective which most people seek to attain in life in Barbados, that is, somehow or other, to acquire a piece of property that they can call their own.

This whole business relates back to a uniform tax system in Barbados, centred around a single ID card, which in my judgment, Sir, was one of the worst things that ever happened in this country, because it gives the Minister of Finance an opportunity to poke his nose into everybody's business by simply pressing a button and getting all this information out. I am saying that each time you bring more and more departments together, when these departments impinge on tax impositions on the public of Barbados, then an element of freedom has been lost in this country, and this is very germain and very fundamental to the principle behind this.

Sir, right on the Floor of this Honourable House recently, there was an extensive debate on the complete mess up in the department under the control of the Minister of Finance where someone pushed a button in a computer and threw 53 000 householders in Barbados into a state of confusion overnight. At that point, the honourable Minister of Finance indicated to this Honourable House that it was his intention to transfer the function of the Collector of Taxes to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue.

We were here awaiting this piece of legislation. At that time we saw it as presenting the same challenge to the privacy and the integrity of the privacy of the private landowners in Barbados. Yet, it has come today in a more subtle form, because, remember, Sir, that the whole question of land valuation at the moment deals with a whole lot of other areas.

As a property owner yourself, and an extensive property owner, and someone with a knowledge of agriculture, you would know, Sir, that that Land Valuation Department also has as its function the assessment of a levy on agricultural land. Therefore, they would already know through that department certainly the minimum amount of money that you declare that you earn from your agricultural land. That is automatically passed on to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue.

Members of this House must recognise that this is a small country and it is important that Government should not have this kind of access to the private information of people. That is information that should only be available, under the Laws of Barbados, to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. So that is a fundamental principle where I would take departure from this, this question of funnelling all tax information relating to the people of Barbados ultimately into one particular area.

There is another area I want to deal with, and this is very important. The administrative regime for property taxation in Barbados over the years has always regarded property taxes, not as a tax *per se,* but virtually as a cash flow situation for Government except for a very small minority of persons. Let me explain what I mean. That administrative regime regarded, for example, taxes paid in businesses for building, professionals and so on for the offices in which they worked, as tax deductible – and they are now deductible. But for the small person, and for the house in which you live, those taxes, which were once deductible, are no longer deductible.

So what is happening here with this kind of administrative arrangement, reinforced by this amalgamation, is that not only would agricultural property be more severely dealt with, and I am sure the honourable Minister of Agriculture would share my view that the Agriculture Levy was a foolish piece of legislation. But equally foolish, in terms of the overall needs of the country in relation to a tax administration regime that is just and conducive to the further economic and social development of this country, is the imposition of a real tax on people who, in the past, were able to contribute during the months of November and March to Government's revenue and then in April of that year, having made their contribution, be able to deduct it when they make their final returns.

Sir, rather than contemplating this kind of amalgamation for efficiency in tax extraction, what they should be doing is contemplating the amalgamation for the purposes of tax reduction. I believe, Sir, the figure has moved from somewhere like $9 million to $25 million, and I would imagine that about $20 million or so would represent real taxes, when in fact the $9 million, five or six years ago, represented probably about $1 million to $2 million in real taxes, because there are very few instances, apart from pensioners and persons whose incomes were below a taxable level, where that would have resulted in a real tax for the persons.

So 95 per cent of the landowners in Barbados never paid any kind of property tax, but they are converting this into a real tax, thus threatening people with increases in taxation and destroying the very foundation of the society, because an inequitable property tax administration regime strikes at the very heart of democracy in Barbados. Just remember that.

I have said this again and again – and many people would not think through the implications of this – that if you remove those basic pillars that have always informed people of their status in society, giving them a reason to maintain stability in the society, giving them a futuristic approach to the development of the society, and you slash those pillars from under them, the whole society will come tumbling down. I am not just talking philosophically. That destructive aspect of tax administration has occurred in many countries.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the honourable Member (Dr. R. C. Haynes) would help me, I want to be helped and guided by the honourable Member. I would like him to tell me of any country whose fabric has been destroyed because the office of Collector of Taxes has been amalgamated with that of Commissioner of Valuations. Any country! I want to study it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Paraguay. Now, Sir, I move on to the question of the principle.....

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am talking about destruction of a democratic regime through a tax administration that amounts to harassment, and that is a matter that we have to deal with.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If I told you to point out Paraguay on a map you could not put a pen to it.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Anyhow, Sir, I will not deal with the question of serving notices. I realise that the

Government wants to get on and get this Bill passed tonight, so I will sit and give him an opportunity.
9.25 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I could move, I suppose, that – the question be now put. But I would not do that, I will move that further consideration of this matter be now postponed until later in the sitting.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that the House revert to Committee of Supply to consider the Estimates.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of privilege. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am really rising on a very serious point of privilege concerning the environment under which we are functioning at this moment. As you recall, Sir, during most of the day we had conditions where the temperature was quite low. Suddenly, for some reason which I am not able to discern, this room is becoming extremely warm and the temperature seems to be fluctuating. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am drawing to your attention that at this hour .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But we have ten minutes more before we will come to the end of today's sitting. If the honourable Member will allow us to go into Committee, he would not have to complain about the environment much longer.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Let me laud the honourable Member for the most outstanding speech which he has made today, Sir.

The question that the House go into Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. There are only ten minutes left in the debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I am trying to deal with some of the questions that I have heard raised before we go home. I would just like to deal, very quickly with the matter of the helicopters once more. Honourable Members must really have a sense of proportion of this. I now understand that honourable Members on the other side thought that they had some big coup over the matter of the helicopters, and that all this talk recently about helicopters, which I have been ignoring, is based on some information which they have. I have no doubt that technical officers of armed forces make enquiries about equipment. I myself would find it inconceivable if the word "helicopter" was never mentioned in a police force. After all, the *Nation* called on the Government to use the helicopter for searching for the escaped convicts. Therefore, it is perfectly possible that enquiries are made so that the technical officers can be armed with facts when they come to answer questions from the political directorate, whether on the Defence Board or the Regional Committee. But I really must assure honourable Members that however much we might like to have helicopters – they are very useful for air/sea rescue – I absolutely repudiate any idea that anybody could ever have suggested to buy a helicopter gun ship. Not a helicopter gunship!

Helicopters are very useful for air/sea rescue purposes; they are useful for all kinds of purposes. They are very useful in transportation over a small island. No doubt speedy transportation from the airport to St. Lucy would best be effective by helicopter. But the truth is that helicopters are simply too expensive for the resources of Barbados to contemplate. It is not just the capital cost, it is the running cost. We have not undertaken any idea of the purchase of helicopters. We are even following particular training strategies in some areas to achieve what can be achieved by helicopters in those areas.

I believe that it is very popular for manufacturing firms to publish in technical journals – it is really an advertisement – that Short, Seale, Harland and Wolfe, whoever it is, have received enquiries about helicopters from – and on it goes. If honourable Members had read these things, all I have to tell honourable Members is that you must not take these things at their face value. Receiving enquiries from technical officers of any defence force about weaponry, vessels, planes, whatever, does not mean that there is anything that could be called a discussion about this equipment.

Honourable Members could no doubt, if they read the French Technical Journal some years ago, have read that the Government of Barbados was contemplating buying a vessel with a weapon system comparable to those used by the Argentines in the Falklands conflict. I could not myself remember if we were particularly offered an Exocet, but I do remember we invited a proposal from the French and the French gave us a proposal in which the weapon system would have cost much more than the vessel itself. The vessel would cost

X million dollars, and the weapon system would have cost much more than that, and it would have fired missiles that could in fact could have been fired at the Key-F, the Russian aircraft carrier, when it past the south of Barbados interferring with the airport radar. It would have been a serious weapon system.

The honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig), who has been looking at one of the technical magazines, have been pointing out to me examples of small frigates in the Chilean Navy armed with Exocets. I dare say that the system we were offered may well have amounted to that.

Now, I suspect that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) would, if he read in a technical journal that the Government of Barbados is examining proposals for a weapon system that would include sea skimming missiles with a range of 30 miles, would have doubted that we were, in fact, considering that. But yet that system, for all its cost, would not have cost as much as the helicopter gun ship.

The honourable Member should apply a little common sense. If a helicopter gun ship is going to cost £7.5 million, you must really ask yourselves: "how likely is it that the Government of Barbados is going to invest £7.5 million in a helicopter gun ship? To shoot at who – Mark Young? The *Nation* said we should have a helicopter. To do what? To deal with Mark Young? There is a point where you have to have a sense of proportion, and a sense of proportion would have defeated the little controversy which we had.

A sense of proportion must also inform our conversations on cost. I call it conversation, because I cannot call it a serious debate. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, in his customary style of desperate exaggeration, said we spent $85 million on the Defence Force for the last five years. It is easy to dismiss the honourable Member's statistics, which are nearly always false.

9.35 p.m.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member now says from his seat that he said Defence and Security from 1977 to 1984. That is eight years, remember – inclusive – and 1984 is not with us yet, and Defence and security means not only the Defence Force, but it also means the Security Guards. Remember that this Head of Defence and Security embraces a couple of hundred Government Security Guards who guard Government buildings and who now even guard schools. I was very surprised to see one in at Harrison College. Certainly Harrison College did not need Security Guards when I was a school boy there, and when the honourable Member was a school boy there.

His new statement is a very different thing from his first statement suggesting that in five years we spent $85 million on the Defence Force. In fact, from 1977, five years, we spent $43½ million on the Defence Force, but only $23 million out of that represented taxpayers' cash flow, because, contrary to what the honourable Member said about loans being raised outside that, that is not so. Out of that, only $20 million was financed by a loan that came from abroad, and it appears as expenditure only because that is the style in which we pass the Estimates. If you want a figure to which you would then add the loan, the figure would be about $22 million, not $85 million, not $43 million. That is all that has actually gone out of the taxpayers' pockets in the last five years for the Defence Force. The balance was raised in a loan on which there is a grace period, and which we have not yet started to repay.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: That includes the Trident?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That includes the Trident. The financing of the Trident, the shrimp boats and the workshop has been done by a loan which came into one pocket and went out of the other. I now know, or at least I think I know, that an effort was made during the 1981 election campaign to make the statement, made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, about the $47 million spent on defence, true, by paying out an amount of $12 million shortly before election day. I now know that during the election campaign itself, when the heat was on, a cheque was drawn, possibly one of the largest single cheques ever drawn for the payment of a single piece of equipment. So what was false at the time when the honourable Member said it would not be false in a week or two's time. That is my assessment of a certain person whom I have seen operating then and since, but that is a different matter.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Whoever it is, give them a break, do not hold that against them).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You might not know. You see, you do not know who your friends are sometimes.

The very last thing, the foreign personnel. This is in answer to the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford). This is the loan service personnel who we have from the British Army. We have three Royal Navy officers, including a Coast Guard Commander, who is also the Regional Coast Guard Commander, a most capable officer. I would like them to stay for a good time. We have just trained some young boys at Dartmouth, but it will take a few years, as you would naturally expect, for a Sub-Lieutenant to work

himself up to the stage of going through Lieutenant, Lieutenant Commander and so on. We have three Royal Navy Chief Petty Officers, we have an Army Major on staff duty, we have an Army Quarter Master Sergeant. All of these are paid by the United Kingdom to work with our forces.

The Commander of the Coast Guard, if I may mention – as I said, he is a most capable officer – was the Executive Officer of the H.M.S. Sheffield before it went to the Falklands, and I am sure he has an outstanding career before him in the Royal Navy when we do, in the end, say farewell to him. His assessment of the needs of the Regional Security Pact, to my mind, is a quite outstanding presentation which he made to the Prime Ministers who constitute the Board of that pact.

That is loan personnel. We have signed on a certain number of contract persons. Some of them have connections with Barbados or the West Indies, some do not. There are two Majors, who are engaged in staff duties, from Britain, and we have recently enlisted two Captains from Jamaica.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Honourable members will have to wait till tomorrow to hear about them. That is all I can tell you. One is administrative, one is an engineer, one is a pilot, as far as I recall.

Tomorrow you must remind me just to say something about USSR defence expenditure. I believe that we are going to have to send in the name of the honourable Member for St. Michael West to the United States Defence Department. He says he knows what the KGB's expenditures are and what parliamentary control exists over it. Nobody else knows.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir! On a point of explanation: I know we have come to the end of the time, but I cannot let him end with what he would term "an elegant lie". I never said anything about knowing what the expenditure is, I said there is a sub-committee on the politburo that oversees the expenditure. The honourable Member knows that too.

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. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m. tomorrow.

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

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

9.45 p.m.

On Resumption:

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17 stand part.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, yesterday evening the Minister of Defence did give us some information in response to our queries about the number of foreign personnel employed by, or engaged with, the Barbados Defence Force, and that information indicated that there were several persons from Britain, which has some kind of agreement with the Barbados Government to assist the Government in the implementation of its defence and security policies, such as they may be.

The information also indicated that, recently, some recruitments apparently had been taking place of Jamaican military personnel into top positions into the command structure of the Barbados Defence Force. We would like to have some further information concerning this development, because we know that sometimes in some countries, the leaders like to surround themselves with non-national military personnel because they may believe that those persons may be more personally committed to them than the local personnel. We know this is true throughout military history. This is no hearsay thing, this is true of military history if you go back into military history, both past history as well as current history.

Now, we know that that position does not apply in Barbados. I do not believe so, nor have I heard anyone say that that is the reason why we have the foreign military personnel. But the recruitments which have taken place recently, I believe, may have something to do with a question which I raised in Parliament not so long ago relating to the very weak structure at the top of the Barbados Defence Force, and in relation to the fact that,

in between the Colonel at the top of that force and the other Barbadian personnel, there seems to be no deputy and there seems to be no persons of appropriate rank in there to carry the command structure of that force. And with a structure that was so weak, I was raising the question as to how, on top of that, you can put regional security commitments on a force that was so poorly structured as far as its top personnel may be concerned.

I would like the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to tell this Honourable House and the people of Barbados what effect this recruitment from abroad will have on the career opportunities for the Barbadian military personnel in the Barbados Defence Force. Will it have the effect of restricting their promotional opportunities or not? We believe that if you interpose the foreign personnel, with all of their authority and with all the prerequisites of office, on top of the Barbadian personnel, it can very well create a problem.

Mr. Chairman, we have a major problem in this country and we had better face it, because countries are reviewing their defence policies, and the countries which are known to be most democratic in the world, from time to time issue White Papers or make major policy statements, not out of any prompting from the Opposition, but because they believe that it is the right thing to do – to take the Parliament and the people of the country into confidence. But the essence of the development of military policies in this country has been a running away by the Government from debate of these particular matters.

It was only in 1981 that the British Government itself produced a White per on defence policies and I believe it was called the United Kingdom Defence Programme – The Way Forward, Command Paper 8288, and in that Paper the United Kingdom Government set out its priorities, its options and its objectives as far as defence policies were concerned, made them plain to the British Parliament, made them plain to the British people – and, of course, who were concerned in one way or another would have to try to find out what were the implications for their country.

We must admit, and the Opposition here firmly admits, that one of the functions of a Government is to made adequate provision within the available resources for the defence of the country, but what that defence must be, what those options must be, what the different aspects in terms of deployment, procurement, weapons system or whatever, must also be subject to democratic control in this democratic country.

In that White Paper the British Government did not say these things are secret, even though they also have their Secret Service, MI–5, or whatever it is. The Minister of Defence would know these things better than I would. Mr. Chairman, the British Government said in that White Paper that it was introducing the Trident missile; it was going to purchase the Nimrods. The British Government said it was going to develop, the Harrier, in association with the United States Government, and went on to talk about systems, its commitment to NATO, it commitment in the East of Suez, or whatever they call it, and, believe it or not, Mr. Chairman, they actually made reference to their interest in the Caribbean and said what they would be doing in the Caribbean. And, you know, when these things do so conjointly meet, let no man say that such and such are their reasons!

Over the past few days we have had a number of warships, aircraft carriers, anti-submarine crafts and things like that in this country; quite a number of them at the same time. We may believe that Barbados is a very good port for recreational facilities, that the sailors and those who work on those ships may be in here just for rest, to have good accommodation for recreation and drive on the buses of Barbados and things like that. They may be in for these purposes, but when you see these British, American and Brazilian vessels in our small island all at the same time, and no kind of announcement to the people of Barbados as to how it has happened that all of them convene at the same time in Barbados.....

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Well, Mr. Chairman, when I read these things and I study the United Kingdom policies in relation to their defence programme and I could understand that part of the United Kingdom policy – I am not dealing with the United States aspect of it yet – is to make particular use of the new carriers that they were getting, equipped with the Sea Harriers and the helicopters, in what they call out-of-area deployment. They said that they were going to coordinate all of their deployment and exercises as fruitfully as possible with the United States and their other allies, as well as with local countries in which they have close defence relationship. They were going to carry out detachments and visits, and exercises – note the places – in the South Alantic, in the Caribbean and in the Indian Ocean and elsewhere.

2.45 p.m.

That is what Britain said they are going to do in the Caribbean, they are going to come inside the Caribbean itself, but our own Caribbean leaders do not get up and tell the people of the Caribbean anything. As far as the Barbados Government is concerned, we are not told how our own Defence Force, for which the people of Barbados pay, is involved in these exercises and what is its particular role in it. But we get some kind of military security pact, devised and signed in secret, and all operations carried out in secret, but still it involves the people of the Caribbean. That is the difference between a defense policy that is worked out and subject to democratic

control and one which is carried out in a country in which we are in danger of going through the forms of democracy but not pursuing the actual spirit of democracy.

We have got to do something about it. It is the function of the Opposition to ensure not only that you go through the forms of democracy, but the very essence of it. Britain have their defence policy. They came and produced a White Paper. The United States produced theirs through their congressional hearings and through their publications. But down here we have to lasso the Government to get it to come to debate military matters.

Mr. Chairman, that is really not good enough and I am calling, in the words of the Government itself, for more "open Government." Far from "open Government" we heard yesterday that the Ministers must clamp down a little more.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, in one minute.....

We want to know, because these things effect policy on a wide basis. Recently, Barbados has joined the Non-Aligned Movement, as far as I have heard. One Resolution that has been passed, or part of the Declaration in the past, has been that the countries which subscribe to that movement must defend or agree to defend the sovereignty, independence, and integrity of the Government of Grenada. I do not know if the Government of Barbados is committed to those kinds of declarations and so on, but I will be glad to hear from the Minister of Defence in relation to those issues that I have raised.

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

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this Head really in relation to the National Youth Service, but at the same time I would like to make one or two observations about the Defence Force. It seems to me, looking back at the figures over the last five years or so, that this is the fastest growing area of Government expenditure. From 1977 to 1981–82, it has increased from $1. 5 million to approximately $10.5 million when one considers that there is no real break down of the expenditure – I was not here yesterday, but it seems to me that only some heads were given – I still would like to know something more about the money which is being spent, for example, on the Coast Guard and the Regional Defence Force.

And one has got to be very careful, too, when one considers that the Defence Force, as I see it, is non-productive. Those of us who have had experience with the Armed Forces will realize that the personnel are highly trained, and therefore at some time or other they will use that training – if the occasion does not arise against a foreign force, then they will make an enemy.

If one would look throughout the world and look at Armed Forces, one would see, whether it be Cuba, Angola, Russia, Afghanistan, England, or in Ireland, that all Armed Forces look for an enemy so as to give their own people something to do. It can be a border dispute as in South America or Honduras. You must look for something for your services to do, and we are creating a problem for ourselves.

As I understand it, there are 700 men and sometimes I wonder what they do. They are not involved, as far as I can see, in any degree of sport. This is the only Armed Forces that I can see that have not even got an outstanding sportsman – footballer, cricketer athlete, you name it. So, therefore, I can only assume that most of their time is spent in training with weapons; weapons that we can do without.

I would just really like to ask the question about the Aero Services takeover, and I would like to know what the position of the pilots will be. Are they going to come in as pilots, or are we to import pilots? What are we going to do? Those are just a few observations about the Defence Force.

My main concern is about the National Youth Service and, although I could not find it possible to be here yesterday, I have been informed that some $552 000 is to be spent on this scheme under this Head. I believe that I can safely come to the conclusion that the National Youth Service falls fairly and squarely on the Defence Force. This has been a bone of contention in nearly every segment of this community, whether it be the church, youth groups, or otherwise, and we can say now it is under the Defence Force.

Now what is the Youth Service supposed to do? We have had some general guidelines given, but I do not think that anybody is convinced as yet. I believe there was some symposium or some meeting last Wednesday evening in which even some of the panelists disagreed with it going under the Defence Force. They are convinced, and people in this country are convinced, that the Defence Force is going to play a significant part in the training of these youngsters. Indeed, as I understand it, the headquarters for the National Youth Service will be at North Point, which, I understand, is the training area for the Defence Force. This means that it will be under the Defence Force and will have to carry out a number of the exercises.

I just want to go back slightly and say that in 1976, when the Democratic Labour Party thought about a National Youth Service, this party had looked at Carrington, an area removed from any Armed Forces,

for the training of our young people. At that time, a detailed study had gone into what activities the young people would do. As a matter of fact, before the plans could have been put to the powers that be, the young people themselves were consulted as to what they wanted, rather than the other way around. In this case, it is a *fait accompli.*
2.55 p.m.

Whatever is said, the plans are there. As a matter of fact, not too long ago I read in the newspaper where, I believe, the Colonel of the Defence Force was saying that all he has had is criticism, as though you cannot criticise it. I do not know why it is that you cannot criticise it. If people do not agree, they criticise, and, as far as I am concerned, the mere fact that the Colonel is supposed to make the report, and not the persons in charge of the National Youth Service, would seem to me that he has an overriding say in whatever is to be done. And that, again, is a *fait accompli.*

I believe that there is some need for a national service, but in order to understand what we are doing we must look back and see where we have come from, and what has happened over the years. There has been a considerable change in Barbados over the last 20 years. We know that the village system as it was is going out of vogue, we know that the extended family is not as prevalent as it was, we know that the strict discipline which was there is no longer there, we know that, with the going out of existence of the village system, the leaders as we perceive them are no longer living in the villages or the housing schemes, but they have set up their own terraces, heights, parks and gardens, which has created a severe strain in a number of communities in Barbados.

We have found that a few of the lower income groups have not got the benefit of leaders, and this has caused a severe problem also. The fact that many more women are working today than previously means that that figurehead in the household is absent. Women must be complimented for the tremendous contribution they have made in bringing up children, because I do not think that men are aware of the considerable contribution made by women in this society. We seem to believe that. because a woman was not bringing in a weekly wage, she was not contributing to the good breeding of the children and the men and women of today, but we are now seeing, possibly for the first time, the tremendous contribution which women made in this area.

Let me say here too, that it is unfortunate that in our society today 43 per cent of the households are headed by women alone, and when they go out to work we have a more serious problem. The answer, as I see it, is not really a National Youth Service as outlined by the Government. Of course, I have not mentioned the impact of the foreign influence, whether it is, by TV or by tourists, but that too has played a significant part in breaking down the normal discipline which we are accustomed to.

I feel that any National Service must involve the whole nation as much as possible. You cannot isolate the age group 16 to 25, because the young people that I talk to feel that they are being picked upon, that they are the only indisciplined people in this community. That is far from true. There are a lot of indisciplined people in this community outside of 25 who need to be disciplined, and therefore I believe you must look at the total country and try and get everybody involved.

What we really want for our children is to ensure that, from the time they are born, they have the benefit of a good upbringing, good surroundings and an exposure to good leadership, people that they can really follow. I believe that as far as the young people are concerned they need to have proper supervision, whether it be on the playing field or whether it is during competition.

I believe that a lot of young people need to have an opportunity to have a second chance at learning. We know that a lot of youngsters have been to elementary school and have left. They were not motivated. This is something that I will speak about later when we come to Education, because I feel strongly on these matters, especially the question of motivation. A lot of our young people need to have a second opportunity for education.

As I see it, what they are trying to impose upon the youngsters under the National Youth Service Scheme does not include this at all. They are even assuming that the youngsters who come into the service are at an educational level that they can understand the skills and therefore they will put them into skills. Whether or not they themselves make an input is not so important!

I think that the Government should rethink the idea, because you cannot take 118 people, as I understand it, out of a total of something like 60 000 or 70 000 and hope that they will change. That is so small a percentage of the number of young people that it will not even make a small dent on the surface of the problem, so therefore anything which we do must be mass oriented.

As I see it, the scheme can be full-time or it can be part-time. It can be part-time, for example, so that youngsters who are in the fifth or sixth forms, of whatever school they go to or even graduates and undergraduates at university, can make some contribution to the community during their holiday time. There are a number of youngsters in this community who are suffering from slight learning disabilities, and I am quite sure

that something could be done in the vacation periods to help them to overcome these disabilities.

I also believe that one of the problems is that in this country there are few people who are willing to supervise youngsters when they are engaged in any type of activity, whether it be sport or culture. You go to a playing field today and the youngsters are out there themselves, they are using the most foul and abusive language; there is no adult there. Therefore, I believe a system could be developed whereby people, and I am quite sure most adults would be willing to give one day a week of their time, possibly for three months, a year, three years, to make sure that the youngsters get the type of supervision they deserve. The sporting organisations are crying out for officials, whether it be cricket, football, hockey, lawn tennis or netball, and therefore I believe that any system which we develop . . . . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: . . . . . needs to have the input of as many people in the nation as possible.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, I will have another opportunity to speak on this, and I will continue when the time comes.

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

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, on Defence and Security I would like to draw to the attention of Members on the other side, and the public of Barbados, that this Manifesto of June 18, 1981 is an important document, because both parties put a document called a manifesto before the population, and in our manifesto under Defence on page 28.....

Asides.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Let me back up a bit, Sir. In 1976 we stated that we would not have a Defence Force. Subsequent to that, it became necessary, and we published a document called *Promises and Performances,* we printed 40 000 copies, we distributed them to the public of Barbados and we told the people of Barbados that though we promised in 1976 not to have a Defence Force, the events from 1976 thereafter forced our hands, and we made no apology. We said we shifted from our policy then and now we have a Defence Force.

Armed with that, we again approached the people in 1981 with our new manifesto, and if I may quote from that manifesto, Sir, on page 28 under Defence, we stated:

> "The Party has therefore established a Defence Force, with the accent on its Coast Guard wing, to provide not only strict defence protection, but also to monitor the movement of persons and things along our sea lanes; to patrol our coastal waters; to assist in the prevention and detection of smuggling and protection of our seas; to protect our territorial waters and 200 mile economic zone; to assist our fishermen and yachtsmen in search and rescue missions, and to allow our airport authorities to comply with the standards of the International Civil Aviation Organisation which demands adequate coastguard services in countries whose airports lie near to the sea."

I will not read the whole thing, but just the salient points. It continues "A re-elected Barbados Labour Party Government" – note these words, Sir. "A re-elected Barbados Labour Party Government"; this is the Gospel; it is on this document that the people of Barbados voted for us.....
3.05 p m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Crosstalk, no interruptions.

Mr. A. TRUSS: We said to the people of Barbados that "a re-elected Labour Party Government will maintain a moderate level of defence expenditure, bearing in mind our limited financial resources and our insistence that primary responsibility for law and order rests on the civil forces – namely the Police."

We further stated "A Coast Guard Headquarters, to be named Fort Willoughby, is now being built at the Pierhead, and will include extensive ship repair facilities which are generally needed in Barbados" and we talked about National Youth Service and Skills Training under Defence.

We are not fooling the public of Barbados. This is a printed document, which was circulated. Forty thousand of these were circulated throughout the length and breadth of Barbados and, to make sure that you read it, we did not even charge you for it.

Sir, Defence and Security represents between 2 per cent to 3 per cent of total Government expenditure.

Asides.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Read the Estimates. It is right here in the Estimates. Any member on the opposite side can challenge me on that. So when you talk about $50 million and $75 million, you are trying to mislead the Press, you are trying to mislead the public of Barbados. We stated that within our limitations we would operate a Defence Force, and if you can tell me that 2 per cent or 3 per cent of total Government spending is excessive, I think that you are irrational. It is not at all excessive.

The time has come when the Opposition must stop opposing the Defence Force. In Suriname we had a situation where there was a coup, and there was a coup because the military believed that if the Opposition won the Government, that would be the end of the military. I am not saying the same thing will happen in Barbados, but it happened in Suriname.

What I believe is that, even though we preach the gospel of open Government, honourable Members on that side will understand when the people of Barbados give them the honour to sit on this side at some future date, be it 1991 or 2001, that there are certain matters under security which cannot be debated in Parliament, which cannot be freely made available to the public of Barbados, because of the fact that it is the security of the island. So you cannot come in here and expect that the Minister of Defence and Security will tell all. If you play a little poker, Mr. Chairman, you must understand that you cannot show your hand, you must keep a little Ace in your sleeve.

It is my view that we must be more rational when we deal with these issues. We must not attempt to separate the military from John Public. It is important that there be a meshing of the two. It is necessary that John Public sees the military as part and parcel of this society, and it is necessary that the military see that they are regarded as part and parcel of this society; otherwise, you will have trouble.

We must stop this foolishness of trying to make cheap political propaganda, trying to capture the headlines, to give the impression to the people that we prefer to spend money on defence and security rather than on housing. You cannot relate matters just like that. It is not that simple.

I am appealing to the public of Barbados. I am appealing to professionals – architects, dentists, lawyers, accountants, business executives – to become involved with the Defence Force reserves. All over the world it is done, and by so doing you mesh the two. The society becomes involved in the Defence Force and the Defence Force becomes involved in the society, and there must be a mutual understanding in respect of the positions of the other.

If you continue to attack the Defence Force, you must alienate it. If they are working hard to protect the country and it is perceived by them that the country is not appreciative of their efforts to protect the country, you never know. Some misguided individual may go down the road and want to start a coup. It is vitally important that members of the Defence Force understand that they have the support of the public of Barbados, so this foolishness must stop. Two or three per cent of total Government spending cannot be excessive – cannot – not in today's world of politics when we know only too well that it is important for the island and our country to have some sort of military.

You may not want to admit it on that side, because you want to score cheap political points, but at some point in the future you will be on this side and you will eat your words. Time and time again, I have called for some balance in this House. We must get away from trying to make cheap political points. There is a time for politics and there is a time when you must look seriously at an issue and make constructive criticisms.

I am not saying that the Opposition must get up and agree with everything that the Government does. What I am saying is that you must offer constructive alternatives if you expect the Government to take you into its confidence, not oppose for the sake of opposing. Those days are finished! We are all Barbadians and we must put Barbados first.

If you have some substantial constructive criticism to offer to the Government, I am sure that the Minister of Defence and Security will listen, because it is in his interest, it is in our interest, it is in their interest, it is in the interest of the public of Barbados, that what we do is right. But to wrench power, from the Government at any cost, even at the cost of the destruction of Barbados itself, to my mind is cheap politics, and there comes a time when we must seriously consider that division.

I will not say that in the last 15 years the Democratic Labour Party was in power, 1961–1976, they did nothing. They may not have done as much as they should, we may have done things differently – I will say that – but I would not say they have done nothing. So why it is that, since 1976, when Members on that side speak, this Government has done nothing. We cannot do anything right, but still the people of Barbados voted us back in – and on this document! And in it is stated precisely and exactly what we are going to do, and these Estimates are proof of the pudding. We said we would maintain a Defence Force, we would not overstep our boundaries, we would stay within certain limits as far as the country can afford – and those limits are 2 per cent to 3 per cent of total Government expenditure. I do not find that excessive.

The society, Sir, if I may reiterate, must be interwoven with the Defence Force. We are all Barbadians; we must not alienate them; they must not feel as though they are alienated; so to attack the Colonel or the Majors or people of the Defence Force is useless. I understand only too well the discipline that the

youngsters of Barbados can get out of joining the Defence Force.
3.15 p.m.

Many older people will tell you, because I hear it when I am campaigning, and you hear it at cocktail parties, that the people of today, the youngsters, have no discipline, they have no direction. If we join the Defence Force and we get proper training and proper discipline, I say that is a good thing. I see that as trying to improve the standard of the individual in the country, and if that youngster at 17, 18 or 19 years of age feels that he belongs to this society, then we have a stronger society. If he feels he does not belong, he does not own a piece of the rock, as you put it, he must fall by the wayside, turn to rastafarianism, lime in the streets, become unproductive or unable to make any meaningful contribution to the society in which he lives; all these things will happen. But a disciplined society can withstand any and every thing.

I maintain that the Defence Force is a good thing, and I do not maintain that from a political stand point. I maintain that because, as a Barbadian, I see it as a good thing for the young people of Barbados, and I see it as a good thing to ensure that we are able to protect our people in the event of the Sidney Burnett-Alleynes and people of that nature who have previously attempted to overthrow this Government. Whether the Opposition wants to believe it or not is another matter. As far as I am concerned, the facts indicate that it was true.

I am also involved in the discipline of young people as a student of the martial arts and a training instructor of the martial arts. I teach and train students from seven years of age up to sixty, and I have seen a transformation in young children and young teenagers as far as discipline, respect and concentration are concerned. If you are told to do something – and martial arts is only an art form, this is not the Defence Force and you do not do it – you pay the price for it with 50 push-ups or 100 sit-ups or something of this nature, all related to physical exercise.

The Defence Force is a lot more serious, but if I can see the benefits in the young people from training them in the martial arts, which hinges itself upon discipline, then I say that, as far as I am concerned, the Government is not excessive in allocating two percent or three percent of total Government spending to the Defence Force.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am going to give my friend from St. Lucy a chance immediately, but I just want to speak in this debate, because I am profoundly disturbed by the very narrow and chauvinistic attitude of Opposition Members.

And I am ashamed of the fact that the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) should get into this House of Assembly in the year of our Lord 1983, ten years after the Caribbean integration movement, twelve years or fourteen years after our attempts at a Federation, and attack a person purely because he comes from Jamaica. That kind of petty nationalism is disgraceful, and I think the honourable Member ought to withdraw, completely, any insinuations that it is wrong for a Government, or for any institution in Barbados to recruit a person because he comes from another part of the Caribbean.

It is terribly disgraceful, it is a bit of nasty nationalism that is creeping back in this country, and the hypocrisy of it all is that many of them who speak about it, when they lie down at night, they lie down next to someone from another country.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Head as far as the Defence Force is concerned. I remember as a boy, Mr. Chairman, we had a disturbance in 1937. Then, I think, some time in the Forties we had a boat called the *Cornwallis* torpedoed in Barbados. Since then the island went quiet, everything was good.

But I would say that from 1976 it was a new era in this country. The Democratic Labour Party were in power from 1961 to 1976, we never heard of anybody planning to overthrow this country or coming here to overthrow or destroy the Lord's people. So I would say that the Defence Force is a must in this country. And it will have to be a different Defence Force from what the Democratic Labour Party used to carry on, because you will agree that in 1976 we could say that we had a Defence Force, the one that we took over from the Democratic Labour Party, and yet someone had the audacity to come here with a small boat to overthrow this country.

Since the Barbados Labour Party came to power and it regularised things and really set up a Defence Force, I do not see anyone who would come to fly in the face of Barbados and say he is going to overthrow this country.

The honourable Members of the Opposition are trying to put up a case and they are talking about $14 million. But when you compare the present position with 1975, the Democratic Labour Party Government budgeted in that day for $170 973 247, now, in 1983, the budget for the Barbados Labour Party is $501 million. Do you see the work? Do you see the improvement? This is really not a small country any more; this is a big country. This is one of the places that is rated as one of the best Third World countries. This is one of the outstanding

and progressive countries, and when you have a country with a budget of $501 million, do you think we could come back and ask for what you asked for in 1975, $923 202?

Some people would say look at the contrast, that sum was very small, but I say it was a wastage of money. Because, as you know, this was the Democratic Labour Party's way of doing things. They bought boats, and when they tried them out in the Careenage, for the first time, these same boats collapsed in the trial tests!

Now, the Barbados Labour Party has brought in boats and I have heard the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) quarrel about the massive ship the Trident. That is something to be proud of. We all remember a few weeks after the 1976 election what went on here. We had the Cubana aircraft crash, and a ship had to come down from England to measure the depth of the water to prove that it was really not in Barbados' waters. It was out of the territory of Barbados. Today we have a ship that can do all of these types of jobs.

When I see that ship passing around the coast, I feel very happy. As I have already told honourable Members on the other side, I live farthest from here, and at night going north I used to see all people on the beach and boats moored in the sea. Since 1976 I never had any luck seeing anything like that. I am sure that on those boats were people who did not pass Customs, but they used to be there, but, thank God, since 1976 I have not seen one ship moored near the Heywoods bay where people go and get water in barrels and go back out to sea. So you can see that this Defence Force is one with a difference, and it is doing a good job.

I would like to explain a few of the benefits of the Defence Force in this country. I would like to announce, and let you all know, that for quite a few years St. Lucy was one of the outstanding places for sea-eggs, which is a delicacy of the people of Barbados; the people of Barbados love them. But we ran out of sea eggs in the last ten years; we never had sea eggs in this parish, but since we had boats like the Trident and these other boats perusing the coast, the men have stopped blowing up the sea, and we now have sea eggs down there again in abundance.

Sometimes a poor fisherman would set his pots in the sea and when he went back, the fish would be blown up and dead in the pots. All of these things which plagued the fishing industry have been checked, and the fishing industry in the North has improved.
3.25 p.m.

I do not like really to mention this too often. We had a poor man in the parish of St. Lucy who built a launch for $35 000. The man could not get that boat insured, so he was sailing at risk. That boat going around the North Point and, hard luck for him, the boat capsized. A boat was close in sight and came to help. and the man put on his set and called the Defence Force, The Defence Force told that man to meet them by the Half Moon Fort beach, give them the location where the boat would be, and they would go and tow the man's boat ashore.

As soon as those men came to Half Moon Fort, and the other boat came along and told them that the other boat was such and such place, the men in the Coast Guard – well, the sea was pretty rough that day, you know – told us that we are going back to town to get the fuel and come back. Up to this day we have not seen them yet!

That was $35 000 gone. But I can assure you that if anything like that happens today, I am sure the Trident, the Enterprise, or the Excellence, either one of those boats could go and take a little boat like that in tow.

I believe that the Democratic Labour Party had a policy of wasting money at times. I would not be so ridiculous to tell you that the Democratic Labour Party has not done anything for this country. They have done well, especially as far as education. We have got to agree with that. But when you look around and see those three Defence Force boats, none of them are working now and they are only eight years old. When you look around at the crematorium up there, you see a double job. They give you fire trucks. Thousands of dollars were used to import trucks here that never went to not one fire. Now, the Barbados Labour Party has a completely different plan. When they spend money, they spend money once and for all.

Let me talk about the oil slicks in this country. Years ago, you would always hear the oil slicks coming and damaging our coasts, and we did not know what was causing it. But nowadays, we have those ships that can call up such boats, and can detect and know what is going on on the coast. Those are some of the benefits that you really can see as far as that is concerned.

This year, you can think again of the prevention of cane fires. The Defence Force men were very helpful as far as the cane fires are concerned. We do not see the smoke to dirty the people's clothes and things like that. Think of the water that we save in the country, especially at a time like this when things are fairly dry. So when you think of the Defence Force, although they will not come back and show you X dollars directly, think about the benefits to the country.

I respect the honourable Member from St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) very much. He is a very good friend of mine, and I know he is a lover of young people. But when I heard the honourable Member talk about the 700 people that the Defence Force is taking care of and trying to educate and improve, I was more than surprised, because I know he does all he can as far as young people are concerned.

There are some people who are very rough to handle, but as soon as those people go into the Defence Force, and you go to them within the next three months, you will be surprised at their standard of conduct. I do not think there is any place in Barbados, not even in the churches, that can discipline people as good as the Defence Force.

I feel this afternoon that none of us should be here worrying about who is the Colonel of the Defence Force, or where he is from. He is a human being. I remember that in the Democratic Labour Party's day, they had a Minister who was from England. Nobody ever grumbled about that, because we have all got to live together. But now it is surprising to me that Jamaica is directly in the West Indies, and there are some people still worrying about a Jamaican working here. I think we should all be happy about this goodly gentleman, and he is doing a fantastic job in this country.

When you look back to a few weeks ago, and think about the escaped prisoners, the Defence Force men were there to assist us. In the hurricane, they were there working side by side with me in the parish of St. Lucy, and not St. Lucy alone, but all over the whole island.

I am happy and proud to know that I can go to sleep tonight in peace. During the Democratic Labour Party day when they had the Defence Force, they only had watchmen at St. Ann's Fort and maybe at the airport, but they forgot St. Lucy and the whole coast around there. But, thank God, we now have security guards all around. If you come from the north, we are there. If you come from the west or from the south; or east, we are there. So you can see that this is a different plan completely, and we all should be very, very happy, and we should be satisfied to know the truth.

One thing that makes me feel very happy is the fact that the Defence Force can be organized for any emergency at very short notice. Nowadays the Immigration Officer does not have to work too hard. As I said, we had a lot of boats that used to drop people down the coast, but you do not get that kind of thing nowadays, so his job is easy again. That is one of the other benefits of the Defence Force. When you think of the Conservation Commission, they also help with that. So we all should be very proud and happy about the Defence Force.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the members of the Democratic Labour Party do not like Defense and Security. They like a play-play thing that they can run through. I am worried. I would not say that either of the members down there would do it, because there are few members down there that I really respect very much as very nice people, but I can see a few people down there that would join hands any day with a kind of coup.

Laughter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please!

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the Defence Force is something that we should be very happy about and then this is the last thing. The Barbados Government was planning to have all youngsters in this country have a skill. I would recommend that any day, because I believe that if those 700 people down there did not belong to the Defence Force, we would have had more Rastas, more criminals, and all of these are the benefits that we can say that we gained from the Defence Force. That is something that we all should be trying our best to try and encourage, and we should do all in our power to try and keep law and order in this country.

Applause.

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

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the speech made by the honourable Member who just sat down was a very nice speech to revive the flagging spirits of the Government, because the spirits of them have fallen into the depths of despair. But I do not believe that the speech he made really addressed itself to the task at hand. That is all that I have to say about that speech, Mr. Chairman.

First, I would like to respond to the statement by the Member for Christ Church East Central. The Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) in trying to discredit the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), got up and made a statement about trying for Federation years ago and the advancement that has taken place, and that we should not be now saying that a Jamaican should not be taking over a certain position in the Defence Force. I believe that the honourable Member for St. Michael South said that his information is that there are Jamaicans taking over high positions in the Defence Force. I am not saying whether that that is true or not. But Mr. Chairman, for the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central to get up and to make a bland statement, that there is nothing wrong in employing or going out and searching for any

other West Indian to work in Barbados, is really begging the question.
3.55 p.m.

You cannot leave it like that. The first thing you have to look at is if there are Barbadians who can do that job. After you have discovered whether or not there are Barbadians who can do it, then you will go out and look for a Jamaican or a Trinidadian or anyone else. That is my view, and I think it is your view as well, so I do not agree with that bland statement by the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John).

The Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss) accused the Democratic Labour Party of cheap politics in the matter of the Defence Force. Mr. Chairman, I have looked through these Estimates, and I see a conservative estimate of the expenditure on Defence and Security of $17 million this year, with expenditure on Housing, $6.4 million. Do you honestly believe, Mr. Chairman, that you can be playing cheap politics with figures like that? Some $17 million for Defence and $6.4 million for Housing? How can you have cheap politics in a situation like that?

I am convinced that persons who speak on this Head have not really gone through this Head and compared it with other Heads like Housing, but it is our job to do that over here. We have to compare the money that is being spent on one Head with what is being spent on another Head, and then we will come up with our opinion over here, so the honourable Members on the other side have to understand that that is how we operate on this side.

Not only that, it is a matter of priorities. We are not convinced over here that Barbados is in any imminent danger, that anybody is going to take over Barbados, and the other side has not convinced us that Barbados is in any danger of any invasion. They will have to convince us when they are spending this amount of money.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have had these arguments before in this debate.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I will go on, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: These points have already been made.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation: The House always turns its face against misrepresenting other Members' speeches and misrepresenting the facts. The honourable Member (Mr. H. A. Blackman) is a new Member in the House, and he should therefore be counselled against the same. I am elucidating what I have said. When he says that the country is spending $6 million on Housing and $17 million on Defence, he is very drastically and seriously misrepresenting the facts. He only had to think of the fact that we have negotiated a $10 million United States currency loan in here to realise that what is voted in the Estimates is not what is being spent on housing. He must understand that, in every country in the world, more is spent by the Government on defence than is spent on housing, because it is not the Government that builds every house in the world. He is seriously misleading the House when he says that!

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, we are here today discussing the Estimates, we are not discussing what money has been lent to the Government for the Defence Force nor what has been lent to the Government for housing. We are discussing what is in here. We can only go by what is in the Estimates.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interruptions on both sides.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I will go on, Mr. Chairman. The honourable Prime Minister, and every Prime Minister throughout the Third World, realise that the super powers – United States and Russia – are eager to lend money as far as arms are concerned. The reason is, when you have arms from the United States of America or the Soviet Union, you are tied to those two super powers, or one or the other, for a long time to come. Your spare parts have to come from them. These people are eager .....

Asides.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Of course it is a fact! You are tied to them for a long time, because if you buy armanents from them, you have to get spare parts from the same people, and they know it, and that is why they are eager. What we have to tell the United States or Russia is that we want some money but for housing and for social development. We welcome the aid, but let us get it for social development and for housing.

The honourable Prime Minister will have to realise that statesmen are felled when they cannot collect tax revenue to pay soldiers. That is a fact, it happens all over the world. He has to realise that. He has to understand as well that the Army usually sets the rules by which the Prime Minister of countries have to operate. It is all right to say that that cannot happen in Barbados now because it is only a small Army, but all armies started off small.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am going to say that when you double expenditure on social services, it is expected

that after a number of years, the output of factories and all those things will improve. When you double expenditure on defence, I would like the honourable Prime Minister to tell me what are the growth linkages between arms coming in from the United States and the civilian population in Barbados?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Certain remarks made in an exchange between Hon. L. S. CRAIG and Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered to be expunged from the record by the Chairman at this stage.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the honourable Member to speak, I will say a few words.

Recently we have been having, coming from this Chamber and from outside, much talk and much concern about the lack of freedom to speak, about democracy, about dictatorship and that sort of thing. I want to say that freedom of speech is a part of the traditions of this country and of its laws. I want to say too that the freedoms and the privileges which we enjoy in this country and in this Parliament rest on the power of Parliament and its Members to control their procedures, their proceedings and to control themselves.

The only thing we have to fear in this country in terms of dictatorship rests with the Members of this Assembly and all who come in this Assembly. As long as we are prepared to discipline ourselves, we have no reason to fear democracy or any loss of our freedoms and our privileges.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South East.

3.45 p.m.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I listened rather attentively to the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) and he was quite right when he alluded to the fact that $17 million will be spent on the Defence Force in this year's Estimates. He is correct when he stated that $6 million is allocated to Housing in the Estimates. But the honourable Member must be able to analyse what the Prime Minister said in presenting these Estimates.

Government will not be really spending $6 million on Housing. I would like to explain what will be happening in Housing to Members on that side. The honourable Prime Minister said that $1 million in equity would be made available to the Barbados Mortgage Finance Co., thereby allowing it to raise $16 million. He also went on to say that he would invite the Central Bank to lease some $30 million. In addition to all of that, the Prime Minister did say that Barbados had negotiated a Bds. $20 million loan with the U.S.A. when you total those sums, you will find that $66 million is available for Housing, $66 million in one year.

Honourable Members really do not understand. I have always said that they do not take time to do their homework. Yesterday, I invited them to do their homework.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I rise to offer that explanation, because I have heard people repeating the foolish arguments and statements coming from honourable Members from that party. I am sure that they will now have a better understanding as to what this Government is making available to housing, $66 million, and I have already explained how we arrived at that figure.

It is not fair for one to get up and convey the impression that Government, rather than finding money for housing, is placing its emphasis in the wrong direction. I hope that honourable Members on that side will desist from making that imputation, which is quite false.

I want to turn to the National Youth Service as it relates to the Barbados Defence Force. There has been a lot of talk in this country from people who we thought would have known better. They have been extremely critical of the Government's intention to pursue a National Youth Service. They talk about this National Youth Service as though it is something new, the Government is bringing something that is wrong, immoral or suspect.

Jamaica has a National Youth Service, and all developing countries have recognized that their youth should be trained, should be involved in national development, and that a sense of discipline is lacking, and those Governments have in turn addressed themselves to these very serious problems.

The honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) got up and made a very sterling speech. I am sure that if one listened to him, one would not wish to get up and say anything, because he summed up everything. He has made out a case – in legal language you will call it a *prima facie* case – for the Defence Force and any expenditure involved on that force.

I need not repeat what has been said by the honourable Member, or other honourable Members, but I listened very closely to what the honourable Member for St. James South was saying. For someone who claims to be involved with youth, the development of youth and the discipline of youth, I find it difficult to understand the point that he was making. It seems that he contradicts himself. The very purpose for his involvement is defeated by the speech he made in this Chamber today, because he knows one of the

reasons why he is involved with the youth is to inculcate in those youths a sense of national awareness.

Discipline is lacking in the youth of today, moreso than in yesteryear, and that is why we as a responsible society and leaders of this country have got to understand and address ourselves to these problems. There is no question in my mind that discipline among the youth has dwindled over the last number of years. We know that the social fabric tends to disintegrate, and we, as a responsible Government, have to address ourselves to these very serious problems.

What have we decided to do? We have decided to have the youth in Barbados involved in national development, to learn skills and be involved in the social development as well as the political development of this country. And we feel that the Defence Force, working alongside the National Training Board, which will be taking over the responsibility for the Skills Training Programme, will jointly initiate a programme that will help to develop the youth in this country along the right lines.

The National Training Board will continue to carry out the functions that it was set up to do, hence its taking over some of the functions which are presently carried out by the Skills Training Programme. But we also recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the Defence Force has got skills which can be imparted to the Youth of this country. Not only will the young people of this country be involved in discipline, which will come by way of involvement with the Defence Force, but we also recognize that skills will be made available in the programme of the Defence Force.

My Ministry, which is responsible for the Skills Training Programme and the National Training Board, is happy to be associated with the programme. Officials of the Ministry of Labour has sat down with personnel from the Defence Force. We have had several meetings and we have decided that a common programme can be worked out to assist the youth of this country.

3.55 p.m.

No one can deny that the Government has done a good job by creating a National Training Board and a Skills Training Programme, and has addressed itself to the problems which confront the country and the country's youth. What we have decided is that there are some skills which can be made available to these very youth, and at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we believe that we can combine the discipline along with the skills programme so that we can make a better youth. I am sure that all of us in here have seen reports and criticisms of our youth, and now that this Government has embarked on a programme that helps the youth with their problems, we are hearing all forms of criticisms.

I will say that most of the criticisms against the National Youth Service are political and I would also say that without any fear of contradiction. We have had persons who even sit on the National Training Board, who have political leanings and do not like the present administration, making attempts to sabotage the scheme. While I am Minister I want to warn those members who have the good fortune to sit on that Board to desist from trying to sabotage the programme of this Ministry and of this Government.

I want to put out a very stern warning, because we have got to understand that there are people on some of these Boards who come in there and, rather than address themselves to the problems and to the Skills Training Programme, try to steer the functions or the activities of the Board from the direction of the National Youth Service. If they make any meaningful contribution or any good criticisms, I am prepared to listen to them, but reading from the Minutes I can see that they are founded on mere political considerations. I am not going to stand for that! I do not think that we in Barbados can put up with this situation!

I have accepted some of the submissions of the Unions. Two unions have submitted some recommendations; they have made their observations of the programmes, because that is the way how this Government conducts its business. We are not running ahead with a national youth training programme. We have invited organisations and the workers' representatives to analyse the programme, showed them what we want to do and make certain submissions. I have read the reports from one particular union, an educational union, and I really do not agree with their submissions. They contend that skills and training should be within the ambit of the Ministry of Education, but what that particular union does not understand is that when it comes to skills training, in most developed countries that has always been the responsibility of the Ministry of Labour. And, so far as I am concerned, the union did not make any sensible or reasonable proposition.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to continue to have these criticisms, but we are satisfied with the recommendations and the analysis done by people who would like to see the development of the youth and see national development in this country, and have endorsed the development through the setting up of the National Youth Service programme with the assistance of the Barbados Defence Force. That is exactly how we see it and we are prepared to pursue our policies in that direction.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot resist the temptation to reply to some of the comments

made by the Minister of Labour. It is a fallacy to believe that the only form of discipline one can get is in the armed forces. As a matter of fact, if he were as involved in youth work as I am, he would realise that the teachers at schools are rather surprised that the cadets are no less or more amenable to school discipline than the average school boy. Talk to any teacher in any school and he will tell you that the cadets are not more disciplined in school as the average school boy, so this point about thinking that you can only get discipline in the armed forces is foolishness. The worst behaved people are people in the armed forces, especially when they go out on a binge. They break up the whole town, whether you are in the American or the English armed forces, especially if you are overseas.

We are looking at discipline in a very narrow sense, a discipline where if somebody says turn right, you turn right; or if somebody says shoot, you shoot to kill. That is not discipline as far as I am concerned. That is not what we are discussing, and to think that you can have 180 boys in a unit and that you have the whole of the country disciplined is foolishness; so the point he is making is no point.

I believe that we should look at this in a wider sense. Discipline does not mean that you stand to attention and salute somebody when he appears. Discipline has nothing to do with that at all. I believe any exercise in this regard should try to make youngsters in the whole society as totally human being in the circumstances as possible.

Talking about skilled people within the Defence Force, do you expect to have more skilled people than in the Teaching Service? If so, you can dismiss the whole Teaching Service. Then, you do not need a teaching service; so that point is a negative point; it is a non-point, so do not come to fool the people of Barbados and make them believe that the Teaching Service has no skilled people, or that the Defence Force has more skilled people than the Teaching Service. That is foolishness. If that was so, I would say to you to put all the school children in the Defence Force.

So you would have better skills training in the schools. And if you are talking about skills training, let it come under the Ministry of Education and they will give them all they want; they have got the expertise because of the experience. That is the point they are making, so I do not understand this point about putting them in the Defence Force and then they will get skilled training.

Mr. Chairman, we have a fantastic educational system in this country, so let it come under the educational system or let it come under the Ministry of Community Services. Our problems with discipline are more deep-rooted than just going into the army and shining boots and standing to attention. I would say that for somebody who has been in the armed forces for only five years, the Air Force, the cream of the crop, you will find that people who have spent too long a period in any armed force are dependent upon other people. They are so used to people telling them when to get up, when to bathe, when to eat, when to dress, when to go out, when to put on uniform, that when they come back into civilian life it is a problem.

I know fellows in the Air Force – I can only speak of the British Air Force, I cannot speak of the American Air Force – who are scared to leave the services because they do not know how they will exist, how they will be able to make their own decisions. Decisions are made for you there. People tell you when you have to go on leave, what plane, train or airline you have to catch even whether your family is going or not. It might not be so elaborate in Barbados, but I should think that, to a lesser extent, it is like that.

So we have got to be careful how we train our youngsters to depend on others to think for them. We have got to train our youngsters so that they can think for themselves, so that they can exist in a society which has become more impersonal and less personal. Probably fifteen years ago you had your mother and father who would tell you what to do. Nowadays, the youngster, at 18 years of age, is leaving and going and living on his own, and we want to train them so that they can be independent, not dependent on you.

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying for one moment that I disagree with a Defence Force. That is not what I am saying, although I would say that I do not agree with it as it seems to be going at the present moment; so do not anybody go and say that this side is saying that we will disband the Defence Force. We are not saying that. We say we will redirect the Defence Force into a more meaningful force so that when they leave the Force, they can go out and exist in civilian life.

I think that the discussion so far on the other side is too narrow as far as discipline is concerned. Discipline does not mean that. Of course, my friend the Minister of Transport and Works says he was in the Army. They only take orders; they do not discuss, so they do not understand what discipline is either. In the Air Force, if you are a Private or Commodore, we discuss what we are going to do because we are a technical force, and that is the type of thing we want in Barbados, where even a Private can discuss what they will do with the highest officer. You just do not do it because the man at the top says, "walk", and you walk. We want our youngsters to grow up realising that they can make an input if they are five or thirty-five years of age. That is all I want to say at this present time.

Applause.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Thomas has caught my eye.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there are a few points that were raised that I want to deal with shortly. One relates to the Jamaican officers. Yesterday, in closing hours of play, remarks were made about the Jamaican officers, and the expression "Green Bay" was used. To those who are not familiar with Green Bay, it is a scene of an incident in western Jamaica, where, allegedly there was a massacre carried out by members of the Army. A number of officers were court marshalled. I do not know if there were any convictions, but the matter certainly occupied a great deal of attention in Jamaica. The Green Bay Massacre is now part of Jamaican history.

Honourable Members will understand that to suggest that anybody took part in the Green Bay Massacre, is to make an accusation which is perhaps just as bad, maybe worse, than the wicked rumours which were invented for political purposes and spread against the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw).

The fact is that one of the two Jamaican Captains that have been enrolled by the Barbados Defence Force was a pilot in the Air Wing and entirely unconnected with any land operation, he was certainly not present at Green Bay, while the other was an officer in the Coast Guard Reserve, even further removed from any of the incidents at Green Bay.

It is time, Mr. Chairman, that all honourable Members of the House get right away from this Green Bay business and massacre business. There is a gentleman whom I had never heard of – I think his name is Rock, from Rock Hall, St. Thomas – until, as Chairman of a Democratic Labour Party meeting held at Welchman Hall sometime ago, he referred to our Colonel as having been involved in massacring over 1 000 persons in Jamaica. I believe that the Colonel made an effort to find out who this "Rock" was so he could hear from his lawyers. But when I was questioned, I said that I had never heard of him. I am sure he is a person of utmost unimportance, otherwise I would have some idea who he was.

We have had a statement by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) which he has had the goodness to be ashamed of, however great his braggadocio and bravado, because he has consistently got up in the House and defended, in an aggressive and powerful style, certain words which he did not use, and which would not indeed been offensive. I have indicated to all concerned that I think that is his way of saying that he was sorry for using the words that he did use, and which are in the Record of Parliament, in the Hansard. On behalf of the Defence Force and its Chief of Staff, I suppose that you could almost say that we accept his apology. He knows that he said something wrong.

But it is time that we get off this business. Not a word is said against the British officers, although the British Army, with its 323 years of existence, must surely have committed some massacre somewhere. But not a word is said against the British Army! But the Jamaican Army, because of an unfortunate incident in the middle of civil unrest and turmoil that left 700 slain found itself involved in an operation, that was not, perhaps conducted in the highest tradition of military forces, and we have Members raving on and on. I will join in what the honourable Deputy Prime Minister has said and deplore this discrimination against Jamaicans in this matter. The Jamaican military forces have the most ancient and the highest traditions in this part of the world. The West India Regiment was firstly raised in Jamaica. The first battalion in 1977 consisted of Jamaicans, and people have forgot that the West India Regiment was not part of the local forces. It was always a part of the British Army. Its ultimate position in the British line was 110, at the end of the line admittedly, although the Rifle Brigade, I believe, always insisted on taking the left flank. But that is a minor piece of military history to suggest to the honourable Member for St. Michael West that I know which end of a gun carries a bayonet.

The Jamaican military tradition is well exemplified today in the quality of its officers and its relentless determination to be subordinate to the civil power in the face of all temptations. There can be few countries where armies would not have intervened in the circumstances which existed in Jamaica in 1980. Very, very few countries would have not seen a military coup, and, as far as I am concerned, if we want officers who can share in the best military traditions, we could do a lot worse than go to officers who have served for sometime in the Jamaican Army.

I also deplore the constant reference to Barbadian soldiers and the dangers of the Defence Force and so on. I would have thought that Barbadians in the Caribbean were second in military traditions only to Jamaicans. The Second Battalion of the West India Regiment comprised only of Barbadians. Barbadian soldiers have gone all over the world over the years. They have fought bravely. They have never, so far as I know, been involved in coups and disturbances. There was a Barbadian Brigadier General in the Jamaican Army, Brigadier Mascoll. I am surprised to hear from an ex-soldier, the contemptuous attitude towards the Defence Force that I am hearing from the Opposition benches.

Barbadian soldiers today are not only in our Defence Force; many of them serve in the British Army, many of them serve in the American Army. I am told, indeed, reliably, that there were Barbadian soldiers in

every unit in the expeditionary force that went to the Falkland Islands except, of course, the gherkers and the guards. But in every ship, the assayers, the engineers, in the infantry, they were Barbadians. Evidently, Barbadians can go to England and join the Army without there being any danger of overthrowing the Government of Great Britain, but they cannot stay in their own country and join the Army without our hearing the time-worn arguments about the dangers which an Army presents.

Police forces overthrow the Government where they have to. People forget that General Torrigos of Panama was a General of Police, not of the Army – the Police Force in the Seychelles, the Police Force in Costa Rica has tanks, it is organised on the same basis as the para-military colonial Police Forces of the Caribbean and has the same capacity as do those Forces to overthrow a Government. The English Police do not carry rifles, they are not trained in rifle drill; they do not march, they are not trained to march; they do not have Sergeant Majors who tell them, "left, right, left, right."
4.15 p.m.

People do not understand that the Police Force is as much a Defence Force, in the context of small colonies, as a Force wearing khaki and carrying guns as part of the uniform. Instead, we try to alarm the public and try to alienate the Defence Force by these constant assaults on their dignity and their integrity. That is what we are doing when we put up these cases!

I gave a figure for the Defence Force which has been grasped at by the Press as implying that all of the numbers I gave are full-time. It is not a fact that there are 700 full-time people in the Force. I should point out that the figure of 700 which I gave included the reserves. I am not giving any further breakdown, but I mention that. I should also mention that there are over a thousand cadets who are all in the strength of the Defence Force.

As far as spending is concerned, honourable Members have gone on and on about the expansion in the spending. Current expenditure of the Defence Force since 1977 has increased by $10.2 million, current expenditure on the Police Force over the same period has increased by $12.8 million; it is more than on the Defence Force.

The Police Force has rebuilt a station at Station Hill, has had a new station at Oistins and is planning for a $16 million new headquarters in the general area of Highgate, Wildey, and so on. The Defence Force has had $20 million in naval equipment spent on it, so it is not even fair to characterise defence spending as being particularly exceptional against Police spending, and indeed other spending areas of Government.

If you really want to see an area where spending has expanded, you can look at this same Head of Defence and Security. The Security Guard force has expanded from really quite a small number of people to over 200. There must be over 200 in the books, although there are not all employed at any one time. The Security Guard force also has a reserve in a sense, it serves as a recruiting area for other security systems, because whenever you are going to train a man as a Security Guard and he is any good, you find him in another uniform.

When we hear somebody, who claims to have special knowledge because of his military service, criticising the Defence Force, and on the one hand he tells you how you learn nothing in the Air Force, you can do nothing for yourself, you are afraid to leave the Air Force at the end because you cannot come back to civilian life, and at the other end of his speech he says how in the Air Force "We were technical people, we were in a technical force, and from Air Commodore back down to Private we held discussions to ....."

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member is not in his place and I think the Prime Minister misunderstood what he was saying. He did make a contrast between the other Forces and the Air Force. When he was talking about not being able to think for yourself, he was talking about the Army. It is when he went to the technical part that he talked about himself. I do not think you should misread him.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Until now, I have wondered on which side the honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) was. I now know! He is not on the side of the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), because the honourable Member for St. Michael West is inviting me to underline that, specifically, the honourable Member for St. James South was speaking of the Air Force because he used the words: "I know fellows who are afraid to leave the Air Force." They are the very words that he used, because he said they could not think for themselves. He has confirmed for us, Mr. Chairman, since he was apparently drawing on his own experience, our opinion of him when he indicates that for five years he was completely thoroughly trained in a discipline where you did not have to think for yourself and you lost the capacity to think for yourself. I dare say that it is not only the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) and myself who have well recognised this in the honourable Member for St. James South.

I think they are the only points I have heard raised in the debate so far, and that is my interim comment on them.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with some degree of alarm. I have heard statements to the effect that the establishment and the maintenance of the Defence Force can be justified because it could help in the hunting down of prisoners, because it can help in restoration of sea eggs to the north of the island, because it can help in controlling the burning of canes, etc. But I think that contributions of that kind should be ignored when we are dealing with a matter that has current and future implications not only in expenditure, but also in respect of many social factors in this country.

Those who seek to emphasise the importance of training under a military regime, as distinct from training under civilian agencies, should well look at the experiences of those many young people who have served in Vietnam, in Korea, and in many conflicts since the Second World War. There have been many social studies done not only on American citizens but also on those citizens in the countries which were highly militarised during those periods of conflict, and what happened to those persons who had such excellent training during that period, such wonderful discipline.

You would be surprised to know that the findings, in many instances, would indicate a completely different picture from what one would have assumed would have taken place in respect of persons who have had the benefit of that kind of disciplinary exposure. In the United States there has been considerable concern over the high incidence of crime, for example, among those youths who were drafted, who were trained and who had participated in the Vietnam episode.

I just mention this to point out that we know in Barbados that the civilian authorities are quite capable of training our youth to an acceptable standard, that they have done this over the years successfully. So when we launch out into an area that involves massive expenditure, then there must be a better reason than the training of youth.

4.25 p.m.

I understand why the honourable Prime Minister would seek to bring in senior officers from outside Barbados. I believe the first person who really expanded on this area quite openly was the late Sir Alexander Bustamante himself, who made it quite clear that he had no intentions of having all his senior officers in Jamaica being Jamaicans, for a very good reason. If they are all Jamaicans, or if they are all Barbadians, they may find themselves caught up in the social and political problems of the country and likelihood of a coup would be further enhanced.

So all the honourable Member is doing – as a matter of fact, he told me so some time ago – is ensuring that the upper levels of the Army would be kind of neutralized, that you have some nationals and you have some non-nationals and so on. You can play one off against the other in that sort of situation, and that, in his view, represents a safety valve. That is an indication that he, too, shares the same kinds of concerns which we share in relation to the development of an Army in a small country of this kind.

So that is a philosophy which is well known! As a matter of fact, I can think of at least three Barbadians, two professional, one non-professional, who were high ranking officers in the Jamaican Defence Force as part of the Bustamante policy. That was done to help protect the Government and to ensure that you have people in there who are not Jamaican, and who would probably be less inclined to be involved in a coup related to domestic, social and political disturbances.

I am irrevocably committed to the view that there was no need for Barbados to embark on this kind of expenditure in relation to the Defence Force, that the money should be spent on a Police Force and, in my judgement, you can have a special branch of the Police Force dealing with Coast Guard duties and maybe to assist in the kind of external assault that you are thinking.

Let us face it. If you spend $200 million and you had any serious attack on Barbados, there is nothing you can do about it! As far as external factors are concerned, you are talking about dealing with probably a small group of mercenaries. Numbers do not matter in that situation, it is the efficiency of the people. The attack by the Israelis on Entebbe Airport in Uganda is a classical example of what two or three highly trained people can do, they can completely mobilize a major Army.

As far as external aggression is concerned, we do not need to have to spend this kind of money to have to deal with that. If you get a major invasion by Russia or a country like that, there is nothing you can do about it. It is as simple and straightforward as that! There is nothing you can do about it.

If you are trying to deal with Sidney Alleyne – let us assume the honourable Member is correct and that Sydney Alleyne was planning to invade Barbados – I doubt very much if we should commit ourselves to.....

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES at this stage were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Under the Head of Defence and Security, from 1977, taking in the year 1983–84,

there is $36.27 million, Capital, on Defence and Security, $55.7 million, Current, under Defence and Security. So I would wish to amend the figure of $85 million and replace it by $91 million.

These estimates are about the allocation of resources in this country, and when we are dealing with current Estimates, you have to look and see in those Estimates what has been the pattern over the years and what will be the pattern for the future. I would invite honourable Members to very seriously consider this.

If you look at Current Expenditure under Defence and Security, you will see that this has leapt forward from $1.7 million in 1977 to some $16 million this year. It went from $1.7 million to $2.4 million, to $3.4 million, to $8.3 million, to $10.4 million, to $13.4 million, and for 1983–84, it is projected to $16.1 million. The same pattern shows itself in relation to Capital Expenditure: $220 000 in 1977, $310 000 in 1978, $1.74 million in 1979, $12 million in 1980, $12.82 million in 1981, then a dramatic drop in 1982 to $5 million and in 1983 to $4.6 million.

The point I am making is that there is a dramatic disparity between the growth in current expenditure on Defence and Security in relation to the capital expenditure. What is happening here is that this Government must have committed this country to a substantial amount of loans in respect of Defence and Security, and the people of this country should know not only how much money has been spent from year to year, but how much more commitments have been made.

We are getting a increased slice of the cake, in terms of current expenditure, being devoted to Defence and Security, and this is a result of the need to reflect a significantly increased capital commitment on the part of this country. So if you see $24 million in capital there, or $30 million or $36 million.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member really has all the force of a torrent falling on a brick stone, and I have contemplated whether there is any point in elucidating and contradicting. Such a torrent of untruths come out that to go on contradicting is beyond my powers.

But the fact is, there are no loans. The loans would have to be subtracted from the amounts he is mentioning, not added! There are no loan commitments over and above what appears in the Estimates. The two amounts of $12 million which he gave for two years do not represent cash flow revenue, they represent the loans. There are no further loans, no commitment to loans. We are not even paying back the loans at present time.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The amount of money is there. It is not shown as being paid back because it is shown in Capital. The money has been borrowed and it has been put into Capital. The honourable Member knows perfectly well that there is no $85 million, no $91 million, no loans, nothing at all except scare tactics, the tactics that helped the Democratic Labour Party lose the last election; lies and untruths. The honourable Member knows all that perfectly well. To reach $91 million he has to include the Immigration Service as well, because all of that is under Defence and Security.

4.35 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am not taking any chances in trying to break down the Head of Security, because when I look in the notes there is an overlap between what appears for the Defence Force and, sometimes, what appears above the note for the Defence Force. I am not going to be trapped in that; I want to present accurate information to this House, and the accurate information depends on a comparison of the global amount spent under Defence and Security.

We would never have had this problem if the honourable Member had at all times come to this Honourable House and told us what he planned to spend and what he planned to spend it on. I would like.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt at this point, I have heard the honourable Member speaking in this debate under this Head and I must warn the honourable Member that he has been repeating much of what he has said earlier. I do not wish to stop the honourable Member. Please continue, but be aware of these repetitions. I cannot have them.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: My recollection, Mr. Chairman, is that I spoke about helicopters last night. Anyhow, Sir, I am not satisfied that there is not a pool of money somewhere out there out of the commitments made by this Government in relation to those people who sell military hardware to this country. I am not satisfied that when you look at the growth in Capital Expenditure and the corresponding growth in Current Expenditure, there is a reasonable correlation between the two. It is a simple accounting method, and the only way it can happen is if the Defence Force was doing exactly what the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) said they were not doing, that is, buying a large amount of bullets and just shooting them off day after day. He has assured us that we have not committed ourselves to that kind of expenditure, therefore I will assume that there has to be some logical relationship between the growth in Capital Expenditure and the growth in Current Expenditure.

Sir, even if you were doing it – let us assume that there are 200 people fully employed as security guards and let us assume they were getting an average of $10 000 a year – it still could not account for this growth in Current Expenditure. That is my job as official spokesman for the Democratic Labour Party on matters of finance. It is my duty to look and see how financial resources are being allocated in this Parliament and to make some suggestions, and my suggestion would be that you drastically cut back on your financial commitments in military hardware, that you divert some of that money to the Police Force. The greatest threat to this country now, and any time in the future as I see it, would rest on matters of internal security. Forget this whole idea of having a Defence Force that is kept to meet a major threat, because if you are going to do that, the money would be wasted unless you go into massive military expenditure, and you just cannot afford it.

So you have to have a rational policy of security which is within the context of your resources. And there is no point going off half-cocked in this direction spending $91 million – the honourable Member does not like $81 million – and end up with a Defence Force that is largely a waste of money and then you have to try to justify the Force in relation to doing non-defence activity like protecting sea-eggs, catching persons, supervising the Fire Service and trying to put out fires in Bridgetown and that kind of thing.

This is the kind of area you have to concentrate on, and I am very glad that last night I was able to corner the honourable Member and force him to admit that he had abandoned the attempt to purchase high powered helicopters because they cost too much, £7 million each.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am really not going to, not while I am present, have any more lies told. I did not say anything about abandoning a purchase. There was never any question of a purchase. There is a difference between knowing anything and abandoning. If the honourable Member cannot master the English language, he has to be taught.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, apart from the antics which we obviously are going to get for comic relief, I want to make the point that the Prime Minister a few moments ago in a very soft and low voice, which is very indicative that he wishes the Press to take what he is saying verbatim to the extent that they can, so that it can be published and so that he can be seen as representing the real and genuine position of Barbados – and he was all love and sweetness concerning the issue of the Jamaicans – talked about the West India Army.

He went back to the Army of the 18th century, and to really hear the Prime Minister, he was all love and sweetness, and was indeed into a lecture on how nice and polite and cute we ought to be in the face of the favour which these distinguished Jamaicans would be doing us to come here and share their special expertise. He said that we were.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable Member intend to repeat the Prime Minister's speech?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: To the extent that I have to destroy it, yes, Sir.

The honourable Member went on to say that we really ought not to talk about Green Bay, because when we do we tend to give our boys in the Army the impression that we are equating their activities with what happened at Green Bay, a very unfortunate incident, and he went on *ad infinitum*.

Mr. Chairman, this is very dangerous. The reason it is dangerous is that it gives the impression that on that side is the side of the angels and over here are the Lucifers; all we do is to criticise the Army left, right and centre; and we hate them personally, and we therefore spend our time relegating them to the lowest round of the social ladder in Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing farther from the truth. The fact is that it is a disgrace that a Prime Minister or a Government can allow itself to get into a position where it wishes to demean its own Commanding Officer by suggesting that any criticism of the Government policy on defence is firstly a criticism of the Army *per se* and, secondly, there is an implied suggestion that any time you criticise the Army you are, by definition, criticising the personnel in the Army. I say that if the Colonel of the Army in Barbados was made of that stock that one could not criticise the Army without being seen as being personally against the Colonel or anybody else in the Army, then he would not deserve to be Colonel of any Army.

Mr. Chairman, he went on to suggest that I have been apologising for a statement I made. And, as Commander of the Army, apparently, he was very generous and he gave me absolution, like the Pope he is, for the statement I made against the Colonel. Mr. Chairman, I have more respect for the Colonel as a person than I have for the Prime Minister, and I will tell you why. I did not know the Prime Minister until I came into public life and so I have to judge him on his behaviour as a public person, and my judgment of him as a public person, well, I do not have to go into. (I see you are immediately reaching for the microphone. I am not going to say what I think of him as a public person, so that you would not have to stop me.) But I have known the Colonel of the Army from the time I was

seven years old. I played and pitched marbles with him in St. Joseph at the bottom of a hill in Chimborazo. So when you people try to give the impression.....

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I used to play with dollies, okay.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order! Order Please!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I may have played with dollies, but I gravitated to playing with other things. You never used to play with dollies and look what you turned out to be.

Laughter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order; order please! Let us get ahead with the debate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is this.....

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, I was a choir boy at the cathedral. I was a soloist at the Cathedral, and everything they can say on that side about me, I can say it about you four times. All you have to do is risk to say it and let me give chapter and verse about you. It is easy. When it comes to that kind of play. I am good at that.

Sir, what I want to say is that the Government and the people of Barbados have to understand that the Opposition party, or any person in public life, has a right to criticize the Army, police, Government, teachers, or anybody who is spending the taxpayers money.

There is more to it, Sir. We on this side have been criticizing the attitude of the Government.

At this point certain remarks made by Mr. B. M. TAITT were ordered expunged from the Record by the Chairman.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You see, Sir, this attitude of their getting up and trying to give the people of Barbados an impression needs to be dealt with at their level. The people of Barbados need to be told. I am not embarrassed about the fact that I criticise the way they have spent money. When we were running an election and I said they had spent $50 million, the argument which the honourable Member is using now to counteract the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is the opposite to the argument they used to prove that I was a liar. Mr. Chairman, you well remember they said in the newspapers that I had included the commitments, and they called me a liar.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Defence and Security.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It was on Defence and Security. They called me a liar when I said that they had bought the Trident, and when I sought to see what the price of the Trident was, they said that I was a liar. The Barbados Labour Party and the Government Information Service published information, and the Defence Force published information, and they never said the amount! They said look at page this, page that and page the other. Now he comes and use the opposite argument to answer the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. Either he was mistaken then, or he is mistaken now. He cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time.

The honourable Member have used the Estimates to come to a conclusion about a figure of the amount we have spent. He can spend the rest of the year convincing the people of Barbados that the figure is wrong in detail. What he cannot convince the people of Barbados about is the principle concerning the amount you are going to spend on your Defence Force in pursuit of a principle which has been adumbrated by the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss), who said, from reading his manifesto, that in 1976 they were of one opinion, but by 1981 circumstances had changed. What are the circumstances? Quoting from *Promises and Performances*, the circumstances they have always trotted out to the people is Sidney Burnett Alleyne. That is all they have ever suggested.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: A friend of the Democratic Labour Party).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: And the friend of half of the Barbados Labour Party. Sidney Alleyne has more friends in the Barbados Labour Party than he has over here.....

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You gave him a license for other things.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Of course, I gave Truss a licence for cement, too. I gave everybody a license for cement. It was easy. You did not have to do anything. If you came in and said you could bring it in at a certain price, you got it.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please.

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of order, Sir: I would like to point out that I never at any time imported cement into this country. I never had a license. I know

that Sidney Alleyne got licenses from a bank and cement. I never had either one.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I was not talking about the honourable Member. He did not have a license for the one-armed bandits either. What did you get up for?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Defence and Security. This is all very irrelevant.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: This is not irrelevant, Sir. It has to do with the threat to security.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is my finding, please. Now continue.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The threat to the security of Barbados has been said by the Government to have been exemplified by Sidney Burnett Alleyne. That is what led the Government to change its policy and come to have a Defence Force whose main thrust, according to these Estimates, is administering the security aspects of the country; that is, checking on various foreigners visiting and living in the island, screening of prospective immigrants for foreign governments, screening applicants seeking employment in the civil service, processing of applications for the importation-exportation of fire arms, and security matters. And the functions under the subhead for Defence Force are: defending the country from foreign invasions and attacks, patrolling the coast line for smugglers and other illicit activities.

Now Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting thing. If, in fact, they could demonstrate that the cost of the Coast Guard has escalated to the point where they are forced to spend this kind of money – the honourable Member said last night that of the $12 million, $6 million is to pay the cost of wages and salaries. At $6 million for 700 men that is $10 000 per man. He says today now that it is not 700, that that includes the reserves, but he will not give us the amount of people.

I do not know what is this big secret that we can have in Barbados that he cannot let us know how many members have to be paid. If we had a Committee of this House that was overseeing the expenditure, I could understand his withholding the information from the whole House and giving it to the Committee. If the honourable Member over here, who is responsible for shadowing Defence and Security, could say to us, "I know what the number is, but for security reasons I cannot tell you all," we would be satisfied because we would trust his judgment.

But he cannot tell us how many people there are in the Defence Force because the enemy might hear. What specious nonsense are we talking about in a society of this size? What threat we have from foreign invasion?
4.55 p.m.

As to this business of patrolling Sir, you heard him say, for the first time, that he is going to allow the ships to put out to sea. He sought to suggest that he took the advice of the honourable Member for St. John, (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) and so they were going out to sea. So, in between before he took the advice and when he took the advice, the ships were not going out to sea, and what patrolling they have been doing, therefore, has not fulfilled the objective.

It is still true that a substantial amount of illicit and illegal goods come in on the west coast of Barbados. It is still true that the police are having their hands full trying to deal with certain aspects of the security of this country as it relates to drugs and other similar activities on the coasts of Barbados. It is still true that the ships that dump their wastage on the east coast of Barbados are still doing it. It is still true that the east coast of Barbados is suffering from the results of the oil tankers washing their tanks on that east coast.

And when we look at the total expenditure for the Defence Force we are not even able to determine how much of this is being used by the Coast Guard. We are not even able to justify our position for spending this expenditure by saying that a substantial amount of it is being used to do the only legitimate activity, in the context of what they have said, which would make sense to average and ordinary Barbadians.

When we purchased the original vessels, those honourable Members over there ridiculed the Coast Guard. Barbadians must remember how the Barbados Labour Party, and in particular the Prime Minister and other honourable Members, ridiculed the concept of the Coast Guard.

(Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: The building of the headquarters at the wrong place).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I accept what the honourable Member says, that his objection was that the headquarters was built the wrong place. I am sure his colleague next door to him might not agree with him, since that error has resulted in substantial benefit to the honourable Member by way of improvement of the quality and the value of his property. I do not think the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) is going to quarrel about where the Coast Guard headquarters was built at all. But that is beside the point, Sir. The point is that they criticised the Coast Guard vehemently. They went up and down the length and breadth of this country and they told the people that we were wasting their money.

Now, they come like latter-day saints and they are patrolling the coastal waters and the 200 mile limit. Mr. Chairman, the 200 mile limit argument, as it is used by

the Government, is really unfair to the population. We passed a law in 1978 in which we said that we were declaring a 200 mile economic zone. That is about the most we could do, Sir. This business of the suggestion that we patrol a 200 mile zone is unfair to the people of Barbados, because we do no such thing; we can do no such thing. Even countries with large fleets are unable to effectively patrol a 200 mile zone. What in essence we do is to patrol the waters around the coast. We hardly go more than the three miles out that we used to go before. We sometimes manage to go into the Grenadines, and occasionally we go to St. Lucia.

And I am yet to find out from the Prime Minister, in a definitive statement, what right the Barbados Coast Guard ships had in the waters of St. Lucia during the elections in St. Lucia. I am yet to find out from the Prime Minister if, in fact, the Defence Force of Barbados was put on alert during the elections in St. Lucia. I am yet to find out from the Minister responsible for Defence and Security why he put the Barbados Defence Force on alert when there were elections in St. Lucia, and if that forms part of the military pact we have between Barbados, St. Lucia, Dominica, Antigua and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. I am yet to hear that!

We have listened to hear from the Minister of External Affairs, or the Minister of Foreign Affairs, or the Minister of Defence and Security, and we have had a total deafening silence on that particular issue. What we have had instead is the announcement that they have signed a pact between the four or five countries.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that what the Prime Minister is doing is playing with fire. It seems to me that, despite our announcement that we have joined the Non-Aligned Movement, we have taken a firm decision, which has not been vouchsafed to either this Parliament or the people of Barbados, to entrench ourselves. And I say this on the basis of a conference attended by the Head of our Army recently in Latin America, let me go no higher than that, a conference of the Heads of Armies of Latin America and Washington, perhaps in Washington, at which it was decided that we would form one area of defence. And Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and Security owes it to this country to tell us: "We cannot tell you about it because it is highly secret, or we are going to tell you about it, and the details are as follows."

Mr. Chairman, I will speak again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It seems as if you are getting ahead and may well be ready for Foreign Affairs.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to make a small contribution to this debate on Defence. I am a little at a loss as to what the Opposition's views really are, whether they are against the establishment of the Barbados Defence Force, or is it the fact that the Government has established a Defence Force during its administration.

My contribution mainly would be to support and congratulate the Government for the insight in having established on behalf of the people of Barbados what they termed in the 1981 Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party," a limited Defence Force with the capacity to withstand the immediate assault of potential marauders, terrorists and mercenaries." I believe the Government should indeed be given a plus for that insight.

Just a few weeks ago, Barbadians from every stratum of society were concerned about a rumour, which unfortunately went on the air waves, that two feared criminals were again at large. It was unfortunate that the media did not check to ascertain whether the story was factual or otherwise, but the news put Barbadians in a general panic that "Buddy" Brathwaite had escaped from the confines of the prison and was at large. You will remember also, Mr. Chairman, the uneasiness that your constituents felt, and all Barbadians felt, for that short period of time until the facts had been ascertained that they were really not at large, but safe in their cells at Glendairy.

My point is that the people of Barbados sensed a feeling of relief during the escape of Mark Young and those other escapees when the Defence Force in concert with the Royal Barbados Police Force mounted an island-wide survey to recapture those escaped criminals from Glendairy. It was not an uncommon thing for motorist to be stopped not only by police but by members of the Defence Force, and that in itself gave the people of Barbados some comfort that, to some extent there was a reason for the establishment of the Defence Force.
5.05 p.m.

The unity that was apparent between the Police and the Defence Force in trying to track down two of the most feared and wanted criminals in Barbados, justified, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, one of the main reasons that Barbados should now have a Defence Force. That was the scene; wherever you went the police and Defence Force personnel were in pursuit of the criminals. I think that, in spite of what the Opposition might be saying against the establishment of a Defence Force, it indeed serves the people of Barbados.

On March 13, 1979, Grenada had a coup where the Government of Sir Eric Gairy was overthrown, and this ushered into the history of Barbados a sense of the need for the countries of this region to be better equipped in relation to their defence and security. Since that day, the history of the Caribbean, the peace of the Caribbean, has changed, and the Caribbean will never ever again see the

tranquility that existed prior to the Grenada coup of 1978.

I was one of the persons who applauded when there was an overthrow of the Government, but we never anticipated that that Government would have been replaced by a Government which has turned out to be one against the common people. If that country had the mechanism of a Defence Force at that point in time, Sir, I am sure that we might have been able to reverse our history.

Let me get on to some of the main complaints by the Opposition in relation to the establishment of a Defence Force. The Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) sees it in the light that some $60 million is being spent on Defence and Security in the Estimates this year which is, he says, a substantial increase over the initial amount which was voted in 1977. I do not see it in those terms. I feel that Barbados has a right to protect the people of this country and no money is enough to spend on the protection of the people.

When the British had responsibility for the security and defence arrangements of all the territories of the Caribbean, I suppose the British on the mainland would have been criticized for the amount of money being spent on places like Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados and all the other Caribbean Islands. I believe that the Government of the day would have been under great tremendous criticism for having to put large sums of money into their Budget for the protection of the territories.

Now that we have the responsibility for self-rule, now that we have attained independence – and independence to all of us means freedom; freedom from domination, from overseas colonists, freedom to self Government, freedom to look after our own destiny – is it unreasonable, therefore, for this Government, which has the interest of the people at heart, to provide, as we have said in our Manifesto of 1981, a limited Defence Force for the protection of Barbados?

The Opposition wants to say that John Banks and Sydney Alleyne are just figments of the imagination. I do not really believe, Mr. Chairman, that those two gentlemen should be dismissed so lightly. Sydney Burnett-Alleyne and John Banks made an effort to overthrow the legitimate Government of Barbados. Had it not been for some information from friends of Barbados that a plot was being planned, I believe the history of Barbados today might have been written from a different angle. And we cannot dismiss the fact that there are many more like John Banks and Sydney Burnett-Alleyne out there trying to destabilize and overthrow the Government, hence, any money spent on the defence of Barbados for the people of Barbados, is well spent.

I submit there are problems which the country is facing in relation to housing. I submit that the people of Barbados need better tenantry roads and other infrastructural developments to make their lifestyles happier. But I also feel that what is being voted for in these Estimates for the defence and security arrangements for this country is a mere miniscule amount of what the country can afford.

The United States Government once operated a naval facility at St. Lucy. That facility offered us some kind of protection, because we felt assured that as long as the Americans were in Barbados, nothing would happen. I felt so personally. I do not know if it was the feeling of other Members, but I felt that as long as the Americans had an interest in Barbados, there would be less chance of any invasion on the shores of Barbados.

(A Voice: Who sent them out?)

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: That is history; the Americans have gone. Am I to surmise that we must blindly continue to feel and believe that the threats of invasion happen in far-off countries, like in Suriname? Do not forget that in Trinidad in 1970 there was some unrest. Trinidad has since established a Defence Force. Do not forget that Guyana is being threatened on its borders by Venezuela, and Guyana with all its poverty, more or less, has established a Defence Force. Why not Barbados?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Just give one second, Mr. Chairman.

I want to support the Government on the establishment of a Defence Force. I believe the criticisms levelled at the Colonel of the Defence Force are certainly uncalled for. He is a Barbadian really committed to doing a service for Barbadians. There is no political overture. He is there to protect the interest of Barbadians – not for the Barbados Labour Party, not for the Democratic Labour Party. I would suggest that the Colonel is doing an admirable job as Commander of the Defence Force and I personally want to congratulate the Government on this particular Head, Defence and Security.

5.15 p.m.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, Sir. I am allowing the break because I have a lot to say about the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) and his speech, so there is no question yet.

I beg to move that Your Honour 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. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for fifteen minutes, which would bring us to 5.30 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
5.17 p.m.

On Resumption:

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, some time ago I used to hold the views as expressed substantially by the Opposition, but a number of things that has happened over the years has brought me around to the position now that I can no longer hold views similar to them in respect of defence and security.

I well remember some years ago the same Sidney Alleyne, whom I heard mentioned so many times during this debate, told me that he was going to inject 10 000 pounds of Antrax into the water supply of Barbados and that he was going to kill 100 000 people in this country by nightfall.

I also remember, too, in 1975 a running gun battle down in St. James between members of the Barbados Police Force and Sidney Burnett-Alleyne at a time when he was living in a house owned by Roger Manning somewhere down the West Coast. I remember the day after the gun battle that he sported around Bridgetown with two .38s in his waist and he said that he had the permission of the then Government of Barbados to do exactly as he felt in this country. I did not want to believe it, Sir, but I did not see anything happen, so I was forced to move in that direction.

I also remember one Sunday afternoon about 5 o'clock that while driving through Kirtons, St. Philip, I again ran into Sidney Burnett-Alleyne, and he was wearing a uniform under regular clothes, and when he pulled his zipper down I saw a range of arsenal on a human body that I thought was unbelievable. I am telling you what I thought, not what I heard. He had a ring of ammunition, hand grenades and the whole works on his body, and he told me then that he had just returned from training his guerrillas.

I was a little bit confused about that, because I really thought that if you were going to train guerrillas in Barbados, you would not pick the flat dry areas of St. Philip to do it. It was in St. Philip that I saw him. I must say, incidentally, that that was the first time I had ever seen him driving. He was driving a Vauxhall Viva. I had never seen him driving a motor car before or since.

I also know that I sat down in a room where the air-conditioning was very low, and where people would normally be freezing, and I saw people with beads of perspiration flowing down their faces. I saw some of the most outspoken, and as the people in Barbados say, most powerful ones with beads of perspiration running down their faces in a very cold room. When we learned that the ship had left Marseilles laden with arms and was plying its way towards this part of the Caribbean, and that there were 200 mercenaries recruited by one Denard and Banks that were on their way to link up with the ship in the Eastern Caribbean to invade and do mayhem in Barbados.

I know that at the time it was the contemplation of the people who were to carry out this action to make Patrick John the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Barbados and Dominica, and I further know that the same Patrick John was hiding in a house in the constituency of the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), up behind the almshouse, the St. Michael's Infirmary. I know he was up there hiding when all this was taking place.

I know further that there was uncovered, in the handwriting, of the same Sidney Burnett-Alleyne, a list of people who were to have been executed by firing squad immediately after they came into Barbados, and I know further, Sir, that one person was singled out to be retained until the same man arrived so that he personally could gouge out his eyes with a piece of wire.

I am talking about things that I either heard directly or saw with my own eyes, and when I hear honourable Members on that side telling me foolishness about whether you spend $85 million, $100 million, or $200 million, I am not satisfied yet that you have spent enough. You can laugh at these things; you really can laugh at them, but these things have happened.

I have heard Sidney Alleyne say that the explosions that took place by the Barbados Light and Power, up by the Pebbles and down by the power station at Spring Garden, were his handiwork. I heard the man say that with my own ears, and that he was only showing what he was capable of doing and what he would be doing in the fullness of time. And you can think he is a madman, he is suffering from meglomania, paranoia, I do not care what you tell me he suffers from, I am just telling you what are indisputable facts. I also heard the man say that he was planning to drop his parachutes into Barbados and take over.

When he had the gun battle down in St. James, they had Special Branch men following him around Bridgetown, I saw that with my own eyes. I know who the officers are but I would not call their names, though I saw them following him around for a period of a week down in the James Street area.

I remember one day he said to me that you can be sure that they are not going to be following him tomorrow. I did not know what he intended to do, but the next day when I saw him down there visiting some Law Chambers that he used to frequent in those days, I know that when I looked around I did not see the bull dogs behind him anymore, and he later came to me and told me that he had been into Culloden Farm just after dawn that morning and some foolish policeman, to use his own words, tried to stop him from going in – I do not believe all this; I am only giving you reported speech – and he had to push him and he had to go in and shake the tenant of Culloden Farm and wake him in his bed and say, "Take those fellows off me", and that they disappeared after that.

As I said, I do not necessarily believe it; I am just giving you what was reported to me, and I stand by it because nobody has given me all this story, and I do not think I have ever said these things in this detail to anybody at all. I heard Sidney Alleyne subsequently in London saying that the plans for the take-over had reached an advanced stage.....

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I talked to the man. If I meet him now, I will talk to him again. I get information out of him. The honourable Member is right. I am not saying what anybody else told me, I am saying what he told me, and that is why I am not prepared to sit down and listen to any nonsense from the other side about spending too much money for defence and security. They are not spending enough now.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Do I look as if I am frightened? They had a few prisoners running around Barbados a few weeks ago and they sent some policemen standing around my house and I had to telephone all the way from Asia and tell them to move the policemen from around my house, that I do not want them; so I do not know what foolishness you are telling me about being frightened.

I am not frightened about me personally, I am frightened about what might happen to this country. The same bad johns that all you were afraid of, I went in the prison and faced them. They were two feet away from me, within touching distance, and if I had to face them again tomorrow, I would face them. So when I hear honourable Members talking very glibly about why you are spending this money and so on, you have to understand that there is a very real problem that we have to face as a small country, subject to the adventurism of the type of person we are talking about.

We have other small islands scattered around the place that have been the victims of mercenary action, the Seychelles, Mauritius, small islands like Barbados that were assaulted by mercenaries and brought a new fear among small states as to what were the possibilities in this area.

The United Nations at the moment has set up a study on mercenarism as they call it, a study of the activities of mercenaries and the potential danger that they pose to small states. So when people try to make light of these things, it is a matter for them.

I am not going to tell the honourable Members on the other side whether any of their names appeared on the list that were to be executed by firing squad. I will keep them guessing. I am not going to tell them whose names appear, but I know the names, because I saw them.

Mr. Chairman, I think the whole question of security and defence of small states must assume greater dimension than it has in the past. Now I want to move beyond these aspects. I said them and I was not joking; I am serious about them, but what is important at the moment in the Caribbean is that the whole of Central America and the Caribbean is in turmoil. For the first time since the time when the European powers used to use the Caribbean as a theatre of war, trade wars and so on, ever since those days, the Caribbean and Central America has been an area of relative calm and tranquility until now.

5.45 p.m.

By a coincidence of social, economic, and political factors over the past few years, this region has become one of the most dangerous areas in the world, and it ranks with the Middle East, South East Asia, and

Southern Africa as the four most dangerous areas in the world. There are conflagrations in El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua, disputes between Honduras and Nicaragua, the problem of Guatemala and Belize and the great arming of Grenada. It is an uncontestable fact that arms have gone into Grenada within the last few months at a rate great enough to supply the whole of the Caribbean, barring Cuba, with sufficient arms for their defense.

It is easy for people in the face of all of this to sit back and say: " We in Barbados, I am alright, Jack. God has a way of looking after Bajans", so we do not have to think about their own security. I do not share that view, Sir. The whole world is changing in its attitude between one country and the other.

I was hoping Sir that we would have been able to reach Foreign Affairs in the course of debating these Estimates so I could spend some considerable time dealing with the whole question of the Non-Aligned Movement and membership in the Non-Aligned Movement, and to lay to rest once and for all, I hope, many of the misconceptions relating to the Non-Aligned Movement.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South in his contribution facetiously made reference to the Non-Aligned Movement and our membership, and he talked about a military alliance and so on. It is foolish and inept to think that a principle of international non-alignment means that you must leave yourself vulnerable, with a lot of chinks in your armour, so that anybody can pick on you and take advantage of you as they please.

I am further alarmed to hear contributions from the honourable Members that the British has a warship in the harbour, the Americans have one and, therefore, the people of Barbados should be alarmed. From the time I was a little boy I heard about the Yankee dollar and the sailors all about the Caribbean. All of us know, from the time we were little children, that occasionally a warship passes through, stops for a few days and moves on. And I am hearing this as if this is something new and sensational, for I hear all kinds of dire, dark and foreboding statements being made.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member (Hon. L. R. Tull) will give way, on a point of explanation: the point I made was that, whereas in Barbados and other Caribbean countries the officials will put out something about rest and recuperation, we had to read in the *Advocate* newspaper that in Washington they were saying up front, that this was an exercise. We are not questioning whether they should come or not. We are saying that we should hear it. Do not let us have to come here and talk of rest and recuperation. It is a military exercise which they are carrying out.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, let me just set the record straight. There is no American or British exercises in Barbadian waters. That is absolutely and totally untrue! If the honourable Member (Mr. B. M. Taitt) is saying that the British and American Navies are engaged in naval exercises in the Caribbean, that is something that happens all year round, year in and year out. But what I am saying is that the presence of vessels in the harbour of Bridgetown for rest and recuperation have absolutely nothing to do with any naval exercise in Barbadian waters, because there is no naval exercise in the waters of Barbados.

But even if there were, let us deal with this as bluntly as possible, the criticisms that I hear imply that you do not want the American and British warships around for the exercises. That is the impression I got, and I am going to express my impressions. They want to know why they are around, I heard all of that. Well, a simple question: is the Opposition against the presence of these ships coming through our area from time to time? I really would like to know the answer to that. If I knew the answer to that, I could go on to make the other point that I would like to make. If they want me to give way, and they want to tell me that they are against that, I would be most willing to give way.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation: Mr. Chairman, what we are indicating is that defense policies and defence activities should be explained to the people of the country, and that when such activities are taking place, as a Government in a democratic country, you have the duty to come and tell Parliament and to tell the people what is going on. That is the point of issue, the secrecy that is taking place in relation to these matters.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And the ships coming in.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) falls in the same grievous error each time. It is no business of the Government of Barbados to tell people in Barbados about some naval exercise between the British, Germans, Chinese, or Russians in waters which are not our own. I do not know of any manoeuvres other than the normal things that they do, and I am saying that there are no such activities in our waters. Am I now to tell the people of Barbados that in the Indian Ocean there are naval exercises by the Americans? Or if there are American naval exercises off Puerto Rico, the Government must tell them that? We only perceive it as our duty to tell them when these things are happening in our waters.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: If the Minister will give way, on a point of elucidation: Why did he not tell the people about the Military and Security Pact. That was within the area.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not know. I was not in the House, but I heard that it was laid in Parliament. But telling him before does not mean that you are going to change it. As far as I know the pact was laid in Parliament.

I go a little further, Sir. Defense matters are matters of such sensitivity that you do not deal with them in the way you deal with other governmental matters, and you must understand that. When the Democratic Labour Party was the government, it dealt with defense matters in no different way in which it is being dealt with by this Government. And that is consistent practice in all countries that I know.....

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: He tells me that it is not true. It happens in Britain, which you seem to quote all the time, because you are one of those who believe that whatever happens in Britain must happen in Barbados. You pick out a country like Britain, one of the major military powers in this world, come in here talking about a White Paper on British defence and try to equate it with a few soldiers we have here to preserve a little peace and order now and then and to prevent people from picking on us. How can you equate the two things? The comparison is between a mouse and a mountain. And it is always a dangerous thing, which the honourable Member is very good at, of importing British situations into Barbados. It will not work!

I listened to him very carefully – White Paper and this committee and White Paper on defence policy. What defence policy White Paper do you want? What is it that Barbados Government is involved in in defence that everybody does not know already? If the honourable Member does not know what a defence force is supposed to do, he is very ignorant of important public affairs.

When we went a little further afield, when we entered into an agreement with four other Caribbean islands, we laid on the Table of this House precisely what we proposed to do, what the agreement is all about. I have a copy in my hands, so do not come up with all this mystery as if some secret and underhand thing is going on to undermine anybody in Barbados.

5.55 p.m.

It says here to me that the areas in which those five Caribbean States will be co-operating are in national emergencies, prevention of smuggling, search and rescue, immigration control, fishery protection, customs and excise control, maritime policing duties, protection of offshore installations, pollution control and natural and other disasters, and threats to national security. There is nothing secret about that, and it was laid on the Table of this House.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am really not going to quarrel with them. If the people of Barbados say that we are the Government and they are the Opposition, then we are going to be the Government. We will come up with policy, make our policy, and then tell them. I do not see the difficulty there. If you all want to be invited into the Cabinet room on Thursdays, you are not going to get in there. The people say they do not want you in there.

We did what we thought was honourable, that is, to come up with an agreement and then tell you, "This is what we agreed to." We have known the Opposition, when they were in Government, to come up with all sorts of agreements and carry out all sorts of deals, including the acquisition of ships, and it was hidden in the Estimates. There was no debate on it, there was nothing laid on the Table of Parliament, and the then Opposition and the people of Barbados knew absolutely nothing about. And they have the colossal gall to come in here today and say that we must sit down before we come up with policy and discuss it with them, Sir! Not as long as I have anything to do with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Three minutes more.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will come back later for another 15 minutes, Sir, because if the Opposition wants to talk about Defence and Security, we will talk about Defence and Security for the rest of the night.

They raised the question of personnel. It is a wicked and iniquitous policy to try to destroy the morale of any law and order institution in a community. The police should not be subject to unreasonable attack by any right-thinking group or section of the people in the community, because the morale and the high esteem in which a law and order force must be held is vital to the maintenance of our society, as I understand it.

Equally so is the Defence Force. To subject a Defence Force to the constant verbal lashes of inconsiderate and ill-advised people is to do an injustice to this whole society. It undermines public confidence in institutional law and order, and I feel disgusted to hear, year after year, the foolish and childish attacks on a disciplined force that has done nothing at all at this stage to invite the kind of condemnation that I hear from the honourable Members on the other side.

They would seek to drive a wedge, Sir, between the Police and the Defence Force. I was overseas when I heard about the escaped prisoners, and I was pleased when I got in touch with Barbados to hear that the Defence Force and the police were in consultation and working together, like two national organisations work-

ing with the same interest, to go out there and look for the men and bring them back in. All the divisiveness that is being pushed by the members of the Opposition will not succeed in driving a wedge between two forces that are led by two admirable young men, Colonel Lewis and Commissioner of Police Durant.

You have to understand that some day the chickens will come home to roost. As usual, one of them always criticises the other, and they do not know what their party's position is on this issue. They do not know whether they are for a Defence Force or against it. I am challenging the honourable Member to get up in here and say that if they ever get elected to Government they will disband the Defence Force. I am challenging him to get up and say so. I am willing to sit down.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I don't want to hear what your policy is, you do not have any policy. You were talking since last night, or this morning, and I have not heard any policy yet.

I want to hear clearly and categorically for the newspapers to tell the people of Barbados tomorrow that the Democratic Labour Party is for having a Defence Force in this country, or the Democratic Labour Party is against having a Defence Force, and if they even come into Government that they will disband it and send the six or seven hundred people packing. I want you to state it categorically! You have been in here talking – words, words, words, a profusion of words – and at the end of it nobody is sure whether you are for or against a Defence Force.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Hon. L. R. TULL: All right, Sir, I will come back.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am just rising to give the Member the information that he wanted. He asked me to give some information and I have got up to give him the information. I am going to quote from a document here, it is the Manifesto of the Labour Party for the General Election 1981. What is in here was, and remains, the policy of the Democratic Labour Party in respect of that Defence Force, let me quote: There will be no need to maintain any standing army or other defence force." Do you hear it now? I can tell you that is it. "There will be no need to maintain any standing army or defence force." Mr. Chairman, that is the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto of 1976, Barbados Labour Party policy. That is not the Democratic Labour Party. That is what they said, and then they went on to say: "A Coast Guard at this time is not a priority." Then they went on to say – they are talking, Sir – "the Opposition (Barbados Labour Party) is still opposed in principle....."

Mr. A. A. TRUSS: On a point of order, Sir: in my presentation I dealt with that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is a matter of repetition.

Mr. A. TRUSS: It has already been aired. I admitted to this Honourable Chamber that the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto of 1976 stated that position, and we changed direction. We subsequently produced a performance document, and I quoted further from the 1981 Manifesto. The people did not vote for us in 1981 based on the 1976 Manifesto, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is well taken. The honourable Member.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am passing on now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must let the Committee know, as I believe they already do, that you have in fact been repeating what the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss) has already said in this House.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I was responding, Mr. Chairman, to an invitation from the honourable Member.....

(Hon. L. R. TULL: I want to hear your position).

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You want to hear my position? Well let me give you our position, because what has turned out now is that it is not the Democratic Labour Party that has changed, it is the Barbados Labour Party that has changed its position. That is a fact. We do not hide behind this, we started talking about a Coast Guard and about the Defence Force, so it is you who have changed, not the Democratic Labour Party. You have changed.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: He has just admitted that they have changed, it is not us, and our position in respect of that was, and remains,... let me give it to you:

"The Democratic Labour Party makes its stand clear. The present reality in the world is one of an increase in sabotage, adventurism, terrorism and guerrilla activities. There is also no shortage of individuals and para-military groups ready to incite insurrection and promote political instability. In such circumstances, the Party pledges to support and maintain a small, effective, highly trained and disciplined Defence Force with the objectives of –

(a) repelling external aggression and threats to our sovereignty and independence;

(b) protecting the democratic institutions of the state from any attempts to overthrow the legally constituted government by force of arms;

(c) coming to the aid of the civil power in cases of severe break-down of law and order; and

(d) providing a body of disciplined persons in case of need arising out of national disasters."

6.05 p.m.

At the same time, the Party is conscious that the power of the armies may be misused, especially in small societies. There is therefore a crying need to identify the role of the Defence Force within the context of Barbados.

The Party therefore promises to do the following:

(i) set up a Military Review Committee to review, study and make recommendations on the type of Defence Force that is suitable for Barbados, to identify the tasks and mission of such a Force and the resources and organisation needed for the efficient accomplishment of the objectives;

(ii) diffuse the tensions and jealousies created by the B.L.P. between the Defence Force and the Royal Barbados Police Force;

(iii) establish Cadet Corps on a geographical basis with the curriculum and instructors being provided through the Defence Force;

(iv) ensure through a system of adequate military education that all members of the Defence Force are made aware of the proper role and function of the Force, and the fundamental principle that the Force is subordinate to the civil power;

(v) revitalize the coast guard service with emphasis on the saving of lives at sea, assistance to vessels and aircraft in distress, protection of the territorial waters, and enforcement of our navigation, marine and other laws, including laws relating to smuggling and drug trafficking;

(vi) remove the youth skills training programme from the Defence Force, where it was hurriedly instituted for propaganda purposes, and return that programme to the civil authority where it properly belongs.

This is a coherent, cogent and very effective programme and policy in respect of defence matters in this country. It is not, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Labour Party that has changed, but clearly it is the Barbados Labour Party which, admittedly, has changed its policies in relation to defence in this country.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am alarmed to think that a Party that is in adherence to all that I have just heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) read out, could get in here today and make the type of hypocritical contribution to this debate that I have heard.

I have heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), unless he is not part of the party – I know that he is a man who is always breaking the traces talking in here today against a Defence Force. He said that Barbados should not have a Defence Force and that, instead, the money should be put into the Police Force and a special section set up in the Police Force to deal with various matters.

I think that, if the Members on the other side are really serious, they should expel him from the Parliamentary party for getting in here and saying things that are so violently in conflict with the policy of the party – if that is what parliamentary democracy is all about. If a man gets elected and he said yesterday that the electoral process is fraudulent, well, by his definition, he was elected by fraud. If he can get in here today and say that you do not need a Defence Force, you should scrap it, you are wasting money on it and all of that, when he went to the people of this country on the Manifesto pledges that I just heard read out by the honourable Member for St. Michael South .....it was so scandalous, Sir, I really do not know what to say. It is a show of the character of the man. It goes .....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I am not giving way, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A Member is on a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. Sit down! Mr. Chairman, first of all.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The honourable Member (Hon. L. R. Tull) said I was elected by fraud.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I never .....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: He said so! He said I was elected by fraud!

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir: I did not say that. I said the honourable Member said the

electoral process is fraudulent, and therefore if he is elected through the same process, it means that he is fradulently elected.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, do not worry about him. You and I know how to take care of him. We ran him out of the parish and the district in which he was born, and if he ever comes back up there we are going to run him out again. Do not worry about him, he is not much!

He is a man who has no level of consistency at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Defence and Security.

Hon. L. R. TULL: He would say one thing one day if it suits him, and the exact opposite the next day, if it suits him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Defence and Security.

Hon. L. R. TULL: All is defence and security. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central got in here today and abused the Government for having a Defence Force and he said that we do not need it.

Dr. HAYNES rises.

Hon. L. R TULL: I am not giving away, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am on a point of order and the honourable Member (Hon. L. R TULL) is on his feet, Sir. He has to sit. I will not speak if he is standing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN stands.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will deal with him when I get back up on my feet.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sit down!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both honourable Members please take your seats .

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The honourable Member for St. George South (Hon L. R Tull) was on his feet when another honourable Member.. . .

Dr. R C HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.. ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the Chair stands, the honourable Member (Dr. R C Haynes) must sit. I will now ask for your point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The honourable Member (Hon. L. R. Tull) said that I got in here today and abused the Government. You were sitting in the Chair, Sir. I think that is a reflection on the Chair, apart from the fact that it is incorrect I criticised the Government, but I certainly did not abuse anybody, and would not do so, so long as you are in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member (Hon. L. R. Tull) surely meant criticised. Continue, please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I sure meant abuse. Do not change that! I thought the honourable Member (Dr. R. C. Haynes) had more sense, because he does not even understand the meaning of 'abuse.'

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair heard no words of abuse in this Assembly at all today.

Hon. L. R TULL: Mr. Chairman, I meant abuse and if he does not understand the meaning of abuse he is even more stupid than I thought he was.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member said he got a Barbados Scholarship in Classics. I got a First Class Honours Degree in Classics. I am the only person on this island with one.

Applause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN stands.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. Order please, order! Please continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Sir, I know the honourable Member is stung, so he will react in that way. I intended to sting him, so I am glad that I have succeeded in what I set about to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please! You must remember the Hansard Reporters whose job is becoming very, very difficult. Please continue.

6.15 p.m.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I want to put the point that I was making before these interruptions into context again. People who were in here today listening

to the debate would have concluded up to the point at which the honourable Member for St. Michael South read out what he said was his party's policy that it was a diametrically opposed position on a Defence Force in Barbados, that the Government was for a Defence Force and that the Opposition was against it. We, in the course of the presentation of our side during the debate on this Bill have accentuated the same objectives, the *raison d'etre* for a Defence Force in Barbados as were articulated by the honourable Member for St. Michael South as his party's policy. They were for a small Defence Force: you must maintain one because of turmoil in the world, the adventurism and the people who want to go around and subvert constitutional authority, and overthrow Governments – and all that kind of thing was far from prevalent then – and therefore they were in favour of a Defence Force.

But when you hear arguments on it you would think that, in trying to keep a Defence Force going in this country, we had snatched a sugar cake from a little child. That is how they were projecting, and that is why I was moved to ask them to get up and state categorically for the benefit of the public of Barbados what their position is. When they did that, we realised that we have wasted a whole day on a debate on defence and security only to find out at the end of it that there is consensus *ad idem* between the Opposition and the Government, that we both feel the same way about a Defence Force, and the need for it in our country at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on again – because they say we are talking until 10.30 p.m. – to the question of regional and international security. We spend a lot of time in this country training people, whether the Police or the Defence Force people, in new techniques against terrorism, subversion, hijacking and all the difficulties that plague modern countries, hijacking; we are training people all the time, year in and year out, in explosives, the way you handle them and diffuse them, bomb disposal, all that, and we are doing that in the interest of the people of Barbados. Every time the honourable Member for St. Michael West cannot withstand the logic of an argument put on this side, he begins to behave as childishly as he is behaving at the moment. That is his way. We, in the interest of the public of Barbados, must make sure that the people have a reasonable chance against these growing ills of sabotage, mercenarism, explosives, the whole lot of them.

It has not been so long ago that you had bomb explosions in Independence Square at the BWIA building. We have had them at Light and Power and other places, and there is a genuine feeling of alarm in our community when these things happen, and rightly so. And for us, as a responsible Government, not to take the necessary measures to minimise the possibility of these things happening, or if they do happen to get to the root of them and bring home to justice the people who perpetrate these deeds, would be a serious dereliction of duty on the part of this Government. The people of Barbados must know that that is the difference between the Government and the Opposition, that the Government says what it means and means what it says!

As to the charge that we have changed our position since 1976, so what? It takes big, intelligent and mature people to change their minds when faced with different circumstances and I hope to God that the people of Barbados will never vote a Government with minds so inflexible that they will never change, that when people take a position, it is a position for all time, and nothing, no phenomenon, whether it is social, political or natural, will ever change them from a position that they had adopted on a particular occasion.

We held a view on the Defence Force in 1976, but the whole world has changed since 1976, and Barbados has been a victim of deeds that we thought for many years in this country would never mar the face of this beautiful island of ours.

It would be obstinate and supine for a Government in the face of these circumstances to say: "I am against a Defence Force, I do not care what happens, I am still against it". That is what they are asking us to do, and that is what they are ridiculing us for doing, for shifting a position in the face of all these new and growing phenomena that present an unusual threat to the security of our island and to the security of our people.

I am not finished yet. I will talk until the Chairman stops me. I was on the international situation when I had to stop the last time. We are facing a new crisis in this region. I am hearing about British ships, men-o-war or whatever you call the things, and American subs. I want honourable Members and the public of Barbados to know that there has been Soviet military exercises in the Caribbean, but, apparently, honourable Members on the other side do not mind if the Russians come down here with their submarines and things and have exercises all around these islands, as they have been doing. I have not heard them criticise that, but they are in here criticising the American and the British exercise in the region! Let it go forth from in here that the Democratic Labour Party's position is to criticise the marine manoeuvres by the navies of America and Britain in the Caribbean, but have not uttered one single word against the Soviets for doing exactly the same thing in the Caribbean. If that is what they want, let them have it!

The reason why I believe that defence and security is a matter that should not exercise all this public debate is because of the upmost sensitivity of the operations of

defence and security. And we would be glad, Sir, without all the hullabaloo and the public bandying of words and so on, to talk to the Opposition – as we do. They do not tell the public that in sensitive defence and security matters, the Government speaks to the Opposition, because we believe this country belongs to all of us. And although we will fight you and fight you all the time politically at the polls, we feel that the integrity, security and safety of this country and its people is not a partisan thing for one side or the other, and when there are difficulties of an unusual and contentious nature, we always speak to the Leader of the Opposition to let him know what the dangers are and how we are facing them.

Thus, I consider it a total and utter disgrace that in the face of that, the Opposition should come in here and use this Chamber to try to create dissention in this country over defence and security, well knowing that we, if we do not discuss anything else with them, usually discuss defence and security matters when they are vital to the interest of all the people of this country. That is the most important point that should be mentioned, that they are taken in consultation when they feel that things are really bad in terms of security in this country.

You hear them! The worse people in the world are a few of our boys, a handful of my constituents, a handful of the constituents of the honourable member for St. Michael South, a handful of the constituents of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, who got up and talked so much garbage in here today. Some of his constituents are in it, all working as patriotic Barbadians unconcerned about one political party or the other, but dedicated to the security and tranquility of this island, and they must come under the tongue lashing and the vile attacks of the honourable Members of the Opposition for doing their duty. Sir, my time is up again. I will speak again.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, just briefly, I am going to give some information which I think honourable Members on the other side requested earlier in the day. Let me salute my colleagues, who I always refer to as members of the debating demolition squad.
6.25 p.m.

You can see for yourself that that was the final chapter from this side. It is not necessary to debate Defence and Security ever again in this Chamber, not even on a Resolution for a supplementary. The speeches made by my colleague and friend in 1978 on the proposals for the establishment of the Defence Force are the same ones he made today. Therefore, it is not necessary ever to hear them again. You have answered him well, you have done your job. There is some information required about the Defence Force and some of the things they do for the young people of this country. Many years ago, they had four Cadet units in Barbados – Lodge School, Harrison College, Combermere and Ellerslie. Since the Defence Force has come into operation, they have 14 more units – Roebuck School, two from St. Leonard's, St. Michael's, Garrison, Parkinson, Coleridge and Parry, the Alleyne School, St. Lucy, St. James Secondary School, Foundation, Princess Margaret, West St. Joseph and St. George. Then, the independent schools, which are not large enough to have their own units, have students who go to the Garrison, which have a unit of their own. The Army in Barbados did not send out a request for these young people to join. This resulted from a request from the Parent-Teachers Association and from the schools themselves. Members of the Army go to the various schools and teach students how to drill and bring about certain disciplines. They do not only shine boots, as we heard today from the Member from St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons). The level of his debate is that we are spending $85 million to shine boots.

The 4-H Club, has requested the Army to come out and teach them map reading and First Aid. Industrial estates has requested them to teach First Aid and, in some cases, fire fighting and things of this nature.

The St. John Ambulance Brigade has made requests on the very Army which also assists the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme.

There is a waiting list at the Garrison Headquarters of the Defence Force. Over 600 young men and women are waiting to join the Army, and it was very well put today that there is a consensus on both sides that they should be a small army. The problem is that they do not like the Colonel. The Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) has said on the Floor of the House that he has no use for the Colonel at all. All along we heard that, now today, we hear that the two of them used to pitch marbles together. They are friends all of a sudden, they were friends from the time they were seven years old, and living in St. Joseph! But I do not believe that the Colonel is interested in you. He is interested in training young men and women to do some of the productive things which I have just read out.

The other aspect is the $85 million. The Permanent Secretary, with almost 35 years experience in the Civil Service, and his officers have been trying to find out, since last night until this evening, how the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) arrived at $85 million And when they heard the $91 million, they went frantic! From $85 million yesterday, in only a couple of hours it has jumped to $91 million.

They have given me the figures for the Defence Force between 1977–83. I want to be as brief as possible,

but I must give the information. It comes under the heading of Defence and Security, but all they are implying is that the Government of Barbados have taken up $85 million, and 24 hours after we spent an additional $6 million and made it $91 million, to spend on the soldiers buying corned beef and bread and shining boots. The civil servants are the ones who put together the Estimates; not me or you, or the member of the demolition squad. They say that the money covers Permanent Secretaries, security guards, immigration officers, the gardeners. All of these people are involved in this money, under the Ministry of Defence and Security. But what has come out today is that this wicked Government has taken up this $85 million and given it to young men who only shine and clean boots. That is the level of your thinking.

Let me cement his thoughts and our views. You have tried, I believe, with great pain, and now in vain, to separate the Army from the police. You have tried for almost five years. You have tried. I believe you have now recognised the fact that you can no longer try, because Commissioner Durant just recently called the Army and said, "Come let us work together as one in the interest of all Barbadians," including you.

Let us stop, once and for all, trying to play up the Police Force. You say that they are the greatest set of people in the whole world, and we had to come and build proper barracks for them, give them beds and all of those things. You had them sleeping on hard boards and in leaking rooms. Now, today, you are saying they are the finest bunch of young men! Do you know why? Because the Army is bad! The Army is not interested in you; not even the Colonel, furthermore the Army.

They said that the Defence Force has no sportsmen. Right now they are at top of Division Three in the BFA football competition. They are the leaders. They have been Volleyball champions on several occasions. They have a netball team that is going very well, and I know, as a fact, that they have bodybuilders who have taken part in bodybuilding shows in Barbados.

(A voice: You are a bodybuilder yourself).

(Laughter).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You get the most heckling from your colleagues! But that is a fact. That is why in 54 years I can do so well and look so well.

I must draw to the House's attention that women in the Civil Service have asked the Barbados Defence Force to give them keep-fit classes, and they had to turn back some of them; they were too many of them to handle.

6.35 p.m.

In the meantime they are being trained and equipped, not to fight the Russians, not to fight the Brazilians, or the Americans, or the West Germans, but what we are a little concerned about is the close relationship that exists between the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) and Mr. Maurice Bishop. There is a friendliness there that has me a little bit concerned.

I am a little concerned about these telephone calls, according to him, and these little letters and cables between himself and Mr. Maurice Bishop. When Mr. Bishop and the Prime Minister of Barbados had what apparently appeared to be a little exchange of words, he was quick to jump on the Prime Minister of Barbados for Mr. Bishop. Beware of the Greeks when they bring you gifts.

I am going to salute the standing army, or whatever you call them, and I sincerely hope that Mr. Durant and Colonel Lewis will be able to work hand in hand at all times for the goodwill of the country.

Sir, that is my contribution, and I sincerely hope that we will hear no more of this conduct, in particular the personal attack on Colonel Lewis. You attacked Commissioner Durant at some time too. Do not try to undermine them, they all mean well. Remember the hurricane, they were the first set of people to be out on the road. When you were in your house sleeping, they were removing trees, removing poles from across the road, restoring the communication links. Stop bringing them down, be proud of them. Have you ever seen them passing down Broad Street or on drill? They look good in their uniforms at ceremonial parades. It is money well spent.

I sincerely hope you got the information you wanted.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support what the last speaker mentioned about aspects of the Defence Force. In particular I want to mention the Coast Guard arm of the Defence Force, and the function it plays in the defence of Barbados.

You will remember that the former Coast Guard had the George Fergusson as a vessel, as well as three other 40 ft. vessels – the T.T. Lewis, the Commander Marshall and the J.T.C. Ramsay – which were, in my estimation, very limited for any use in the defence of Barbados. These vessels were able to rescue fishing boats between a range of five to ten miles. Now, under the present reconstruction of the Coast Guard, we have the Trident, which is much better equipped to act.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I hate to interrupt the honourable Member (Mr. L. L. Sisnett),

but I have to draw Your Honour's attention to the rule concerning repetition. We heard those same remarks more eloquently put by the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite). I do not think we need to have the honourable Member contaminate the contribution of the honourable Member for St. Lucy. He put it, the same words, T.T. Lewis. etc., Mr. Chairman.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Yes, it might be contamination, but certainly it is contamination in a different light.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the honourable Member develop his theme.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: I am saying that the Trident as an arm in the Coast Guard of the Defence Force is much better equipped than anything that existed under the former Administration.

One of the things, Mr. Chairman, which the Coast Guard is responsible for is an arrangement where certain aircraft must be accommodated at sea by proper marine patrol. The George Fergusson was totally incapable of assisting, let us say, a jumbo with over 200 people on board, because the George Fergusson in any emergency could not accommodate more than 200 people in a rescue operation. The Trident, as is now constructed out of the purse of the national economy of Barbados, can accommodate some 200 people in case of an emergency. This is money very well spent on the Coast Guard.

I am saying that the Coast Guard is playing a major role in the defence operations of Barbados. The George Fergusson, the Commander Marshall and the Lewis were all equipped with a police officer who carried a 303 rifle on the bow, and when the seas began to break he became seasick. That was certainly no purpose of any operation of the Defence Force. I am saying the present arrangement is one of which the Opposition should be very proud and should support the Government on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe the honourable Minister can wind up this debate.

Hon. L. R. TULL: No, Mr. Chairman, Defence and Security is.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister is not going to wind up. Please continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: ..... of such paramount importance .....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I just got this information which we are also interested in. Of the $54 million spent, or the $85 million that you have, much of this money was also spent in paying the fishing boat owners to go out and rescue the J.T.C. Ramsay and the Commander Marshall when they went adrift.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that the whole question of defence and security is of such paramount importance to this country, that we should not be.....

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Man, keep quiet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please, on both sides of the House.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I was saying, Sir, that this subject is so important that we should not try to seek to limit debate on it, and on that both the Government and the Opposition are agreed. It should be given the greatest possible ventilation.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: You were not here, so talk your talk).

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) is so enamoured of his own voice that he never stops talking. I am now using my opportunity, because I do not like to talk as much as he does. But when they get me upset, I talk, and he now wants to prevent me from talking. How unfair the man is!

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order!

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: We want you to talk on the law. Talk on the law).

Hon. L. R. TULL: All right, we will bring the next Head as the Head of Legal Affairs, so we will deal with that, but in the meantime I am talking about Defence and Security.

Mr. Chairman, everybody knows that tourism is vital to the economy of Barbados and that a great part of the foreign exchange earnings of this country comes from tourism. If our tourism industry is destroyed or seriously damaged, it is going to wreak extreme hardship on every single person in this country.

The Defence and Security vote holds provision for the cleaning, as I gather, of Oistins and so on, and it is important that I mention that four million barrels of oil

pass through these Caribbean waters every single day. A major oil slick can do irreparable damage to the coastline and the marine life of Barbados, and in the event that that happens, it will be a tragedy for Barbados.
6.45 p.m.

Tourists do not come to Barbados because of any special affection for Barbados, and with those 4 million barrels passing through every day in those super tankers that ply their way through our seaways, if there should be a major oil spill and damage is done to our beaches, even for a short period, it means that a large number of tourists will go to other destinations, because they do not want to come to Barbados and swim around with oil all in their face.

The Coast Guard, as an important arm of the Defence Force, has been re-equipped, upgraded and trained for the early detection of oil spills. They can do two things; if the spill is not at all a gargantuan one, they can deal with it themselves; if on the other hand it is a major spill, their early detection of it off the coast of Barbados will assist us in soliciting, at very great speed, the assistance of other countries to come in and carry out a serious rescue operation to prevent damage to the shores, beaches and marine life of this country.

I would wish that when honourable Members are getting into these emotive debates, they try to concentrate, on more positive aspects of these matters so that the people of Barbados can be alerted and made knowledgeable about what we are spending their money on.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Sisnett), who just sat down, pointed to the job we do in the area of search and rescue. The Bible says in Psalms, "Those that go down to the sea in ships and occupy their business in great waters, these men see the works of the Lord and his wonders in the deep." I want to know what wonders our fishermen see when they go out there trying to earn a living and get lost, their boats break down, and they are out there for many days. Last year there was a case where an old man and a younger man were drifting out there for almost three weeks, and all they could see were stars and darkness and big, bad waves coming at them.

In this vote for Defence and Security, we have equipped vessels that can go out there and search for Barbadian fishermen whose lives are at stake, and who have their women and their children sitting on the beaches looking and hoping that they will come back. The Opposition is getting in here and saying that we are wasting money when we spend it on that! Tell the people that. If that is what you are serious about, tell them that.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: He is talking. You see what I mean, Sir? That is like saying if the Fire Brigade did not go to a single fire, you should not have a Fire Brigade. That is the argument.

We had a problem here with the marijuana trade that was going on in St. Thomas and the St. Andrew area, where they were growing a few acres of it.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not know why the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) always behaves so badly. Everybody knows that cocaine passes more through diplomatic pouches than anything else and the honourable Member used to deal with diplomatic at one time. The Customs do not search diplomatic pouches, and if you want to get cocaine, marijuana or those sort of things from one place to another, you put it in a diplomatic pouch. The honourable Member used to deal with diplomatic pouches at one time, so do not get in here, with any attempt at malice, and talk about cocaine. Raise the level of public debate in this country and stop trying to impute nasty and improper things to people just because they are a little more frail than you are. When you have your personal things to say, say them to me so that I can eat you raw!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Defence and Security. Order, please!

Hon. L. R. TULL: Marijuana, Sir, I understand.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN stands.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of explanation, Sir. The honourable Member has given way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the honourable Member given way?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is sitting down.

Hon. L. R. TULL: If he is on a point of order, I will sit down. If he is not on a point of order, I am not sitting down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I cannot understand the honourable Member, Sir.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: the honourable Member (Hon. L. R. Tull) just made a statement which said I used to deal with diplomatic bags. He used it in relation to the question of drugs. I am saying, for your benefit, Sir, that I was Consul General for Barbados. I never walked with a diplomatic bag, I used to seal them in New York. When I was Consul General, there never used to have cocaine in Barbados, but now he is Attorney General, there is cocaine here. Does that mean he brings in cocaine?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. That is not a point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable gentleman is saying that you can always interfere with people, but when you pick back on them, they run for cover. I did not mention anything about cocaine. I was making a contribution about the Defence Force and marijuana coming to the country, and I heard the honourable Member talking about cocaine. If you cannot stand the heat, keep out of the kitchen.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: You are a light weight, full of hot air.

The Defence Force was able, however much it is attacked by honourable Members on the other side, to go into areas in St. Andrew and St. Thomas. They are trained to do that. The Police are not trained to go through any thick shrubbery and it is not the kind of work you would expect the police to do. The Defence Force had to go in, seek out the people who were cultivating large acreages of marijuana, uproot the trees, run the people out, and get a number of them prosecuted.

You have to mention the total role of the Defence Force. As the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) has said, it is not all shining shoes and knocking around doing nothing in particular. They are making their contribution in many areas of the social life of this country.

I am responsible for the Police Force, and those who want to put out that there is this division between the two forces should talk to me I am in a better position to know than any of them. I am responsible for the Police Force and I am also a member of the Defence Board, I deal with both sides.

It is a wicked thing to try to stir up a division between the two disciplined groups, as has been done with such great malice in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party in 1981. That the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) has shamelessly got up and read that out, shows a total insensitivity to the feelings of the people on one side or the other. I am in a position to know, and I know it is not true.

I know that the police enlisted the aid of the Defence Force to go in and smoke out the people who were cultivating marijuana in the northern part of the island. And who invited them to go in? The Commissioner of Police! They asked the Defence Force to go in and do the work, and they did it. He mentioned the few prisoners who escaped. I know that there was the utmost collaboration and co-operation between the two forces in seeking to recapture those men.

Why then does the Opposition continually, because they like to hear their voices and because they like to stir up discord in this community, try to undermine the security and law and order forces of this country that make it possible for each and every one of us to sleep in relative peace night after night.

6.55 p.m.

It is a peculiar brand of wickedness that could move anyone to use the security forces of this country as a political football to suit partisan needs.

One other thing, Sir. I heard brief reference to it. We were plagued in this country for a long time with a number of yachts coming in on the west coast of Barbados at night, coming into Carlisle Bay, St. James and down to Heywoods and Maynards in St. Peter, night after night. We detected that there were a number of yachts coming in and all kinds of activity was going on. Obviously, they could have been trading in contraband, they could have been bringing in drugs, they could have been beating the Customs and Excise in all sorts of ways, they could have been bringing mercenaries, they could have been bringing in guerrillas, they could have been bringing in Sidney Alleyne, they could have been doing anything, and that was a situation that we felt the people of Barbados should not be asked to put up with night after night.

We used to get endless calls from people in many parts of the island, not least at Bath in St. John, where people were disturbed during the night and worried about sleeping because of the activity they were seeing with vessels coming in, and we had to take some important decisions. Either we would sit back like the foolish virgins and make no provision for the danger in hand or we were going to behave like the wise virgins and make adequate preparation to deal with the type of problem that was growing on the coast line of Barbados. So we had to spend money to buy coast guard vessels.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Oh, boy it is hurting them; they cannot take it.

Mr. Chairman, we had to buy vessels to patrol our coasts and any idiot who would suggest that it is the role of the police does not understand policing. What happens is that the police do patrol in the territorial waters, but policemen are not sailors. They do patrolling in the territorial waters and the Coast Guard does patrolling in the exclusive economic zone, further up, a completely different function. You are not asking any policeman to get on any boat and go 30, 40 or 50 miles off the coast of Barbados to do work. That is not the role of the civil police. They work just in the territorial sea and therefore you must have somebody to do the work beyond that, including the work of hot pursuit.

How can you, as an independent country with no defence pact with any major power, with nobody looking after you, not make provision for hot pursuit? People commit acts against the laws of the country in your territorial waters or in your exclusive economic zone and all you can do is stand up on the beach and wave goodbye to them as they go. You cannot do that if you have a Government as serious as this one. You can do it with the Opposition, because they are against protecting this country. We need to have vessels with the speed that could pursue small craft that commit breaches of our immigration, customs and criminal laws; we must be able to go on hot pursuit to apprehend them to bring them to justice.

Sir, these are some of the things about the Defence Force on which a substantial part of the money that we spend on defence and security, and these things should not invite the unreasonable criticism of the Opposition in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is a convenient time for me to stop, and I therefore move that Head 17 stand part.

The question that the sum of $14 427 890 under Head 17 – Defence and Security – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour 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. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

RULING BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER ON NEWSPAPER ARTICLE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we proceed further, I would like to make a statement in respect of yesterday's meeting.

At the end of yesterday's sitting the honourable Member for St. Michael Central complained to the Honourable House about the contents of an article appearing on the front page of the *Daily Nation* under the heading "Haynes stopped on Point of Freedom."

The honourable Member read certain extracts from the report which he contended were a breach of privilege of this Chamber.

At that time I enquired from the honourable Member whether he was moving a motion. The honourable member said he was bringing the matter to the attention of the Chair.

The honourable Member for St. John then rose and said that the procedure was for the Chair to look at the article and report to the House if a *prima facie* case had been made out. Standing Order 76 of this Chamber deals with Privileges and sets out the procedure which must be followed. That Standing Order provides for:

(a) leave of the Speaker to raise a question of privilege.

(b) Move that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

(c) restrict debates on the motion if the Speaker rules that a *prima facie* case has been made out, and refer the matter to the Committee of Privileges.

It is therefore clear that Standing Order 76 has not been followed and therefore I am precluded from ruling whether a *prima facie* case has been made out and referring the complaint to the Committee of Privileges.

Albeit, May's Parliamentary Procedure 19th Edition from page 79 onward states as follows:

"Closely connected with the Power to exclude strangers, so as to obtain when necessary, such privacy as may secure freedom of debate – is the right of either House to prohibit the publication of debates or proceedings."

Dealing further with the rights and privileges of the House, it also states "when a wilful misrepresentation of the debate arises or if it may be necessary to enforce a restriction on reporting, the House censures or otherwise punishes the offender whether he be a Member of the House or a stranger admitted to its debates.

Further, although the privilege of freedom of speech protects what is said in debate in either House, this privilege does not protect the publication of debate outside Parliament – May's – further states "A member who publishes his speech made in either House separately from the rest of the debate is responsible for any libellous matter it may contain."

In the case before the Chamber it should have been clear to the reporter and editor of the *Daily Nation* that the Statement made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, having been ordered by the Chairman of Committees to be struck from the records, should never have been reported by that newspaper since the ruling of the Chairman meant that the words uttered by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central infringed against the rule of the Chamber and could form no part of its records.

It should also be noted that those words having been withdrawn and struck from the record are deemed never to have been spoken – I must say that this House will not tolerate the creation of records of its proceeding other than through the official and recognised method.

Since no motion has been moved by the honourable Member for St. Michael Central, the only course of action open to me is to warn reporters and editors of the media that they should, in their own interest, urgently familiarise themselves with the rules of parliamentary reporting.
7.05 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am glad to hear the stern warning. I hope that this House can make the Standing Orders available to the media so that they can look at them. Then, they would not be able to say that they do not know. But what can we do? They all have Standing Orders, I am told.

I read in the *Nation* that Dr. Trieloff was going to celebrate his 70th birthday on Wednesday – and he dropped dead three years ago. Now, what really can you do about such things?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for dinner until 8.05 p.m.

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

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

RESUMPTION

On the Resumption:

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

HEAD 72 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $4 625 500 under Head 72 – Defence and Security stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 18 – AUDIT

Head 18 – Audit was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $119 474 under Head 18 – Audit – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING – CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

Head 19 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Central Administration, was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $2 846 947 under Head 19 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Central Administration, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question 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 $2 355 307 under Head 20 – Revenue Collection, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question 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 $198 308 under Head 21 – Statistics – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 23 – LOANS AND ADVANCES

Head 23 – Loans and Advances was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum under Head 23 – Loans and Advances – $1 961 735 – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: We would like to ask the honourable Members what precisely do they mean here under Subhead 1 – Loans and Advances. This subhead includes provision for the Student Loan Revolving Fund, provision for writing off loans to individuals and loans to parliamentarians.

First of all, the language as it is written there suggests writing off loans to parliamentarians. But we think that that particular subhead ought to be amended if it is intended to mean otherwise. As it is written, it means writing off loans to individuals and to parliamentarians. I do not know of any parliamentarians on this side who have any loans to write off. I do not know what the position is on that side. I do not know if there are any industrialists, as my colleague said earlier, who have any loans to write off. I am going to give it the better interpretation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: As I understand it, the Minister of Finance indicated that he is going to make car loans available to Members of Parliament at the same level and on the same basis as the civil servants. That is why you have it in this Head. It is not writing off. It is a provision for loans to parliamentarians on the same basis as you give to civil servants.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: We would draw the indelicate phraseology to you for what it is worth. But that is not the point that we are going to take, we are going to take the subsequent point. We are grateful for the explanation given by the Minister.

I just wish to indicate that we on this side wish to divide on this. We wish to divide on this because we cannot accept the principle that seeks to suggest that a person who seeks office in Parliament....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the honourable Member (Mr. B. M. Taitt) would just take his seat. When I am giving an assurance, as a man I like to keep my word in whatever I do in life, up to a point. If I cannot do something, I am prepared to say that I cannot do it well in advance.

The impression given to me by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), was that we could get on with these Heads, because I indicated that I was going to do Legal Affairs and, therefore, my colleague, the Attorney General, brought his officers down. I therefore did not expect a debate on this. However, I am prepared to withdraw this particular Head. If you are going to divide the House, and want to talk about giving a loan to a parliamentarian, just as you do with civil servants, to buy a car – and I have always argued not to tie me to the civil servants – I am not in that. I will withdraw the Head, because this will now lead to a big meeting outside about how the parliamentarians' pockets are filled up with money to buy motor cars and all of this cheap garbage.

I am going to withdraw it, but I feel very, very concerned about the arrangement which you made with me, only now to get up and say that you are going to divide the House on this.

Sir, I am going to withdraw Head 23 and ask that further consideration be postponed. And I must have this said on the record that I am very, very disappointed about the arrangement made. You gave me an assurance, and now you are going to even divide the House on this.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word on that motion. The honourable Member (Hon. L. S. Craig) cannot be serious when he seeks to suggest that we indicated from this side that we would not

debate the Ministry of Finance and Planning. The Ministry of Finance and Planning embraces a large number of Heads which went through without debate. Head 23 is the final Head in this area. Is the honourable Member seriously suggesting that indicating to him that we wish to debate just this part of all the Ministry of Finance and Planning is a breaking of confidence.

I do not accept it! He has gone on record, and we are going on record. I believe that if the honourable Member withdraws this particular Head, that will solve the problem. But I do not like the manner in which he is withdrawing it, suggesting that we have somehow double-crossed him. The Ministry of Finance has Heads, as you know Sir, on which you can talk for five days, and we let them go through. That, to us, is fulfilling our part of saying that we will let Finance go through.

On the question of parliamentarians, this is a matter which happens to be in this Head. You will recall that when we discussed Parliament, the right honourable gentleman sought to raise the issue, and we said that we would leave it until we came to the appropriate Head. That is all. So, withdraw it until the Prime Minister is here, but do not withdraw it by suggesting that we have somehow double-crossed you.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I have to defend the Government and myself on this. I feel it is a lack of confidence. I will say that. It is as simple as that. You said to me, "We are finished with the Ministry of Finance and Planning." I said, "We are going to call Legal Affairs." You said to me, "No, go on." Then at the end of it, you pick up something, which I believe you did not see earlier, and started to say that you are going to debate it. This is really not fair.
8.15 p.m.

Let us be very, very honest. Do you really believe that this side would run away from debating anything with you all over there? We do not have to run away. You gave me an assurance. I said I was not going to call any more of the Heads under the Ministry of Finance and Planning. You said no, go on, call them. You are something else in truth!

The question that the Head be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 28 – MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS
$3 310 548

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 28 stand part.

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

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on this Head, Legal Affairs, from time to time, almost probably in every Estimates, we find comments being made.....

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Please let us get ahead.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I would like to start, Sir, but I cannot start with what is going on.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Asides.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: You have fulminated enough. You have said enough, you keep quiet now. Shut up. We had enough from you.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig).

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: You should keep yourself quiet for a change and know your place.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. Provocative statements such as these will not help the debate.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Now, Sir, it is customary almost on a yearly basis to make comments on the conditions of the courts. I want to say here and now, first of all .....

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable Member (Mr. P. M. Greaves) would be good enough to give way. Just before the honourable Member starts, I would want, in moving that the Head stand part, to ask that certain monies under Item 6 – Travel, and Item 8 – Maintenance of Property be moved into the Estimates. It is a total amount of about $80 000, so I want the Head, as amended to reflect that, stand part. I believe the amendment is being given to the honourable member for St. Michael South. (Mr. L. E. Sandiford).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is being circulated.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: First of all, in discussing the condition of the courts, I want to start this time by paying compliments to the condition of the court at Oistins. That court represents how I would like to see the rest of the courts in this country looking. It is far better than any of the Supreme Courts that we have here.

Sir, there are four Supreme Courts. The No. 1 Supreme Court is unbecoming of a court for the Chief Justice; for the dispensation of justice, period. This is nothing new. I want to make this clear. It was so in our time as well, so one has got to be fair. The condition of No. 2 Supreme Court is certainly worse than the No. 1 court.

In the Supreme Courts, those that have wooden floors, you will find that there are three or four different colours of wood. When some of the floor boards are rotten, sometimes you walk on them, the boards are creaking, and if one is not careful one will fall through one of these days. Sometimes when these boards are replaced they are not even stained to make them in conformity with the rest of the floor.

The seating arrangement, Sir, is terrible for everybody. Sometimes there are some windows in the Supreme Courts that cannot be opened or closed. Some of them appear to be in danger of falling apart, and what I think is worst of all, is that in the No. 3 Supreme Court and in the No. 4 Supreme Court we have raw cement floors, and in some cases the cement is pitted, so we have little holes in those floors.

Sir, this is a disgrace to the country, and it is nothing new, I repeat it. It has been so from time of yore, but nobody has been doing anything about it.

I want to make a suggestion. If we cannot build this Hall of Justice that we are told the designs are ready for, if we are not in a position economically to build this Hall of Justice in a reasonable time, well then something should be done about the courts that we have. As a matter of fact, even if we start the Hall of Justice, the building will still be used for some purpose, so we should do something about them. The courts are disintegrating.

There is an ante room, Sir, before the Chief Justice's Chamber where lawyers congregate on Chamber days. If one were to look at the louvre windows in that room, they are literally black. Now, Sir, I will agree that this does not require parliamentary time, but I am just reporting on the conditions of the courts, and I would like to see the Government spend a little time on the conditions of the courts here in this country. Having done something at Oistins and set a standard at Oistins, I know it would be impossible for the Government to repeat Oistins at all the courts that exist in this country, but, Sir, at least do something about the Supreme Courts of Barbados.

Visitors come to this country, and when they come to this country some of them visit the Supreme Courts — those whose business abroad has got to do with the courts — and they come to see how our courts operate. Frankly, I must say that when I see them in there I feel a little ashamed, because I do not think this is in keeping with what we, as an independent nation, should have. I think the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) and the Attorney General know of what I am speaking. The other gentlemen might not be so aware, because their business does not keep them in the courts, or probably has not kept them in the courts for a long time, but I am sure the two I mentioned are aware of this.

I am hoping that the Government would, during the coming financial year, if they have not got the money in these Estimates, bring down a Supplementary Resolution for enough money certainly to do something with the floors in the Supreme Courts and to do something about the other courts. I think at least they deserve it.

Again, the library. There is not much that one can do with the condition of the building as it stands; it is a very old building. The library is put in a room to the west of the building. The books that are new books become old books in a short space of time because they are not properly ventilated, I really would like to see the Attorney General, I believe he is the person responsible, do something about the general conditions over there, including the Registry. That is my contribution.
8.30 p.m.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I really had no intention of getting in the debate on this because the problems which have been articulated by the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves), are problems which I hear ventilated in this Parliament year after year, not only in this Government's time, but before, and it seems to me that certainly Legal Affairs has not been an issue which has been taken very seriously by either one of the Governments. It is certainly not an issue that is highly charged politically, and I suppose for that reason, there being not a lot of politics in it, nobody pays too much attention to it.

But the problems which the honourable Member for St. Michael North articulated are real problems which exist. In addition to those, you have the problem with the litigants, who, apart from Oistins, have no conveniences in the court yards, and day after day you can see sometimes hundreds of persons in the courtyards milling around waiting for their cases to be called and to be disposed of. They are sometimes seen sitting in the hot boiling sun. You will recall that the Magistrate's Court is a place where 95 per cent of the criminal work in the country is done, so you can imagine the number of poor disadvantaged people who have to stand in the courtyards waiting to be heard.

These are real problems which all Governments have been faced with, and yet have done nothing about

solving them. We welcome the new court at Oistins and the facilities, particularly those which are available for witnesses, litigants and those who are involved in court problems generally. But apart from Oistins, as I said, even for the Supreme Courts in town, witnesses, litigants and some lawyers have problems with appropriate conveniences.

The Registration Office is a department which is plagued by problems of space. People have nowhere to work, they are treading over each other, and we have the situation where the morale in the Registration Office is at an extremely low ebb at this time. With all the new volume of work which is being thrown on the Registration Office – the new companies law, the new copyright legislation, Patents – the Registration Office, with the cramped space that it has, has to deal with all these problems without the appropriate adjustment in space, or staff for that matter, to deal with the new areas which are being thrust upon it.

I think those who are responsible for the drawing up of the new companies law recognize that the administration of the new companies law and the new commercial legislation generally creates problems for the Registry, which have not been dealt with in the new dispensation, so to speak.

I would hope that the Attorney General would pay some urgent attention to relieving some of the problems and pressures on the Registry. What the problems and the pressures which exist in the Registration Office does to the morale of the staff is that you find you have great difficulty in communication between the staff and those persons who have to deal with them. You have a public relations problem and you have, latent hostility developing between the staff and the members of the public, whom they have to serve. One can understand the pressures which those people have to undergo, with the result of ill tempers, which seem, to flare day after day.

I have no more to say on this issue at this time except to express the hope that the Attorney General would get on top of the problems which exist in the courts and in the Registration Office and make some attempt to alleviate, if not completely resolve, them at the earliest possible opportunity.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I welcome this opportunity to speak on this subject. I have not been in the law courts for a long time, but I know that the situation in the Courts would not have improved since I left them – and they were bad then.

The problem with the administration of the courts is simply that the so-called Judicial Advisory Council does not function. Nobody knows who is the real administrative head in the courts of Barbados, and the Bar Association does not function, so therefore no proper advice comes to the politicians as to precisely what should be done.

If we are going to make progress in the courts. the first thing that has to be done is that modern storage technology has to be introduced. It is nonsensical in the latter half of the 20th century to talk about storing records in old big books, completely ignoring the advances that have taken place in micro-filming, microfiching and in the word processing industry.

We, at the Executive level, have tried for six years to interest somebody in the courts in this area of modernisation, because it will release space in the Registry specifically. One of the problems in the Registry is the lack of space, but all of the documents in the Registry can be stored in one room if you record them on modern technology, and this would release a tremendous amount of space, which could then be cleaned up for other things.

But who is to look after it? You have a Judicial Advisory Council. Why have a body called the Judicial Advisory Council, when no advice flows from it. You could as well abolish the body, and I do not care who quarrels with me for saying this either.

I see that the President of the Bar Association, the mouthpiece, one Member who was once a Member in here, said that you cannot comment on the administration of justice. Let me remind him. There is a famous case which says "justice is not a positive virtue." You know it? McCloud! The basic position is that politicians have to comment on the administration of justice when there are failures in the administration of justice. And as far as the administration of the courts are concerned, we need to get better and more attention being paid to modernisation. I feel that you must get a concerted attack in this area. It is really shameful!

I do not believe, in the context of today, one can reasonably expect that the new Supreme Court will be built to conclusion for at least another three years. I, during the course of the time when the Estimates were being considered, requested that some attention be paid to getting a physical clean-up.
8.40 p.m.

I honestly cannot understand why you cannot have two or three weeks spent on physically cleaning up the inside of the place and giving it a good dusting. It cannot be done with a maid. Let us not fool ourselves. You have to bring in a contractor in order to do the cleaning, then the maid can keep it going; and if you are sensible, you will have the contractor come in once a quarter and the maid can do the in-fill. It is a shame that we have a good

library there and I am shocked to hear that. I hope the air-conditioning in the library is working because if the air-conditioning is not working, it means even your new books are going to degenerate.

Why can't we get the Judicial Advisory Council to look at these matters What is the function of the Judicial Advisory Council? That is why it was created. My understanding is that the Judicial Advisory Council was created to give advice to the Executive as to what they needed in this area. This is a matter that I have always worried about. Why is it that we do not see specific suggestions emanating from them?

Obviously the Government cannot say that it can rebuild the new Supreme Court this year. We have already said that that cannot be a priority in relation to other areas. The new Police Headquarters is a greater priority. Therefore, some money has got to be spent on cleaning up the courts and seeing that the physical conditions are improved, bearing in mind that you contemplate a new building.

But I do hope that we get a non-partisan approach within the Bar Association, together with the Judicial Advisory Council. If the Bar Association and everybody really wanted this done, the Judicial Advisory Council should put up a joint submission on this thing to help us to get across the idea that modern technology has to come.

I understand that the hospital records have been microfiched and microfilmed. I understand that the University have done the same thing. I know we have to give up with the Land Tax people because they had their full opportunity, but gradually where more than one department of Government does it, people get confidence. It is amazing, Mr. Chairman, in these days of modern technology, how in a society like this, which is supposed to be progressive, that as soon as you mention the utilisation of new technology people get scared, people are afraid. You pick them up and send them abroad to look at it to see how it is done, and it is now 20 years and we cannot get it done. I do hope we will get the unanimous support of all sides for a start in this area.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, my contribution is just to draw something to the attention of the appropriate Minister. We have a situation at District "C" that is causing real hardship to people. The assigned magistrate is acting more often than not as Registrar, and there are many occasions where people have been going there, week after week, losing days at work and cannot get any cases tried. It is really a genuine hardship. I have known of a case that has been going on, and on nine occasions the poor lady has gone to the court and cannot get anything done.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is a point the honourable Member has raised. Judges come under the administration of the courts. We settled that last week. As you will recall, the Prime Minister said that certain negotiations were taking place between the judges and the Executive with respect to salary and conditions of service. These negotiations are going on and we can say, as he said last week, that we have put certain proposals with respect to leave. For instance, in some countries leave is not taken other than during long vacation.

Secondly, the question of acting judges is a very serious one. It pays you better in the long run to have an additional judge so that you have a complement of people there that allows leave to take place. Despite the strictures of the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Dr. R. C. Haynes) about expenditure, the Government feels that this is such an important area that we are trying to get concurrence.

But I cannot tell you whether this is going to go through or not, because, as you know, we cannot change the terms and conditions of a judge without his consent. All I can tell you is that negotiations have started and we are bearing in mind the fact that, having regard to the leave conditions and so forth, we do not want a yo-yo situation with the poor Registrar acting every minute as a judge and somebody acting as Registrar. At present there seems to be such a yo-yo situation.

This also gives me an opportunity to say one other thing. I am just going to deal with one point raised previously. There is no question of the new Companies Law and the Intellectual Property coming into operation under the same conditions as of old. There is no question about that. I think the Attorney General has agreed, and the Prime Minister and myself have agreed, so there is no question about that. Our view is very clear. The fees will be fixed in these areas so that they will command sufficient revenue to be able to pay for their own operation. Even if nominally it may be under a Registrar, there will have to be a head of that division as a separate division, so there is no question about that at all because it is well recognised.

The World Intellectual Property Organisation is doing a costing study for us as to the Intellectual Property Offices, but we also believe that, in the context of Barbados, companies, bankruptcy, friendly societies and intellectual property would have to be a convenient sub-division.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate and I say at the outset that I am aware that the Minister cannot direct a magistrate and/or a judge how to do his job. However, we have heard of judges who have not given judgments in cases, and I have

heard, for as much as seven years. I do not know, but I think it begins to become a little bit of a problem when you hear of magistrates who have had judgments in cases outstanding for more than two years. I think that we are reaching a very dangerous stage in the community if there is a magistrate who has done a case and cannot give a judgment in.....

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am being warned by a man, who should know, that I had better not put my mouth in judicial business, so I am going to stop at this point. Apparently something happens to you when you put your mouth in judicial business.

However, I think to the extent that the Ministry of Legal Affairs can assist in this by increasing the establishment, because apparently part of the problem comes from the number of acting appointments, he should look at this area.

I am not able to speak with any authority on the workloads of the magistrates or any of these things, but it seems as if part of the problem comes from magistrates having to shift from one particular job to another job which, though it may fall within the Judiciary, may not be of the same kind. I am told that this is one of the reasons, that it is not laziness on the part of the particular magistrate or whatever it is.

I wonder if the Minister would wish to discuss with those persons with whom he has communications in the Judiciary this whole area of the allocating of people, to see if, in fact, we are deploying our resources effectively to the extent that he can be of assistance.

I do not want to go any further than this, but I am merely saying that, for the person who is at the receiving end of the dispensation of justice, if you have tc wait two years or more for a decision from a magistrate, that is simply not good enough in the administration of justice in Barbados. That is all I would say at this point.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, there is just one other small point I would like to raise, and this is by way of a question to the Minister of Legal Affairs. Earlier in this session we heard talk about the vast amount of legislation which has been passed by this Government, and I believe one honourable Member from this side made the point that there was a lot of legislation which had been passed, but which had not been proclaimed.

I am concerned in this particular context about one bit of legislation which I believed passed this Parliament some time ago and has not yet been proclaimed, the Maintenance Act of 1981, which would have removed the upper limit of $10 for support of children in the Magistrate's Court.

One knows that, with the galloping inflation, the rising cost of living, when women with children have to go to the courts to get maintenance for their children, they find this is limited to the ridiculous situation where the monies they can get, irrespective of what the man is capable of, in the Magistrate's Courts, is $10.

I wonder if the Minister for Legal Affairs could explain why this new bit of legislation has not been proclaimed, and if there are any circumstances which inhibit proclaiming that legislation at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution?

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I really have not got such a long memory, and I have heard about five different contributions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is not winding up, are you?

Hon. L. R. TULL: No, Sir. I have several times to talk, but so many things have been mentioned that if I wait until everybody is finished, I am not going to remember. So let me talk from time to time.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) started, and I think he and his colleagues have paid a unique compliment to the Government for building the finest court in Barbados. I think it is very generous of him to admit that in the era when the law courts are dilapidated. And this era is not the era of the Seventies or Eighties, because if one takes a look at Estimates debates over the last twenty years, you will find each year that the type of contribution one Member has made has been made by one or more Members during the debate. The Magistrate's Court is a fruitful area for debate during the Estimates and we know that the conditions in the Magistrate's Courts are not as palatial as Sandy Lane, and I hope to God that we do not miss our priorities at this stage.

I would like to give the honourable Member the assurance that we will give them a little touch up and put them in a better state of repair, but I ask him not to be too ambitious because the law courts are not exactly very high on our list of priorities for expenditure at this time, and this underlies everything we are going to talk about these various departments, in the debate for the rest of the evening.

It is vital, if there is to be any efficiency in the administration of justice, that there be very close

collaboration between the administrative sector of the Judiciary and the Attorney General. I have certain responsibilities by law; the Attorney General is the only constitutional post other than the Prime Minister in Barbados and he has certain functions to carry out, and there are functions to be carried out that are removed from Cabinet decision. I have a job to do in which I cannot and will not be inhibited by any member of Cabinet, because my job is not a political job as Attorney General, it is a constitutional position, and if I am to carry out that job.....

Asides

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) does not understand, but I can account for the ignorance of the honourable Member. When you come into Parliament you are expected to understand certain things. Read the Constitution of Barbados and you will understand what I am talking about, and stop interrupting me all the time.

There must be communication at the base level and co-operation between the Head of the administration of the Judiciary and the Attorney General. Over the past year there has been some confusion, and I said two days ago in the debate on the Judiciary that I was not even certain that the confusion had been cleared up. It is a hybrid situation in which you put part of the responsibility of Judiciary in the Prime Minister's Office and the rest, the administration of justice, in the hands of the Attorney General. Quite often you do not know who is responsible for what, or who should report to whom, and unless this is cleared up and the lines of demarcation of authority are clearly drawn, there is going to be confusion in this area.

The honourable member for St. Michael West raised the question of the delay in cases. There is more than one reason why cases are made in the Magistrate's Court, and the most important, I believe, is not judicial negligence. It is not the fact that the magistrates are not working. It is because the litigants and their lawyers are, more often than not, not ready to do their cases. The lawyers ask for a lot of adjournments, for one reason or another – maybe because they have not received their fees – and they whisper to the magistrate that they are not properly advised, which means they have not got their coppers yet and they will adjourn. Sometimes they say they are working in another court, which is true. Sometimes the police are not ready because their witnesses are not ready. So it is important for me to point out that delay in the hearing of cases in Barbados does not rest solely on any lethargy on the part of people on the judicial bench.

8.50 p.m.

Questions were also raised about the Registration Office. I am tired, as the honourable Deputy Prime Minister has said, trying to light a fire under the people who should look after these things to come up with clear and precise proposals for microfilming all of the records of the Registry.

God help us if they ever get a fire down there. They had one in Lagos recently, and it is a great thing, because civil servants, who were shortly to retire, would now be able to come out with affidavits that they were 10 or 15 years younger than they used to be. So God help us if there is a fire in the Registry, because very important records would be destroyed.

I know that I cannot say this and expect that, as a member of the Government, to say that you are tired of it is enough. But I really am tired of the fact that I cannot get the people who should be looking after these things to come up with clear and precise proposals as to how we can microfilm all the records and store them in more than one place. We can store all of them in the Archives, we can store another set in the Registry itself, and we can find a third place to store a third copy. It is very easy. It is unlikely that you will have three fires at three different locations in Barbados at the same time.

I am seized of the difficulties and inconvenience that obtains in the Registry at this time. And I will give the Member the assurance that I will do what I can to see if I can get further action in this area before very long.

The Judicial Advisory Council, as the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) has commented, is not in my mind functioning in the way that it should be. I have submitted draft reform legislation to the Chairman of the Judicial Advisory Council asking that a meeting of the Judicial Advisory Council be convened to look at the legislation and make comments on it – and sometimes for many, many months I do not get a reply.

Now my patience is running out, and I get the feeling that before very long I will tell the Judicial Advisory Council that I have no time to waste in referring anything to them. I will bypass them, go to Cabinet with my legislation, and come to Parliament.

We have also the question raised by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) on the Maintenance Act. Again, Sir, I usually think that if we are going to proclaim new legislation that is going to require greater judicial activity and so on, and is going to bring new matters before the courts that they must deal with, that, as a courtesy, I should consult with the Chief Justice and judges and say, "Please advise me about when do you think that this should be proclaimed and when you will be ready for it."

Well, sometimes you have to behave discourteously, and there is a limit to a man's patience. That is all I have to say at the moment. But I take the point that the honourable Member is making in respect to this Maintenance Act. You do not have to plead any case with me in that area. In this day to give a woman $10 a week for a child in a court is a slap not only at womanhood, but also motherhood. I am entirely in agreement with you, and now that you have jarred my memory again, I will take some action on it in the immediate future.

This Head was moved without an introductory comment, and I think that if perhaps at this stage I make some general comments in respect to the Ministry of Legal Affairs, it might, perhaps, preclude a number of interventions that are being made by the other side and, some of the questions that are being raised.

The Ministry of Legal Affairs has over the past year been trying to bring the new computer technology into play in the department. We have been taking a very close look at it, and we have started, first of all, by bringing a word processor into the Parliamentary Counsel Department. Anybody who is familiar with legal drafting would know that it is a monotonous job of doing the same work over and over again, and we believe that the introduction of this word processor will go a long way in minimizing the drudgery that the people in the Parliamentary Counsel Office, both the professional staff and the supporting staff, have to go through month in and month out.

9.05 p.m.

We are going a little further than that, Mr. Chairman. We feel that the whole question of training of draughtsmen require applications of new technology. We believe that the whole question of interpretation of laws needs new approaches; we feel that there must be innovative approaches to statutory interpretation to assist in the construction of statute generally by the courts and beyond, and we believe that there should be computerisation of legal material. Lawyers are becoming absolete now, Sir, and we are becoming redundant, too. In the United States you can use a computer to give you judgments on almost anything in the United States.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You cannot read them, though).

Hon. L. R. TULL: Whether you can read them or not is a different matter.

All these long hours that lawyers spend doing research, burning the midnight oil, waking with the Glendairy bell at 5 o'clock on mornings will not be necessary. New computer technology will make such facts available in a flash, not only in the United States but throughout most of the world. I will have to do some adjustment towards that type of development, so we are looking very seriously at the moment at the computerisation of legal material.

We are also, Mr. Chairman, working on a number of areas of law reform. There are some things that have been troubling me in relation to some of the developing problems in this country that are social. I will give you one example, Sir. There is the whole question of offenders in prison. I will deal with that at greater length when we come to deal with Prisons, but just let me say at this stage that the prison population has been increasing at a rate that alarms me. There are a lot of reasons, not only an increase in crime, which I think is not as alarming as some would have it, but I believe that it is a change in sentencing, that magistrates in particular, more so than judges, are inclined to send people to prison more so now than they did in the past, and that for offences where a person would have been fined or put on probation or something long ago, people are now finding themselves in prison. Therefore we are having a fairly steep increase in the prison population.

What troubles me, Sir, is that in the 1980s we can still find it possible to send people to prison for debt. That is as anachronistic as some of the arguments that come from the Opposition benches, and therefore I have had a series of discussions with the principals in my various departments and we are working at the moment on a draft Act that would repeal certain sections of the law dealing with debtors, and limit the power of magistrates to commit persons to prison for civil debt. We will restrict that, but we will ensure, however, that, in respect of Maintenance Orders, that will be preserved.

I am also concerned about the question of bail. I believe that anybody who has practised criminal law in Barbados in the last 20 years would know that something is very wrong with the existing system of bail in Barbados. I am not going into that at this stage: I have asked officers of my Ministry to sit down and talk with me about it. We have worked out where we would like to go, and at the moment we are working on a draft Bail Act, which I hope to bring before Parliament before very long.

We are also doing work on a Parole Act. I was alarmed when I found out the number of teenagers in prison. I am equally alarmed at the number of people who go to prison for terms of less than six months, and I am equally alarmed at the fact that people who have gone to prison for long terms, long prison sentences, and have been model prisoners for a number of years, have nothing to look forward to other than the end of the prison sentence that was imposed initially. There is

no reward for *paenitentia*, Sir. If a fellow straightens out and becomes a model prisoner, and in the opinion of the Superintendent of Prisons and the Visiting Committee is a fellow who will not do too badly if you release him, there is no provision for that, as I would like to see.

That is one of the areas that we are looking at and bringing some reformed legislation. There are several other areas. I mentioned some in debate two days ago, but we are looking at the Offences Against the Person Bill, the Criminal Damage Bill, the Theft Bill, Community Services Orders Bill, Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill. At the moment, all of these are not under active consideration because it has gone beyond that – but action is being taken on them in the department, and we will be bringing legislation in regard to each of these some time, I hope, before the end of this year.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Repeal the Vagrancy Act).

Hon. L. R. TULL: We are looking at that too.

The foolishness in these days of deeming people a rogue and a vagabond! Somebody goes into the courts on some little trifling offence and a magistrate sits down there and deems him a rogue and a vagabond and puts it on their record, and a few years later he goes to get a visa to go to the United States and has this silly card showing that he was deemed a rogue and a vagabond! We are looking at all of that, but you cannot expect the Ministry of Legal Affairs to do everything at the same time.

I want, before I take the other questions being raised by honourable Members, to put on record my feelings about my Ministry. I do not like to praise civil servants. They do not get paid to be praised, and when they do their work, that is it; that is what they get paid for. I am not in the habit of giving them any commendation. I do not want any from them and therefore they should not expect any from me.
9.10 p.m.

I believe, however, that it is in order for me to say that the people in the Legal Department in my Chambers are working far beyond the call of duty. The amount of the legal work coming into the Government departments has multiplied tremendously in recent years. There is more legal activity, the Chambers are extremely busy, they are doing more complicated work, and I do not think many people appreciate that. At times I am surprised at how they hold up under the strain.

I also want to commend the people who work in the Drafting Section, the parliamentary counsel, because they are always easy fodder for ignorant people who do not understand the pressures under which they work. Only recently I heard Senator Greaves in the Other Place making a very unwarranted attack on the parliamentary counsel, without an appreciation of the difficulties under which those people work.

Nobody likes to be a parliamentary counsel. It is the most unglamourous area of the law. You can hardly get people to go into parliamentary drafting, because it has no prestige, it has no glamour and nobody ever cares about you. But they work hard and I am appealing to honourable Members to attack the Attorney General when we bring down legislation here with one or two errors in it. I do not mind. If you want to pick a fight in here, I am always ready but I do not think it is fair, as the Opposition has been doing from time to time, to attack the parliamentary counsel.

Over and above everything else, the parliamentary counsel can only draft instructions from Ministries. A Minister has to decide what he wants in a Bill relating to his Ministry, and he must give instructions to draftsmen to draft what he wants. Therefore, when a Bill comes before Parliament and it does not meet certain standards required by honourable Members, pick on the Minister, because parliamentary counsel only draft on the instruction of the Minister.

I thought it was really appropriate for me to say something about my office. I understand the pressure under which they work and I would counsel honourable Members to go easy on them. If you want somebody to attack, attack me.

I am willing to answer any further questions which honourable Members may want to raise. I believe I have dealt with all of the points that have been raised so far, and I will deal with any others that may arise.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, during the course of the contribution by the honourable Member for St. George South, (Hon. L. R. Tull) the Attorney General, there were a couple of points which he raised, which I wish he would clarify.

He said that his function was not a political one, it was a constitutional one. The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) enquired what he meant, and the Attorney General tended to belittle him. As far as the Constitution of Barbados is concerned, it seems to me that the Attorney General is just another Minister.

Section 72 of the Constitution says that the Governor General may assign to the Prime Minister, or to any other Minister, responsibility of the business of the Government including the administration of any department of the Government, provided that one such other Minister, who shall be styled Attorney General, shall be

assigned to the functions of principal legal adviser to the Government.

What that, in essence, says is that there shall be a Minister who shall be designated Attorney General and his functions shall be the role of the principal Legal adviser to the Government. So it would seem to me that the Attorney General is in no different position than any other Minister. As far as I know, there is not even a requirement that he should be a qualified lawyer. It would seem to me that even the Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw) could, by virtue of the Constitution, be Attorney General, but I do not know what sort of legal advice he would be able to give.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Sir, if the honourable Member (Mr. M. A. King) would give way. Implicit in the fact that the Attorney General is the chief legal adviser to the Government, means that he has to be a lawyer. I would not expect to hear such a statement coming from another lawyer, I would expect to hear that coming from somebody who does not understand these things.

The other point I was trying to make is that the policy decision of a Minister are usually the decisions of the Cabinet. The Attorney General, as chief legal adviser, is not subject to any Cabinet direction. The Cabinet of Barbados cannot tell the Attorney General what opinion he is to give on any legal matter in this country. That is the only distinction I am drawing, and you very well know that.

Mr. M. A. KING: The honourable Member (Hon. L. R. Tull) as usual, has missed the point I was making. I was not suggesting for any moment that the Cabinet could tell an Attorney General how he should advise. A Cabinet cannot tell anybody how they should think. His role is to advise his Cabinet, and anybody can advise. But that is a small point and one which needs quite an awful lot of debate.

The honourable Member went on to articulate a point which the right honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) had made in relation to the fact that he was surprised that a lot of persons were imprisoned for debt in a day and age like this.

I think the honourable Member for St. George South would know that it is against the law to imprison anyone for debt *per se*. In other words, if I owe you $5, you cannot lock me up for debt. I think what the Prime Minister must have been referring to was that situation where a lot of people have been ordered by the Magistrate to pay fines in criminal cases and have defaulted in payment of fines, and for that reason have to serve a sentence of imprisonment.

Asides.

Mr. M. A. KING: All right, if that is not so, let us deal with civil cases. If I owe someone a debt in a civil case, you do not get sent to jail because you do not pay. An application has to be made to the court by way of Judgement Summons and then it is opened on the hearing of the Judgement Summons for the debtor to come to court and say, "I am not able to pay this" and satisfy the Court that he is unable to pay. Once the court is satisfied that the debtor is unable to pay, no court in the world can send him to jail for that. The whole procedure of sending people to court for debt is when it can be shown that they can pay and deliberately refuse to pay.

Asides.

Mr. M. A. KING: The theory is that they get sent to prison for contempt of court, for willfully refusing to pay the debt.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, on both sides of the House.

Mr. M. A. KING: Does the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw) want to demonstrate his capability as Attorney General?

One of the problems relating to persons who owe civil debts is that, in a lot of cases, people are not fully aware of their rights. They are not aware that they are entitled to come to court and explain to the court that they are unable to pay. As a result, a lot of them get terms of imprisonment enforced on them whereas if they had only gone and took advantage of their rights, they would have avoided the liability to be in prison.
9.20 p.m.

The statement of the right honourable Member for St. Thomas in the way it was articulated tended to indicate that it was an indictment on the judges for sending people to prison for debts, and that the magistrates and the judges in those circumstances were at fault. But it is not as simple as that, and it is not to be taken as an overall indictment that you send people to prison and that the prisons are full of persons who just have refused to pay debts. Perhaps some system would have to be devised where, in situations in which people who in theory commit a contempt of court, they are not required to bear the burden of being incarcerated in a prison.

The fact that so many people in this day find themselves in debt which they are unable to pay, and are being fined in situations where they, too, are unable to pay, is quite relevant. The fines are heavy indeed, but one of the problems is that the whole economic situation in the

country is in such a state these days that the people at the lower end of the socio-economic ladder are the persons who are finding themselves bearing the brunt of the pressures which the policies of this Government are inflicting on this country, and it is those people who are finding themselves in a position where they are unable to meet their obligations, which in former times did not bring the types of pressures on them which they are finding themselves bearing today.

Mr. Chairman, all these factors have to be taken into account when you are dealing with the whole problem of people being sent to prison because of the failure to pay debts, and I think the Prime Minister's statement has got to be adjusted as not to tend to indict the judicial officers to the extent which a bland statement of that kind would indicate.

Asides

Mr. M. A. KING: What is your statement? You repeated the statement of the Prime Minister.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member (Mr. M. A. King) would give way; he is saying, as I understand it – I do not know about any statement by the Prime Minister because I was not around – that the Prime Minister is blaming the judicial officers for sending people to prison for debt.

I am saying no such thing. What I said in my contribution is that I was alarmed that people in this age could still be going to prison for debt, and that I had set up meetings in my department to reform the law to prevent this thing from happening. I made no reference at all to it being the fault of judicial officers that they were going to prison. All you are saying is what the Prime Minister said, but I did not say that, so try and draw a distinction. If you can understand a distinction, please draw it for me.

Mr. M. A. KING: Let me assure the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) that I understand fully the distinction which he has made, and I accept it fully, but he seems to want to object to my criticising the Prime Minister. I am not criticising the honourable Attorney General for the statement made by the Prime Minister, and he asks me not to attack the statement he made. I am not attacking him, I was talking about the statement made by the Prime Minister, so I accept the statement which was made by the Attorney General in this matter.

I would hope that the Ministry would take a hard and serious look, and a quick look, at the problem, because obviously to fill the prisons up with people who owe debts is not in the best interest of the community, and we would hope, too, that something is done quickly about the economic state of the country so that people at the end of the socio-economic ladder are in a position to meet their obligations and live as reasonable people in the community.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for Christ Church West would not have to wait for too long. I am sure his contribution on a matter like this would be far more substantial and probably more meaningful than mine, but there are two general areas that have concerned me for some time.

I have often wondered, not only in the administration of legal affairs, but also in the administration of health and other areas, why it is that in a small country like Barbados we plan to duplicate a whole lot of law courts all over the country.

I have gone to many countries with three or four times the population of Barbados, and very often covering a larger land mass, often with more transportation difficulties, that they have one central Hall of Justice where all the legal work is carried on, where you have the situation where the lawyers are not running around all over as in Barbados, from one court to another court resulting in all sorts of adjournments, where costs not only in the initial building but also in maintenance can be controlled, where the profession itself would have much greater facilities available to it, and where their time can be better utilised in any given day.

I wonder whether in this day and age when you are planning for the future, you think that in a country like Barbados you need to have a lot of new law courts all over the place, plus a new Supreme Court, rather than a large central Hall of Justice.

It is often a mistake to think that because you have a court in St. George or near St. George that it is any easier for the people of St. George to get to that court than to come to a court in Bridgetown. A person wanting to get to Boarded Hall from some parts of St. George might find they have to go to Bridgetown and then catch another bus and go to Boarded Hall, and I presume the same thing can be said for many of the courts around the country.

I think in that area of administrative planning one should really look at the size of the country and look and see how best you can make a capital investment in courts, or in the development of physical facilities for the courts, because it seems to me to be a monumental waste of money to be building these things all over the place just to say you have built a court here and built a court there and built all over the place.

The same thing, in my view, applies to health too. You build polyclinics all over the place, and I think it is a monumental waste of money where they all will be under-utilised. We are a small community and we have to look at how best we can serve and use our resources, and particularly how best we can advance the cause of justice particularly in ensuring that the professionals involved in that particular discipline would best be able to utilise their time.

I do not think that in Edinburgh, as far as I can recall, I have ever seen any court apart from the famous Hall of Justice on the Royal Mile, and that is a city with a population of three or four times the size of Barbados, and it is certainly much bigger than Barbados. I lived there for twelve years and I certainly have not seen any anywhere else, and you have to travel sometimes 20 or 30 miles, and maybe more, to get to the Hall of Justice.

What I know happens there, particularly in relation to the close liaison with the university, is that the whole professional atmosphere is upgraded. You have central libraries, you have good record keeping and the whole atmosphere of the profession itself is uplifted through the process of centralisation in that particular way.
9.30 p.m.

However, that is a matter of policy. It would seem to me that in looking at that area in Church Village, where you are constructing the Central Bank building and that kind of thing, that may present an ample opportunity to really address yourself to whether you need to duplicate these facilities all over the country.

The second thing that has always concerned me is this whole question of the administration of the law in relation to bail. As I understand it, as a layman, an individual is presumed to be innocent until he is proven guilty. I would like to say that I would think that probably 90 per cent of the people in Barbados who are refused bail should not be refused bail. You should have to show a good reason for that person not to appear before the courts, or, in the alternate, I presume that if he is not allowed bail, he would be a threat to the community in some other way. It seems to me that those criteria are not usually applied in relation to bail.

I remember raising this question in this Parliament already, and I was told that I was silly, that I was ignorant, and that I did not know anything about the operation of the law. But I was fortunate, just before I raised that, to have talked to a very distinguished black judge in New York State, who has just run into a lot of criticism where he spelled out beyond any doubt that if you accept the principle that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty, then he has an inalienable right to bail, and there have to be very compelling reasons why that person should be denied bail.

In Barbados, as I understand it – I do not want to cast any slur on anybody – you may get a situation where the lawyers themselves might be glad that their client is refused bail, because they get more money if they have to get him out of jail. I am just repeating what I hear the progressive-looking lawyers say among themselves. I even hear that the thing operates in a way where you probably make sure that the guy is arrested and taken before the court at a time where if he is refused bail, there will not be enough time to appeal to a High Court judge; so he has to spend some time inside. All of this kind of thing operates in Barbados, so I am very pleased to hear that at long last we are paying some attention to this question of the rights of the individual.

I gather that there is a charge for receiving stolen goods and there is a charge for breaking and entering. Very often, the police, instead of bringing the charge of receiving stolen goods, knowing perfectly well that the person never broke and entered anywhere, will bring a charge of breaking and entering. And, because the charge is breaking and entering rather than receiving stolen goods, then the person is less likely to be given bail, because the charge is a more serious charge. I am just bringing this to show how the whole thing can be structured in such a way that the rights of the individual, I think, would be seriously impaired in those circumstances.

I sincerely hope that when this question of bail is being looked at, it would be looked at against the principle that a man is entitled to his freedom unless he has been duly tried and found guilty by an appropriate tribunal and sentenced to jail. I also hope that there will be clear circumstances set out in any Act relating to bail where that right should be withdrawn from that individual.

I go further and say that with the kind of social structure that we have in Barbados, that kind of attitude towards denying bail to people usually affects the lower stratum of society, often people who do not have access to legal counsel at short notice and that kind of thing like that.

I believe that although we say that we are one of the freest nations of the world, nevertheless there are many areas in relation to the laws of Barbados, where I see it as a non-legal person, and certainly where I have been brought into contact with it in several areas as a professional person, that several injustices are perpetrated against people within the context of the administration of the laws of Barbados. And the area of bail is one that needs to be dealt with.

I find it difficult to understand how the legal profession as a whole in Barbados does not address itself to these serious problems. I do not know when last I heard of a constitutional case before the courts of Barbados.....

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: They have two now. I believe the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) is trying to get a particular piece of legislation, which he brought in here as modern legislation, declared as being unconstitutional.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That does not matter, Sir. On the whole question of testing laws at that level, I see very little activity in the legal profession on questions of basic rights of freedom, like the ones in relation to bail.

All lawyers in this country know that there are certain problems that impinge on the basic freedoms of people. I have never heard the Bar Association, never heard them once create any fuss about that. They seem not to address themselves to the concept of justice in Barbados and it is about time that the legal profession should recognise that they have a more important role to play in the society than they are playing now.

The economists in Barbados have just formed an association, and those fellows contribute considerably as a professional group to public life of Barbados. I would say that, generally speaking, doctors have had a tradition over the years of moving outside the area of their direct contact with patients and their direct case to-case dealings to look at the overall development of the profession.

I think that it would be a fair criticism to say that that kind of initiative has not been emanating from the legal profession in Barbados. Indeed, unless that is done, many of the wrongs in this country will not be corrected. I cannot stand up here as a layman and even articulate in any detail, not even conceptually the legal problems which I seem to perceive involved in matters of bail and so on. But I am sure that there are many people in this Chamber who would have had experience in jurisprudence, and who would recognise that what I am touching on tangentially has some substantive merit.

Mr. Chairman, do you know that there are states in the United States where you can get bail even on a charge of murder?

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You may be able to get bail for murder, but I have never heard of anybody getting bail on a charge of murder in Barbados.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Well, it is very unusual. It would be most unusual for a client to get bail on a charge of murder. I believe that you are more likely to get bail on a charge of manslaughter. I just do not know. There may be one, but I do not know. My understanding is that the reason why you do not give bail in cases of a charge of murder is that if a man is on a charge for his life, he would do anything rather than face the prospect of such a trial, but on the other hand that in itself does not seem to me to be a reason for denying a man his freedom.
9.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, many of the points which have been articulated in this House have been articulated on several occasions, certainly during the 12 years I have been in this House now. Some time in September, I think September 11 or thereabouts, I would have been a Member of the House for 12 years.

If I may begin with the point made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) about centralising the courts, the Bar Association has discussed this matter for several years. Indeed, I think some time in the early 1970s there was a conference held at the Windsor Hotel, which was very well attended by several members of the Bar, and I believe the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) who was then Prime Minister, actually attended and made an address at that conference, since he had responsibility for the subject of justice, the Judiciary. The consensus of opinion was that it is better to take the courts to the people, and that therefore the presence of the courts, like indeed the presence of the police, within a district, can have a very stabilising influence; and that, rather than centralise all the courts in Bridgetown, it was better to keep the tradition of allowing the people to recognise that law and order was administered openly in their districts. I believe the judges have supported that view.

At first, when I was a young member of the Bar, I thought it would have been easier for the legal profession to centralise everything in Bridgetown. But I can see the argument, despite the size of our country, for taking the law courts, among the people, particularly at the magisterial level, where most of the work of the courts is done. I think it has a psychological effect on them, and I am not sure that being cost wise and centralising the whole administration of the courts in Bridgetown will eventually redound to the credit of law and order and respect for the Judiciary and the legal institutions in this country.

Another point made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is about the question of bail. I believe the Attorney General has already said that his department is looking at reforming the law dealing with bail, but I think, although there are several criticisms which can be levelled against the Bar Association – and I have certainly levelled quite a few against the Bar Association in some respects – this is one area of the law on which the Bar Association has made its views felt from time to time.

I think the honourable Attorney General is right when he says that the people in the Legal Department of the Government are seriously overworked. In particular in the legal Drafting Section, they are sometimes being asked to draft laws at very short notice, because other departments of Government sometimes sit down on measures for several months, and years, and they always find the excuse of saying that it is in the Attorney General's Chambers. Sometimes the measures get to the Attorney General in a week, and he is castigated in Cabinet for not getting the Bill out, whereas the fault has been in the department, and I mean every department, including the Ministry of Finance. This is the case right through, and often, as the honourable Attorney General said, you have to defend the members of the Drafting Section, who work beyond the call of duty in certain circumstances such as this.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) talked about the Debtors Act. I believe, like the Attorney General, that the time has come to amend that Act. The Act was passed in 1879 and it is certainly outdated. There are features of it that I do not think even some of us realise – for instance, in one section, what is *"mien"* process. The writ, what is called the writ *ne exeat regno,* still rules within that section, and when there is an instalment made and you fail in the instalment, the chances are that you will be sent to prison immediately.

There is no doubt that English law, and law in many of the Commonwealth countries, have reformed that Debtors Act, and that our Act is certainly in need of reform. I believe the Attorney General is quite right in putting some emphasis in this area and to give it some priority.

Now, the honourable Member made the point about the Prime Minister's statement being taken as an implied criticism of the Judiciary when he said that there are several people up in prison for debt. I believe the honourable Member is mistaken. I can understand him trying to make the political point, but some three years ago, I think it was, probably a little later, we got Professor Howard Jones, who is a professor of criminology at Swansea, University of Wales, to do a study, because we were laying the basis and the framework for reforming the penal laws, and we took a look at everybody who was in prison on a certain day, and it is a fact that over something like 65 per cent of the people in prison were in there for debt. I believe we were looking at the study to see whether or not it was not in the interest of the country to reform the laws dealing with debt, to have a look at penalties, because the cost of keeping a prisoner at the prison even on economic grounds is very expensive.

Now, the Howard Jones Report was followed by the report of Mr. Delroy Chuck – I believe the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) might well have sat at the feet of Mr. Delroy Chuck, who is really a great criminologist – and he gave a lot of his time also to follow through with a second report on this area. I do not think it is right to believe that the Government has not been doing anything about it. I believe the Attorney General is taking positive steps to ensure that these necessary reforms in the criminal law are being brought about. When the Prime Minister made his statement, he was really speaking from a report. It was not a criticism of the judges, it was a criticism of some of the laws and some of the provisions.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, quite a few of the people who were there were in prison for failure to pay maintenance arrears for their children and for their spouses. We had not yet implemented the Family Law Act. We have placed in the Family Law Act provisions for attachment of wages, although, from my observation in the courts of how the Act is working, very few lawyers are using the provisions at the moment. Perhaps they are new.

The Maintenance Act, which deals with the situation where you are not a married person or a spouse for five years, also has provisions for attachment of wages. So it is possible to get an Attachment Order; serve it on the employer, and just like a National Insurance contribution is deducted weekly from the salary of a person, so you can get a weekly deduction from the salary of a person in order to pay the Maintenance Order. That may well have one of the effects of reducing the high incidence of people going to prison for debt.

I think that when the Attorney General speaks so eloquently and so well on these matters, he is speaking from a position where his department has laid the basic framework for necessary reform of the Laws of Barbados. There is a tremendous amount of reform still to be done, some of our laws are archaic, but I want to take up the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central on another point. He said that challenges to the Constitution are not made. That is really not so. There have been several cases in Barbados so far dealing with the Constitution, and certainly when I was Attorney General I came

down in at least two cases, in fact one in which the Minister of Agriculture, the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Dr. R. L. Cheltenham) had actually raised a very, very interesting point affecting Section 13 and Section 24 of the Constitution.
9.50 p.m.

Eventually, of course, it did not go on appeal, because the Crown succeeded in showing that they did not act contrary to the Constitution. I had seven cases dealing with an Act, which was passed when I was Attorney General. In four of the cases, I was arguing that it was constitutional. In three of the cases I was arguing that it was unconstitutional. Unfortunately or fortunately, the one for unconstitutional came up first and I argued it.

I believe my friend, the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), rather obliquely referred to the fact that I may have changed my mind on something, the other day when I made the point that the DLP had changed its mind on something. All I will say is this that it is a sign of a good lawyer if he is able to argue either side of a problem, and argue it on his faith.

The other thing I would say is that if you are a draftsman and you drafted a particular Act, and you subsequently become a judge or a Chief Justice and you have to adjudicate on that Act, whether it is unconstitutional or not, you cannot remember whether you draft it. You cannot pay any attention to that. You have to pay attention to the real argument.

But there is a case for us to look at the Laws of Barbados and bring several of the statutes up-to-date with the Constitution of Barbados.

At the Constitutional Conference – and I think my friend, the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. Philip Greaves) will remember this – we were advised by the experts, Professor Marshall, Dr. Tachett and Sir James McTetrie, that if we did not have the existing clause in the Constitution, we would well find that the next day, almost a third or more of the Laws of Barbados, or sections of them, would be declared unconstitutional. Therefore, we needed to review each of those Acts and bring them to accord with the fundamental rights provisions. We are into the 17th year of independence and I believe that at some stage we are going to have to find the money to set up, perhaps, a group of people to look at this.

Let me state that there is a tremendous amount of talent in the University of the West Indies in the Faculty of Law at Cave Hill. I think that some of us who have been educated overseas do not recognise this.

Asides

Hon. H. deB FORDE: I am being very frank, including the honourable Member for St. Michael West. Although the honourable Member for St. Michael West has not done his Certificate on Legal Education, I have the greatest respect for his views on law. I have seen some of his work and I know of his lecturing.

We must recognise that the Cave Hill Campus and the University of the West Indies have produced people, with quite a deep knowledge of the law, who have been particularly studying the position in the context of the Caribbean Constitution, and they are developing a good deal of articles and journals which are beneficial to those of us who are very busy practising.

I can cite Professor Carnegie; I can cite one of the most brilliant West Indians, who is an outstanding administrative constitutional lawyer, Dr. Alexis, who can give tremendous assistance on the matter. I am sure that they would be willing to render this sort of assistance without too much trouble.

Mr. Chairman, an Attorney General is a very busy person. I sometimes think, perhaps, that he is the busiest member of the Cabinet. I know that my colleagues probably would not like to hear me say that, but the Attorney General has a lot on his plate. In addition to being the Minister of External Affairs, which in itself is a pretty hard Ministry, he has Home Affairs subjects, he has Legal Affairs subjects and, unlike other Ministers, he has to be a technician because when every thing stops, it stops on his plate.

I have the greatest respect for anybody who undertakes this Ministry, both my predecessor and my successor in office, because I know it is a very exacting and very difficult job. And when they are making errors in the law I think that people should be sympathetic to the view that, obviously, each of the Attorney Generals tried their best.

Just this one last point, Sir. The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) said that the Attorney General is like any other Minister. He is not! I had to make that quite clear in the Pele debate. I do not know if the honourable Member remembers that. I made it quite clear to my Cabinet colleagues, including the Prime Minister, that there is an area in which the Attorney General takes no direction from anybody in the Cabinet; and I made it clear, in turn, that if I was being forced, I would have left the Cabinet on that issue.

It must be clearly understood in the constitutional practice of this country that an Attorney General does have an independent role to perform, including in this House. There are times that an Attorney General cannot

take a partisan political stance on issues before this House, when they involve issues of privileges.

I would commend to the House an article written in the *West Indian Law Journal* on the role of the Attorney General, and one written by an outstanding person in the Attorney General's Chambers, Miss Richards, again a product of Cave Hill Campus, who has produced a very brilliant LLM thesis, which ought to be published, on the role of the Attorney General. I think it would be very instructive to Members of this House and to Prime Ministers, because sometimes you have to tell Prime Ministers, both there and here, that on certain issues, people who are Attorney-Generals are not there to be dealt with like any other Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the honourable Member for allowing me to say a few words on this Head in relation to two things. He ended on a note which I would like to take up. I would like to recommend to everyone who is interested in the role of the Attorney General in the Caribbean to really get hold of Miss Richard's thesis and read it. Mr. Chairman, if you would pardon the expression, it reads like poetry. It is a fantastic piece of work.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Attorney General is off on a frolic of his own again. No, I am not discussing her sensuality. I am discussing her legal capacity.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a point concerning the statement by the Prime Minister. I am not going to question the veracity and/or source of his statement, but I am going to question the desirability of the Prime Minister in a society like ours making certain statements, because one has to assume that when the Prime Minister makes a statement, it is a studied and considered statement, and therefore the Prime Minister is taking the opportunity to do something.

It would have been much more useful if the Prime Minister, in his recent utterances concerning censoring and other related matters, had taken the trouble to explain to the community that he was agreeing with a view put forward arising out of a study, because what the former Attorney General was saying to us is that it came out of the Jones study. He puts an entirely different complexion on what the Prime Minister had to say, as compared with the impression given by the newspaper report.

Earlier, the Attorney General was indicating to us how we have to give moral foundation and assistance to the para-military forces in the execution of their duty. 10.00 p.m.

When a Prime Minister says to a population that he cannot imagine that anybody would want to jail anybody for uttering a bad word, or words to that effect, the Prime Minister is making a fundamental error. In the first place, it is presumed that a magistrate who decides to sentence a person has the opportunity to hear the evidence first hand, to look at the demeanour of the witnesses and to make a decision.

As a lawyer, the Prime Minister may be critical of such a decision, but he is not cast in the same role when he speaks as a Prime Minister. As he said the other night, he is *primus inter pares,* and I will go with him on that, but, more important, he wears a hat in this country in which he is the epitome of what a number of people see as the leadership in the country. So when a thirteen year old turns to his father and says that means we could curse as much as we like, you begin to get the import of the inefficiousness.

I have to speak for the Attorney General (a) and the Attorney General (b) on such a statement, because where on the one hand you are trying to get the children in school and the youths in the community to have a certain view of life, on the other hand you have the Prime Minister exposed on the television saying, in essence, that it is all right for us to curse and swear and carry on.

The bogey of the policemen coming for you if you cursed and swore is one of the tools used by parents when you are growing up to help you to get a moral standard worthy of the community. The Prime Minister himself may be exposed, in his dealings either with his colleagues or in his other dealings, to a certain level of communication, but he must not presume that that level is sufficient for the community. He himself as Prime Minister must set a much higher standard, even if he disagreed with the standard.

I myself have learned all of the words of colour in Barbados. If you grew up in the village where I grew up and you pretended that you did not know the language that was spoken by the people of the village, you would be a liar, if not a hypocrite. But at the same time, I, too, have lived a life at some time when the use of such words was considered to be outside the pale of what is decent, respectable and desirable.

In this Honourable Chamber I think each and every honourable Member is capable, with the possible exception of my friend, the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) and the acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), who has been known to bring a meeting to an end until the word was withdrawn, of using what has been euphemistically described as colorful language, and, Sir, we nonetheless have never used such language as a model for those whom we would have follow us.

It is wrong, therefore, for the Prime Minister to utter such words in relation to the courts in the circumstances in which he did. And I want to go on to make this point to the Attorney General, that he, too, must be careful how he makes certain statements which may be expressive of his own personal view on certain matters, but which ought not necessarily to form the basis of policy statements uttered even here in this Honourable House. I think he should be very careful how he articulates his views concerning parole and concerning first offenders and that sort of thing. I believe that, until you are in a position where you are able to put the entire gamut of positions on these issues, to issue one or two statements out of context can lead to a misinterpretation of what it is you are saying.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the most sophisticated community in the world and there are a number of persons who take things literally in this community. And while I think that the views articulated by the Attorney General are views that would be shared by almost all right thinking persons, it is not the view itself, but it is the way in which it is articulated which is important when you are in a position of leadership in a community such as this.

I do not wish to be gratuitous or appear to be holier than thou, Mr. Chairman. You know that I am not holier than thou, but I think the Attorney General, in his unique position of leadership which is constitutional and not political, whatever that means – idiot that I am – should recognise that when he is going to make such statements, he has got to phrase those statements in such a way that he cannot be misquoted even by the ordinary people, who, after all, make up the vast majority of people in this community.

I think, too, that there is too much anger expressed between lawyers in this community in the normal scheme of things. Unfortunately, Sir, the professionals in our community have acceded to the principles of maximum confusion, that if you operate in a certain way and do a certain level, you confuse the rest of the society and they do not know what is happening; therefore, when they come to you, you are able to retain the magic.

For example, Sir, if you go to a doctor – I have checked to see if my colleague is here, but I did not say a specialist – he never says to you: "I have examined you and I believe that you have possibly one of three things and I am thinking of No.3 for the following reasons." He examines you and he writes a prescription and he tells you to take this and you should be all right.

To the vast majority of people in Barbados that might have been all right 25 years ago, but I believe that we have reached the stage where they ought to take the people into their confidence and allow them....

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: My colleagues are beginning to tell the specialist that I am saying things about him, but he does not practise medicine like that except when he is practising on the honourable Member, according to what he says. He does not practise like that. He usually tells people what he thinks is wrong with them. I have had that experience.

The point I am making is that the professionals in this community have a special obligation to the rest of the community to start uplifting the community. I am not joining the bandwagon of running down lawyers, but there are too many lawyers in Barbados who seem to be afraid to discuss their profession openly and frankly. They seem to feel that somehow the name "lawyer" means that some special magic has been added, and from time to time the Prime Minister has been guilty of this particular fault where he has sought to suggest that a discussion of the law necessarily requires some 20 or 40 years' practice at the Bar or some such thing.

I wish to share with the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) the view that not enough use is being made of the facilities at the Cave Hill Campus. I say that in all humility. There are a number of persons who are doing very important work in this whole area of Caribbean law, and it can be of great assistance to the decision making in the community if they would stop viewing the law Faculty as somewhere where there are them versus us. My experience in the Law Faculty is that the vast majority of persons up there are scholars rather than politicians.

I have to declare an interest in the next point I am going to make, because I have been involved to some extent in a project of law reporting which seeks to bring the law reports of the Barbados Judiciary and judicial situations up to date. I wish to suggest to the Attorney General that his department should exhibit more interest in what is an extremely difficult job. The stipend which is being offered is not sufficient to attract other than the most public-spirited persons to participate in this exercise.

The exercise is one that is of crucial importance to the Barbadian jurisprudence, and the project could have been much further advanced if sufficient, shall I say, "interest" in getting it completed had been exhibited. I recognised that I am in an area where we are talking about money, but the former Attorney General can vouch for the fact of what I am saying, that a number of persons who would be eminently capable of producing the total number of volumes in a relatively short time

have had to leave the matter until they have nothing else to do, precisely because the cost in time and effort is too high in relation to the reward.
10.10 p.m.

As I said Mr. Chairman, I declare an interest, as I am required to when I am speaking about this, because I, myself, have had the actual experience of trying to assist in this area and discovering that, quite frankly, it is not worthwhile unless you have some kind of public commitment to it. I am not saying that my public commitment is higher or greater than anybody else's, and for these reasons I feel able to speak about this, because none of the other persons involved is able to speak about it.

In that respect, I do not think it is against the Rules of the House if I said that the yeoman service which is being performed by Justice Williams in bringing the written law in Barbados within the scope of the practitioners of the law, as well as those who are interested from the scholarly point of view, needs to be acknowledged in greater form than it usually appears to be acknowledged in Barbados. If Barbados has a scholar in the law of which it can boast and can be proud, I think that Justice Williams could claim, quite justifiably, that particular mantle.

I am sure that he would need no gratuitious praise from me, but I think it is something that ought to be acknowledged. How he has been able over the years to continue to send out the West Indian Reports, while doing his other duties and finding time to assist in the prodigious work of the Company Law and other related matters, is something which one can only watch with a certain degree of awe. He has been able to do it without missing a beat, as it were, because the quality of his scholarship shines through, no matter which direction you turn in relation to law.

I would also like to take this opportunity to say that, despite some unkind remarks that were once hurled at him, Dr. Francis Alexis is a West Indian whose area of work, and whose production in the field of law in the Caribbean, in a relatively short time, is something of which we as West Indians should be proud. I am very grateful to him that, through a series of fortuitous circumstances, I have been able to share a lot of his experiences and a small part of his knowledge.

He has now undertaken to write the law notes of the West Indian Law Journal. Let it be known that no one who contributes to the West Indian Law Journal gets any kind of remuneration, and he has undertaken to write the law notes for each issue of the West Indian Law Journal *ad infinitum*. That in itself forms the basis of a full-time job for persons involved in other journals and so on. He does this while teaching at the university and turning out, an average, one serious article a month.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Attorney General is suggesting that I should stick to the issues but, with the greatest respect, I wish to suggest to him that these are matters that ought to command the interest and the attention of the Ministry of Legal Affairs. There is, unfortunately, a view abroad that the Ministry of Legal Affairs is so concerned with the mechanics of drafting and getting legislation before the House that they have no time for other matters in relation to the development of the Law. I do not think that is a good thing to happen to Barbados and, for what it is worth, I suggest that the Attorney General take a little bit of the time that he can afford, if any, and pay some attention to this area of his Ministry's responsibility.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member who has just sat down has spent a long time advising the Ministry of Legal Affairs on matters that are within the full competence of the Ministry. You would have thought that the Ministry of Legal Affairs would have never heard of Professor Carnegie. I was a student of Professor Carnegie when I was at Oxford and had the best relationship with him, and he has advised the Ministry on International Law and Law of the Sea Matters for a long time, and Constitutional Law.

He mentions Francis Alexis and says that we do a lot of work in drafting and we have no time for these things. I asked Dr. Francis Alexis, early in my term of office, to come in and discuss how best he may be able to advise and to work on certain areas of the law for the Ministry of Legal Affairs. There are others. I have spoken to Dr. Liverpool, who is always ready, willing and able to give advice to the Ministry of Legal Affairs on special areas of our interest.

The honourable Member did not get up and talk as if these things are so far removed from us, and that we are so rapped-up in our own little legal cocoon at the Marine House, that we cannot appreciate the significant contribution that the scholars at Cave Hill can give. I only want to let you know that they do contribute. Your advice is well taken, but it is a little bit late.

He made a point about law reporting. I do not know why the honourable Member goes into that. I think Mr. Justice Williams is perfectly able to put a case about the work he does on law reporting. He makes reference to the former Attorney General. I do not know why you do not deal with this Attorney General on this

subject. Law reporting was going on during the time of my predecessor, and it is still going on.

I have consultation from time to time with Mr. Justice Williams, Mrs. Newton, and the people who are working on it, and I have never heard them complain that they were not being properly looked after. When they feel that the money for which they work is too small, they ask for increases, and we grant the increases. It seems remarkable that I should hear the type of remarks that the Honourable Member should hear in that regard.

I have talked to Mr. Williams over and over and we have agreed on his level of remuneration. I talk with Mrs. Newton all the time, my Permanent Secretary does, and I do not know if there is any complaining about the level of remuneration. The honourable Member for St. Michael West has just started on the way, and is talking about money already?

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: But I would have to say that! The people who have been working all the time have never mentioned anything about money.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman! I really would have preferred if the Attorney General would not have accepted the remarks that I made in that spirit. The fact is that they pay something like $400 for a volume of Law Reports. It takes about five hours of serious work to do one case properly, and each volume might have as many as 12, 15, or 30 cases.

I cannot really understand why the Attorney General cannot be gracious sometimes. I did not ask him for any money. There is no one, except a creton, who heard my statement who could interpret it as wanting money. Does the Attorney General genuinely believe that someone who raises a question concerning a law volume could be raising it in the pursuit of money? Does the Attorney General believe that $400 is an issue for someone to raise? I am disappointed that he would take it in that spirit.
10.20 p.m.

Hon. L. R. TULL: There is no mistake. The honourable Member made the complaint that these people were not well paid for the job they were doing. It is a misrepresentation, because they have not complained to the Ministry of Legal Affairs that they are not being properly paid.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I am saying it is not true, and if you were so told, that is not true either. Mr. Chairman, he has talked about Mr. Williams. I do not want to get him into the debate, but the persons who actually did the law reports are persons out there, like Burgess, a gentleman in Trinidad, and the former Attorney General would tell you that there have been reports that it is not enough. The former Attorney General would confirm it. Do not get up in here and give the impression that somebody out there is lying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be seated, please. That is not a point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, we are accustomed to his bad manners, so he carry on like that. I have just checked with the officers in my Ministry and we have not had any complaints from Mr. Burgess, from Mrs. Newton or from Mr. Justice Williams that they have been exploited. Each time they say we have a little bit more work than we were doing in the past, we would like some more money, we ask them how much, and we pay the money.

The honourable Member has now got into it and he knows all about it. We are dealing with it all the time, Sir, and it is not fair for him to get in here and misrepresent the position and give people the impression that somehow or other we are exploiting these people.

The honourable Member used a very cheap debating point in relation to something I said earlier. I did not say anything in my contribution about any first offenders. He dressed it up very prettily and said the Attorney General should try not to make certain statements and give the wrong impression, and this sort of thing, Sir, and he went on to make a point about first offenders. I never said anything in my contribution about first offenders, and it is a cheap debating point to put words in the mouth of someone and then seek to criticise them. I never said a word about first offenders, nor anything that is critical of judicial sentence.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Sir: The honourable Member in his contribution talked about his amazement at the number of persons in prison who were up for certain sentences of up to six months. Do you remember that? He said that. Now, to a person who is not unintelligent, that could be interpreted as first offenders. If I use the term "first offenders" and you prefer me to say those persons serving six months or under, I apologise for using "first offenders", I say those persons serving six months or under. It is all right. It was not intended to be a cheap political point, it was an honest interpretation of what you said.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I cannot go on with this, because if one does not understand the difference between somebody doing a short sentence and somebody being a first offender, it is a waste of my time trying to go on any more on this.

I beg to move that Head 28, as amended, stand part.

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

HEAD 29 – PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS – $81 917

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 29 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 30 – POLICE – $6 583 112

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, one of the most refreshing things that happened to Barbados in the past year is the resurgence of public confidence in the police in this country. We went through a very difficult period over the past two or three years where the public regard for the police had reached its nadir, and during the past year ever sector of the community has been effusive in its praise for the new image of the police and the work that they are doing to contain crime in this country and indeed the way in which they are reaching out to embrace the public in the work they are trying to do.

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that I can be peripherally associated with this new development, and I want to commend the new Commissioner of Police, Mr. Durant, for the way in which he has gone about his work, the way in which he has inspired confidence not only with the public, as I have mentioned, but the confidence of the men under his charge. The relationship between him and the Ministry has been a good one up to now, and I am confident that the new high will continue for a long time to come.

There are a number of significant developments that I believe I should make short reference to. One of the most popular new introductions was the Resident Beat Scheme where the Commissioner assigned an officer to a district, and the officer is the man of all sorts in the district. He is a little bit of a priest, a little bit of a teacher, a little bit of a social worker, he is a consultant, he is a friend of the children, he is everything. The scheme has been working admirably well, and I commend the police for the work they are doing in that area.

We also have a great deal of internal re-organisation in the Police Force. One of the difficulties in any organisation is the difficulty of proper mobilisation of your resources. Quite often you have people and you have materials and you are not able to get the best results because they are not being properly mobilised. Over the last few months I have seen an improvement in the mobilisation of the forces of the Barbados Police Force that is bringing out the best in many areas of that Force.

But we must not be complacent and rest on our laurels, we have a lot more to do. I, unfortunately, Sir, was off the island at the time of the recent escape of a few prisoners from Glendairy, but all reports that have been brought to me subsequent to my return have spoken very eloquently of the spirit and the dedication of the policemen as they went about trying to bring these men back into custody.

What also very much pleases me, Sir, and this is a little bit sensitive, is what I notice to be a marked decline in political activism among members of the Police Force. That is one of the things that used to cause a few problems in recent years, and there were some police officers who felt they were more politicians than any of the 27 Members of the House of Assembly.

I had occasion to talk to the Commissioner of Police, I believe before he was appointed or shortly after, and told him that that was one of my concerns, that I lived in this society and I know as well as anybody else what is going on, that there were a few members of the Police Force who were too active in partisan politics, and that it would do well for the Force if he could contain this. I must say that I have seen a decline in that type of activity over the past few months.

The Police Force has also enhanced its public relations in the past year or so, and those of us who have time to listen to radio and watch television would see that the police are sprucing up their public relations, eliciting the aid of the public in a lot of what they are doing. They have set up a Public Relations Office in the Force to look after that particular aspect of their activity.

Mr. Chairman, I do not at this time propose to go into all the aspects of the police activity that please me. There is so much more that can be talked about, the Commissioner's attitude to the social role of the Police Force, the emphasis on the preventive aspect of policing, to get to the social causes of crime, to work with other agencies in the community to extirpate these causes before he has to send his men out there and arrest people. That is a new approach to policing in this country that is welcome by all progressive social thinking persons in Barbados. There are several other areas, Sir, and I do not want to prolong the encomiums being showered on them.

10.30 p.m.

I remember seeing my predecessor in office under terrible seige over a lot of misconceptions about the role of the Minister in relation to the police, the public and so on, I felt sorry for him at that time. He is a little different from me, because he took a lot of the pressure with

a certain gentility that would not have characterized any actions of mine. I am glad that it went through that phase, and I am glad I am not reading in the newspaper or hearing on the radio why the Attorney General, the Minister of Legal Affairs, Minister of the Police, does not get up off his rump and do this and curtail crime and so on.

I have noticed that the figures for the number of crimes being committed in Barbados have fallen. Usually, you would hear about these when they go up; there is a lot of public comment and so on. I am not so foolish as to believe that this is the beginning of a downward trend. I expect that they will fluctuate up and down, but, at least at the moment, I am happy to know that we are seeing a decline in the number of crimes being committed in Barbados.

The Government is continuing its commitment to further training members of the Force and the provision of newer and better equipment for communications and for the detection of crime. There are a number of areas where we believe that a lot more will be necessary, but, like all things in this country at this period, we cannot afford to provide everything at the same time. We are very much conscious of the need for further upgrading the terms and conditions of the policemen, and the training and equipment for the important job which they are doing.

Before I finally ask that the Head be moved, I want to make a last plea in relation to maintenance of public order. One of the things that I am a little bit concerned about is the increase in the number of complaints made by the public against the police. These letters come to me with a bit too much frequency now. But policemen have a difficult job, and the people who complain cover the whole range of society, and they complain about things as trivial as bad manners, through to victimization and crime itself.

For many years we have had the internal enquiry, the police themselves investigating complaints against the police. I have a feeling, that that will have to stop very shortly and that there must be an external element drawn into the complaint procedure of the Police Force.

Now, we have to be very careful how we do this, because we have to strike a balance between the liberties of the individual on the one hand, these are the people who are complaining against high-handed police action, and the integrity and the morale of the Police Force on the other. We do not want to make the people of Barbados or individuals feel that their liberties are being violated in respect of police conduct without having the proper redress, and on the other hand, we must be assured that the community at large maintains its confidence in the police and that the morale of the Police Force does not fall.

Maintenance of public order lies at the very root of a stable society, and this is why we will have to devise some system with the Police. I will have to talk to the Commissioner about it, I believe I have mentioned it to him already, but we will have to sit down and devise a new police complaint procedure, so that we can strike the balance that I have been referring to, so that the public does not begin to feel that it is a waste of time when these matters come up.

I have noticed that the Commissioner himself, without anything on my part, is doing a cleaning of the Augean stables, getting rid of the bad eggs and the ne'er-do-wells of the Police Force. Institutions and agencies like these have a way of protecting themselves.

I well remember that when I went into the Ministry, the Police evinced a hostility towards me that was a little bit frightening. They somehow felt that my predecessor was their best friend and I was their worst enemy. But I see now that they are clearing their heads and have gotten their act together. They no longer have those fears, and they have been working together to move in the direction that Ministry and the Police Force would want.

I have found it unnecessary to communicate with the Commissioner a lot. That is another sign that things are going well. It is when things are really bad that you have to keep in touch with the Heads of departments and go into consultation on one thing and another. I do not think I have spoken to the Commissioner on any matter within the last two months. That is a sign that things are going good.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go any further. If honourable Members want to raise any questions in regard to any aspect of policing, I would be glad to do so.

I beg to move that Head 30, as amended, stand part.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman I do not propose to be too long under this Head. When the Attorney General began his statement on this issue, he was full in his encomiums for the Police Force, its new image, and so on.

Let me begin by saying that I am satisfied that a genuine effort is being made to generally improve the image of the Police Force, to improve its capability and to improve the Force in all aspects. We are glad to see that it has taken a new turn, a turn for the better, but I am glad too, that the Attorney General at the end of his statement has not shut his eyes to the fact that there are problems which still need to be addressed in the Force, that there are still public complaints about aspects of behaviour of certain policemen.

I am satisfied that he is approaching the matter in the right way, balancing the rights of the citizens against the need to preserve law and order in the community and the need to give the police support in this very difficult task of maintaining order in this community. But the new Commissioner has only recently assumed office.
10.40 p.m.

I think it is incumbent upon all of us to give him a chance to implement the very many valuable suggestions and ideas which he has articulated from time to time, and we wait with anticipation to see a complete change, so to speak, in the image, the responsibility of policemen. We hope we can get away from the situation where policemen regard their duty as the prosecution of people, without any regard as to whether they are right or wrong. We are looking forward to the time when there will be a serious reduction in the complaints about how the police treat people when they are arrested and then detained for questioning. We look forward to a total change in the public impression. We look forward, too, to an elimination of some of the bad ends, so to speak, in the Police Force, which at times still mistreat people, and whose members sometimes misconceive of their roles and take advantage of innocent citizens.

We on this side believe that the approach of the new Commissioner is right. We know that it will not be easy for him to deal with all the problems with which the Police Force is confronted and the very many complaints which can be made about them, and we recognise that in the administration of the Force itself the Commissioner, and certainly his senior officers, are going to have problems in regulating precisely how the junior officers under their command are to effectively carry out their duty, because it must be clear that a Commissioner cannot supervise every single detail of the activities of the police officers under his command.

But the challenge for us all as a community, and for the Police Force, is to create in the minds of the younger officers of the Force – and some of the old ones too, if you can change some of them – that they have a responsibility to the community, that they are there for the purpose of serving the community of which they too form a part, that they have to recognise the rights of citizens and they have to treat people with respect. Sometimes it is clear that they have to be firm with persons whom they have arrested, and firm in a variety of ways, but in the overall analysis we want to be assured that police officers in general respect the rights of persons as persons in the overall scheme of things.

That means, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to have to have co-operation with the police at all levels, not only at the level of those of the lower end of the socio-economic ladder, but we have to have co-operation as well from those midway up the ladder and higher up the ladder. So all of us have got to demonstrate a respect for the law and a willingness to co-operate with the police at all levels.

We want to be rid once and for all of the possibility of any suggestion being made and entertained that police officers may be on to something big in the solution of particular crimes, but they find themselves being frustrated and inhibited, one way or the other, in concluding their investigation and bringing justice to the community by persons who may be higher up either the social, economic or political ladder.

Asides

Mr. M. A. KING: I say we want to be assured – and I will repeat that statement – that the community is not inflicted with statements and led to believe that the police are inhibited in the detection of crimes and bringing persons to justice because of either social conditions, economic position, political position, any kind of position.

What is wrong with that as a general statement? There are instances where we have heard in the community that circumstances of that kind have been in existence and all I am saying is that I am making a plea that, irrespective of where you are, the police be given the fullest possible co-operation. How can anything be wrong with a statement of that kind?

Asides.

Mr. M. A. KING: I ignore that statement. That is the type of statement the honourable member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) would make.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please, on the Government benches.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I do not have anything more to say on this Head.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I want to lay to rest this myth. I hear it all the time at Estimates time, or the year before and last year, the honourable member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) got in here and made a statement that political interference with police prevented the police from bringing court cases in certain types of drug crimes in Barbados. He got in here and said that. An officer in the Police Force in an interview with the *Nation* newspaper subsequently said that whenever they get on the verge of cracking particular felonies, people from high up in politics interfere with

them. I say that the Commissioner of Police should investigate the statement by the particular officer, and if he cannot prove it, he should be dismissed from the Police Force.

I am tired and fed up with politicians making snide remarks about politicians interfering with the administration of justice when there is not one iota of evidence to suggest that that is so. And the newspapers repeat it, and we have to put our foot down on it right now, because there is nothing that undermines the confidence of the community in the Police Force than if from within the Police Force itself there is a suggestion that they are being interferred with in the administration of their work. You all get in here and make the statements and you have no iota of evidence to support it, and the newspapers pick it up and publish it because they do not have any sense of responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, if the newspapers had any sense of responsibility they would not take a statement from a police inspector, superintendent, or whoever it is, alleging that they are being interfered with without saying "My man, this is a very serious allegation to make, you have to give me sufficient evidence that I can publish that". They must not allow themselves to be used as a conduit pipe for publishing irresponsible matters without some fundamental or scintilla of evidence to support.

I object to that strenuously, because that would do away with all of the good work that we are getting done, all of the co-operation that we are getting now. The people will say: "Oh yes, why am I wasting my time; why am I exposing myself to help the police?" This in truth and in fact has happened, and when you investigate it, when you ask about it, it is a few malcontents in the Police Force who are trying to do that because they did not get promotion, or because they believed that somebody else did. We do not want that.

Mr. Chairman, whenever I hear any politician make such a statement, I am going to get up and challenge him to publish the details of who it is that is interfering with them, and I want that particular officer who made that statement in the *Nation* to give proof. It is not too late, and when we get an opportunity again in here and outside I am going to challenge them again.

I am very glad to see that the progress that has been made and is continuing to be made, and I hope that we will get rid of this attempt to make the police into a political football. We went through six years of the other side trying to make the police into a political football, trying to make the Attorney General into a political football with the Police Force, when we knew all along that week after week inside Cabinet we were discussing how we could get more resources and how we could flow more resources to the Police Force.

And we were exceedingly careful never to attempt to interfere in any way with police promotion. I do not even know how the police get promoted. It does not interest me; I do not care how they get promotion. Ninety-nine per cent of the Cabinet Ministers do not even know how they get promotion. They do not know who is on the Police Service Commission. They are not interested in that. It never engaged their attention, therefore when we see people making these statements and making these suggestions, it must incur our wrath.

10.50 p.m.

I also want to say this, and this is something that the public should learn. In the administration of the Criminal Law, the responsibility for investigations under our Constitution rests with the police. The responsibility for prosecution rests with the Director of Public Prosecution. It has nothing to do with any politician. It has nothing to do with the Attorney General. People must understand that, and the newspapers have understood the constitutional process to point that out.

I hear a lot of foolishness being talked all the time about the Government has to stop clubs, there is racialism in clubs. The Government has passed the laws. The laws are there. We know for a fact that investigations have, in fact, taken place and there are criminal charges being brought. You cannot say that the Minister of Tourism or the Attorney General can bring a case. If the conduct of the people is such that they report the facts to the police, the police then carry the evidence, with their preliminary conclusions, to the Director of Public Prosecutions, if they need his advice.

It is time that the newspapers understand the constitutional process. Leave the politicians out of the administration of justice. The politicians do not want to get in it. It is not our business. The Constitution segregates the administration of criminal justice completely from the politicians, and I, as a politician, feel free to criticise the police if I feel that they deserve criticism, to point out their short-comings if I feel they deserve that, without any accusation that you are interfering.

I feel free to do it with judges, too. I cannot tell a judge what decision to give, but once he has given a decision, I am entitled in this democracy to comment on it. If the sentence is too light, I can say that, in my opinion, the sentence is too light. I want to get this across, because the Press in this country has to be educated. Nobody but an ignorant Press would have repeated the foolish talk by Sydney Smith, because you are entitled, as a matter of liberty, to comment on the manner of sentencing. You cannot tell a judge how to sentence in a particular case, but once he has sentenced, you can comment on it.

Let us not forget that not so long ago in the United Kingdom a judge sentenced a man who had raped somebody, I believe, for a day, or a month. So vigorous were the comments on the injustice that was felt because of the slight nature of the sentence, that the Prime Minister repeatedly had to say what her views were, what the Government's views were, what the Home Secretary's views were, and what the Lord Chancellor's views were. I believe the judge was called upon to resign, because it was an outrage.

In New York, apparently – the Attorney General reminds me – there is a judge who boasted how he spun a coin to decide what sentence to give a person and the Press murdered him. Let the Press understand that it is not their duty to repeat foolishness, bogus talk coming from a former bogus Attorney General. You must not deal with that. That is bogus law. It offends commonsense, really offends commonsense!

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: the honourable Member is not entitled to use insulting language about that person. You cannot call him a "bogus Attorney General". That is insulting and improper.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: If what the newspapers report is accurate as to what he said, he is not only bogus, he was ignorant and unfit to hold office of Attorney General because of those foolish rules he had. I say that!

I am not having any more of that talk in this country. I am not listening to it. I am not going to tolerate any of this foolishness that politicians cannot comment legitimately, fairly and squarely, on the conduct of anybody else in Barbados.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am very, very happy to speak on this subject of the Police and to hear from both the honourable Members for St. Michael North West (Mr. L. A. Weekes) and the Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) and my friend, the honourable learned Attorney General, of the progress which the Police Force has made and of the goodwill which the public is showing to the Police Force.

I believe the Police Force suffered, unfairly, tremendous criticisms over a period of certainly three or four years, and, as the head of the Ministry then responsible for the Police, I got my fair share of it. But I took it all and stood up aside of and firmly behind the Police, because I recognised that they had a very difficult job to do, they were doing it with very limited resources, and it would have taken some time before the good effects of proper planning could show in the work of the Police Force.

I believe that in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party of 1981 is, perhaps, one of the clearest and best statements, not only of the then existing position of law and order in this country, but also of a programme for how to improve law and order in the country. On page 27 of that manifesto we reported, quite rightly, that there had been no long-term planning made for the police for several years. Certainly, it had to take a period of time before you can recruit enough policemen and train them in order to make them available to carry out some of the tasks that they now have to carry out.

I believe the period of training cannot stop. I am very glad to hear the assurance of the learned Attorney General that the accent on training will continue, because I think that it is a very important part of the building up of the strength and the morale of the force. I take the opportunity once again to thank the British Government in particular and the Canadian Government for the assistance which they so rapidly gave to the Force over the three or four year period to help us try to retrain the Force.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I know that we are getting near the end of tonight's session and I will want to continue tomorrow. But before I continue on policy for the Police Force, I want to take this opportunity publicly, as I have done privately, to congratulate the present Commissioner of Police. It was always obvious to me, if it was not obvious to anybody else, that we had in him a person that was not only a strict disciplinarian, but who had the guts to fight for the members of the Police Force, just as he had the guts to stand up and discipline them if they were wrong. Therefore, it seemed to me when I was looking down the line of how the Force would develop in the future, that he and other young officers were the people with whom we could rebuild the Force over a period of time.

I have not been disappointed, and I am quite sure the public of Barbados cannot be disappointed in him at all. I am sure that he will get the absolute and maximum loyalty of the Force, because not only is he an intelligent person, but he has the strong characteristics of leadership, and one of the other things about him is that he understands constitutional government.

I want to make one comment about the relationship between the Minister and the Commissioner of Police. I know that this point was not accepted in my party by some people, and it was not accepted on the Opposition benches from the statements they made on the public platforms, but I think it would be improper for an Attorney General or a Minister in charge of the Police to give directions to the Police on the investigation of any particular case. I stood up for that, and, I will stand up

for it again in this country or anywhere. I think it has strengthened the hands of the police, and I believe it was a correct principle.

11.00 p.m.

I suffered grievously with some of the most stringent criticisms because I defended the police. Not only from the Prime Minister, I have heard it from the Democratic Labour Party platforms. I heard it both from my party and from outside, but, you see, I am the sort of politician who could not care less, because politics never meant anything to me, once I am fighting for the right principle. I believe it is a constitutional principle, and I hope that the Commissioner of Police will stick to his guns on it, and that the Police Force will realise that it is a convention that must be upheld.

I will tell you why. Today if I, as Minister, had the power to tell the Commissioner that he must investigate a particular person, I may put him on my political opponent, just as if my political opponent had the power he may put him on me, and I believe that we must recognise those constitutional conventions. I am satisfied that the Force has that behind it and that they will honour it.

Let me say this for the Police Commissioner. He has always made it clear that that was the position that he understood, and that is the position that I hope will be honoured. Not that the Police cannot get general policy directions – of course they get general policy directions – but the actual day to day investigation of crime is a matter for them, which they must carry out within the Constitution of this country.

I am glad to see that there is an increase of $2 million in the vote under this Head, and I suppose a certain percentage of it has obviously gone to pay for increased wages and various other things, but I believe that we must continue to spend more on the civil forces – and I am talking about the civil forces of law and order – the Police Force in this country. I have made the point before that no matter how well we do in manufacturing, no matter how well we do in exporting, no matter how well we do in tourism, if law and order in this country is not maintained on the streets of this country, the whole structure of Barbados will come tumbling down, and that places a tremendous responsibility on the police of the country.

I consider that the police services of law and order are as much part of economic development of a country, as indeed do I consider that tourism or manufacturing is part of it, and therefore in the allocation of resources we must make sure that we give the police adequate resources. I am happy to see in the Estimates that the honourable Minister has been able to get some additional money for some of the needs of the police, and the equipment they need.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have again to repeat, because I am hearing that they are glad to see a new turn. That new turn could not have come about without laying the proper structure. There was a time when the police in this country did not even have enough walkie-talkie sets. There was a time when people in the C.I.D. were sleeping on their kits, and Barclays Bank had to come to our rescue and give us a few things for the police.

The police have not been as well treated in this country as they ought to have been. I have been fighting for them since 1959 when I came back here and was representing the Police Association. From time to time everybody has given them pious words. In times of need, when we are sleeping and there is danger, everybody calls for the police. At times they abuse the police. They do not realise that this is a group of men who have the responsibility for maintaining the stability of this country as much as any of us. That is why if I have spoken very strongly on this issue it is because I know that they are a very, very important and crucial part of the structure of Barbados, and we could not have maintained democracy and a stable country without a Police Force that, I think, has reached a high high.

Now, any Force has a few bad eggs, Sir. If it is the police, if it is the soldiers, if it is the politicians, whatever you like, there are a few bad eggs, but by and large we have a Police Force that is not a corrupt Force. You may have one or two people that have erred, and I have known that there has been strict discipline in the Force whenever the opportunity presented itself.

I am well satisfied that the present Commissioner will not allow an opportunity to pass without investigating every case. In fact, I am sure that the Attorney General will find several cases in his office which the Commissioner has investigated. As a matter of fact, the present Commissioner at one stage had special responsibility for this and he was always very fair in the way he investigated the complaints of the public, and if you look at the annual reports that have been published by the Police Force you will see the number of people that have been dealt with over the period of time when they have abused the public confidence in many ways.

Now, Sir, I want to talk about some of the buildings. The new police station at Oistins is perhaps the first station built since 1955. Since Hastings another police station was never built until the new police station at Oistins and the refurbishing of District A. There are still police stations in the country that are in need of assistance. I am glad to see in the Capital Estimates that we are now providing some money to start the station at Welchman Hall. When I left office the architectural plans for that were finished. Let me once again congratulate the present Commissioner by saying that he went out of his way to ensure that all of what would be a

modern layout, maximum security measures and what not, were put into that architectural planning, and from time to time he would come back with the Permanent Secretary on issues such as this to ensure that we have a good thing.

Some people say that we are putting the police up in "Luxury Hall", and all that sort of thing. Some people say that there is a "luxury hall" up at Oistins, but in my view that is the type of station that we ought to be trying to build and have for men who have to spend sometimes 24 hours or 48 hours away from their homes on the job doing hard work all the time against ruthless criminals. A lot of people in here feel very sorry for the criminals, but when the criminals are shooting down the police or are shooting at the police, the police are to put their hands up and go on.

I feel strongly on this, because almost wickedly it was said in an inquest that I told the police to shoot Sylverton Small. I suffered from that sort of thing, you know. My own view, and I said it on the public platform, is that if I am a policeman and I am out there against a dangerous criminal who is armed and who is shooting at me, I would shoot back at him, and I hope the police would never hesitate to do so. I make no apologies for that, but it was never true that I told the police to shoot Sylverton Small. The inquest never showed any such thing.

But this is where politics get into this sort of thing, because all of these problems with the police started with the bye-election in St. Michael South Central. The Pele issue was ruthlessly misused for political purposes. The police were never allowed to do their job, because you had some people trying to say that there were politicians involved in the matter, and I agree. There are one or two policemen who believe that there have political loyalties, maybe on both sides of the fence, which may make them not perform their job properly.

I still make bold to say, no matter what the Malone Report may say, that the police's job in the Pele case was hampered because of the lack of decency on the part of a lot of politicians in Barbados, who used the issue ruthlessly to exploit the situation for partisan political purposes. When I left the office I had photocopied every possible report on the Pele issue, and my former Permanent Secretary will tell you so. I have every one, because one of these days I intend to write it up.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member asks if the Prime Minister knew that. Look, some members of my party did not agree with me and some members of the Opposition ruthlessly and almost dastardly used the position as well.

Asides.

11.10 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: One of the things that I will make sure I write up correctly is the Pele case, because the Pele case is an example of the Barbadian politicians at their worst at partisan level in this country! There is no way that the politicians in Barbados can feel proud of the roles that they played. They are the people who ruthlessly and maliciously attacked the Police Force and undermined them in the Pele issue, and put the Force through a period of crisis that they are now trying to recover from.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am going to finish, Sir. I am blaming a lot of them. One day I am going to call the names, some of them are my friends, too. But you see, when people want power, it is power at any cost. I do not believe in power at any cost. The police should have been allowed to do their job in the Pele case.

Some of the newspapers jumped on the bandwagon, too, without even investigating the position, thinking they were going to pilloried me. The people in Christ Church West had more sense. They returned me with the most votes in the election, because when you stand up for decency, justice and fair play, the right-minded people will always recognize it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member has once again on this subject risen to his heights of wrestling, and I am not even going to suggest tonight that he has outdone himself. He gets really worked up on this issue, but, Mr. Chairman, when all is said and done, there is nothing he can say which would make the Pele case palatable in any form. And while it may very well be true that there were politicians who sent too far, it is also true that the Pele case was a case which required public comment.

Not even the former Attorney General, nor any other person in Barbados, can say that the investigations of the Pele case is a bright spot in the history of the Barbados Police Force. And no one can get me to say that even now as we recognize that we have a Commissioner of Police whom we all can praise without having to be gratuitous!

I do not wish from the Floor of this House to have to say anything about the Police Force under the last Commissioner; he was doing the best he could, but do not let us reach the point now where we turn in the

persons who were investigating certain crimes, I think they were drug crimes, were being stymied in their investigations. We sought to have the Government investigate that. We stand to gain something from it politically, and there is no point pretending that when something happens to them that we are not going to jump on it and gain a political advantage.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: We are not dealing with Pele, because we will go back down that road. I am dealing with the issue that the *Nation* raised.

The point is that even when you are trying to gain political points, as a Barbadian citizen in public life you also have an additional interest, and when we read that a high ranking politician may be baulking an investigation, we feel it is incumbent on the Minister responsible for Police in the community to clarify that issue for us. We came to the House, we asked questions about it, we did not get a satisfactory answer; indeed, we got no answer. We wrote about it in our publication, but what was very interesting, Sir, is that neither the newspaper – I am dealing with the issue about the newspaper responsibility – seemed willing to deal with that issue in the kind of way that a responsible newspaper should deal with it, that is, smoking out the Minister.

For the first time this evening we heard the honourable Deputy Prime Minister indicating that that officer should be examined, and if what he has had to say is not true, that officer should be dealt with. I want to agree with him, and I will tell you why I want to agree with him. Until that matter is investigated, if the *Nation* prints that a high ranking officer says so, we on this side have to assume that the *Nation*, as a responsible newspaper, has checked its sources and accepted the story as true, or the *Nation* itself should have published that that story that they published did not warrant that kind of prominence which it gave.

All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and I recognise that time is running out, is that in respect of political positions which we take, all of us are Barbadian nationals first, all of us are citizens, and we have a vested interest in having a good Police Force, one not only that will maintain law and order but will recognise the rights of the citizens as well. We believe that we are on the road to having such a Police Force, but we also think that the administration, the Minister responsible, has got to create the necessary framework in which we can have confidence as a political entity that they are doing all that they can and all that they should. We will resume tomorrow and discuss this in a little more detail.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
11.30 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Before I suspend this sitting Sir, I would like to give notice of a Resolution with the leave of the House. I discussed this matter with members of the other side, and if there are no objections, I hope to do it in all of its stages during this sitting.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the House is seeking to give notice of a Resolution and to proceed with it in due course in all of its stages. If there are no objections, leave is therefore granted.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of:

A Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of US$7 million from the United States Agency for International Development for the purpose of on lending to private enterprises in the non-sugar productive sectors of the economy as well as financing of the local currency requirements of priority infrastructure projects in Barbados which are externally financed.

Sir, I have not yet made up in my mind if I should do it first thing tomorrow morning or if I should do it at the end of the Estimates. But I will surely inform my colleagues tomorrow morning about what time we hope to do it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am in receipt of a message from the Honourable the Senate dealing with certain amendments to the Factories Bill. I am hoping that the Leader of the House will find enough time to deal with this matter before the sitting. The necessary amendments would be duly circulated before they are dealt with in the Chamber.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that this sitting be suspended until March 18, 1983, at 11 a.m.

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

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

Resumption:

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in making my contribution to the debate on this particular Head, Royal Barbados Police Force, I wish to state that we on this side view the Royal Barbados Police Force as a very important institution in this country and we are very glad to hear that crime is on the wind as far as the statistics are concerned. We are also glad to know that we are coming out of that very bad period from 1977 until recently when this whole country was very terrified and worried about the crime wave.

At least during that period from January 1977 to December 1980, there had been at least 54 cases of murder, 188 cases of rape, 49 cases of carnal knowledge, 85 cases of indecent language, 377 cases of robbery, 190 cases of burglary, 2540 cases of housebreaking, and 22 422 cases of all other crimes and offences. What those statistics meant, Mr. Chairman, was that house-breaking had increased over 122 percent over the 1976 figure, robbery by 445 percent and rape by 28 percent. Those gross figures in crime were very alarming, outstripping the rate of population growth and outstripping the growth in incomes or in the Gross National Product. We were into a period of a kind of hyper-inflation as far as crime is concerned.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order: Let me first interrupt my colleague this morning in drawing to his attention and the attention of Parliament. That is an analogy that I have never yet heard on the Floor of the House since I have been here for the past 16 years. What an analogy and what a point to score. I have no doubt that my colleague will give you the comparable answer. It is really a classic piece of parliamentary grand-standing and newspaper catching. Let me give you credit for that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member will make a speech later, I am sure.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is not a speech, Sir. It is an observation.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think in these matters we have got to set our principles clear, and, as far as the Royal Barbados Police is concerned, the principles from which we operate in relation to that are quite clear, and they need to be spelled out.

First of all, we believe, and all our arguments are framed against this kind of background, that the quality and the size of the Royal Barbados Police should always be kept under review, it should be improved in terms of the conditions of service and that it should be increased from time to time so that that numerical strength would relate to the functions that that force has to carry out. This should be done by improving screening and selection procedures during recruitment in order to minimize the chances of wrong doing, because if we have wrong doing in the Police Force, we believe that improved recruitment and screening procedures can minimize the chances of such wrong doings occurring.

Secondly, we believe that there should be efforts to uplift the levels of efficiency throughout the Force by completely revamping the initial training programme for new recruits by providing more inservice courses and by developing regular training programmes for the middle and other ranks of the Force. That revamped training programme, together with new course content, should result in a more professional force, broader in vision and experience.

Thirdly, we believe that advice and counselling should be provided for each member in order to improve .....

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am hearing some noises.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, there are some interruptions. Please continue, they seem to have abated.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am going through those principles, Mr. Chairman. I have referred to the first principle, that of raising the quality and size of the force by improving conditions of service through better screening and selection procedures in recruitment in order to reduce wrong doing. Secondly, that efficiency throughout the force can be improved by revamping the initial programmes and providing regular training programmes for middle and other ranks of the force, and also by improving course content.

Thirdly, we believe that advice and counselling should be provided for each member of the Force. It should be available to the Force in order to improve career prospects and ensure that promotion is on the basis of merit and demonstrated ability.

Fourthly, we believe that there should be no discrimination against females, either in terms of recruitment to the Force or access to training programmes, or to advancement in any other way within the Force.

Fifthly, we believe that the number of civilian employees in the Force should be increased in order that policemen may be relieved to perform the duties for which their rigorous training prepares them.

Sixthly, we believe that we should seek to develop greater cohesion in the Force by opening up avenues for discussion and consultation among all ranks of the Force with a view of achieving the overall goals of the Force.

Seventhly, we believe that full recognition should be given to the Police Association so that they would be heard not only in matters relating to pay and conditions of service, but also, more broadly, in terms of welfare matters.

Eighthly, we believe that the capability of the force should be strengthened in relation to the investigations of crime.

Then, we also believe that the disciplinary procedures within the Force should be improved in order to ensure that public complaints and allegations of misconduct against members of the Force are speedily and fairly investigated, that the outcome is made known to the complainant, and that an impartial review board should be set up to reconsider complaints in which dissatisfaction still persist.

11.10 a.m.

I think that with all the talk that we have been hearing recently about the Force – there has been some adverse comments, the level of which has taken me a little by surprise; perhaps we have to do something in that area – some new system is needed, and I am calling for the establishment of an impartial review board to reconsider complaints in which dissatisfaction still persists.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have indicated a sufficient number of principles to make it clear that we are very serious about the role that this Force has to play. We commend the Commissioner of Police for the efforts that have been taken so far to give some kind of recognition to the principles which have been outlined. All of these are based on sound police procedures.

We are pleased to note that efforts are being made to reduce the time lag between a call for police services and the police response to that call, and we hope that when the police is called upon to investigate crime that they will let the persons who have made the complaint, or against whom the crimes have been committed, know that the police would keep them informed about the progress of the matter in hand.

We are also pleased, and it is part of our principles also in relation to the Royal Barbados Police Force, to see that the Commissioner has given and is giving due recognition to the role of the police patrol officer as the front line element in the delivery of police services. We hope that the patrol services can be increased so that there is an island-wide coverage in that particular regard.

We also hope that the Narcotic and Drug Unit should be strengthened so that drug problems may be investigated with a greater degree of thoroughness, and that the relative laws in respect of those matters can be administered within the capabilities of the Force.

Above all, we wish to support the Commissioner, and it is part of our principles that the Royal Barbados Police Force should be established as the prime disciplined force in this country as far as its mission is concerned. It should be given the resources to carry out that role not only in respect of routine functions of maintaining law and order and of preserving peace in heightened circumstances and situations involving armed criminals and terrorists, but we also believe that the Royal Barbados Police Force is the prime disciplined force in those areas and that the Defence Force should be kept severely out of those areas unless their services are requested by the Royal Barbados Police Force.

The aid of the Defence Force in these matters should only be sought if the situation is beyond the capability of the Royal Barbados Police Force, or if it becomes clear that there is an attempt to overthrow the lawful Government by violence.

Those are the principles, Mr. Chairman, and anyone interested in sound police administration, strengthening the role of the Royal Barbados Police Force and in ensuring that law and order is maintained in this country must pay due attention to these principles and ensure that they are implemented as far as possible.

In conclusion, I refer to the question again of appointments, promotions and discipline. We on this side are pleased to know that we have a Commissioner who is a professional in all aspects of the word, and who is interested in carrying out the kinds of principles and implementing the kinds of procedures that we have outlined clearly. Our only regret is that it took the Government so long to make an appointment to head the most important institution in this country, and up to now the Government has not explained why it took them so long to make an appointment at the head of the prime disciplined force for law and order in this island.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, when my colleague, the Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) rose this morning to speak, I had to get up and compliment him for his take off, an analogy which I have never heard before, but certainly the end of the speech is something which I would say has destroyed the impact of the first part of the speech.

You are questioning the Government as to why it took so long to appoint the head of a department.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Of the Police Force).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The head of a department. The Police Force is another department of Government. It is an important department, and it is equally as important as the Labour Department, which the people of Barbados must depend for laws to protect themselves. We took approximately three months, I would say, to the best of my knowledge....

Asides

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Not so long? However, Sir, we have taken less time to appoint the new Commissioner of Police than you took to appoint your present Research Officer, Mr. Pedro Welch, who was then Acting Commissioner of Labour for almost nine years. You had him down at the Labour Department like a slave acting as Labour Commissioner for nine months, and now you are in here this morning questioning the Government as to why they have taken just a few weeks to appoint the new Commissioner of Police.

As I understand it, in the first place, Sir, the Commissioner of Police was on pre-retirement leave, and to my mind it would only be common sense that when the former Commissioner of Police went on pre-retirement leave, then you appoint the new Commissioner of Police. Otherwise, you would have two Commissioners of Police in Barbados, one on pre-retirement leave and one in the post. You have now destroyed what I considered to be a relatively good speech, citing statistics, searching the Government, by asking why we took so long to appoint a Commissioner of Police.

When we came into office there were more acting appointments in the Civil Service than ever in the history of this country. Even at a place like the Port, everybody was acting, and before the Duffus Commission, so ashamed was one of the actors, one of the people who acted down there, that he referred to it as Hollywood, a place full of actors. That was in the Port where millions of dollars was coming into Barbados, and you destroyed your own argument this morning by questioning the Government as to why it took so long to appoint a head of the Police Force. That is when you have nothing to say.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You really cannot finish, you have always been a weak person, out front all the time at election and at the end you nudge home by 12 votes, always floundering coming home. That is what you have done again this morning. Be like us on this side. Do you not see how we come home? Chests up and batons in our hands!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am going to try and see if I can bring the debate back to the specifics concerning the Royal Barbados Police Force. These diversionary tactics early in the morning are really designed well, but not moving smoothly.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is fair to say that, especially in the last ten years or so in Barbados, crime has taken a turn in a different direction. We have seen an increase in the levels of sophistication, we have seen that crime is taking on a different context, operating with a different methodology from what we were accustomed to in Barbados. We have become a nation where white collar crime is on the increase, but, more importantly, we have seen a lot of what we call professional criminals operating at the very sophisticated levels.
11.20 a.m.

For some time now I have been among others calling for the sophisticated tools that are necessary if crime detection in Barbados is to match the quality of crime in Barbados. Mr. Chairman, it may come as a shock to many people when I say that I believe that, perhaps, one of the easiest ways to commit murder in Barbados and to go unpunished would be via the route of poisoning. The chances are that if a person is poisoned in Barbados, unless the perpetrator of the crime was particularly obvious in his attitude, such a crime could go undetected.

I say that because although we have some aspect of forensic capability in Barbados, we are too far away, in my view, from the quality of forensic laboratory capability which is absolutely necessary, not only here in Barbados, but in the Caribbean. We have been talking about a forensic laboratory in Barbados now from ever since which I was a member of the Government, and I believe the police can only do so much by way of investigating a crime before they need assistance of tools which go beyond the mere deductive reasoning of the individual, and call, indeed, for more sophisticated equipment.

When, for example certain types of crime are committed in Barbados, when the Police go to investigate it becomes necessary for them, sometimes, to start their operation on a clue as infinitesimal as a strand of hair or a strand of clothing, in Barbados today chances are that our police would not be able, in the same way as in other countries, to use that form of detection.

I cannot recall seeing in these Estimates any provision for the updating and the improving of the forensic capability in Barbados. I know that there has been some improvement in that I understand that there is now a permanent officer attached to the Attorney General's Chambers who performs the functions of pathologist and does some of the forensic work as is necessary in crime detection.

I think that is a step in the right direction, and I am not unaware of the difficulties which have been adumbrated from time to time concerning the ability to attract the level and quality of person that would be necessary, but it is my contention that before we move to the level of person, we need to move to the level of equipment and facilities and environment that is necessary for the quality of detection of which I speak.

Mr. Chairman, on the question of white collar crime – we talked about overseas training earlier – here again because we are inexperienced to a large extent in the field of white collar crime, it will be necessary for us to give our Police Force that capability through exposure in countries and places where, because of the prevalence of this kind of crime, the capacity to solve the crime has increased.

We can benefit substantially from exposure in some of these developed countries through relatively short courses for our more industrious and capable policemen at all levels. I do not believe that it is only necessary to give those officers at the top such training, although they themselves must have it, but I think that those officers lower down the ranks who, by their perspicacity or enthusiasm and ability which they show, demonstrate that they are capable of benefitting from this kind of exposure, should be given it now so that in 10–15 years we will have the kind of capability of which I am speaking.

I am not here saying that we have not got it at all. Clearly we have been able to solve some of the white collar crime in Barbados, but at the levels of sophistication I am discussing, I believe that the hierarchy in the Police Department and in the Ministry of Legal Affairs would wish to take cognisance of our need.

Mr. Chairman, I recall that when I was in New York, I engaged a former Deputy Commissioner of Police, who was coming through on his way to Washington for one of the short courses, in discussion, and it became clear to me at that time that he had never, in fact, seen one of the marijuana plants. I speak of this because he has always given me permission to speak about it because it was a fact. I then made arrangement with a Barbadian, who held a high position in the New York Police Department, for him to have one day at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, which is the Police College in New York, and in that one day, the Deputy Commissioner reported to me that he was able to grasp a significant amount of information .....

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Probably in 1968. He said he was able to grasp a significant amount of information relating to that, and, as a result, when he returned to Barbados he was able to share that knowledge.

I am saying this to make the point that I do not recall, for example, any Barbadian having been trained or exposed, say, for two or three months with the New York Police Department. I do not recall that; I am not saying that it is not so. It seems to me that, among the type of assistance which is offered from time to time by the United States Government, attachments to some of the police departments in the United States, where there is a certain level of sophistication in the detection of what I call the sophisticated crime, can only redound to our benefit and would not be of extreme cost to us or to them.

I am talking here, Sir, of short attachments. I know that we have some assistance in Canada. I know we have some attachment in Washington itself, I believe with the FBI – I am speaking subject to correction – and other agencies. But I am suggesting that we can do a bit more of that in relation to white collar and other newer crimes.

I am not in any way reneging from the position which I firmly hold, that a substantial amount of our own police training should continue to be done here in Barbados, and that a lot more can be done if we utilize all the agencies that are available, to assist in the training of the policemen not only in crime detection, but in all of those areas that form part of the environment of his job and his role here in Barbados as a police officer.

I think that while we all recognize that there are certain drawbacks and certain difficulties concerning the availability of funds, when it comes to making money available for quality service, I do not believe that on either side of the House there will be any difficulty in accepting that we need to give the Police Department the tools to do the job effectively.

11.30 a.m.

Indeed, it would be grossly unfair to them for us to move like yo-yos, from extreme criticism to extreme praise, while at the same time not taking into account the real substance of their need. It is one thing to provide them with a good physical environment in which to do their work, but it is equally important that they be given the kind of resources, which they themselves are better able to indentify than we as the political directorate would be able to identify, in this very specialised area of our life in Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, I would also take the opportunity, during this first intervention this morning, to clarify for the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN) specifically what we were talking about earlier in the year when we raised questions concerning statements made by a senior police official.

The statement we specifically referred to was made in the *Sunday Sun* of February 21, 1982. Two weeks later the Democratic Labour Party put out an official statement asking the Government to respond to that particular statement. I am reading here from an excerpt which caused the question. It comes from one of the better newsletters, a newsletter called *Horizons*, which I can make available as a document if necessary, and at page 3 in a letter, the gist of the Sun's article was reproduced. It said, and I quote:

> "The police official added that marijuana trafficking was becoming more and more profitable every day, and what was even more disheartening about the whole affair was that persons at every scale of the ladder were involved in the trade, and whenever they wanted to clamp down on a particular opening, there was always some senior person in society to cause trouble."

I raised a question here and the Attorney General said he was unaware of the statement and then subsequently there was an editorial in the *Advocate News* after Dr. Henry Fraser had made a speech on alcoholism. There was an editorial in the *Advocate News* headlined "Timely Warning on Drug Abuse", and then subsequently the *Nation* newspaper also carried an editorial dealing with the same matter.

The point that we made is akin to the point which the honourable Member raised, that if a senior police official is reported as having said something, it should be clarified. The senior police official ought to be examined by the senior people in the administration and the whole circumstances should be examined by the Minister. And if the Minister gets information, he could enlighten the people so that people would not continue rumours suggesting that a high official in society means a high official in the Government.

However you look at it, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be so interpreted, and if that is so, then we have a problem, and the police have a problem. Those are the basic facts concerning the call which we continue to make for the Attorney General to clarify the position on this.

That incident occurred in February 1982. I do not believe that that situation can be said to exist now, because, as I indicated last night, I believe that with the quality of leadership which we have both in the Commissioner and his colleagues at the top of the Force, no high official in society is likely to be able to influence them in the performance of their duty, at least not in a negative way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the honourable Member has put in sequence the statement which was the subject matter of comment by me yesterday. Now I think the gist of the contention I was making yesterday was that it does the image of the Police Force and this society no good when statements of such a grave implication are made by a newspaper which is supposed to be reputable.

I said that, in my opinion, and I still hold this strongly, just as the Government had a duty to carry out what investigations lie within its power to carry out, so too the administration of the Police Force had a duty or has a duty to ensure that either the statement was properly reported, in which case then they have an obligation to pursue rigorously the so-called obstructionists, or in the event of the statement not being properly reported, to make a correction in the newspaper. That is the important point.

You cannot leave a statement that is pregnant with allegations of impropriety on behalf of people, hanging in a small community. Our Press does not believe that it is its responsibility before it makes such a statement at least to have it checked, and that is my complaint.

In the absence of a Press Council or some other body that you can call upon for an investigation, then both the Government and the police authorities are under an obligation to ensure that the true and accurate clarification of the position is made. Now, when the Government does something about it, of course the first thing you are going to hear is that the Government is interfering with the administration of the Police Force. That is why we say that as far as we are concerned we prefer that the initiative comes from the Police Department and from the newspaper.

I feel that the proper way to deal with this is to challenge the newspaper to publish who the people are that they say obstruct justice, and if they cannot publish them, then we will be able to deal with the newspaper. But we are not going to make any progress at all if we continue to allow a situation to exist where these wild allegations that are made continue without any specific agreed machinery to ensure that the truth can be brought to light.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will just raise this question until the Attorney General comes. There is one other aspect of the Head which I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister, and it has to do with the Police Band, Subhead 4. I believe, Sir, that we in Barba-

dos are not making sufficient use of the Royal Barbados Police Band as part of our image thrust in our promotion of Barbados.

I believe that, first of all, we need to take another look at the structure of the Royal Barbados Police Band. I do not know that it is desirable that the head of that band be seen as only equal in rank to the third or fourth rung of the Police Force itself. I believe that if we regard the officers in the Royal Barbados Police Band as members of the Police Force, if we agree that those members of the band are to feel equal to their colleagues on the other side as it were, then I think we should make the levels of attainable rank sufficiently high to make it worth their while.

I really believe that if we have a Force that carries a Commissioner, a Deputy Commissioner and three or four Assistant Commissioners, the Royal Barbados Police Band, with an expanded role, ought to have at its head a person who can participate in the decision making and planning at the level at least of Assistant Commissioner. But it may very well be that it is felt that that is too much money or too high.

What I am concerned about, however, is that if a person is exercising artistic talent on behalf of Barbados within the Royal Barbados Police Band, then that person's potential for advancing ought not to be stymied by the fact that he or she is in the band and the band can only carry so many ranks.
11.40 a.m.

I believe there should be some specialist arrangements for those whose talents are being used in that way. I am not prepared to outline how it should be done, it is a matter which will obviously require some thought, but clearly some kind of additional allowance for those persons who have been in the band for a very long time and who, because the ranks are closed, cannot get advancement. They still ought to have some incentive to be able to remain. When they go and improve their qualifications, let us say there is a Sergeant in the Royal Barbados Police Force Band who becomes an Associate of the Royal College of Music, there ought to be some recognition of that kind of initiative rather than his having to make a choice between staying in the band and moving farther afield.

I think, as I said at the beginning, that the band can be used in a much more effective way. I am not saying that, with its present complement, it is not doing enough. I am saying that we are not using the band as part of our promotion effort as much as we should. I am aware that the band makes the periodic trip to Disneyland. I believe they went to Scotland on one occasion. But, Sir, on the occasion when the band appeared at Radio City Music Hall in the United States for a relatively brief moment, the effect which they had going on national television across the United States was more than three years of advertising could possibly bring to the name of Barbados. Marching bands in the United States at American football games, which I am sure Your Honour knows about, are hot stuff, and we in Barbados ought to make better use of our band in our overseas expansion. I do not want to expand this point anymore because I believe that I have made the point. The Attorney General is back and I am going to sit and let him respond.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Perhaps when the Minister is replying he could possibly also give me some information as to whether there are any plans put for increasing the number of Inspectors, Superintendents and other middle rank persons. In view of the fact now that we have abolished the rank of Corporal, we are going to have a tremendous bunching at the level of Sergeant and the opportunities for promotion should be expanded, and, in addition, I think with the increase in numbers in the Force as a whole, there may well be a strong case for strengthening the middle management level of the force.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Any other honourable Member? The honourable Attorney General.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, there are so many points that have been made by honourable Members during the course of debate this morning, that I do not know if I can appropriately reply to all of them within 15 minutes. In the circumstances, it may be necessary for me to speak on more than one occasion to handle the points raised in the debate as fully as possible.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) started off this morning with the enunciation of eleven principles which he would like to see guide the operation and management of the Police Force, and these followed hard on the heels of some very tendencious statistics which sought to prove that there is a rapid increase in crime.

I understand, because I was not in my place, that the honourable Member referred to statistics between the years 1976–1980, but very conveniently ignored the period between 1980– and March 1983. Well, the facts that I have, and these bear more serious consideration than the statistics of three to seven years ago, is that from the middle of last year, June 1982, there has not only been a decrease in the number of reported crimes in Barbados, but there has almost been a cataclysmic drop in the number of crimes.

I do not believe that at anytime in recent history in this country there has been such a large decrease over a six to eight months period of reported crime in Barbados as there has been between June of last year and March of this year. This applies over the whole general range of

crime. There may be an exception here or there, but generally, over the whole area of offenses, there has been a very significant decrease in reported crimes between the middle of June last year and March of this year.

The honourable Member in enunciating his eleven principles and making, as I said, his tendencious comments about the rise in crime did something that I consider very significant. Everytime you are criticizing something that is wrong in relation to the Police, you criticize the Government and the Minister. If there is an increase in crime, you criticize the Government and the Minister. If there is something good happening, you praise the Commissioner.

Now I do not want to take anything away from the Commissioner, that is not what I am trying to say; but it should be obvious to all people who listen to comment on matters relating to police activity, that that is the trend today. Whenever something goes wrong, you blame the Minister. When anything goes right, you praise the Commissioner, and that is the gist of what the honourable Member was doing here in his contribution.

I will not deal with the eleven principles all at once, because I really cannot cover all of them in the time that is allotted to me. The first one he spoke about dealt with the quality and size of the Force. He said that these should be improved by proper screening and recruitment methods.

I really cannot comment on that, because that is the existing practice. We have very rigorous and screening recruitment methods, and I know, with absolute certainty that the days when politicians will get after the recruiting officers and tell them who to recruit in the Police Force are over. That will not happen under my tenure in the Ministry of Legal Affairs.

I am satisfied that the Commissioner of Police and senior officers know what kind of people they want in the Police Force and that they do their rigorous screening not only through interviewing, but by references and inquiry in the districts where these people who apply live, so that they will get a good picture of the character and disposition of the people who they recruit in the Force. So, the honourable Member and I are agree on that point.

He mentioned secondly, that efficiency throughout the Force can be improved by ungrading the initial training programme and by providing regular training programmes for middle and other ranks in the Force.

11.50 a.m.

Again, Mr. Chairman, we have no quarrel with that one, because that is already the position in the Force. We are constantly reviewing the training programme at the Regional Police Training School, and we are constantly bringing in consultants who are attached to the school, who can bring to bear experience in wider policing in other countries, like the United Kingdom, on the core of the curriculum, its direction and its emphases, and on the training of new police recruits. So again, Sir, the honourable Member and I have no quarrel with that.

He mentioned that there should be continuous training for the middle ranks and up Sir, the honourable Member really should have left that one out, because the evidence is clear and unmistakeable that there is a far greater level and intensity of training for police officers in the middle ranks in the last few years, since the Barbados Labour Party has been the Government of this country, than ever imagined before. There can be no quarrel or dispute about that at all, that the level of training, the intensity of training, and the opportunities for training have been increased and enhanced in the last few years.

The honourable Member made a third point about advising and counselling the members of the Force and so on. I do not know of any institutionalised counselling and advisory service in the Police Force, but I would suspect that the senior members of the Force as a normal part of their training do talk to junior members and advise them in the regular weekly meetings they have, and in one-to-one meetings with police officers directly under their charge. I would assume, and I believe, that this happens, but if the honourable Member is asking for institutionalised counselling services, I must admit that that does not now exist, nor indeed do I think it is absolutely necessary at this stage.

The honourable Member also talked about discrimination against females that are recruited. I do not know. The police recruit officers for themselves, Sir, and I do not really know that there is any discrimination in recruitment against female officers, nor indeed if there is any discrimination with access to training. I do not know of any, and I would doubt if there is some.

I do not, however, agree with the honourable Member that more civilian employees should be employed in the Police Force. Policing is for policemen, and if the honourable Member is trying to say that non-police duties should be removed from the police and done by civilians, then I agree with that. I do not at all agree with him, as he put it, that civilian employees in the Force should be increased so that the police may be released to do strict police work. I think, perhaps, he is trying to say the same thing I am saying, that police should be allowed to do police work and all this business about quasi policing and civilian work should be completely removed from police supervision.

We have started that, Sir. We have removed the immigration services from the Police Force and set up a separate Immigration Department, because we believe that we should train policemen in the rigorous responsibilities and duties of policemen, not just to sit down and stamp passports and the other peripheral matters being dealt with by the Immigration Department. We have taken away that from the police and set up a new department.

We have also, Mr. Chairman, set in train a plan to move licensing, drivers' licences and motor vehicle licenses out of the Police Department. It is absolutely unnecessary for a policeman to sit down in a motor car and drive around Barbados trying to decide if somebody should get a driver's licence or not. We have more important work for the police to do, and we believe that this can very satisfactorily be handled by the MTW, and we have plans to move all this licensing out of the hands of the police and into MTW and allow the policemen to get on with the important work of policing.

We have, Mr. Chairman, the additional point made by the honourable Member that we should develop greater cohesion in the Force by opening avenues of discussion and consultation among the ranks of the Force with a view to achieving the goals of the Force. That is a high sounding phrase that means very little to me, Sir. It looks good on paper and it sounds good when it falls from the lips of the honourable Member, but if all it means is that there should be consultation between the various ranks inside the Police Force, I do not believe that anybody in 1983 has to recommend that.

One assumes that that goes on, and if one cannot assume so far, one would have seen that the Commissioner recently had a conference of the senior people up at the Police Sports Club at Weymouth, and the Commissioner gave it due publicity, and he made statements subsequently as to the plan to continue it. I have seen the Public Relations Officer, Inspector Lunn, give an interview on it, and he said precisely how these areas of consultation are working inside the department so that they can use the lofty phrase of the honourable Member for St. Michael South, to develop greater cohesion in the Force with a view to achieving the goals of the Force.

These things sound good when they come out, and the newspaper people might probably put them in headlines, but what do they mean, really?

The honourable Member also says that full recognition should be given to the Police Association so that they may be heard not only in matters relating to pay, but also, for example, in welfare matters. The honourable Member knows that that is already the situation, that the Police Association is a fairly well organised and influential group both inside and outside the Force, and that the Police Association speaks for the vast majority of the policemen when they are talking either to the public or to Government, whether they are speaking to me or to the Chief Establishments Officer and so on, and the police have a long tradition of using their Association for seeing after the welfare needs of its members.

For about 25 years now, I can remember the Police Association with its canteen services, Credit Union and a whole range of services. Therefore, when the honourable Member mentions this, he is only speaking words, because as a perceptive political figure in this country, and a former Minister in a Government, he knows that that is already the case.

He went on to talk about how a section dealing with crime investigation should be strengthened. We have strengthened the Criminal Investigation Department. Since we took over this Government we made sure that, in addition to an Assistant Commissioner of Crime – there used to be one before – there is a Senior Superintendent of Crime. There never used to be one before, and we introduced one.

We set up a special unit in the Criminal Investigation Department dealing with records. I do not remember the precise name it was given. I think Inspector Lewis looks after it. The number of the officers in the Criminal Investigation Department have increased, and continued emphasis on criminal investigation is being made over and over again, Sir.

I think that that point again sounds good, but it only highlights the considerable improvement that has been made in the Criminal Investigation Department in the last six or seven years.

I spoke yesterday already about the disciplinary procedures within the Force as they relate to public complaints. Since the honourable Member, despite my explanation and exposition of last evening has sought to bring it up again, I think it is only fair that I should repeat what I said.

12.00 noon.

I have said that I have been receiving an increasing number of complaints from the public about the Police and it has been causing me a great deal of concern. I have already discussed it with the Commissioner of Police, and I have said to him – and he is looking at it – that there should perhaps be an external element brought in to the adjudication of complaints against the police – and I stress adjudication, not investigation.

I am not, while I have the responsibility, going to allow anybody other than the police to investigate complaints. In other words, they must seek out the facts and

the evidence surrounding complaints; the police must do that. But in respect of adjudication of evidence that is gleaned, I believe that the time is ripe for the introduction of an independent element into this procedure.

I know the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) talked about an impartial review committee. I do not say "impartial", because I assume that any procedure is based on impartiality and to use the word "impartial" suggests somehow or the other that impartiality was a little bit distant from the procedure up to now. I prefer to say "independent" rather than "impartial."

I make the point, Mr. Chairman, that this is a matter of the utmost sensitivity. You have to be careful when you are importing alien influences into Police adjudication of, in many cases, complaints of crimes against the Police that you do not so destroy the morale of the Police Force that you get a negative result. To put it another way, if the Police begin to get the feeling that they are being pilloried by outside people who do not understand policing, who want to come down like a ton of bricks on Police officers every time a complaint is made by the public, the police officers are going to feel that they are unduly restricted in the very difficult job of investigating crime and bringing people to justice, so you have to balance this thing.

On the other hand, Sir, it is important that the public be made to feel that their rights are not trammelled by a *laissez-faire* attitude of the Government about complaints made against the police. We have to look at these things.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman; I am not really complaining about the procedures within the Police Force for the investigation of complaints about members of that Force. I believe that within the Police Force, any complaints about them should go that particular route, and I believe that a high percentage of the complaints can be settled within that procedure if the Police Force has the necessary resources to devote to that aspect of the problem.

I do not know how many persons are involved in that kind of investigation of complaints about members of the Force and the operations of the Force, I do not know what are the resources devoted to it. I am saying that there will be some cases – I believe there would be a very small percentage of cases, but some nevertheless – in which dissatisfaction might still remain.

Persons might not be entirely satisfied that a matter has been thoroughly investigated, or investigated to their satisfaction. There may be some residual dissatisfaction on the part of members of the public, and it is in relation to that small percentage that I am suggesting that this impartial body should be set up to function virtually as an appeal body on an impartial basis.

I throw it out for what it is worth. I believe these matters should be discussed and considered.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I take the point which the honourable Member is making. I will have to deal with this issue a little bit longer than I had intended, because it is one of utmost sensitivity in this community.

What are the difficulties involved in this whole operation? At the moment, the complaints made against the Police emanate from the widest possible groups of society. Complaints are made by criminals that they are ill-treated while in police custody. They are made by the normal law-abiding citizens that the Police are behaving high-handedly when they want to report them for parking in the wrong place or whatever. There are complaints by decent citizens in this community that police officers are guilty of bad manners. There are complaints, occasionally, that a Policeman has committed a crime. So there are a variety of complaints and the source of the complaints are infinitely variable.

The existing procedure is that the police institutes an investigation of the complaint inside the Force itself, come up with their conclusions and usually write a very critique form to the Attorney General as a result of their investigation. I think that is unsatisfactory. It offends a principle of natural justice, that no one should be the judge in his own cause.

You cannot blame a man who is kept by the police for investigation and complains that he was mistreated, if he says that if I complain to you, the Attorney General, that they treat me badly and you hand it to the Police to investigate, it is like going from Caesar to Caesar; you are asking the same people who mistreat me to investigate my complaint that they ill-treated me. That goes to the fundamental principle of natural justice that no man should be the judge in his own cause. Now, we start there.

On the other hand, we can go to the other extreme. Get an external body, some fine, outstanding and experienced citizens whose reputations are beyond question – like Caesar's wife is supposed to be, beyond reproach – to sit down and listen and adjudicate on these complaints made against the police. The result very well might be that it will destroy the morale of the Police Force and make them feel that in carrying out a job of exceptional difficulty, that is, dealing with some of the worst elements in this country, and trying to make this place safe and habitable, they are being pilloried by outsiders who do not understand what they have to go through. So you

have to decide whether you are going to use the existing system where the police investigate complaints against themselves or you go to the external review body, which can cause you to lose the morale among the Police Force. I am submitting, Mr. Chairman, that the answer lies somewhere in between, that you have to find some middle ground where you can reconcile the competing interest of the two positions, and this is the position which I am working towards, Sir.

The police can deal with most of the complaints that are made; those are minor complaints. But certainly on substantial complaints against the police, we must import an independent element into the procedure. I am currently looking at it, Sir, and I will, in conjunction with the Commissioner and the Police Association, before very long come up with what I would think would be a workable solution that would meet the interest of all sides.
12.10 p.m.

In this regard I also want to mention the fact that there are two aspects of this whole business of complaints – I was trying to make the point before the honourable Member made his last intervention – and this is the question of investigation of the complaint and adjudication. At the moment the Police Force both investigate and adjudicate a substantial amount of the complaints made.

In our system of law, our system of jurisprudence, some people investigate, that is the police, and other people adjudicate the offence that they come up with, that is the magistrate or the judge. But in this narrow area of police complaints, the police both investigate and adjudicate. The honourable Member for St. Michael South agrees with me that even although it is a situation of long standing, it is one that needs to be reviewed and see if we cannot come up with something that is more consistent with modern development in thinking and jurisprudence.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I am not moving on because this is too important an issue to move on. A further question arises, and I am sure when I mention it the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) would not tell me to move on, because he would be interested. How do these review committees, these independent committees, which look into police complaints square their position with the Director of Public Prosecutions?

If they investigate something and find that a policeman is guilty of one thing or the other, does this exclude the constitutional authority of the Director of Public Prosecutions from taking action on the same set of evidence? If the answer to that is "yes", then I am saying that it is a violation of the Constitution of Barbados. If the answer to that is "no", I am saying that the principle of double jeopardy arises, and the principle of double jeopardy in our law says that a man should not be tried more than once for the same offence.

When the police finds that a policeman assaulted a prisoner he had in custody they find him guilty and he is punished for that. But the man still has a case in the criminal courts, and the Director of Public Prosecutions can still bring a case, because an independent body like that cannot usurp the powers and authority constitutionally given to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member for St. Michael West says that the honourable Member for St. Michael South does not mean it that way. I am not dealing with the honourable Member's submission now. I am speaking generally about the difficulties involved in this thing and why it is so sensitive, and why we cannot make slack decisions. As a matter of fact, I have agreed with all that the honourable Member for St. Michael South has said in his contribution this morning other than the fact that he sought to create the impression that there is a massive increase in crime in Barbados, and used the figures for 1976 to 1980 and refused to touch the figures from 1980 to 1983. That is the only quarrel I have about what he had to say. I have no quarrel about anything else he has said.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way. For us over here it may very well be that those are all the figures available. If he can give us the figures from 1980 to 1983 for the same areas of crime which my colleague raised, it would be of great assistance to us.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I guess I can do that. I have the figures, but I do not know. I can give honourable Members on the other side a copy of the figures from 1980 to 1983, but for me to read them is to waste everybody's time.

I am only saying, and I have said it earlier, that there has been a tremendous drop in the number of reported crimes in Barbados in the last nine months, not a little marginal or gradual drop; a very big drop! I am going to make the figures available.

Asides

Hon. L. R. TULL: What are you quarrelling with me for? These are the figures given to me by the Commissioner of Police, whom you say is the best man ever born in this country.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way. For him to say that there has been a significant

drop in reported crimes and not indicate to us the areas in which the drop has occurred, will scour the position. The fact is that there has been a significant increase in violent crime. If you are giving us statistical information, give us properly.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member will get all the figures he wants. We have all day to talk and I will get a copy of the figures on crime later on. What he is trying to do is to divert me from the direction I am going in respect of police complaints. I cannot deal with so many things at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I need to pursue it any further. I am saying the investigation is one thing and the adjudication is the other, and that you need to get a harmonious approach to this. The best way it can be done, Sir, is by a higher level of consultation between myself and the Ministry of Legal Affairs and the Commissioner of Police and the Police Association, and I believe that when we get into that we will be able to come up with something that will meet the needs of this community.

Asides

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will get on to the forensic laboratory. Give me time.

The honourable Member said that the Drug Section should be increased. That has already been done. If the honourable Member was following the developments over the last year or so, he will see that the number of people who have been arrested for drug offences has spiralled phenomenally. There has been a tremendous increase in the number of people who have been arrested by offending against the drug laws of this country.

While I am at it, just let me say in answer to the honourable Member for St. Michael West, who raised the question about whether police officers are trained and attached to the New York Police Force, what is so special about the New York Police Force? I cannot understand why he mentioned the New York Police Force. I know that the New York Police Force is perhaps the most dishonest Police Force anywhere in the world, but I can say that members of the Barbados Police Force receive training all the time, year in and year out, at police institutions in the United States of America, and that they are trained with Police Forces and at Police Colleges in the United Kingdom. They are trained in Puerto Rico, if you consider Puerto Rico as not part of the United States, and this type of training attachment goes on all the time, so that is the answer to that question.

The final principle raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South is this: he states that the Royal Barbados Police Force should be the prime disciplinary force in the country. Well I do not know what that means.

(A Voice: Disciplined.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: The prime disciplined force in the country. Why prime. I would like to think that all our disciplined forces are prime, not one prime and one secondary.

The honourable Member throws in something about the Defence Force should be kept severely out of the area of policing. I do not know that the Defence Force in Barbados does any policing. I am willing to sit down and give way to the honourable Member if he can give me one single instance, not two or three or four, when the Defence Force was carrying out normal civil policing duties and usurping the powers and responsibilities of the Police Force, and I do not want him to mention to me any instance when the Defence Force had been invited by the Commissioner of Police to assist them in carrying out certain responsibilities.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member said he would give way for me to give him one instance. I am going to give him an instance where all reasonable people came to that conclusion. We had a fire in Bridgetown and the Defence Force was out there with fixed bayonets and rifles. In fact, the police who were on the scene left the scene.

That is one instance where all reasonable and right thinking people came to the conclusion, that the Defence Force had acted prematurely in the matter. Indeed, it formed the basis of serious discussions between the Police authorities, the Defence authorities and the other authorities concerned. And as a result of that, if the Minister does not know, the lines have been more clearly drawn.

12.20 p.m.

So, when he asks for one instance, I think my colleague is on firm ground when he is asking for a public statement. We want to know that the Minister's view coincides with our view, or that it diverges from our view. That is all we want to know.....

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: As I said last night, I suffered grievously at the hands of a series of lies told when I was Minister. On the occasion of the fire that is being referred to, I was on the scene of the fire. I was called there by the Commissioner of Police through the Police Contact Force, and the Commissioner of Police

requested the Defence Force at the time. This is a fact, and the Opposition continues to lie about this as they continue to lie on several aspects of policing and the various positions. The records will show.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT rises.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not giving way.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: I do not know why it is that he is not giving way. He cannot say immediately after I have made a statement to the Minister that the Opposition continues to lie. He is saying, inferentially, that I lie. He has to withdraw that, because what I said was a statement of fact.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been really overtaken by this. I am not altogether sure on what the honourable Member (Hon. H. deB. FORDE) rose, if he is on a point of order or if he is making a speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am making a speech in reply to the allegation made during a period when I was Attorney General.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot make a speech until the Attorney General has completed his speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I understand that the honourable Member (Hon. L. R. TULL) got up and spoke, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You misunderstood.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well, I will give way on that but I will speak afterwards on that aspect of the matter, because the Opposition continues to lie on this aspect of the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please let the Attorney General continue. Order please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not know what the honourable Member (Mr. B. M. TAITT) is trying to stir up these things for, because what he says about the Defence Force is not true! These points can be made without a great deal of emotion. The Police Force invited the Defence Force to come in and asked them to help seal off the barriers and so on around the fire. That is what I saw in the records.

When the honourable Member throws these little irritants into the debate, Sir, I do not think the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. FORDE) should jump at that kind of bait because I think that it is unworthy. People tell lies in politics, people tell lies all the time, but you do not have to get worked up about it.

I will deal now with the question of the appointment of the Commissioner. Nothing has been more malicious than the attitude of some people in their public statements in relation to the appointment of the Commissioner. On the one hand they walk about and say that I wanted Durant to be Commissioner, and I said that if they did not appoint him, I would resign.....

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I heard them say that. They want me to resign and they want to weaken this front bench. Do not plan to weaken the front bench that way.

The fact, however, is that when Mr. Prescott went on pre-retirement leave, Mr. Durant was on a long training course in the United Kingdom, for six months or some such longer period. In his absence Mr. Boyce, the Assistant Commissioner of Police, the No. 2 man there, was acting as Commissioner of Police while Mr. Durant was away and Mr. Prescott was on pre-retirement. Mr. Durant returned to Barbados, I think, on the 15th or 16th of October. I am saying that prior to Mr. Durant's return to Barbados that I, as Minister responsible for Police Affairs, sent out a recommendation to the Police Service Commission recommending that Mr. Durant be appointed as Commissioner of Police in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to ask the honourable Member (Hon. L. R. TULL).....

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: .....yes ..... under what provision of the Constitution the Minister in charge of Police Affairs can make a recommendation? My recollection is that the office of Commissioner of Police is on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, unless the honourable Member was acting as Prime Minister then.

Hon. L. R. TULL: If the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), who is very cognisant of these things, wants to tell me that I did the wrong thing, I did the wrong thing. But I recommended Mr. Durant, and I made my recommendation after consultation with the Prime Minister, who endorsed it. So if you are going to get in here and split hairs and tell me foolishness about what I do right or wrong, I am saying that I made that recommendation. Moreover, I talked about Mr. Durant coming back on the 15th or 16th of October, and he was appointed Commissioner of Police on November 1.

Now, I hear all this nonsense. Yesterday the Opposition wanted to get up in here and create a war between Mr. Durant and Colonel Lewis. I do not know what they are doing, Sir. You have to be beware of the Greeks when they bring gifts. I hope Mr. Durant does not feel that the things you all say mean that you are for him.

All you all want to do is create a lot of chaos in this country. I am finished with that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, let us get ahead.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I want the right honourable Member for St. John to know that my recommendation was made to the C.P.O., who is the Permanent Secretary of the Prime Minister in personnel matters.

Now, let us move on. The honourable Member for St. Michael West raised the question of forensic lab. We cannot afford a forensic lab now. We do believe that Barbados needs a forensic lab, and we have felt so for a long time. Do not let us mince matters, I am not dancing around it, it would be great if we could have a forensic laboratory in Barbados. We are planning to build a new Police Headquarters somewhere up in the Wildey area, and we believe that that will be the opportune time, when you are putting up a multi-million dollar Police headquarters, to construct a forensic laboratory.

We do not need to be preached to about the necessity of a forensic lab, we are going to have one, but at the moment we are doing the best we can under the circumstances. We have employed a forensic pathologist, who is attached to the Ministry of Legal Affairs, and who is doing all the forensic work for Government, within the limitations that exist.

I think that he is doing an exceptionally good job, and the fact that Grenada, Dominica, Antigua, and other islands in the Caribbean are constantly asking for the assistance of our forensic pathologist to do work for them in forensic medicine, suggests that our man is contributing something and that our facilities here are at least a whole lot better than facilities in surrounding territories.

I want to deal with the question of the *Sunday Sun* and *Horizons*. If ever there was a misnomer in this world, *Horizons* is a misnomer. It is one little piece of two by four sheet in which Peter Morgan writes an extremely nasty and untrue article about this business of a senior police officer, saying that people – I do not remember the exact words; but high up in the society – are interfering with the Police .....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I must say the honourable Member (Hon L. R. Tull) is misleading this House, Sir. I have a copy here, and what Peter Morgan did was to quote the *Sunday Sun* of February 21st. That is all he did. He wrote a letter and quoted the *Sunday Sun*, so do not accuse Peter Morgan of writing something nasty. It is the *Sunday Sun*. Tackle your own paper. You are a shareholder in the *Sunday Sun*. Talk about that!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. Will the honourable Member please take your seat. Will the Attorney General please continue with his speech.
12.30 p.m.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not know why the honourable Member (Mr. B. M. Taitt) does not leave me. He knows that in that thing there in his hand that Peter Morgan did more than just quote from the *Sunday Sun*. I have read it. I will deal with substantive points, Sir, I cannot get into all this.

The fact is that the first time I heard about this article was here in Parliament when the honourable Member for St. Michael West asked the Attorney General to react to a report that was carried in the *Sunday Sun*. I said at the time that I had never heard nor read it, and that I would undertake to get a copy of that issue of the *Sun* and read the article, and I did that. I believe I asked my Permanent Secretary to get it, but it eventually came to me and I saw the article, and to me it is a very, very serious article.

I was cautioned last evening by the honourable Member for St. Michael West that, because of my position as Attorney General and Chief Legal Adviser to the Government, I should be very careful in the type of statement I make because of the impact it may have on public thinking and so on. It is equally important for the media to be extremely careful, in the interest of stability in this country and the continued confidence in public institutions, that they do not publish such alarmist stories without first doing some investigation.

When I saw the report I sent a letter to the then Commissioner of Police – either the substantive or acting – and I asked that the matter be investigated, that they try and find out who was this senior police officer who had made this very awful, frightening and untrue statement, and to report back to me, because as Minister responsible for Legal Affairs and law and order I felt it was incumbent on me to clear the air. I received a report that there was absolutely no foundation in fact, that a senior officer, who will remain nameless, had in fact spoken on the occasion that the *Sunday Sun* had referred to, and had said nothing remotely approximating to what was reported in the Press. That is the situation.

I have a discretion. My discretion is whether I should publicise certain things long after the event to again incite public consciousness and public debate over these things, or whether I should test the waters, see how the wind is blowing, and so on, and decide whether to let certain matters lie. You can criticise my judgment in that, but you cannot criticise the right for me to use discretion in these matters, and as far as I am concerned, the matter was investigated. There is absolutely no foundation in fact

to that story that was carried in the *Sunday Sun* and repeated with such relish by this misnomer called *Horizons.* I say that now.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order again: we did not repeat anything, all we did was to ask a Minister, and today one year later, for the first time the Minister has vouchsafed information to me. I asked on the Floor of this House. If he did not wish to make it public, the honourable Member could have written me a letter, as the Prime Minister has done on one occasion, and said I have investigated this and there is nothing to it. It is not fair for him to leave us hanging and wait until today to come in and say he investigated it and found absolutely nothing. I do not think people are going to have confidence in that statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I do not know about writing letters to anybody on the other side, and I am not going to do that. I am going to tell the honourable Member the answers to any questions he may want to raise, I am not going to write him. If I took a year, as he says, to answer, well maybe I am slow in coming.

He also raised the question about police being trained in the direction of sophisticated crime in the United States and all that. I want the honourable Member to know that the detection rate of crime in Barbados is higher than anywhere in the United States of America, and that the detection rate of crime in Barbados is higher than it is in the United Kingdom. We only know about crime that is reported, because that is all you can deal with, and I am saying that the detection rate of crime in Barbados by the Barbados Police Force is higher than in the United Kingdom or in the United States of America.

I have not read these things for a long time, but I believe that the detection rate in the United Kingdom is below 23 percent, and I am absolutely certain that the national average in the United States cannot come anywhere near 23 percent. I do not know why we have to go to these people to pick up this sophisticated thing when they cannot even detect their own crime and apprehend their own people.

The Police Band, Sir. The honourable Member makes out a strong case for the Police Band, and I commend him. I am a great supporter of the Police Band, and I think that the contribution they have made to the cultural life of this country deserves a little consideration now and then. I do not know, however, that the consideration means necessarily that you must make the Director of Music an Assistant Commissioner of Police, but I am prepared to look at that if the requisite recommendations are made to me.

The Police Band has been given a lot of opportunities recently to make the kind of tour recommended by the honourable Member. They have been to the big opening of EPCOT last year, they have been the year before that to Disney World in Florida. In relation to the same point the honourable Member made, that they should have national television across the United States, they did in fact get national television coverage in the United States last year. This year, a major tour for the Police Band is in the pipeline and we believe that that is good not only for the standards and the morale of the Police Band, but also for the image of Barbados, so I am supportive of the point the honourable Member has made.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) raised the question of officers in the middle level of the Force. The number of posts for officers in the middle level has been already increased since we have abolished the rank of Corporal, and there are plans for one or two other such increases at the senior level.

I believe, Sir, that that is about all I have heard in the debate so far. I still am prepared to answer any further questions.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is only one point which I would like to make, Sir. I think that everything that needs to be said about the improvement in the status of the members of the Police Band and the Royal Barbados Police Force has been said by my colleagues. 12.40 p.m.

There has been a story circulating around – I do not know if the honourable Member is a Latin scholar – that *lares et penates* of certain Government officials were transported from Florida in violin cases and drums and that kind of thing. That is not good enough, and I hope that the Attorney General will investigate this.

When you send a man abroad, you do not expect that when he comes back paper towels and tins of corned beef and things of that sort, not connected with the man but to some official who was not connected to the band, but connected with tourism, should emerge from violin cases and drums and that sort of thing. It is not good enough.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the Head of the Police Force. I would like to start by praising the Commissioner of Police for doing a splendid job from the time he assumed office, but I would also like to bestow a few words of praise on all the top officers of the Force, because I believe that from 1976 we started really in the Police Force. We have quite a number of older people who I believe work hard with the Commissioner of Police, and I believe that he is

one who is willing to co-operate. I believe we will continue to get things going as they are going.

But first of all, we have to realise that to get work and productivity, there have to be good conditions where people can work. Members of the Democratic Labour Party for 15 years had the privilege to do something. Their rule in the House of Assembly was not for 15 months or 15 days, it was 15 long years. They never did anything for the Police Force.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) is now asking about things for the Police Band. I do not think that the members of the Police Force are so dumb that they do not know who really took care of them, but I will say that it is the policy of this Government, the Barbados Labour Party Government, since it came into power, to improve conditions for the Police Force. They did not deal with the Police Force alone, they dealt with agriculture, they improved housing, the Defence Force, education, health, all the Heads we have here this morning.

I, myself, am very, very friendly with a number of policemen, and at times I go to the barracks to discuss things with them. The men are so ashamed to come to you, because you see them in a big open hall and the poor policemen in a canvass cot, no kind of privacy whatsoever. In 15 long years, the Democratic Labour Party would have visited those barracks at some time, and they never did anything at all to improve the standard of the Police Force, and I know that when you improve a man's standard of living, he will try to perform much better.

I really would like to see the cells at Glendairy Prison. I have never had that privilege yet because I heard that they have some sort of hammock-style where the prisoners.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We will be dealing with the Prison. This is Head.....

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I know, Mr. Chairman, but I am just making a comparison. I was just trying to tell you that when a policeman takes care of a prisoner and sees that the conditions he lives under are parallel with those of a prisoner, that he cannot do of his best. So you will understand the position there.

I would also like to talk about a few of the things that have happened to me in relation to policemen in this country. I definitely believe that policemen should be fair, we all should live nice and together. Some members of the other side are some of the best friends that I have in Barbados and I do not believe that any policeman should get between politicians, or they should not get around political meetings and try to encourage people to disturb them, but I would like, Mr. Chairman to let you know what I suffered.

I remember an old policeman – not one of the young boys, he has resigned now – and these were his words at this big mass meeting. "The Barbados Labour Party knows that this is a stronghold of the Democratic Labour Party. They had no right coming up here and the boys have the right to break up the meeting." When you hear a policeman, who was there for law and order, encouraging the crowd at the meeting to break up the meeting, you could not expect that things really would go like that. I believe that we should always strive for law and order because I am one person who believes in law and order.

In the last election in 1981, there was a gentleman, I am sure all of you on that side know him, a strong campaigner for the Democratic Labour Party, and you know what the gentleman did to me, Mr. Chairman? That gentleman came into the booth and commanded the police officer to get me out of the booth. I had paid my deposit that I would pass in the booth to look at my people and he commanded the police officer "to get Mr. Brathwaite out, because Mr. Brathwaite is influencing people like me to vote for him."

I was surprised when that police officer came to me and asked me to leave the booth. It never worried me because I could have gone to Trinidad, as far as the vote in there was concerned. I did not have to be in the booth for the good people over there to vote for me. I knew what the people would have done. I am just saying that the policemen have to use their discretion and they cannot allow people to push them around. Now, I knew my rights. I knew that no police officer could send you out of a booth on election day when you were a candidate, but I did not want any big showdown.

I believe that the Commissioner of Police would co-operate with his men and they will co-operate with him, because we have to give and take to succeed. There is no man that can come with a hard and fast rule and expect, when he is domineering and do not try to give the policemen a break, that things would go on good forever. We have to always learn to try to co-operate with each other to get things moving.

I would like to see policemen educated to be a little more co-operative with the public. We should not be enemies of the Police Force, we should be friends of the Police Force. But sometimes you are driving on the road and you pay for the licence, but it unsticks and it just drops on the dashboard. The policeman stops you, because it is law that the licence should be on your windscreen. When he comes, he sees the disc has dropped

on the dashboard, but he still writes you up, when he could just warn you and tell you to go and get the disc stuck on and bring it back to make sure that you have it stuck on in the corner. But they waste time with you, write you up and then drag up before the.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: .....then they bring you before the Police Court for a case as small as that. Tomorrow when something serious happens in the district and the police comes asking for information, you know that person is not going to give the police information, because he automatically becomes an enemy of the person by trying to be hard.
12.50 p.m.

There are certain small cases in which the police can use their judgment and try to keep the people of this country with them, because we all must live together and we have to work together. We cannot do without the police, we cannot do without the Defence Force, we have to depend on them.

I remember hearing quite a lot of things this year in this Honourable House about the tourist industry, and I am wondering.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I was very happy even last night going down after 12 o'clock and seeing the amount of tourists on the street. We have to commend the policemen in this country for the job they are doing. I can tell you directly that I do not care how much money you spend on the tourist industry, when these people come to this country and you do not have policemen and the Defence Force to take care of these people so that they could not be molested, raped, robbed and all kinds of things, I am sure these people would catch a plane the next day and go back to where they came from. So I would like to commend them again for the job the Commissioner and all his workers are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch on a point that I heard yesterday, and this is in relation to the Pele case.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.

Mr. L. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I am just making a point, but I am sticking to Police. I heard many honourable Members yesterday talk about the issue where we had some police molested and treated badly and all sorts of things during that particular case.

Now-I would always put it this way. We all know that when this thing took place with the police at Atlantic Shores, the day of election had already been announced and we knew who were the two candidates. We knew that the man who was killed was a friend of the candidate for St. Michael East, and a friend does not generally kill his friend. That boy was one of the strongest canvassers in the Barbados Labour Party, and we knew that having him alive the Democratic Labour Party might not have won that seat, so under those conditions we always saw that was a trap set to move him out of the way.

Then, I would say it was the first time that the Democratic Labour Party really put the Barbados Labour Party on the run, because the Democratic Labour Party went all through the length and breadth of this country talking on platforms about this issue with the policemen, that the police were lying and the police were doing all sorts of wrong things.

Mr. Chairman, are you saying something to me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said you have two minutes more.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: They were saying all sorts of wrong things about the policemen and I agreed with the then Attorney General not to have an enquiry, it was a waste of money. We had to have an enquiry because I remember that the honourable Member in those days was just walking and trembling from the way the members of the Democratic Labour Party had him humiliated, and not only him alone but some honourable and good policemen in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad we really had the enquiry because it saved the honourable Member from this side from a lot of embarrassment, and I would say that was a time when we all listened, but it just proves to the members of the Democratic Labour Party that we really did not have anything to hide.

This morning we can mark down some of the recent benefits of the Police Force. With regard to the assistance with cane fires, all night I feel relaxed when I can see the presence of policemen between the canes when I am driving through the district. They have things under control.

Asides.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: The honourable Member asks me about some person in the car. When people like him have to stop in certain roads now, they can relax because they know they will have policemen in the roads.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable Member saying that he sees them in cart roads at night?

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I will say that members of the Barbados Police Force are doing a fine job and I will appeal to them to continue in the way they are going and bring this country back to the place we would like to have it. I would like to give them the assurance that this party to which I belong will do all that lies in our power to treat them as human beings.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, this debate has been dragging on for some time, and much as I was not prepared to enter it, it dawned upon me that it was correct that I should say a few things.

On hearing the charter of the Royal Barbados Police Force as enunciated by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) I wondered if he was in the Cabinet at any time during the difficult days of the Police Force. If he was, he would certainly have been a very sleeping member not to have realised that the problems he complained of that affect the Police Force were there existing for many, many years.

The speeches coming from the Opposition benches revealed a pattern of the old idea of dividing and ruling. On the one hand you get a vicious onslaught upon the Defence Force and on the other an attempt to portray the Royal Barbados Police Force as a paragon of virtue and a people who have not only arrived, but have arrived and doing very well. I hope that the members of that force will not be so misguided as to believe that you are their friend, but that they will certainly be aware of the Greeks even when they are bringing gifts.

No Government has done more for the Royal Barbados Police Force than the Barbados Labour Party. The party has helped the Force in a very short time, and in times when there were great difficulties. You only have to look around and see the physical improvement, the type of infrastructure which was made available for them to operate in. You just have to go up Roebuck Street and look at Weymouth where they have their sports club and centre for activities.

The Opposition was charitable yesterday in saying that Oistins is a model area for the type of activities in which justice should be dispensed and police should operate. We have seen the necessity for that, and I am sure that the Royal Barbados Police Force will agree that a Government which has set about to improve their lot will not just stop there, but will continue to ensure that the guidelines which they set for themselves will be accomplished in the fullness of time.
1.00 p.m.

The whole idea of trying to play one force against the other will certainly not easily succeed. I want the Opposition to realize that the members of the Royal Barbados Police Force as well as the Defence Force come from the same society in which we all exist. I believe that their training is such that they will respect the democratic system and will do all to defend this system.

In our time we have done all that is possible to bring about security within the land, and any Government that is elected to govern must ensure that, in the laying of plans for the proper governing of the country a number of measures are taken. We have been playing football too long with a number of important institutions in the land – our Parliament, our Judiciary with the maintenance of law and order, and the defence of the country. It is time that we bring a new thinking to bear upon the problems which confront the country and stop embarking upon these things which come so easily to us and which we believe can bring us cheap popularity and, hopefully, victory.

I have seen in my time that your playing to the Gallery never helps very much, and most of the speeches I heard today and yesterday were mainly speeches playing to the Gallery. They were nothing to do with law and order; nothing to do with defense and security; nothing of the kind; just questions of when somebody is to be appointed, who should have precedence over who, and all of these matters.

Essentially Mr. Chairman when it boils down, no matter who is in charge of who, the Government of the day will have to govern, and there is no question about that. In governing it must involve this Parliament, because if right measures are to be arrived at for the better governing of the country, Parliament will have to make the final decisions in those measures.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the time has really come when the Opposition must examine itself, and that when Opposition members have to speak on matters like these, they will take a very positive and definite approach and not allow themselves to look ridiculous in the eyes of the public. The public is aware of what is happening in the country. Earlier in the day, the learned Attorney General referred to the fact that crime has been considerably reduced between June of last year and this present month in which we are now living. That is very significant, and it gives you a clear message.

The Royal Barbados Police Force went through a very difficult period in its history just a few short months ago – I would not even say years. It is time to allow the dust to settle. It is time to give them a breathing space and allow them to operate within that breathing space, and give them the necessary encouragement to allow them to bring themselves back to the highest expectations which the country has always held for them. Attacking the Force at this time is not the very best for law and

order. The Force is operating under very difficult circumstances. Crime has become extremely sophisticated. You have international gangsters who are linked up with the local gangsters and they are very well tutored in the type of crimes which they embark upon. It is therefore in the interest of the whole country to mobilize behind the Royal Barbados Police Force and the Defence Force to ensure that this country continues to be a safe place in which we can live and operate.

We cannot be happy and contented unless crime is removed from the scene. And much as the Police will be attacked by people, they are the first to be called upon when homes are invaded or people are personally attacked. I want to appeal to honourable Members on the other side that in this difficult task which we are now faced with, when crime in the whole world is on the increase we join forces. The Attorney General has proven this morning that we have reduced the level of crimes. This trend can only continue if we give positive assistance to the people who are the law enforcement agencies in the country.

I want to publicly thank the public for the manner in which they responded to the police. In the requests for information leading to the recapture and imprisonment of the men who got out of the Glendairy Prison, we have seen positive indications that the public is willing to co-operate with the police in bringing criminals to justice. We must let the public know that we, too, are fully lined up behind the police in enforcing the laws of the land. Scoring points in these matters and trying to play one force against the other will not help anybody, and I want to advise the Opposition benches that they are not playing a good game, but, on the contrary, they are playing with fire.

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.15 p.m. today for lunch.

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

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

1.10 p.m.

On Resumption:

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

HEAD 31 – PRISONS – $1 090 511

Head 31 – Prisons – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 31, as amended, stand part.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I think at this stage, Mr. Chairman, we are only seeking some information. We wish to find out what is the present population at Glendairy, broken down in terms of males and females, in terms of the staff actually available to deal with those prisoners, and if the ratio between staff and prisoners is at the optimum level, or what measures are in train in order to provide greater resources for the present administration to deal with the many problems existing at that institution.

We would also like to know whether the Government has any proposals for.....

Asides

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We really want to know what is the Prison staff that the Prison administration considers adequate or necessary for providing optimum custodial and other care for the prisoners there, and how much staff is actually there. Then we wish to know, Mr. Chairman, if the Government has any plans for expanding the accommodation at the prisons.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We want to cut down the crime).

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I just ask what are your plans, I do not know. That is the kind of information that we require at this stage.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the prisons were very much in the news recently with the breakout

from that institution by three persons who had been imprisoned there. As a result of this breakout, of course, a lot of attention was focused on the prison.

We have found, Mr. Chairman, that at least two of the prisoners had been escapees from Glendairy Prison on more than one occasion. It obviously then brings into question the security at Glendairy Prison. One must necessarily want to find out how secure is the prison in particular in relation to prisoners who are known to be difficult prisoners.

There are some prisoners who are model prisoners, who give no trouble whatsoever, and you can almost leave them unattended, almost leave them unsupervised. They will do what they should do and you will have no problems with them. There are others who will always be looking for a chance, especially those prisoners who are sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. Even some of them might be model prisoners, but in particular with the difficult ones, when in fact a chance of seeing a little bit of freedom is so remote, they look for an opportunity, even for a day or two, or a week or two if they can manage that, to see a bit of freedom outside the prison walls.

It would appear to me that greater attention should be paid to that kind of person. I know that in the prison you have all kinds of persons. They are prisoners, I know, but they are different psychologically; in everything they are different; and one has got to be able to try to tread a middle road, the road where you can do the best for them all, and I know that that is not easy. I know that is difficult, but I think that the prison authorities will have to pay greater attention to those persons who are known to be difficult.

For instance, Sir, it had been said – I do not know how true it is – that when those persons who broke out, in fact there were a number of prisoners exercising at the particular time, with one or two warders supervising them. In other words, not enough warders were supervising them. That is what was said.

I have not got access to any report, and in fact I believe the last time there was a problem at Glendairy Prison when a number of the warders were held hostage, the Government at the time commissioned an individual to report on Glendairy Prison. As I understand it, that individual, Mr. Clyde Gollop, reported some time ago, but we are still in the dark as to what that report says.

Does that report refer, Sir, to the prison population in terms of the physical conditions there at Glendairy? I would like to know how many prisoners there are in one cell. These are things that we would like to know, because as we are hearing, and as we heard from the Attorney General yesterday, who in fact was repeating – I am not saying he had heard it – what was said earlier by the right honourable Prime Minister, the population at Glendairy Prison had grown to such a size that in fact they had to make use of some of the accommodation reserved for the female prisoners. We would also like to know what the position is as regards that. How many male prisoners have had to be accommodated in the female section of the prison? How many prisoners are in one cell?

On the positive side, Sir, I have had to make a visit to Glendairy Prison and I have seen some of the work the prisoners do, and they have done some very good work. They are capable, particularly in woodwork, of doing some excellent work at Glendairy Prison, and I believe that from time to time those things are sold. I feel that Government could probably pay greater attention to that aspect.

I am not suggesting that they set up a factory at Glendairy Prison, but maybe the market could know, especially when we have articles of quality, that these are things that have been manufactured at Glendairy Prison. I believe that the prisoners would be very proud of what they have done. We hope that when they leave there they can carry on their crafts on the outside. I would like to know what kind of revenue is realised from the sale of these articles that prisoners produce from time to time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wishes to speak? The honourable Attorney General.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the questions raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South, (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), today there are 320 men and 15 women in Glendairy Prison. We have 114 prison officers. The establishment was 108 until recently, and a request was made by the Superintendent of Prisons for an additional 10 officers. Six officers have been granted so far, bringing the total to 114, and we are hoping to have the other four posts made available some time in the near future.

2.30 p.m.

The other question was raised in relation to the occupancy of the Women's Prison by men now. We do not have any men put up in the Women's Prison. It is against the law to do so, and I am surprised that honourable Members should even ask that. How could you put men in a Women's Prison? It does not work that way.

We have had, as I pointed out yesterday, increases in the number of prison population over the past year which causes me some concern, and at the moment we are having more than one prisoner in a cell. That is not unusual, that happens in prison cells all over the world. We do not put two men in one cell for obvious reasons,

but we do put three occasionally, and at the moment there are some cells at Glendairy where there are three prisoners. What we have done is to look at the situation in the Women's Prison because – I do not have the exact figure – I believe that there are over 100 cells in the Women's Prison.

Now, in the old days, 50 years and 100 years ago, the people who used to run these countries did not care too much about women and they used 120 cells for women and they used to fill those 120 cells not many years ago. In those days they had so little regard for women that they felt that they should put them in prison for the slightest misdemeanours and shave off all the hair off their heads. That is how it used to be.

Well, honestly, 120 cells for women in Barbados now-a-days is far in excess of what we would need. We have 15 women in prison today, and that is a high figure. It is more usual than not that the figure is under ten, so we have almost 100 cells in the women's part of the prison that are not being used. What we propose to do is to do a major division in the prison to cut off part of the cell blocks from the women's side and allocate it to the men's side, and we have an allocation of $400 000 – I think that is the figure, in the Estimates for doing this work.

Even before these escapees that everybody is talking about, we had already undertaken a job of refitting the locks and doors at the prison. We were doing it gradually, because the prison is a very old building and a lot of work has to be constantly done to keep it up to the minimal standards required for security, so we continued this job of changing all the locks and strengthening all the doors for security and so on.

I think we have 11 cells in the maximum security wing, but a different kind of prisoner is going into the prison these days. We have a lot of dangerous, vicious psychopaths going into prison these days, so far the security of the prison officers themselves, for the security of the prison and the people, we find that it is necessary to have a bigger maximum security wing. Therefore, we will extend the outer barrier of the area adjacent to the maximum security wing to accommodate another 11 cells in the maximum security area, so we will have shortly 22 maximum security cells rather than 11.

We have, Mr. Chairman a situation at the prison that is perhaps something new in Barbados. In the past prisoners have escaped from Glendairy. It is nothing new. I think in the early 1960s two or three escaped one time.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Do not tell me, "No, no, no." Buddy Brathwaite was one of them. In 1966.

Whereas prisoners in the past who tried to escape might throw a cuff or something if the prison officers got in their way, nowadays we have the type of prisoner who would probably kill to escape. This is something that is new in Barbados and it is incumbent on the Ministry to try and do whatever is possible to secure the lives and safety of the people who work up there.

I went up to the prison some time last year when there was the prison insurrection, and what was abundantly clear was that it was a little bit too easy to get weapons into the prison. The prisoners who were involved in the incident at the prison last year had either a knife or knives.

We know that Glendairy Prison was built in another era in another situation, and that, from a strategic point of view, it is not the greatest prison in the world. Those of you who know it would know that when you go up Station Hill you have a number of houses that are adjacent to the prison, and all the people in those houses have to do is to climb up in the ackee tree in their back-yard and they can throw anything in there. On the western side of the prison the wall is very low and there are houses checker block right up under the prison wall, and it is possible that anything can go over the wall.

The prison is not ideally located in an age like today, but we have to make the best of the situation and carry out such improvements in security as is necessary, or consider whether it is a priority to perhaps build another prison for $40 million or $50 million, and we on this side know where the priority lies in that area.

One other thing I want to mention before we hear other contributions from honourable Members is the fact that the prison officers who work up there are unarmed. A lot of people do not understand that. They do not carry arms. The burden is great on them where it is possible by whatever means of getting weapons into the prison, because if the prisoners are able by whatever means to arm themselves with knives or otherwise, it puts an unreasonable burden on prison officers who are un-armed at all times.

I would want, just as I would want with the police, that we could continue to have prison officers unarmed in their normal duty. I hold the view, old-fashioned though it may be, that the show of force itself invites force, and that if police are armed, criminals are going to be armed – and are going to use their arms. If prison officers are armed, the likelihood of prisoners reacting with violence and with the use of arms will heighten.

2.50 p.m.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary for us to use our best advice in coming up with whatever means we can to tighten security both by the physical structure of the place and by increasing staff, the deployment of staff, the setting up of watch towers, the setting up of electronic panic buttons.

We will have to pursue whatever is necessary to ensure the utmost security in the prison, and we have started. We cannot do everything one time, but we have started this. The Estimates include $400 000 to start that construction, and the $400 000 will go a lot further in the construction than it does outside the prison, because all the labour will be provided by the prisoners, so we do not have to pay any high wage rates. We have already been in discussion with the Ministry of Transport and Works, which will provide the engineering assistance to help us construct the walls and the other barriers that we think are necessary.

A question was raised about the proceeds of the handicraft, furniture and so on that they construct in the prison. I do not have the figure at hand, but before the end of the debate I will give honourable Members the figure for last year on how much money we have collected from sales of work that was done by the prisoners.

I also ought to mention that we have just acquired additional land adjacent to the prison which will enable us to expand the farm at the prison. I do not know how many people are aware that one of the biggest chicken farms in Barbados is in the prison, and I believe the biggest rabbit farm in Barbados is in the prison. Before we finish the debate I will give the figures of exactly how much money we take in each year from the sale of eggs, the sale of rabbits and whatever.

One final thing, Mr. Chairman, and this relates to the question of people under the age of 21 who are in prison and doing prison sentences of less than six months. Under the existing Prison Rules, the Superintendent of Prisons on his own discretion can release prisoners under the age of 21 who are serving a sentence of less than six months on licence to do public work. They have to behave themselves or, if not, he can get them back in to complete their sentences. Recently he has released five such persons. One is working at District "A" Police Station, two are working at the Geriatric Hospital in St. Michael, and two are working at the Old People's Home in the Pine. It is reported to me that these people are enjoying the work that they are doing and are causing no problems, and that is an important part of rehabilitation of these people. They go home at night; they do not sleep in the prison. They are still under the control of the Superintendent of Prisons, but they go home at night.

I have the figures here now. Over $30 000 were received in the past year for sales of prison manufacture to the general public. The figure of $32 000 was collected in 1981/1982 for sale of handicraft made by the prisoners and sold to the general public.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few brief comments on this Head. I believe that honourable Members might know that I worked at the prison for about four years as Visiting Justice. I should just like to say that our prison, despite what anybody else says, is one of the best I have seen, and I have seen prisons in America and most of the Caribbean Islands.

Of late, because of the security risks, I know that certain steps were taken to make sure that there is clear vision from all sections of the prison. Nearly all the trees have been cut down and at night there are spot lights which make the area as bright as day. We must understand too that if a man wants to escape, he can. It is one of the hazards, and people escape from the greatest maximum security prisons. It is one of those things. The most we can do is to make it as difficult as possible.

Unfortunately, because of the smallness of the world today, we must accept that we will have more violent criminals and more intelligent criminals, and in a place like Barbados which is small, we have great difficulty in controlling such things.

What I would like to see really is if we can separate the young and first offenders from the more hardened criminals. I know it is difficult and I know that steps are being taken to see what can be done, but we are working with a small budget and it is not always that you can create a prison for every type of offender. We have 250 000 people and the prison population averages one per cent of the population, which is rather small.

Anyhow, my main concern really is in the expansion of the workshops. There are two workshops at the prison, one for woodwork, generally speaking, and one for tailoring. They are really crowded out at the present time and very often a number of prisoners have nothing to do. This is where I believe problems can be created, or plans can be made for their escape or any other untoward activity. If we can have these two rooms extended, I believe that a lot of problems may be solved, although I know there has been an increase in the supervision of prisoners in these workshops.

One area which I would like the Government to possibly look at is the question of the prison using its profits to plough back into any activities that they might have. As I understand at the present moment, the money which the prison makes goes back into the Consolidated Fund, and, like everything else, there can be a problem in

getting the money to use on the prison. As the Attorney General has just said, the prison is nearly self-sufficient, if not self-sufficient. My last check there indicated that they had so many pigs that they had to stop breeding pigs, there was no more room for pigs. They have any amount of rabbits and chickens.

I, too, would not like to see our prison officers armed. I believe that if we were to arm our prison officers, then it would cause our prisoners to become more vicious. And when we talk about viciousness, as far as prisoners are concerned we are talking about a very small minority, possibly about three or four at the most, and I think that only one is really very dangerous and violent. So we must not try to put things out of proportion, but must look at them in their true sense.

One question I would like to ask as well is whether or not there is a direct communication link between the prison and the police headquarters. I ask that because about two weeks ago there was a rumour that two prisoners had escaped and there was a mad rush of vehicles out of the police compound all over the place, then only to hear it was a hoax. I believe if there is not, then there should be some contact between the prison and the police headquarters so that any hoax can be dismissed.

I am also happy to see that there has been the purchase of additional land for agricultural purposes, because this is one area in which I believe our prison can assist other institutions. In St. Vincent the prison there supplies all the institutions with bread. I believe we can do likewise and possibly supply all the government institutions, such as the old people's homes, with vegetables and so on, and it would cut down the cost of Government expenditure in this area for these institutions.
2.50 p.m.

Those are the only remarks I want to make, but I would like people to understand that, generally speaking, our prison is about one of the best on this side of the world.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I myself do not know much about the prison, but I would like to ask the honourable Member two questions. What provision is made, if any, for the prisoners to participate in what for them would be external examinations in either the CXC or O Level and/or a programme which I believe has been started by the university?

I understand that in other prisons in the Caribbean provisions are being made for those prisoners who have behaved themselves and who have shown an aptitude and desire to participate in the advancement of their education. I wish to know if this is being practised at the moment in our own prison.

In the context of the maximum security area, it has been suggested from time to time in public arena that some prisoners are kept with a ball and chain. I, myself, do not believe this, but I think the Minister could possibly clear the air on that.

I really do not know what is the maximum security system we are using. I form the impression you were saying that we are going to be using the electronic method of keeping the doors locked and unlocked and electronic scanning, etc. If that is so, I support the effort to move toward a more modern approach.

But from time to time, one hears that one or two prisoners, who are very prone to escape from time to time, are placed under extreme maximum conditions, which include some attempt at keeping them immobile. If it is not so, just make the statement that it is not so. I do not need to have a long thing on it, because I myself really do not know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to put a few questions to the Minister on penal reform because I myself am concerned about some of the conditions which exist in the prison. You will remember that sometime in 1980 the Government commissioned a Report on Penal Reform and that committee made certain recommendations on the alternatives to imprisonment – the suspended sentence, community services, compensation and restitution order, rehabilitation of offenders, the probation service, parole, corporal and capital punishment. I would like to find out from the Minister what efforts have been made over the past two years to bring our penal system more into line with the recommendations of that committee, which was headed by Professor Howard Jones.

The Minister stated earlier in his first report that at present there are 335 inmates at Her Majesty's Prison, 320 men and 15 women, and in the Report on Penal Reform it states in the introduction that Barbados has always had a low prison popularity. In recent years, the average was approximately 240 prisoners a day at Glendairy. During the past year, however, the average had increased to 260 prisoners per day, and the Superintendent had expressed concern to the committee about the strain and accommodation if the population should increase significantly beyond the then average, which was 260 prisoners. The Minister today said the population has risen to 320 men and 15 women and I would like to find out how equipped is the prison to take this additional influx of prisoners.

I would also be happy to find out what plans, if any, are being made for first offenders. I feel that there is a lot of work in the community which can be done as payment, or part payment, for the prison sentences some of the prisoners are serving. It is difficult to find people to clean wells nowadays and I am of the opinion that some of that labour could be supplied from within Her Majesty's Prison. Also, there is a lot of debushing that could be undertaken.

Many people come to me with financial problems. They are given short notice to pay a particular debt; if it is not paid, they claim they will be apprehended and sent off to prison. But the point I am trying to establish here, Mr. Chairman, is what consideration can be given to persons who have such debts to pay; if they could be permitted to offset the cost of the debt by providing labour to an institution.

Perhaps, this is a question that would have to be looked at in co-operation with the trade union. I do not know. But rather than sending someone off to prison for a debt if he is unemployed, if some programme can be devised whereby such persons could give their labour and offset the difference, I believe that we indeed will be saving the lives of a lot of fathers in many cases who, because of their inability to find a job to support their families, must hide, and eventually when they are caught are taken to prison for debts which through no fault of theirs they cannot adequately repay it.

I would like to hear the Minister's views on this, Mr. Chairman, in particular the suspended sentence, to see whether that can work in Barbados. It has worked in many other countries. I find that the report is a very interesting one, and I would like to hear the current thinking of Government on these issues.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in my contribution to Head 31, Prison, under these Estimates, I would like to state that the public of Barbados is not very well informed as to what really goes on behind the prison bars or the cells behind the walls of Glendairy Prison. There are convicted prisoners and unconvicted prisoners. My understanding is that there are over 270 convicted prisoners and 50 unconvicted prisoners. The unconvicted prisoners are those who have not yet faced trial and on remand, as separate and distinct from the convicted prisoners.

When one compares how this Government treats its prisoners in relation to other Caribbean territories, I think it is reasonably fair to say that the prisoners in Barbados are treated much better than many of the other territories. The convicted prisoner has visitor rights of one visit per month of three persons for 15 minutes; but no children under fourteen are allowed unless special permission is given by the Superintendent. Special permission can be given in certain circumstances such as if a prisoner is convicted and he finds himself behind the Glendairy bars at a time when his girlfriend or wife was pregnant and he had not as yet had the opportunity of seeing the child. In this sort of circumstance the Superintendent will allow a child in so that the prisoner could see his son or daughter, which, I think, is extremely lenient and fair, and quite humane.
3.00 p.m.

The unconvicted prisoner is entitled to the same rights, except these rights are for periods of week to week rather than periods of month to month.

We know very little, Sir, about a day in the life of a prisoner. The prisoner is awakened at 5.30 in the morning, and between 5.30 and 6.00 he must clean his cell. At. 6 o'clock sharp there is a security check to ensure that all heads are counted and all prisoners are accounted for. At 6.30 there is breakfast and at 7.30 work commences until 11.00 a.m.

This work entails constructive sort of work – carpentry, tailoring and animal husbandry, that is, the breeding of animals, pigs, sheep, cows, rabbits and chickens. All this is presently going on. So when a prisoner leaves the prison, he or she would be entitled to come out and make some sort of contribution to the society.

There are over 200 pigs, as far as my information goes, 250 rabbits and over 800 chickens are maintained by these prisoners, and these in turn help to feed the prisoners themselves.

Lunch is served between 11.00 and 12.00, and between 12.00 and 3.00 the prisoners are back again at work. I am considering going to prison, Sir, because the life seems kind of sweet compared to the hectic day I have to deal with in here listening to the Opposition spokesmen when they begin to talk.

Sir, dinner is served at 3.30, and again a security check is made to ensure that all and sundry are accounted for. Then there is recreation – football, basketball, cricket, road tennis, dominoes, draughts – so prisoners again.....

Asides.

Mr. A. TRUSS: No poker, no cards are allowed, no gambling, so when you go to visit them you must not encourage them in that.

At dusk, Sir, between 5.30 and 6.30, depending on the time of the year, as it gets dark, this is the time that the prisoners are moved in stages back to their cells, and there they remain until the next day.

Aside

Mr. A. TRUSS: Not as yet, no television, but they have video recordings. Seriously, Sir, if the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) will give me a break, I have never been in prison and I really cannot tell him if they have video.

The maximum security accommodations previously were for 11 prisoners, and I understand that that has recently been updated to 22. You heard before that there are 320 male prisoners and 15 female prisoners.

The point mentioned by the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) about the reason why Young, Harding and Hunte were able to escape, that it was because of a lack of proper supervision during the recreation period, I believe he is correct. My information also indicates that this is exactly what has happened, and this is why the Superintendent put in for ten more prison warders. He was only granted six, but the six will go a long way toward alleviating the problems they have had in the past, and to ensure that tighter security is maintained. I urge that at the earliest possible opportunity the Superintendent is granted an additional four security personnel so that he will have a full complement of officers to run the compound as efficiently and as effectively as possible.

At the prison, Sir, they also offer classes to those who are interested in English, Maths and the Arts. These classes are held twice weekly by the Ministry of Education.

The sum total of all I am saying is that in my view the prisoners are treated in a very humane way as one possibly can, and I am assured by the Superintendent that all is being done to ensure that people such as Young, Harding and Hunte will not be able to jump over the wall as easily as they did on previous occasions.

I compliment the Attorney General for ensuring that the facilities and the treatment of the prisoners at Glendairy are upgraded and maintained, because most of the prisoners there are for house breaking, petty theft and drugs. They are not really hard core prisoners as such; they are in the minority, 11 of them, and now they have extended the maximum security to 22 cells. That dictates that at any one time you will have no more than 22 serious prisoners at Glendairy Prison.

It is therefore important for Government to devise new policy that when the prisoner comes out of prison for theft, for house breaking or for drugs, that that prisoner would not feel alienated, that prisoner would find it easy to become integrated into the society.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One of the first things you could do is to refrain from referring to them as prisoners once they have left the prison.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Thank you, Sir, thank you for your guidance. The prisoner once he has left prison is no longer a prisoner.

I am assured that there is video and there is television once a week, to answer a question from the honourable Member for St. Michael South. There is television once a week and video too.

Those, essentially, Sir, are the few points I wanted to raise and to congratulate the Attorney General for the humanitarian way in which he has gone about his job to ensure that people, even though they may break the law, are still entitled to have a useful and fruitful life after they have paid their debt to society and leave the prison.

Thank you, Sir.

3.10 p.m.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the science of penology is a complex discipline that is relatively new to Barbados; so new, in fact, that it is going through a very steady and on-going evolutionary process. I believe that the purpose of having this is so that administrators of the penal court are able themselves to define a coherent strategy for the rehabilitation of offenders.

Throughout the years, we have looked at penology as a discipline for which the principal aim is to punish offenders for crimes committed against society, and very frequently that punishment has been simply that. There has not been a clear consensus in the minds of society generally as to what attitudes they should adopt with respect to persons who have broken the law.

In the United States and Great Britain and the major metropolitan countries in the world, a large new discipline is emerging, a discipline that is really more a discipline of confusion that anything else, because there is a school of thought that argues that the best way to rehabilitate an offender is to put him in prison in circumstances that as nearly as possible approximates the situation in which he would live had he been still in society.

The result is that most modern penal institutions are really very sophisticated dormitories in which modern technology is very heavily in evidence for the purpose, not only of entertaining but of rehabilitating. In effect, so advanced and so *avant-garde* has the current thinking become that in some United States jails the experiment is currently in progress where male and female prisoners are

allowed to cohabit, in both of its meanings, in the penal institutions. The reason behind this, they say, is that it is abnormal, cruel and unkind to deprive an individual of his freedom and deny him the freedom of association with his peers and to those persons who helped to round out his life before he became an offender.

So it is obvious, at least to me, that it is still not clear in the minds of most administrators in penal institutions what they ought to do with persons once they become criminals. My own view is that a penal institution is a penal institution and while it should not be designed around cruel and inhuman intents, from my point of view I cannot see where you can be punishing a criminal and at the same time having his accommodations in prison so completely approximate with the conditions and circumstances which he would have enjoyed had he been outside.

The whole purpose of putting a man in prison in the first place is to deny him some of the things which free people have. The moment we become confused in our thinking as to the nature of penology, then, from my limited appreciation of the subject, since I am not an expert in the field, it would appear to me that what you are going to do is to set up an institution that is not sufficiently penal in nature, with the result that you will not really reform persons at all and you will still continue to have a very disturbed person, a person who is on the one hand criminally inclined and, on the other hand, who recognizes that once he breaks the law there is hardly going to be any penalty attached to it.

In today's society, it is a very difficult task indeed which those persons charged with the responsibility of the administration of penal code have to carry out. The police, for example, have to be infinitely more sophisticated than the policeman of many years ago, because being a policeman in today's society is a very difficult assignment indeed. It requires a level of discipline, a level of psychological balance, a level of self-assurance, that is not found in every individual, and it would appear to me that we have to put out a great deal of effort in order to identify the persons in our society with the aptitudes that translate themselves easily into good police officer potential.

Policing in a small society like Barbados is even more difficult than policing in a big metropolitan country, because all the psychological pressures to which a Barbadian policeman is subjected to, are not as readily in evidence in a large metropolitan society. The reason is obvious. In a small community it is almost impossible to find a policeman who is not readily known to a very large cross-section of the Barbadian public because of the smallness of the society, and therefore when a policeman has the responsibility of carrying out his duties as a policeman, he is confronted with all kinds of real psychological pressures, pressures that would tax the resources of the average individual, because he may have to apprehend his friend and he is not able to easily make the distinction between the carrying out of the law and dealing with that friendship to which I have just referred.

This is a real problem which our police officers have to endure. It is somewhat like being a politician in a small community when pressures begin to mount up and people are seeking to get all kinds of concessions. It is not really a task which should be easily overlooked.

To this end, therefore, it would appear to me that we need to be conscious of the requirement for policemen and penal officers to be well-trained in the modern science of penology so that they can be sensitive to the need for the law to be upheld and for a penalty to be paid, and at the same time balancing delicately the social conscience and the psychological conscience that is so vital to proper and humane treatment of persons, even if they have been identified as offenders.

Barbados, because of the pressures that are mounting around the world, is coming under severe strain itself. Once upon a time, it was possible to speak in very glowing terms of the relative safety in this community. But like everywhere else on earth, the standards to which we once subscribed with assurance are now under assault by a number of persons who are not as committed to the maintenance of law and order as we ourselves might be. The result is that we have a new breed of juvenile and adult offender and in this the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) comes to mind.
3.25 p.m.

To be serious, Sir, we have juvenile and adult offenders who are going to be disturbing us badly, breaking our hearts when they themselves break the law. We are attempting to develop law abiding citizens in this country, but all kinds of strains, some of them extraneous to our own society, are creeping in, and they are creating problems for the people in our society who are responsible for the maintenance of law and order.

We have seen a situation in recent times where we have had an increase in crimes against the person, some of them particularly vicious in nature, and we are torn between the need to redress these offences and at the same time to show a humane face to the offenders. I hope that in the process the Attorney General, together with those persons who are his co-workers, would be able to identify a course of action that would allow us not to become soft in our attempt to be humane. Sometimes I think what happens to us is that we confuse humanity with softness, but we can be humane and at the same time firm so that we do not unwittingly encourage persons to become offenders because they conceive that we do not have the will to impose the kind of punishment that fits the crime.

I may surprise a number of persons by my own stance on this subject. I believe that we have to make every effort to make sure that people conform to the law, but once we have recidivism creeping into the criminal system, we will then have to let these recidivists understand in clear language that we have the will to punish, and that we will punish to the extent of the law, so that we do not encourage others outside looking on to believe that it is always a good course to break the law, and that they can feel that they may break that law with impunity.

There is a great deal of talk going on now about capital punishment, and when that comes up in this House for debate, I will have more to say on that subject. For the time being I merely would want to encourage the Attorney General and the others who work together with him in this sphere to use their best judgment to identify the most sophisticated information available to us regarding informed penal administration so that we in Barbados are able to continue to secure the peace that this society has become accustomed to, and continue to make sure that the citizens of this country have a safe environment in which to live and continue to raise their children.

I thank you, Sir.

The question that the sum of $1 090 511 under Head 31 – Prisons – as amended, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 32 – FIRE SERVICE – $647 396

Head 32 – Fire Service – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, just briefly I think I would be failing if I did not rise to salute the Chief Fire Officer and his men for the outstanding work which they have given this country again over the past financial year. I think it is a job in which the young men and women in the Fire Service sometimes go unnoticed, until there is some fire or something which might occur that would bring the Fire Service before the eye of the public.

I do not know of any difficulty which I have been told that they have been experiencing, and, equally as we have saluted the members of the Defence Force and their chief, the members of the Police Force and their new Commissioner, I would like to salute the outstanding work done by the Chief Fire Officer and his men over the years. I believe this feeling is a mutual feeling between members on both sides of the House.

With those few remarks, I beg to move that the sum of $647 396 under Head 32 – Fire Service – 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 33 – PROBATION DEPARTMENT – $70 452

Head 33 – Probation Department – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $70 452 under Head 33 – Probation Department – 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 75 – MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS – $3 310 548

Head 75 – Ministry of Legal Affairs – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $3 310 548 under Head 75 – Ministry of Legal Affairs, 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 36 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES – $59 728 974

Head 36 – Ministry of Health and Community Services – was called.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $59 728 974 under Head 36 – Ministry of Health and Community Services – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I am a bit disappointed that the Minister did not give some information on this particular Head. Nonetheless, in prefacing my remarks on this particular Head which has seen much debate over the years, I want to say that if we agree that it is Government's responsibility to provide adequate health services for the people of this country, by providing the kind of facilities in the kind of day to day policy that would meet the administration for such services, we therefore then cannot frustrate or deny

people the right to the use of any of those services in an effort to acquire the best medical health care.

I want to say from the outset that I believe that priority must be given to the Government's own programme in introducing the National Health Service. I believe that after having now the third Minister dealing with this particular problem, there is a definite need to review all that has taken place. I say this because whatever takes place in that health service, which many of us would agree is the spring-board for any effective programme for health care, the community health services were bound to suffer, and the community health services deal primarily with the polyclinics, the outpatients centres and other areas alive to them.

Now, over the past years we have had very unhappy experiences with the service being rendered at some of these polyclinics. We have had practically one year with a particular aspect being removed, and one cannot calculate to what extent the effect that that has had. But I know that the very people who you prepare to benefit from that particular service in these clinics have had a very hard time. It was always a dislocation for them, Sir, because it drew an additional workload in the very area in which we had designed these clinics to relieve pressure.

3.30 p.m.

I do not want to go through the sad stories about the Casualty at the hospital, because nearly every year we highlight it, but we moved away from that because we anticipated that after three years Government would have been able to get its own programme going. I would like the Minister to give us some good explanation as to why there was a reshuffle, and at the end of that reshuffle we immediately saw the clinics open. We were given no explanation and I certainly believe that he should tell us why this was so, and ask this on the basis of research into the very Estimates before us.

When you look at the total amount voted for the present individual services, there is a very slight increase. So this clearly shows that we either had the money or, which is something I cannot explain, we did not give the people what they deserved. Furthermore, Sir, I do not anticipate that this year we may even be any better, because in the very vote itself, although there is an increase in the total vote, there is a decrease in a very vital area, Materials and Supplies. I would also like to inquire from the Minister if he can give us the information as to what effect this reduction in Supplies and Materials will have in carrying out this particular service.

Sir, we have talked about the polyclinics a lot. We have already warned what the consequences would be if you are not certain as to what you want to do. Clearly, Sir, it is evident if there is confusion and misunderstanding, then they would have to explain to us that it is a money problem. But then how can the money problem arise when we are already paying a Health Levy?

I want to draw to your attention that the projection for this Health Levy was originally something like $4.5 million. But a revised Estimate said $10 million, and the very Estimates today, Sir, we are anticipating $11 million. It is not fair to the taxpaying public to have this money deducted from them and still, up to this very point, do not have an efficient service.

I would like to add, there can be no excuse. Long before that this Democratic Labour Party Government instituted a sort of network in which they carried the services for the people, and we did that with less expenditure. We did it at a cheaper rate and the people did not have to produce that extra to make it work. Even though you are producing that extra, it is not working. Therefore, I would hope that the Minister will carry out this review and find out the real reason why we are still at this standstill position.

The position at Enmore will also arise, because if the other areas in which you carry out public health services are not functioning, it will also throw additional work on that institution. But since you have removed Enmore from a central position, it is also creating that extra difficulty for other people who live far away to get there. This difficulty will be further increased because of transportation, and, if as I understand it, there could be an increase in bus fares. So we need to make sure that the Enmore project is quickly brought to completion.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of this that the very people who we would least want to suffer are suffering. I draw this to the Minister's attention with the hope that he will find the extra energy to make sure that this project comes through. But, Sir, I am at a loss, because the project has two phases; and if you have been a failure in Phase I, I do not see how you are going to be able to attack or carry out Phase II. Again my advice is to make sure that Phase I is properly instituted and is properly functioning, so that when you have to carry out Phase II you would not have a double problem. Phase I deals primarily with the Drug Service, but before I move on to the Drug Service, there is something that we need to understand.

I talked about the inefficiency of the service, the malfunctioning of the service, and everything tends to suggest to me that it either never worked or someone is trying not to make it work. Now in the Revenue Section of these Estimates, you see a collection of fees for $5 000 from all the dispensaries. Who really goes to the dispensaries? If you can only collect $5 000 in the sale of

drugs as the note suggests, then it means that the people are not using the service. They have moved away from it and you have to find out why they moved away from it. Before we had something like nearly 80 000 visits in those clinics, and even if you had 50 000 of those visits at least under the system of which medicine may be free or half free, I would think that you should be able to make a better sale of these drugs than $5 000. So, to me, this is a reflection on the service itself. Either you do not get the drugs, people are not getting the drugs, they want, or on the other hand, they just bluntly refuse and choose to go to the private sector. This again probably shows a reflection, if not of the quality, something else, in the public sector dispensaries.

Mr. Chairman, I warn over and over again, pharmacists are like other people in business, and they will only go into it if it means some kind of proper remuneration for them. We are dedicated people, Mr. Chairman, but I am enquiring of the Minister if he can give me the information as to why no proper arrangement has been made with the private pharmacies as yet. My understanding is that not too far from now if no proper arrangement can be made they might opt out of the service, even though they are willing to render the kind of service that is required. I would suggest to the Minister to look very carefully at this area and try to see if he can find a solution to that problem.
3.40 p.m.

I do not want to repeat the things I have said in the past about the very service, because by now I think the Minister would be aware of the problems that I have highlighted. I will not spend much time on the hospital because the same problem recurs over and over again, but if you look at the hospital again, you see that the problem can be relieved if your programme is going well, because there seems to be some over working with the nurses in that institution. I have said before that we have got enough people trained, that very institution trained a number of people, and I believe they can be recruited. I will not go into the hospital any more than that.

I am very concerned, and I will tell you why I am very concerned in dealing with this Head. If the reports are not correct, we are likely to have some interference with our other hospitals. I think it would be a good thing for us to sit back and analyse why the Geriatric Hospital is there as well. That used to be what we called the almshouse, and I am sure that under the Democratic Labour Party Government we did our best to remove much of the unpleasantness that was usually associated with it. That hospital has made a name for itself, and only a few days ago I was requested to ask if I could find a place in that institution for an elderly gentleman who could not be kept in the Q.E.H., who could not pay for his private services in another hospital. So he found that that was the only place that would have suited his condition, because I do not think the Home Help Service would be any help to him at all.

The Home Help Service is still under review, in my opinion. I have not seen any statistics laid to prove whether or not it is effective, neither do I have any understanding as to the quality of the people who are working in that service. But in the case of this particular gentleman, even if you were going to give him Home Help Service, you would have to give him the kind of service that is above just an assistant, because his condition required the above average nursing care.

I say that to suggest that that Geriatric Hospital is not an almshouse. It is an institution which I believe has a staff of about 107 nurses, which suggests that that institution is not just another place. There are qualified nurses there as well, and I believe that unless you can find an alternative to that, we need to go cautiously on whatever plans we have.

Likewise, Sir, in the other hospitals that have been set up to relieve these problems, which the lower paid people in the community, who cannot afford care at other private institutions use, they also have a nursing staff of about 120 nurses. Clearly that is about 250 people employed, and qualified people, which should speak for the quality of service within those institutions, and I only mention this because I understand there is some feeling that, these institutions may have to go.

Mr. Chairman, I will just make one last point, and I will speak again, because this is not the only subhead. It has attached to it Welfare as well, and when we hear that much more money has been voted for the health services in comparison to other years, we have to remember that we have added welfare to it. I would like to say something on that particular department, but for the time being I will take my seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, over the years we have seen a progressive deterioration in the delivery of health care in Barbados at all levels, primary, secondary and tertiary, for a variety of reasons, and about the only area which seems to be holding its own is that area where we have been traditionally strong for over half a century, namely, the public health sector of the health services.

The reason for this is because we have had a policy relating to health in Barbados which has been informed by the propaganda and political needs of the ruling party rather than by the health needs of the country. It has been informed by the need to put up as many monuments made with concrete and cement rather than recognising a fundamental principle in health care delivery, that it is about people looking after people.

It is not the amount of money that is spent on a health service that determines the quality of the health service, it is how those resources are allocated.

Every single person on that side who has any sense or any knowledge of the financial requirements of a free National Health Service, would recognise from the very beginning that this was nothing other than political propaganda. Unfortunately, as I have said before, health is such a sensitive area that if any political party comes and says we are going to give you a free National Health Service, then they are likely to catch a few votes.
3.50 p.m.

Far from being a free National Health Service, what we have seen over the years is a progressive deterioration in the Health service, and increased charges for everything that was offered to people free in the past. If you were to take that one institution like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, many of the services that were offered to the public of Barbados free, they now have to pay for; and what they paid for before, those charges have been substantially increased.

In the meantime, we have thrown a lot of money, millions and millions of dollars down the drain over the past seven years. We have wasted money on a whole lot of bureaucrats who should have been sent home a long time ago, because they have produced nothing; absolutely nothing. When you look at their records to date, after paying them new salaries for years, and you look at the areas for which they have responsibility, nothing has happened in relation to the health services.

You take that whole polyclinic programme. It has always been my contention in this Honourable House that the proper place to have started with a polyclinic programme after the Maurice Byer Polyclinic was completed was to have built one as near as possible to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, or if possible, bearing in mind certain major psychological factors that impinge upon on health care delivery, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital within the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Compound.

I think the area under Casualty was identified years ago as a probable area for expansion in that particular area, and if I have to keep you here until 12 o'clock tonight – no, the guillotine may come down before that – but I am going to keep you going on this one this afternoon, because what you have done? You have committed this country to a whole lot of borrowed money. You have put up a whole lot of structures throughout Barbados. You have spent money on bricks and concrete, on cement, and in the end you have closed down the same buildings that you have built.

So, what do you have? You have a monument to the Barbados Labour Party, you have a monument to the Minister, but yet the people cannot have access to proper health care, or proper secondary care, or proper tertiary health care.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This is not to be contentious, but if he would just give way on a point of order, Sir: Is it not a fact that the polyclinics have been re-opened? He is saying that they have been closed down after they were built and there are monuments to the Barbados Labour Party. The polyclinics are now in operation. What are you telling me?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To continue, Mr. Chairman. I started off by saying that health care delivery is about people looking after people. All that money could have been saved and I dare say, and I repeat it here on the Floor of this House, that Barbados needs one or two, at the most, sophisticated polyclinics.

There is nothing that will go on in a multi-million dollar polyclinic in the Glebe, or anywhere in St. John, or anywhere in St. Philip, that would not go on in a doctor's office, which he probably pays a rent for of $1 000 a month. There is nothing that would go on there that would not go on in a 3 or 4 bedroom house, and I will say that in doctors' offices in Barbados more work would be done in 2 000 or 3 000 sq. ft. of space on any given day than in any polyclinic in Barbados. Now, that will give you some idea of the monumental waste that has taken place over the years!

(Asides)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: He does not understand what polyclinics are all about. He is saying that you look after mosquitoes in polyclinics. That is what he is trying to say.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Are you sure you are right? You are saying that sanitary inspectors only look after mosquitoes? That is what you are saying? All right. Go along.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have already adverted, Sir, to the public health services being the one that has been maintained over the years and all the others have declined, whereas the sanitary inspector services would fall under the Public Health Services.

But the point I was trying to make is that we must have some sense of priorities, and when you are building a building you have to have some kind of projection as to what kind of services you will put into that building. My contention has been that if you had rented or bought a three or four bedroom house in one of the parishes of this island, you would have had a lot more money available to you to spend on people in the process of delivering health care delivery. The point is that the

public health service was there before you were born and it was as good then as it is now, and it will remain as good after you have gone as it was before you were born. I know that you were born a long time ago but, nevertheless, that is the situation.

So, Sir, when you go and you allow an international organization to sell you a polyclinic programme which they have designed for Chile, and you bought that programme after Chile turned it down, and you transport that to Barbados there will be problems. Those polyclinics were designed for Chile for situations where they would be serving populations of half a million people which were cut off from the rest of the main stream of health care delivery and where it was envisaged that you would have a totality of services, including X-Ray services and so on, within the polyclinics.

Now, it would be utter madness in Barbados, Mr. Chairman, to attempt to put an X-Ray department and full-scale laboratories in the polyclinics around this country, for the simple reason that there is no point putting an X-ray department in a polyclinic unless you have radiologists to read the X-rays. Doctors now-a-days hardly ever read X-rays, Sir. It is an expert matter. There is a difference in training. You now have specialists in that area. Where are you going to find the radiologists from? Where are you going to get them from? It is a complete waste of time!

That is the problem that you have, so the main service that you will be delivering at a polyclinic would be basically clinical services; with one or two specific tests, and that is done in every doctor's office in Barbados, basic urine test, a little blood taken off to do a few basic tests and sent to a central laboratory.

So all that money, in my view, has been wasted. And after wasting all that money for six years, you are now in the process of building the one polyclinic that should have been built seven years ago, whilst you have now discovered that you cannot even find the money to run the polyclinics that you built, and they have been closed down for some time.

That is the way of the Barbados Labour Party. They are interested in putting good propaganda in relation to health. They are interested in putting up buildings. And because they have put up buildings, they believe that they have solved all the health problems in Barbados, no matter how much suffering is taking place in the meantime.

You take that Queen Elizabeth Hospital. When I was there as Chairman, the only valid complaint they could make about it is to walk about and call it the "Richie Haynes Hilton". That was all they could say! It was such a splendiferous place, so well run and so well organized that there was nothing to criticize inside there. They used to call it the Richie Haynes Hilton, the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) among others.

4.00 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, it is not really fair for the honourable Member to misrepresent something that he heard or that he imagined.

Mr. CHAIRMAN ordered that certain words spoken by the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) be struck from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me ask honourable Members please to give some consideration to the Hansard Reporters. I know that they have no end of trouble at times hearing what is said, so leave out the cross talk.

The honourable Member has four minutes to complete this phase of his speech.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is a fact Mr. Chairman, that over the years, in increasing numbers unfortunately, patients who cannot afford to pay for their medical services because of the problems that they have at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital come over to Delaware to seek my services. They indicate that they are unable to pay but they cannot get the kind of quality of treatment which they were accustomed to when I was there, and I gladly offer them my services without any charge under those circumstances. That is an absolute fact.

Mr. CHAIRMAN ordered that certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) be struck from the record.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point I am trying to make is that one of the most corrupt industries in the world internationally is the drug industry, and the most corrupt sector of that industry is the industry related to generic drugs. So when one attaches himself to a policy related to generic drugs, then they are attaching themselves to an industry which is internationally known to be corrupt and has nothing to do with Barbados.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, there is a group of very reputable people, including doctors and pharmacists, in Barbados who sit on a committee that deals with these drugs, and you also have a special Tenders Committee. Is the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) seriously suggesting that these people are involved in a corrupt business and that some form of malpractice is involved?

He must name those officials. Those people are not in a position to defend themselves and therefore they will have to be defended. He has to say who they are and he

must name people. He cannot come in here in a bald way, because he thinks he has the privilege to come in here and attack the character of people, and do this. It is certainly improper.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must tell the honourable Member that I took note of the question he has raised and I am sure the Committee are all aware of the propensity of some honourable Members for exaggeration. No name of any person was however called by the honourable Member, and I do not believe that he could in any way be referring to any of the doctors and the people who are concerned with drugs coming into Barbados.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege: I want to know if you are ruling that the honourable Member can say that if a committee is appointed and the Minister of Health has to approve the appointment of personnel to that committee, and the committee is involved in drugs and they are generic drugs, that internationally the most corrupt body dealing in drugs are the people who deal in generic drugs? Is it all right to baldly say in here that this is the case and that there is no redress, and the people who are on that committee dealing with these drugs can be attacked in this way?

You do not necessarily have to call the names of people. The mere fact that you say that the system is corrupt, you indirectly, in my respectful submission, think of people who are involved. The Minister himself, who has to approve the committee and appoints the committee, is involved as well as the personnel on the committee. I want a ruling on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: From the remarks of the honcurable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) he addressed his remarks to international drug companies. Now I think it is a very unfair comment to make in view of the fact that he did not specify which companies he meant. It is not my belief, nor I am sure is it the belief of this Committee, that he could be referring to all international companies. I certainly feel that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central could have graced this Committee by giving us the names of those companies for the benefit of the country, which is his country too. He has failed to do this, but I certainly do not indict him for making references to individuals and to doctors and to people in Barbados.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the operation, not even of a company. I am talking about the operations of an international drug system. I have said that again and again. I have said nothing as yet about any local person related to drugs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt at this point, I would like.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have probably had about one of my four minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No, no. You have got just about one minute to finish after I have spoken. However, I think the honourable Member would be doing a very good service to the community and of the Committee if he would indicate, to his knowledge, if drugs that are sub-standard and are manufactured by this company or these companies which are referred to, are in fact coming into Barbados, and I myself would like to know if he has done anything about it to inform the people concerned about these things.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Firstly I have informed the public again and again from the Floor of this House, I have expressed my views on the impotence of small developing countries to handle the international drug industry in relation to generic drugs, and I will point out, given the time, the kind of corrupt practices that operate within that sub-division of the drug industry that deals with generic drugs.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: That is a prevarication.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it is almost impossible to communicate at one level and have objections again and again at a completely different level.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has had fifteen minutes to debate, and he will be able to speak again.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have had more than fifteen minutes of interruptions and this has been going on day after day.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a comment you must withdraw.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I withdraw that, but I draw it to your attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. When called upon again you will speak.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir. I think that we all expect that this is a matter that so intimately affects the honourable Member's position in life, and his pocket in particular, that we would know that the honourable Member would generate within himself a tremendous amount of heat whenever we come to debate Health.

4.10 p.m.

At this point certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. Chairman.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am perfectly entitled to say that from the content of his speech, the honourable Member disclosed the lack of objectivity. And I will go further. I have listened to the honourable Member now for some 6 or 7 years, or 5 years, whatever it is, on this matter, and he repeats himself on every occasion, and he has never been able to demonstrate at any particular period of time the worthiness of his charge in relation to corruption with generic drugs.

Many countries and many institutions in the world have been trying to contain the escalating cost of health delivery. Health delivery in all of the countries have defied many attempts to contain it. Barbados is no exception. What the honourable Member should be trying to do is to bend his mind to try to demonstrate how he can make constructive suggestions for helping us to contain the health cost in Barbados. He does not deal with it that way.

Sir, the Government is well committed to a programme of delivery of health to all of the community, irrespective of their ability to pay. Is the honourable Member against that concept? We do not feel that in the small community of Barbados anybody should be deprived of the best medical care because they do not have the requisite amount of money in their pocket. That is our philosophy. If the honourable Member disagrees with that, then he must state that.

We recognize, of course, because we cannot deliver the health care, that we have to have the co-operation of all of the agencies that are capable of delivering the care, and that is why we have proceeded along a somewhat slower path than many of us would like.

It is positively clear that any doctor that the honourable Member has any influence on will fight the Government tooth and nail to prevent the Government from carrying out its concept, because the honourable Member delegates it, and he is that kind of man. He will raise hell, heaven, the earth, anything that is within his command, to obstruct the Government from carrying out its policy. That is what the honourable Member discloses in here; not only today, but every time that he speaks on the subject. As far as the honourable Member is concerned, he is going to obstruct; he is going to prevent; and he is going to persuade everyone that he has any control over to do the same. So we know that we have a fight on our hands because, as the honourable Member says, he has a following in the medical profession.

But let me tell the honourable Member something. The situation is changing in the world. No longer do particular doctors have a monopoly in a particular place on a particular type of knowledge. I have a document, and I am quite willing to make it a document of the House. It is the *Times* of England, Tuesday, 15 March 1983 and this is a signal. I am going to lay it on the Table of the House because it indicates a general trend in the world. It says:

> "Medical Student Cuts Urge: Senior members of the medical profession of Scotland have called on Mr. John McIye, the Scottish Minister for Health and Social Work, to make a substantial cut in the intake of students to Scotland's five medical schools in Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrew, Dundee, and Aberdeen. They say the cut is necessary to prevent unemployment of doctors in Scotland forcing the closure of one of its medical schools. About 150 doctors are unemployed at the present."

This is a world-wide trend. All your monopoly powers are going. You cannot obstruct it as much as you would like to have obstructed it. What we need to have and what the Government needs to have is the will to persist in the pursuit of what they want to effectuate notwithstanding the obstruction of the honourable Member and his like. If Barbadian doctors, given full opportunity, and after maximum consultation, do not desire or wish to participate, the Government should import doctors who are willing to participate and do it. That is the position, Sir.

Of course, in any elaboration of a scheme of this nature, there are going to be disagreements as to how you can effectuate it. That is why you have consultation. I noticed that the spokesman for the Opposition on Health speaks in a completely different vein. I can understand the reasonable nature of the honourable Member's speech. I know that he has a similar interest, because the National Health Service will effect his pre-existing mode of delivering that part of the health delivery that he delivers. But there have been consultations between the druggists and the Government and, as far as I am aware, more and more progress is being made towards a solution.

The Government knows fully well that we are operating in a capitalistic society. The arch-capitalist in Barbados is the honourable Member. So we know that you cannot expect a doctor, druggist, or anybody in the health delivery service in Barbados to accept a cut in their standard of living. We know that the honourable Member and his like wants $200 000 a year. He is entitled to his $200 000 a year, but he must pay his taxes.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: These are factual surveys that can be proven. You only have to stand up outside a doctor's office to know how much he charges, you

multiply it by the number of patients he has, and you will know. There is no big thing in this.

The basic position is that we know that there has to be a level of remuneration, and that is the basis of the negotiations that are going on. So do not let us seek to create a political issue out of something which ought to be beyond the realm of politics. Every society, particularly progressive societies, most countries of the world, are trying, whether via insurance or via levies, to have a system of medical delivery in which everyone of its citizens can get the best medical care without having to be concerned about not having the amount of money when they need it at the particular period of time. That is an objective. We have reached the stage where we should try to carry out that objective.

Now this question of the polyclinics. There is always an argument about that. I am very pleased to see the one in my constituency. Let us get it straight. I do not regard the polyclinic in Oistins as a white elephant. The honourable Member should look everyday and see how many young people go there to get their vaccinations. Look and see when the public health officers are going in there in the morning. All of them do not go in by the time I pass, but I presume that they go in at some time. But you look and see. It is a good building and it provides physical facilities for a number of state agencies dealing with health to be under one compound.

The honourable Member talks about a 3 bedroom or 4 bedroom house. Those days are over. Dingy, dirty doctors' offices – those days are over. You know that too. You know that the trend today, even among general practitioners and specialists, is a group medical practice. Therefore, they are forcing the medical profession to combine in such a way that they can have delivery over a reasonable period of the day working on a shift system. You know that too, and you are going to tell me that that is going to be carried on in a three bedroom house? That is not true.

I am hoping very soon to see or to hear that a number of medical practitioners are operating from these clinics, because I would like to see it working.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Does your G.P. come out at night? Well, he has probably just started, or he is an old-time type. Do not let him get in touch with the honourable Member, he will teach him a thing or two. The position is very clear. The honourable Member knows that, world wide, the trend is for there to be group medical practice.

I think there is one good point which the honourable Member has which is a good point. I know it is the point that he wants to hear about all the time, and I hope the honourable Minister will be able to help him. The point is this: What is going to be the role of the specialist in the National Health Service? That is what the honourable Member is worried about. You see, today it slipped out. The honourable Member said today that you do not need all of these facilities concentrated around because these things are in fact provided by specialists; you only take a few little tests, the rest goes to the laboratory to the specialists. I know that the honourable Member is interested in this.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: I said it goes to a laboratory where people are specialists in laboratory work. I am not talking about medical specialists, and if he thinks I am looking forward to participating in the health service as a specialist, let him know that by 1986 I will have to change my profession; full time over there.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, there is absolutely nothing wrong with the honourable Member having an ambition which he cannot realise.

The basic position the honourable Member has articulated today, as he has done on many occasions, is this particular problems, which I know it is of interest to him: what is the role for the specialist to perform within the context of the National Health Service. I hope that some enlightenment will be given to the honourable Member on that point, because it is an important point, and I know that, perhaps, if the honourable member is satisfied as to that, some of this violent objections may well be removed.

Whenever we come to a debate on this every year, we are going to get, until the honourable Member is satisfied about that particular point, these violent exhibitions of tantrums. The honourable Member is behaving in a manner which one would expect from an eight year old child who is deprived of his chocolate bar. He will try to break up everything, he will curse if he knows curse words, he will lie down and make a lot of noise, and he will make a lot of wild statements. The honourable Member is going to continue to do that until he is satisfied about these things, so I hope that during the course of this debate he will be enlightened in these respects, Sir.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have here with me, and these are documents of this Honourable House, the debates on Health in the course of the general debate on the Estimates for the year 1981–82, and I believe that they are fetching the debates of 1980 for me. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) stars in all of these debates, and the record shows that the matter of drugs and the Barbados Drug Service is of particular concern to him.

In the 1982 House of Assembly Debates, page 1279, we see his contribution, which is almost exclusively on drugs. In the House of Assembly Debates, 1981, at page 5183, again there a long intervention on drugs. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central – yes, I have it here – in 1980, House of Assembly Debates at page 3582, again gave a long intervention and much discussion on the question of drugs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is a member of the medical profession, and the attitude that he displays on this subject, the argument that he trots out every year on this subject, is to be found everywhere in the world in the medical profession. What the Deputy Prime Minister was saying is perfectly true. Everywhere in the world today there is a major argument about drugs; those for a brand name and those for generic. I have always heard that the racketeering in the international drug industry was in the area of brand name production, manufacture and distribution rather than generic. I am hearing for the first time today about corruption in the international drug industry in the area of the manufacture of generic drugs.

The medical profession has always had an interest in brand name drugs. The medical profession invests heavily in brand name drugs every where in the world, and they naturally have a vested interest in protecting the market of brand names. They have fought everywhere in the world, and particularly in the United States of America, and in other First World countries, the introduction of the generic drug market, and today they fight it, they spend millions and millions of dollars fighting it.

I have said before, and I will say it again. After the advertising industry, in North America the drug industry is the highest earner, and members of the medical profession and professions allied to the medical profession know that.

There is another wide area where the medical profession falls down in two camps, and that has to do with the delivery of health care, as the Deputy Prime Minister was saying, and again he is absolutely right. Everywhere in the world today there is a fight amongst those members of the medical profession and the allied professions who are prepared to back a fee for service or the capitalistic style of the delivery of health care, the kind that we have known all the years here in Barbados where you pay your fee and you get your service.

When we came into this Government in 1976, we made it clear that the Barbados National Health Service would not be a "fee-for-service" one, that ours would be a prepaid insurance scheme.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You said it would be free).

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: There is nothing free in this world, so do not worry to shout this word free up to me. I heard enough about that when I heard about free school meals. It would be free from the point of view that any prepaid insurance scheme is free at the point of delivery. That is why there is a Health Levy, and that was made perfectly clear in here by me from the year 1977.
4.30 p.m.

But this fight goes on everywhere in the world, Mr. Chairman. It is not peculiar to the medical profession in Barbados. And all that is happening here is that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is the only doctor in the House, so to speak, and he is making it perfectly and abundantly clear to us that he falls in the camp of fee-for-service. He describes the other service as "utter nonsense" – those are his very words – and indicates that, as far as the manufacturing and distribution of drugs is concerned, he falls in the area of the brand name.

He has made that clear. That is his stance. This is a free country and he is entitled to hold that view. But he is not entitled to stand up in this House and mislead and misrepresent, in the pursuance and in the protection of his own interest, to the detriment of all the rest of us who live in this Barbados.

Dr. R. C. Haynes rises.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am not giving way.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I believe that there is not only a Standing Order, but there is a fundamental rule of Westminster democracy that no Member can under any circumstances come to a Parliamentary and make a speech in pursuit of his own interest.

I am suggesting to you, Sir, that such a statement is certainly unparliamentary, and breaches one of the most fundamental principles of parliamentary democracy and the privileges and rights of Members.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has said in here today that the world international drug industry especially the world of generic drugs, is too heavy and hot and corrupt for us to handle.

This Barbados Government that is handling the world of the international offshore banking industry, this Barbados Government that is handling the world of the international exempt insurance industry, this Barbados Government that is handling the world of the International Monetary Fund, this Barbados Government that is handling the world of international petroleum industry, the international sugar industry, the international tourist industry, cannot manage or handle the international drug industry? Oh, Mr. Chairman, Sir, it would be very difficult for the honourable Member to expect us to believe that he is not pursuing and protecting his own interest.

Now, the polyclinics. He said the polyclinic service could be dispensed from any three or four bedroom house anywhere in Barbados. For years the honourable Member has been operating out of very expensive and sophisticated premises at Delaware Clinic, Jemmott's Lane. Not any three or four bedroom house for him! What are you saying? That the people of Barbados are to expect.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order: Delaware Clinic cost less than a three or four bedroom house would cost today.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: And that is why it is falling apart.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get ahead with the debate.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want to know if the honourable Member is saying that Delaware Clinic is good enough for some, those who are his patients, and that a three or four bedroom house somewhere in the country is good enough for the rest of Barbadians. I want to know if that is what he is really telling us.

The polyclinics have a wide and varied role to play. The Democratic Labour Party has never had any basic purpose in the delivery of public health services. The Barbados Labour Party came back in 1976 and found the health centres that it had built in the 1950s as it had left them.

The polyclinics are meant to dispense all of the public health services which are critical – I do not think anybody is going to deny that – which have increased as we have become more and more developed, which have become more and more sophisticated as the style of our development has also become more and more sophisticated.

The polyclinics are expected to dispense drug services. The same little dispensaries that we grew up and found dotted around Barbados cannot be expected in 1983 to deliver the services that they did 40 or 50 years ago. In every polyclinic built since 1976, there is to be found a well-equipped dispensary.

Two of the polyclinics, the one at Oistins and the Ladymeade, which is currently under construction, are designed to offer X-ray services. Every polyclinic is expected to house the offices of the public health inspectorate. The public health inspectorate districts are expected to be re-organized around these new catchment areas.

The polyclinics were not designed or built in any higgledy-piggledy fashion. We did not swallow anything from any overseas consultants. We tailored made them and built them according to our needs here in this Barbados, and you well know that. They were designed by Barbadian architects.

There is a miniature laboratory in every polyclinic. It cannot be denied that the laboratory at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is even now severely overworked. Until we can get our own forensic laboratory in this country, it has to continue to do the bulk of the police work. As the incidence of diseases such as cancer increase, the more will our laboratory service at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital be overworked. Every polyclinic is designed to have a mini-laboratory where simple laboratory procedures, such as the ones he talked about, that he does in his sophisticated accommodation at Jemmott's Lane, is expected to be done at the polyclinics.

Family planning services, clinical services, and a number of other services are now expected to be delivered from the polyclinics. There is no way, in this day and age, that we could even begin to think in terms of delivering those or any other services, health services for that matter, from any three or four bedroom house anywhere in Barbados. I think that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central should be ashamed to suggest to Barbadians that some three or four bedroom house is suitable for delivering health care services.

The polyclinics are all designed so that general practitioners, in due course, would be encouraged, I believe that there are some already willing and eager, to set up their practices within the premises of the polyclinics, so that a complete service in each clinic will be available.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the point of departure should be the simple statement that Barbados has one of the best health services in the developing world, and that, over a period of years, the political directorate, the administrators and the professionals have performed yeoman service to maintain a quality health service.
4.40 p.m.

I believe it is irresponsible and incorrect for doom seers in this House to create the impression that the health services in Barbados are about to disintegrate. As Minister responsible for Health, I can attest to the fact that I have found the health services in reasonably good condition, and here I must pay tribute to my two immediate predecessors for the sterling work that they have rendered in this area.

I think it is important for me to meet some of the questions which have been raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael North West (Mr. L. A. Weekes). He claimed, in what I believe to be an overstatement of his critique, that the hospital was failing to deliver proper services to the public of Barbados. It is a well established fact that that area of the hospital with which the public makes first contact, namely, the Casualty, has for many decades presented health administrations of this country with the problem of how to deliver an expeditious service to the people who use it.

The problem of bottlenecks in the Casualty is nothing new, and indeed it attracted the attention of Ministers of the Democratic Labour Party. They tried several innovations which granted temporary amelioration, but never were they successful in achieving a permanent solution to the problem of that department in the hospital.

The explanation for this is that the history has etched itself almost indelibly in the psyche of Barbadians. When a Barbadian feels pain, or imagine that he feels pain – I am not thinking of affluent Barbadians, ordinary working class Barbadians – the first institution that comes to mind towards which he would gravitate for assistance is the hospital, and this is the case whether the ailment is a serious one or not.

In periods when service at this area within the hospital is difficult to achieve in a speedy manner, there are some Barbadians who stay away and tend in those circumstances to use private medical assistance, but as soon as the situation eases by the introduction of some particular programme, and word gets around that people in the casualty are now being speedily dispatched, then their numbers multiply.

This is a hydra-headed problem that has confronted many administrations throughout the history of health services in this country. Indeed, much has been said about the recent reopening of the polyclinics, and I have in my possession some suggestions which illustrate the point that I have just made.

In the first week after the polyclinics were reopened, there was a drastic reduction in congestion within the Casualty. But over a period of time when the word went around that persons were now speedily served within that area of the hospital, there was a gradual build up, which has brought walking patients virtually to the same level as existed prior to the reopening of the polyclinics. This is the problem, the paradox of finding solutions that are essentially shortterm in nature. It stands to reason therefore that this aspect of our primary health care programme must be attacked at the essence of it.

The Pan American Health Organisation supplied the Ministry of Health with the services of a consultant, who conducted extensive investigations of the problems within the Casualty and submitted a report of December last year. Early in 1981, a special committee of the hospital was set up, which undertook to embark upon exhaustive studies of this problem within the Casualty, and both the Hospital Committee as well as the consultant from PAHO were *ad idem* in what has to be done to bring about a permanent solution to the problem of congestion within the casualty.

The functions of the Casualty are dualistic in nature. The staff there are required to deal with emergency problems as well as the problems of walk-in patients. We know that in the well organised hospitals these functions are rigidly segregated, and the proposals which have been made – and I believe these proposals were made to the Democratic Labour Party organisation – is that there must be a permanent and lasting separation of the functions of the Casualty, as an emergency agency within the hospital, and the walk-in patients.

It seems to me that the implementation of this solution has been retarded for a long time by the parsimonious attitude of Governments to the problem, because the solution has financial implications. If we are to have an emergency section of the hospital which functions as a genuine emergency section, and where professionals are not over extended by having to dash madly from a person hurt in an accident to an individual seeking a pill for high blood pressure, we need two different sets of personnel dealing with this particular problem. The Ministry of Health will be seeking, with all of the pressure it can command, to have financial

resources which will make staff available to ensure that the Casualty becomes the emergency area of Government and deals with emergency problems alone.
4.50 p.m.

There are other short term solutions proposed by the consultant and this committee, which are recommending that the separation could be effected by placing the walk-in clinic below the emergency area of the hospital. I believe that, in the fullness of time, when the much malign National Health Service becomes fully operational, it will be possible to move the walk-in clinic from the precincts of the hospital altogether and the Casualty would become transmuted into an exclusively emergency operation.

There are some other proposals which, in the short run, can be implemented to eliminate the problem within the Casualty. It is a fact that most experienced doctors shun the Casualty like a plague. It is considered to be dirty donkey work, and, consequently, aspiring juniors, who want to establish a toe hold in the hospital or who are now trying to establish themselves as professionals within the medical field, are by and large the only persons who can be induced to work, within the Casualty on a continuous basis. There is an enormous turnover in junior staff in this area which keeps the operation in a state of flux and instability that operates to the detriment of the patients.

In 1977, the Government took steps, again upon the recommendation of the professionals within the hospital, to appoint a full-time consultant with responsibility for the Casualty. But his functions as an orthopaedic have become so onerous, together with his other medical responsibilities, that he cannot devote himself on a full-time basis to the multifarious problems that arise within the Casualty.

What is absolutely crucial to bring order into that area would be the appointment of a permanent senior consultant. Not only that, but the prestige of that part of the hospital needs to be enhanced, and it can be so done if the Ministry of Health can interest the Faculty of Medicine at the University of the West Indies to extend its teaching facilities within the hospital to that area.

Indeed, in the development plan within the Ministry of Health, insofar as it impinges upon the hospital over the next year or two, it is contemplated that an extension to the hospital will be carried out which could accommodate 72 more beds. At the same time, it would have an auditorium, a medical library and other facilities which would enable the Faculty of Medicine to conduct its work in more congenial surroundings.

It is hoped that when these facilities are improved, and even before then, the Faculty of Medicine would be able to extend its operations to the Casualty. This, I believe, would improve the prestige of that part of the hospital. It would lose its status as a "Cinderella" among hospital departments and would operate to the benefit and improved efficiency at a professional level in the delivery of services to people who use that area of the institution.

I do not want to get into questions in relation to the National Health Service in this particular intervention. I am happy to report that the Establishments Division has now agreed to increase the staff at the QEH. There will be three registrars, senior house officer, and one cleaner, and all of these people will be assigned to the Casualty.

I do not believe that it would be fair to my immediate predecessor to say that it is due to any efforts on my part, exclusively, that this was successful. I believe that he set the ball rolling, and it is due mainly to his endeavours within the Casualty Department that we have been able to be successful in beefing up the staff.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North West expressed some dismay at what was going on within the dispensaries that come within the ambit of the Drug Service, and he went on, in righteous indignation, to declare that the dispensaries were not being used.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that he can be forgiven for making these inferences by looking at the Estimates, under Revenue, with respect to fees collected from dispensaries, when he saw the amount of $5 000. It is not clear to me, Mr. Chairman, why the amount of $5 0000 was inserted, but I do know that during the current financial year the Ministry of Health collected $40 000 in fees from dispensaries throughout Barbados. In addition to that, the number of people using dispensaries doubled from 10 000 to 20 000 from 1979–80, when this service was introduced, to the present time.
5.00 p.m.

I believe those statistics clearly indicate quite the opposite to that which the honourable Member for St. Michael North West was claiming, it indicates an expanding service. And this year, the Ministry of Health contemplates the expenditure of a half million dollars on the Special Benefit Service, which is the service that will provide free drugs for persons over the age of 65, children under the age of six, and patients suffering from cancer, hypertension or diabetes.

Just one final point, Mr. Chairman, before I sit, and it is that the major reason for the dispensary service operated by the Barbados Drug Service is to dispense

drugs as a private service and not to function as drug stores for profit. So even if the fees collected were only $5 000, it would in no way serve to vitiate the purpose for which the dispensaries are operating, because they are not operating essentially as profit bearing offices, but to facilitate the distribution of drugs under the Drug Service. That is the primary reason for having the dispensaries.

Mr. Chairman, I will not trespass upon your time any more, but I will continue when I am given the opportunity again.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If you will please give way, Sir, I beg to move that you do now report progress to his Honour the Deputy Speaker and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that this sitting be suspended for 15 minutes, which would bring us to about 20 minutes after 5.00, for a tea break.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
5.05 p.m.

On Resumption:–

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Michael North West raised the question about the status of the special benefit programme in so far as it involved the pharmacists. He went on to say that the negotiations have left the pharmacists disillusioned and there was a danger that they might opt out of the service altogether.

I believe the truth of the matter is that proposals have been submitted to the pharmacists, and the Drug Service is now awaiting their response. There is every possibility that, when this response is forthcoming, the outstanding issues will be amicably disposed of.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North West then directed his attention to what he described, and what is officially described, as the Geriatric Hospital. He then took issue with a view which I have oft repeated, that these hospitals were euphemistically described as such and in fact functioned as almshouses.

A hospital is by definition a place where sick people go. An almshouse, on the other hand, is a place where indigent people are lodged. Indigent people can be found in all of our district hospitals. Even in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital there is a section which is used as an almshouse, and patients so retained are called socio-economic patients.

The fact of the matter is that we have in Barbados today an appalling situation where many old people and many poor people have been abandoned by their families. And once they are safely lodged in these institutions, the families believe their responsibility toward them has come to an end and make no effort whatsoever to retrieve them from these institutions, even though they may recover from the illnesses from which they have suffered.

One of the most heart-rending spectacles I can remember was seen by me in Licorish Village about three years ago when an ambulance from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital pulled up in front of the home of a man who had suffered from a stroke. The man was unceremoniously bundled out of the van in a half naked condition with his genitals exposed. The door of his residence was broken down and he was put in a bed and left there.

The man's family consisted solely of an old mother, who was 87 years old at the time and not possessed with the strength to take care of him. This man, like most people in Barbados, felt that as long as he did not fully recover, he was a sick man and his proper place was in the hospital. One of the serious problems in this society is that there is no place to put such persons who may be chronically ill, but who, given the appropriate care, may function outside of an institution.
5.30 p.m.

The Ministry of Health has recently conducted a survey of 48 per cent of the patients in the institutions known as district hospitals. The results of the survey confirm the hypothesis which people in the Ministry of

Community Services had years before formulated, namely, that approximately 50 per cent of the people who are now lodged in district hospitals are fit enough to live outside of those hospitals. The survey focused around 385 patients. It was found that of those 385 patients now currently inhabiting the district hospitals, 198 of those persons were deemed fit to live outside of those institutions.

What this means clearly is that at least half of the inmates of these hospitals are not *bona fide* patients because they are not genuinely sick people. Many of them have been left there for years by relatives. If at any time during their confinement within these institutions there was a justification for placing them there, that justification has now long past. This is the basis for the proposal which I have put forward that such buildings should no longer be used as almshouses.

Now, there is no shortage of people in Barbados who are willing to put the most ludicrous utterances in one's mouth, and the most absurd thoughts in one's head. So without asking any further questions, some people, who do not understand anything about social policy, rushed simplistically to interpret the recommendation as meaning only that these institutions would be closed.

The programme for removing and integrating these people back into the society is not a programme that will be crudely effectuated at one fell swoop. It is a programme which will be executed in conjunction with the other social agencies within Barbados. It will be executed in conjunction with the National Assistance Board, which has the responsibility for housing the indigent. These persons will be removed from these institutions when proper housing is made available to them by the National Assistance Board, when these houses are properly furnished and when all of the necessary care to ensure a comfortable life as independent, dignified people within the community have been put in place.

It was never the intention of the Ministry of Health to rush in blindly and crudely like a bull in a china shop and tell the people to get out of these institutions and go and look for somewhere to live. That would be a policy diametrically opposed to the humanism that categorically rejects that a man or a woman, because of his economic position and because of disinheritance by a family, should be forced to live in conditions of humiliation, shame and disgrace within the boundaries of a poor law institution.

Mr. Chairman, in these days of economic austerity, social planners are hard put to developing programmes which can be fitted into increasing these cursory sources. Indeed, serious social planners welcome the opportunity to develop programmes that are not only progressive, but have the merit of being efficient.

Many reactionaries, who subscribe to right wing orthodoxes, maintain that whenever we disburse money on social services, that is automatically wasting money, it is a transfer payment which does nothing at all to generate resources within the society. The community-based programmes, which will abolish for all time the eyesores and the shame of almshouses, also have the merit of being more cost effective and more efficient than institutional programmes.

I will give you an illustration of what I mean. The district hospitals combined accommodate about 850 persons. The Home Care Service in Barbados today caters to just over 800 persons; it takes care of nearly as many people as the District Hospitals. You will see that there is an expenditure of nearly $10 million on the district hospitals as opposed to half a million dollars on the Home Care Service.

So, the programme is not only superior in its humanistic orientation, it is not only superior in that it satisfies the needs of these people, it is not only superior in that it once again invest these people with dignity of which they had been stripped when they were put in these institutions, but at the same time it satisfies the demand of the supposedly hard-headed realists by being a cheaper programme, and it considerably saves the tax dollars of this country.

It has also had the effect of improving the delivery of health services in this country. In the past, complaints were legion that public health doctors refused to cross the threshold of indigent old people who they were paid to serve. Old people complained time and again that public health doctors looked upon them with scorn and would not touch them. There were public health doctors in this country, Mr. Chairman, who even had got into the habit of refusing to respond to calls.
5.40 p.m.

With the introduction of the Home Care Service, it was possible to create a domestic ambience whereby doctors could do their work properly. A doctor cannot do his work properly if he is confronted with a situation where the woman is living on a bed that is full of squalor. A doctor cannot do his job properly if the clothes that his patient is wearing had been on her body for months.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Just sixty seconds, Mr. Chairman, please, I beg.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have it.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: With the introduction of this programme, it is now possible for these doctors to enter these homes, and some of the most reluctant doctors have become transformed into the most enthusiastic. So it has contributed substantially to the improvement of an efficient public health service.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am a bit concerned about Head 36, Subhead 24 – Grants to Non-profit Agencies. The amount has gone up by about $600 000 this year, and the note says: "Provides for an annual subvention to the Child Care Board," and the Board was established with the following main functions: (a) to provide and maintain child care institutions for the safe keeping of children in need of care and protection.

The Minister made a pronouncement a few weeks ago that they intend to close down the institutions in which children were cared. What I find very remarkable is that he closed one of the happiest institutions and, certainly before the present Government took over, one of the best maintained. It has been in a little state of dilapidation over the last few years, and when we made enquiries we were told that the restoration, rehabilitation and maintenance of these children's homes are given out to private contract and they cannot get the contractors to come around and all that kind of business.

What I would like to find out from the Minister is why he chose to close down the Newcastle Children's Home and scatter the unfortunate children to the four corners of the earth when he has come to the House now for an additional $600 000 for the same children's homes when one of the best homes has been closed down. I am not going to say why he did not go to Belleville or the Nightengale Children's Home, or the one up in St. Philip, or the one down at Farrs or Barrows or any of the other homes, because I am not a dog in the manger, but I want to know why he chose the St. John Children's Home first. I am in very close association with that place.

Now he has got a lot of theories. He has got a theory that these children should not be in homes at all. I could not agree with him more that we should have been investigating the possibility of foster homes for many years now, but it is fraught with a lot of difficulties of supervision and so on that the Minister, I feel, has not had chance to properly investigate. Furthermore, as evidenced by the increase in vote, it is not going to bring about any economies in closing down these homes. Some of these children are children who – I would not like to call them retarded – have disabilities of one kind or another which are only capable of being properly provided for in some kind of institution. I want to make that clear.

Secondly, I heard the Minister say something in public, that these children are looked down on and that kind of thing. This is not so, especially in the case of the Newcastle Children's Home. These children go to church, they go to school in the area and they do not wear uniforms where they are identifiable. As a matter of fact, I had one very interesting experience once when I was taking Sir John Mordecai, who used to be the Deputy Governor General in the Federation, around the east coast a Saturday afternoon. I had to stop in at the Newcastle Children's Home because I wanted to discuss some programme with Matron Daniel. (She has now retired so I can call her name). Sir John Mordecai and Lady Mordecai came inside with me and looked around and admired the beautiful view.

As a matter of fact, the late Mr. B. B. Ward had built his house in the grounds of the Newcastle Children's Home a little before we acquired the property, and Sir John Mordecai walked down there and all of a sudden I noticed that the place was very quiet, and I asked Matron Daniel, "Where are all the children, I am sure that Lady Mordecai would like to see them," and she said very casually "Mr. Barrow, they have gone to Sandy Lane to tea". Tears came to my eyes because I remember the days when well-heeled citizens like yourself, I mean people of substance, could not go to Sandy Lane, and here were my orphans in Newcastle down there and the Matron went on talking as if it was something usual. She said "Oh, they sent them down to Sandy Lane to tea."

These are the unhappy children that he is speaking about and fulminating against the dereliction of these – I do not know any ten-syllable word to describe the children, because he will probably provide us with one – but of these unfortunate children as he describes them. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I will tell you another story. At the Nightengale Home the late churchwarden and Mayor of the City of Bridgetown told me he had some youngsters who were of school leaving age and asked me whether I would take on one of them to help with the garden on the basis of about two to three hours on mornings while I could supervise them, and I said: "Certainly, send them in." So I got one youngster and my neighbour opposite, who happened to be manager of the Housing Authority, took on another one, and one day I asked the youngster who was with me if he would mind helping me clean some shoes – I had about three pairs of shoes to clean – and he said he did not know how to clean shoes. He was not being rude or anything, so I said, "Well, who cleans your shoes? He said, "We have somebody to clean our shoes for us".

Another day – my garage was in two sections – I heard him telling the little boy opposite saying that he

would make his thousand in May, so I turned to him and said "I did not know you used to play cricket, and you can make a thousand in May!" He said "A thousand in May, cricket? I do not play, I pitch marbles; I mean a thousand dollars in the bank." I said "Now you are working, do they call on you for any contribution towards your upkeep?" He said "No, mother makes us" – he called the Matron down there "mother" – "put all their money in the bank."

They had some 16-year old girls working in Bridgetown in those days for what used to be a fairly good salary of $80 a month. Every single penny went into the bank. Are these unhappy children? As a matter of fact, my children had to learn to clean their shoes at a very early stage, and they did not have anybody to do the washing and all that kind of thing for them. I think that in that sense the institutions have sort of created a lifestyle for the children which their brothers and sisters outside did not enjoy.

The children in St. John lived in the greatest plantation house, or used to until they were chucked out by the Minister. I think that it is much better for them – I agree with him – to grow up in an atmosphere which is not out of harmony with the way the West Indian community live: Make sure that they have decent clothes and meals, and that kind of thing, but in that way, I would like to see some sort of children villages rather than a great big plantation house.

5.50 p.m.

I tried to get them in St. John interested in keeping chickens. They told me that they buy chickens so they do not have to raise chickens and wake up five o'clock in the morning and have chickens all over the place. But their general attitude was that there was not anything unmannerly or anything like that with them, they were brought up in a kind of sheltered and protected atmosphere.

What I am trying to illustrate to the honourable Minister is that they are not unhappy children, and there are some children who need institutionalization. I think that I gave a six syllable word there to the Minister. The Minister may have to answer.

There is a hospital for Hanson Diseases. It is not so described in the Estimates. I think they call it the Hillside something. There is a very large staff of about fourteen people and I would like to ask the Minister how many inmates there are in the hospital for Hanson Diseases, described as Hillside Home or something like that in the Estimates, because I think that with modern medicine there is a case for getting these people out into the community.

We once had one of the fellows working at what used to be Seawell, and he was very, very efficient in telecommunications. Unfortunately, he died some years after. But we feel that a lot of people could be taken out of the institution and away from the kind of stigma that used to attach to it. You see in the biblical films how they used to be in caves living outside the walls of Jerusalem; that kind of atmosphere does not prevail anymore.

I wonder if the Minister can tell us whether we are justified in maintaining an elaborate staff of fourteen medical superintendents and all the other paraphernalia just to keep a few people. I do not know how many there were, but in my day I think there were no more than six or seven who were state institutionalized.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I indicated that I wanted to make a brief comment on Welfare in respect of assistance to persons. This is a very touchy area in view of the fact that one finds it very difficult, sometimes, to determine the areas of assistance.

But quite recently complaints seem to suggest that people have been refused the opportunity to have either their light or water bills paid. There seems to me that the impression given through this grant would be that those people were entitled to have this benefit. There is a feeling that there is some discrimination among some of them and as a result some people feel aggrieved by the fact that they have no reason to be discriminated against.

I personally feel that the Minister ought to clear that kind of misunderstanding so that others may be able to know when they go to the Welfare Department what their fate would be.

There is another feeling that the Housing Programme by the Welfare Department runs in a similar direction. There are a large number of people who believe that they ought to be given assistance to repair their homes, and again they have been refused. I hope that the Minister will be able to clear up this and make it known once and for all what his approach is, in general, when this kind of assistance has to be given.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am going to continue in the vein which my colleague just completed on this question of Community Services. Now it is very interesting. When the Minister is making his intervention, he talks about a humanist approach to the solution of problems concerning the old and infirmed in the community. I do not believe that there is anyone, who is right thinking, who could disagree with him that that is the approach we ought to have to our more unfortunate persons. But I do not know how I can reconcile his view, which he articulates at each opportunity that presents

itself, with the actual occurrences of persons who are in a similar condition, except that they are not institutionalized.

In a sense, those persons who are institutionalized are better off than a substantial number of persons who are old and living alone in Barbados at the moment, in that they are being cared for – and I will have something to say about the quality of that care – they are at least getting meals on time, they have persons who come and speak to them, they are linked with their own kind, and many of them feel at home.

It may very well be that the institutionalization itself induces a sort of syndrone which allows them to feel at home, and, perhaps, that is not good for them. But compared to some of the people who live, for example, in my constituency, who go for weeks without seeing anyone and who have had some of the most disgusting humiliation at the hands of Government institutions, those persons in the Geriatric Hospital and other places are better off.

Let me give you an example of what I mean, Sir. The honourable Member will know that I have drawn some of this to his attention personally when he was not the Minister of Health, although he had Community Services, where we have persons who were led to believe that they could have certain services paid for. I do not know what form of maladministration caused the system which was outlined by the honourable gentleman not to function the way it should. But there is nothing more heartbreaking than an old person, who is a pensioner, hanging on the very word of Government Ministers, who indicate to them that they will have their water bills or electricity bills paid, or that they will have some other bill, which is an onerous part of their existence at the moment, relieved.

They hang on those words and they believe them. They sent all the bills to the Welfare Department, and in some cases that I know of, Mr. Chairman, coming towards the end of the last financial year they had the bills returned to them. They were told that in the new financial year they would be able to bring them back and some of them again, faithful old souls, took those things back. Here is what happened to them. They have had their water cut off. They have had their electricity cut off. They find themselves constantly in a position of complete humiliation.

The humanist approach to these kinds of problems require that we never give those people any hopes which we cannot fulfill. The vast majority of them, or a substantial number of them, ought not to be led to believe that they can expect something when we cannot deliver it.

Let me give you another example of what has happened. We have a situation which I can speak of on my own knowledge. The bills accumulated to $116 to Light and Power, of which $23 would fall to be paid by the lady. She was not in a position to know how to calculate it. The rest fell to be paid by the Government services, the Government services defaulted, and on a Friday afternoon Light and Power cut off the electricity.

6.00 p.m.

Do you know what the welfare officer said when he went to deal with the issue? "She had no right with the electricity anyhow," that was his response. That is nothing to do with politics, it has to do with the same dignity which the same honourable Member seeks to tell us that we ought to be restoring to these people. I am merely drawing it to his attention that those who are in the institutions may indeed have more dignity at this point, and be better off, than a large number who are out of the institutions.

Take this whole question of the repair of houses. Mr. Chairman, what tends to happen mostly to widows is this. They are married to a man who has Government service, who is getting a Government pension. They have lived in a relatively modest house, a frame house, not a bungalow, but you know, Sir, how we add on a little piece here and there. He was in the Government Service, 30 or 40 years' service, and then he got his little pension for five or seven years, and then he passed to the Great Beyond.

The husband and wife when they were living together on his pension, plus whatever she is getting in national assistance, either National Insurance or some other pension – in our day she used to get old age pension – the two of them used to hold on on that. They had a refrigerator for the last 15 years; it is old, but it is working. They had electricity, and she had a telephone. This is the standard of life she had become accustomed to. That cannot be described as ostentatious, or fancy or anything.

Now the husband dies, her children are overseas, and they do not always remember to write as often as they should, so she is operating now as she used to when she was putting her children through school. She is doing higher mathematics on a monthly basis. She is reducing her intake of food, she is bunching her eating to coincide with when she gets her two cheques, and the house starts to deteriorate. She has been told that she can expect some assistance in putting a sleeper board there or a side board here, or a window there, and she seeks assistance from her representative.

What I am saying of my experience I am certain applies to all honourable Members over here. Somebody comes and tells her she does not qualify for the assistance because she has a refrigerator, a stove, a telephone

and electricity, so by those criteria she belongs to a category which does not qualify for "welfare". But this is the standard to which that poor lady has become accustomed.

The question is, how is the Minister proposing that we tackle these problems? I am not going to say to him, "Why have you allowed it to happen," because obviously it is something that should concern the entire community. But again, if he is talking about those in the institutions, I wish to suggest that before, perhaps, we deal with those in the institutions, who have some measure of protection, we re-examine the standard of living which a number of the older people in this community have at the moment. Let us do it, if we must, on a bi-partisan basis, but let us do it. Let us not pretend that we in Barbados have such a high per capita income and such a high quality of life that that extends to all and sundry.

What is happening is that there is a sector of this community that is able to weather the storm, but the vast majority – in a bell shaped curve these would be the ones in the centre, Sir – are finding extreme difficulty existing. And there are a lot of indigent people in this community who do not admit that they are indigent, because of the same dignity of which the honourable Member speaks.

Our institutions, that is to say the welfare system, the community services division, ought to be examining these matters now, not in the old time way, not with a rhetoric. You know, Mr. Chairman, if we examine this Head for the last seven Estimates, we will find that the general rhetoric is basically the same; what we propose to do, what is going to happen. But I would like on some occasion before we come back into power in the next two or three years to hear someone from that side saying we have attempted this and this is the result. This applies with equal force to the Casualty Department, the problem of casualty where emergency services have been dovetailed into walk-in services, and there is total confusion. It applies to the closing of the polyclinics. Logic demands that we have an explanation beyond what we have been given.

The honourable Member who has taken over as Minister of Health cannot really pass over the fact that a Minister in that post before him closed down the polyclinics, that he came in and in a couple of weeks reopened them, and that the hiatus between when they were closed and now they are open has been left unaccounted for. There must be an accounting for that. Either the Minister was totally inefficient or the Government has sought to justify or pacify the shift in portfolios by allowing this particular Minister certain leeway which they did not allow the other Minister, in which case it would be the right honourable Member for St. Thomas who must bear the blame for the fiasco which has occurred in the polyclinic system. I want to deal with that separately, I want to continue the community services.

What I want to say is this. We have had a lot of tinkering. We have had systems in this country which have served this country well, and what has tended to happen is that instead of the new Government coming into power recognising that it ought to find out those things that are working well and improving upon them, in their mad rush to demonstrate that they had to do something new and different, they have interfered with the momentum which was created during the time of the Government before them.

What they have done, by trying to introduce a system in spite of solid reaction from those who have to implement it, is to behave in exactly the same way as the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) seeks to suggest that honourable Members on this side seek to behave, like eight-year-old children.

He says that if the doctors do not do what they want them to do, they should bring doctors from outside to do it. What madness are we hearing in this Honourable Chamber? That is total and complete madness. Is he going to bring Pakistanis that cannot speak the English language to administer health to us? It is better for them to find a compromise with the doctors.

The doctors are Barbadians who understand this system, who can communicate and understand the nuances between patient and doctor. If the Barbadian doctors have their own view about a health service, it is the responsibility of the Government to persuade them. Why are you going to have confrontation with the doctors? So that a few doctors can live well, the others do not live well, and the total community suffer? Just to prove that the Barbados Labour Party can implement a particular system?

The honourable Member for the City (Hon. Miss B. A. Miller) was the Minister when this matter started. I think that when one listens to her one hears a concession in her presentation, that she brought the system, that she believes in the system. She was committed to it, but she understands that the system has not worked as was projected. Fortunately for her, or maybe unfortunately, she was not administering the system after it started to demonstrate that it would not work in the way they projected it. There was an alternative, and there remains an alternative.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order: Mr. Chairman, I cannot have words put in my mouth, or thoughts put in my head.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: No, you cannot put anything anywhere.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that this is right for Barbados, and that it can work. I am

committed to it, the Barbados Labour Party is committed to it. I have no knowledge of any aspect of it that is not working as planned. That is special knowledge that he has. Do not ascribe it to me, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the honourable Member will not let me put words in her mouth, or ideas in her head, and, according to her, publicly, she is not going to let me do anything to her, so I could as well stop trying.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman the point I am making is that the honourable Member has given up the portfolio, or had it taken from her – I prefer to say that there has been a shift – and she remains committed. But she does not fight with the fierceness of the terrier, as one used to see her in the early days.

It seems strange then, and it falls very strange from the mouth of the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, whose acquaintance with medical matters has not been proclaimed – there are not a lot of people who can describe the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central as having a great knowledge in this area – that he has to be pugnacious about it; he is in favour of bringing doctors from outside.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But the honourable Member must make the ones here see the light, or he himself should become enlightened. The whole gravamen of my argument is that it is the health of the community that is at stake. The National Health Service, as designed by the experts in California, has been described accurately by people who know as a joke.

The National Health Service concept which the doctors in Barbados, as a matter of public responsibility, offered to the community, part of which the Government has already accepted, is an alternative that provides them with an aperture to back away from the position that they have taken, and it allows the community to return to a position where we can truly say what the Minister said in his opening sentences, that we have the best Health Service in the West Indies.

The honourable Member for St. Michael East (Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman) knows that he will not say that with the kind of conviction he would like to say it with. He knows that he wishes not to embarrass his colleagues who went before him; that is the nature of the game. But he must not while doing that, seek to tell us on the one hand that he is bringing this new humanistic approach. Is this humanistic approach different from the ones the others had? Were they less humanistic?

I wish the Minister to explain to us how he proposes to equalize the humanism. Spread it through the community, spread it around the country, so that the old people in St. Michael West, for example, will not feel that they have been passed by, by the Government in a train that was travelling very fast during election time. It slowed down by them for the vote and has gone on with increased speed since then.

I will have a few more words to say about the specific Heads as the opportunity arises, Sir.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to the question of children in homes and urge the honourable Minister that when he considers moving these children out of the homes, to move cautiously. I say so because my own experience in working with these children indicate to me that a number of them have serious psychological problems.

Indeed, at our camp, when we first started, we realized that there were some problems with which we could not cope. For example, the children would come in on mornings and the first thing they will do is to eat their lunch. Some would come in and cry all day, throw tantrums and so on. Because of this, we had to bring in some psychologists to help us to understand the problems.

I am saying this to say that if you are going to have foster parents, I hope that you understand that these people must be properly trained. If you were to look at the English experience, you will see that a number of the foster parents only do it for the financial reward and the children are better off in the homes where there are people who are working in the system and could tolerate the problems for an eight-hour period, go home and come back. Therefore, I am asking you to be very careful.

There are children's homes in this country, in particular Farr's, at which all the children go to secondary school, and there are some of them who even work in banks. So you have got to be very careful.

What I would suggest, however, is that the system of fostering should probably start with babies. Wherever you have mothers having babies and not wanting them, instead of sending them to the homes, you could start that way rather than taking the 15, 14 or 13 year olds and sending them out to people. You see, once they come up in that system, as the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) has so ably demonstrated, then it might be difficult to break them off and put them into the system about which you spoke. So I am asking you to be very careful and to move very cautiously.

There is one other thing I would like to draw to your attention, and I hope something could be done about it rather quickly. In St. James, at Prospect to be exact, there is a home there for older people and next to the kitchen we have the incinerator, the dog pound. It is

about 10 feet away from the kitchen, and when the dogs are burnt, people cannot inhabit that place. As a matter of fact, they cannot even cook their food in there for two or three days after, and I hope that you will find it possible either to move the people or move the dog pound. Even the people on the opposite side of the road complain bitterly about that and, it is about time that something should be done about it.

Those are my two comments.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I want to correct something that the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) just said. I want to make it positively clear. I said I would advise the Government that, provided they go through all the consultative processes and they gave doctors in Barbados full opportunity to make their representations, if it came to a point that they could not agree, rather than hold up the National Health Service, I would exercise my will and import people who would be willing to go along. That is my personal position.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I want to have a look again at certain aspects of Government policy in relation to Health. My own feeling is that the policy, as I said before, is not informed by reality, and hence all of the serious pitfalls that have arisen in this country.

I do not propose to respond to the remarks either of the honourable Member for the City (Hon. Miss B. A. Miller) or the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Hon. H. B. St. John) because if either of them or anybody in Barbados could believe that I practise medicine for money at this stage of my life, they need their heads examined. Let us forget that part.

Sir, I have dealt with certain aspects of generic drugs in the past. I want to deal with a new aspect, and this is where you can have all kinds of professionals advising you. One of the things that they have to understand is that there is a market out there for drugs, we are a small community, and although we are 250 000 people, the fact is that if you are going to deliver adequate health care, you need a full range of drugs available to the people in this country.

6.20 p.m.

What is happening here is that there are very few drugs in Barbados that are used in large quantities, and Government is the main consumer of these drugs. You get some fly-by-night operators coming along and offering you these drugs cheaper than the proprietary drugs; so you get one drug. The only problem is, Sir, that the community loses another 20 drugs because.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable Member suggesting that the Government Service deals with fly-by-night operators?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: When you are buying generic drugs, Mr. Chairman, you do not know who you are buying them from. You place an order with an agent in New York, or you place an order with ICI, even a reputable firm, and you do not know who ICI has bought it from.

What I am saying is that you may have a proprietary company that may have 20 drugs in Barbados. One is used in a substantial amount in the private sector and in the Government sector. You hand over that drug to another company that cannot supply the other 19 drugs, and do you know what happens? You get that one drug and the other 19 disappear, and I knew it was bound to happen. You write a prescription today and you put two or three things on it and I will guarantee that tomorrow morning the first thing I have to do in my office is to rewrite prescriptions or to respond to druggists. I get at least six calls a day for alternative drugs, whether they are on the Formulary or not.

This is a serious matter, because very often the drugs on a prescription are all inter-related, and it is dangerous to take one and not the other. The druggists may give the patient one drug, because he is discharging his duty in prescribing that drug, but the other drug is not available.

I will give you an instant example. Over the past month I would say I must have seen at least 30 to 40 people complaining of vertigo in Barbados. There is a drug called Stemetil. There is a generic drug here in Barbados. You could not get Stemetil, but the generic drug was here, and there are so many people who complain more of the vomiting caused by the drug than by the disease itself.

I took the two tablets, I cut them in half, looked at an old proprietary preparation, and saw what the problem was immediately. One was a tablet that was properly constructed and put in a proper matrix, the other was a mere shell, what looked to me like a bit of plastic with the powder inside of it, and that was the problem.

I must tell you my personal experience. I have had a patient who has come to my office, and who was taking 27 generic drugs, 16 Aldomet tablets.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said it last year and it happened again this year in a more serious form. The patient was taking 27 generic drugs, each one cheaper than the proprietary preparation, but you know what happened? The patient ended up taking three drugs, all three more expensive than the other drugs taken individually, but when you added up the cost of all the generic drugs, they were four times more than the three drugs that the patient was taking.

I am saying that if you look at the way the market behaves in Barbados, you will find that you can enter into contractual arrangements on a long-term basis with proprietary companies and eventually you will get the drugs at the same cost and you will guarantee the continuity of supply, not only of the main drugs that you buy but also of the other drugs.

Mr. Chairman, Guyana had this problem, and it was stopped only when a senior person in the Government suddenly discovered one night that he could not get the drug. I will also tell you that even the World Council of Churches.....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order: I want to have the name of the drug again.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said that the proprietary name is Stemetil. You could not get any in Barbados up to last week, the proprietary one, and the other one just causes more confusion than anything else. I am a practitioner and I practise every day, sometimes on Sundays, and when you take away from me my ability to prescribe the best drugs for my patients, it is like taking away a saw from a carpenter and sending him to work.

It is not a question of bringing in the drugs. The point is that the drug firm has no more interest in a small market, and in emergency situations if you do not have it, you are in trouble. Although you are only 250 000 people, let me tell you something, almost every drug you can think about is required in Barbados because you get the same spectum of diseases almost as you get in developing countries, with slight variations here and there.

And because of your policies, you have not reduced the cost because once the generic companies are locked into the market, they are going to push the prices up like anybody else; and you are going to end up paying as much, with a complete disintegration of the drug supply in relation to demand in Barbados.

I cannot understand why it is that people allow all kinds of foreigners to give them advice when, if they would listen to the people who have been involved in this exercise over the years and who have to face the problems with the patients from day to day, they would get proper advice.

When you give someone a prescription, they say "Can I get it at the Government Health Service" and you say you think so, so you write down the three items, they go to the St. Michael's Hospital Dispensary and they have two. Then, they call you at home, or come back to see you again, and you have got to give them another prescription where they can go to a private druggist in order to get it.

These are day-to-day problems, and I am telling you that there is endless confusion in Barbados at the moment in relation to getting drugs for patients, particularly for poor parents. It is a serious matter. Many of the drug houses in Bridgetown at the moment do not carry any significant stocks of drugs the way they used to carry drugs.

There was a time when, in any emergency, you could get almost any drug you wanted in Barbados, and if you look at the amount voted for drugs in the Government Service in those days when you had adequate supplies, you will see that they were substantially less than they are today – and in those days people got their drugs free!

That whole policy of the supply of drugs in relation to the market values that determine availability must be resolved in a constructive manner. There is no point attacking me personally, because I am in a position to tell you what is happening from day to day. I am the person who doctors call several times during the day, and sometimes at night, asking me what alternative I would suggest in my role as a consultant in this country. I know the day-to-day problems.

Mr. Chairman, I want to look to another problem. I believe there is a little gleam of hope. The only speech I have heard in this Honourable House on any matter relating to health that seems to me that any kind of constructive mind would be brought on health care delivery is what I heard from the honourable Member for St. Michael East (Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman) today. I must be honest about that.

He recognised – and if he cared to do so, he can tell this House – that the same proposals that he brought in relation to separating emergency from non-emergency service by physically organising the downstairs part of the Casualty was a recommendation made not only by me, but it was a very advanced recommendation at the time in 1976, and if it had been implemented that problem would have been solved. The engineers in the Ministry of Health had gone down there and identified the problem.

6.30 p.m.

I hear jokers in this House saying I do not want a National Health Service. It has always been my personal belief that doctors always do better under a National Health Service than without a National Health Service. If there is any group in any community that benefits most financially by a National Health Service, as has been proven over all in the world, it is the doctors themselves.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two more minutes.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point is that I made specific proposals as to how the general practitioners could be involved in the Health Service in this country. One proposal I made was that you recognised the facts of life, and these facts are that doctors already have some

capital investments in that they are working some place in Barbados; that they are generally brought into three categories of persons, persons now entering practice, persons with established practice, and persons who are reaching the age of retirement, and that if you approach a system of remuneration, recognising the various inducements for doctors entering a Health Service, then it can be done. A young doctor now starting a practice might well want to take on 5 000 to 6 000 patients practice; a doctor in mid-stream in his practice may opt to take on 500 to 600; and a doctor later in his service might be looking for a little more security, and may take on 2 000 or 3 000.

There was a specific method set up by which doctors could be integrated. It would not cost the Government of Barbados one penny in capital expenditure, not one penny in any study, because the people in the Ministry of Health and in the Health Service of Barbados were perfectly competent to do all the planning that was necessary. The only cost would have been the recurrent cost, which could have been negotiated with the Barbados Medical Association.

The big advantage of this is that you are talking, really, of probably only about 30 000 to 40 000 who, on a continuous basis require medical care in this country. Because if there are a million incidents of illnesses in Barbados, it is my humble judgment that only less than 100 000 of those incidents of illness in Barbados require medical care at all.

So the point I am trying to make is that you have to tailor a Health Service to reality. And it is quite wrong to suggest that they were the authors of any programme for the involvement of general practitioners in the health care delivery in this country. It simply is not true! What you did is that you put a propaganda stamp on the method of health care delivery, you have wasted a lot of money, and you have done nothing about it so far!

This is my field. Do not come in here talking about what goes on day to day. I know what goes on and I can respond to the kind of propagandistic nonsense that I hear from you, because I happen to know that you know better than anybody else in this House the implications of a National Health Service, and that is what you are frightened for.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, a number of points were made by the previous speakers, starting with the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), who questioned the proposal to close down the Newcastle children's Home in St. John.

It is necessary for me to start from the beginning to provide some rationale for the policy. The entire child care area deals with the problem of parenting. Children who find themselves in one of the residential homes under the Child Care Board are there either because they have incompetent biological parents or no biological parents at all, and therefore the state, acting in loco parentis established these homes for the care of these children.

The homes such as those at Newcastle and Sterling, though elegant Edwardian mansions, which are appropriate to plantation landlords and plantation owners, are nonetheless inappropriate kinds of habitation for children. Mass homes, such as the home at Newcastle, accommodate some 40 or more children, and in fact, the ambience of these homes are a far cry from the idyllic picture portrayed by the honourable Member for St. John.

It is not my impression that the children of these homes are constantly in a state of pleasure, and that they are happy individuals with healthy bank accounts who disport themselves around St. John and are "Hail Fellows" and well met with their neighbours.

In fact, it has been long been recognised that it is a waste of money to convert old plantation homes for uses that they were not originally built to serve. It leads to enormous strains upon the plumbing and every other aspect of the house, and what it normally takes to repair one of these houses annually is perhaps very close to 50 per cent of what that House could be sold for.

Quite apart from that consideration, Mr. Chairman, is the incontestable fact that an atmosphere not dissimilar to that which prevails at Glendairy obtains within these homes. A cold, impersonal atmosphere prevails, and children are placed in bedrooms that have a close resemblance to prison cells.

This institutional setting, and the pathologies that it produces, were clearly recognised by the Democratic Labour Party when, in 1975, that party moved for the first time and introduced a very progressive development in child care by bringing the small group home into Barbados. The small group home at Six Roads, St. Philip, and the subsequent group home which this Government built at the Nightengale complex, Black Rock represent a clear and unequivocal admission that the mass institutional home was obsolete and inappropriate to care for children in the decades of the 70s and 80s.

You introduced the small group home, which accommodates about eight children, with house parents, and where the atmosphere of what is considered to be a normal Barbadian home is simulated. It was felt that children who did not come up within a domestic setting which enabled them to benefit from the proximity of a reasonably well organised family, showed remarkable psychological mal-adjustment later in life. This was the basis upon which you moved to the smaller group home.

6.40 p.m.

But the smaller group home though more personalised, and though abolishing the prison attributes of the mass institutional home, still did not satisfy the needs of most children for having a normal family life. Many of the children believed that a fraud was being perpetrated upon them, that the employed individuals, dedicated professionals as they are, who were addressed as Mummy and Daddy, were, in fact, bogus mummies and daddies, because at some time during the course of a week they would go home to their own natural children and then they would be replaced by two other persons whom they were required to address as Mummy and Daddy.

Now, while within an African social structure one accepts the existence of many parents instead of two, within the Barbadian situation that constitutes a deviation from the norm. Many years ago this society was terrorised by a criminal who rejoiced in the sobriquet of Doctor Rat, and the history of Doctor Rat reveals that he was the product of a mass residential home, with all the psychological mal-adjustments that they produced.

Mr. Chairman, within the Child Care Board itself there is an abundance of evidence to link deviance in persons who were products of the mass residential home, and the experiences that they had within these homes. It is a clear, undisputed, scientific fact, having regard to what is accepted as basic, that the family unit represents the very basis of this society, so it stands to reason that if we are to produce children who were not deviants within the society, if we are to produce well adjusted children, the dictates of social policy within this domain require that children be given the opportunity to live within a family unit.

The institutional setting of mass residential care as obtains in the Newcastle Children's Home, Sterling and some six other places clearly is not the answer. If you accept that analysis, and that analysis is grounded in scientific confirmation, then clearly you are committed to develop a policy where children are offered a family situation which, normally though less ideal and desirable than a situation where a child lives with his biological parents, is better than the mass homes. That is why we moved into a policy of foster care.

Now, for foster care to work properly, it is absolutely necessary for the foster parents to be other than charlatans. There is no doubt that there are a lot of people lurking about Barbados who would hope to use the Foster Care Programme exclusively for their own personal enrichment, but we have been fortunate within the Child Care Board to have experts, people who are well trained in foster care and who have developed a system of monitoring which will ensure that there is a minimum of misconduct on the part of foster parents.

Persons who register with the Child Care Programme as foster parents will be required to enter into a contractual relationship with the Child Care Board, and they are responsible for doing certain things which will be monitored. There is no question of letting loose an unsuspecting and innocent child to the mercies of a crook or a charlatan who abuses the child. There is no possibility of this if the mechanism which the Child Care Board has developed is properly implemented, and I am satisfied that the dedicated people who work within the Child Care Board will ensure that we have a foster care programme which is the first of its kind in a developing country, which is as good a foster care programme as anywhere else in the world.

I doubt that the honourable Member for St. John would want to maintain that it is preferable for a child to live in that big old building in Newcastle rather than in a community with people who bestow love and affection on that child. I doubt that he would wish that upon any child that is unfortunate enough not to have biological parents, or whose biological parents are incompetent, and that is why he sought to paint a glorious picture of children living within these homes. This picture, Mr. Chairman, does not accord with reality at all.

Now, this Foster Care Programme again has the benefit of not only being more progressive than the existing institutional care that predominates on the child care scene, but it costs one-tenth of what is necessary to maintain the institutional structure which we have.

I must not be taken to assert that there will never be any more residential institutions in Barbados. In the fullness of time, there will never be any more mass institutions in Barbados, but there are always situations where you will have need for the smaller group homes. You will have need for children who are recently brought into reception and are being held over until they can be fostered.

This is the declared purpose of the retention of the small group homes which we will always have need for in the future. But given the psychological maiming to which our children are subjected within these mass children's homes, I will rejoice when the day comes that we will no longer see a mass residential home in Barbados. It will be a day of rejoicing for all persons, including the honourable Member for St. John.

6.50 p.m.

The modernistic philosophy here with respect to child care is that no child in unfosterable. There used to be a view held that there were certain children, who by reason of their age, or who by reason of their temperament, were incapable of being fostered. This is old hat, Mr. Chairman, and the smaller group homes are now used primarily as centres to prepare children for functioning effectively within a domestic environment

that most children in Barbados operate within. That in a nutshell, is what our foster care programme represents.

The honourable Member for St. John also drew attention to the fact that the sum of $600 000 more is allocated to the Child Care Board than in the previous financial year. I believe it is a good point since the new foster care orientation will have the result of reducing the cost of child care.

The additional $600 000 can be explained as going mainly towards increases in salaries of the staff of the Child Care Board, except for $75 000, which is a subvention which the Government pays to the Thelma Vaughan Memorial Home. Initially, this subvention used to be paid from the vote of the Welfare Department. This year we have decided to transfer it to the Child Care Board because the Thelma Vaughan Memorial Home deals with matters relating to child care and as such have an ongoing relationship with the Child Care Department, and hardly anything to do with the Welfare Department at all.

Moving now on to the Welfare Department, let me briefly answer some questions.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just give me one minute. I want to check with Mr. Clerk. Another 1.5 minutes.

Laughter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue. You may wind up.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I want to state that, as the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) percipiently observed, the problem with welfare in rooted in delivery of welfare services, and this stems from the historicity of the Welfare Department.

The Welfare Department, as you know, was the poor law institution *par excellence* in Barbados operating under a system known as "Mottleyism." I understand that the honourable Member for St. John attempted to bring that system to an end, but he merely transferred from the Local Government to the Central Government, because with that department came a number of poor law officers who were steeped in the practices of dispensing welfare in a particular way.

Over the years, many dynamic and well-trained young men and women have entered the Welfare Department with a lot of zeal and enthusiasm; some of them believing that they would change and modernise that office. But far from changing the Welfare Department, many of them found that they became absorbed and incorporated in the poor law value system that they found. Instead of changing the institution, they were changed by the institution, and became as tough and callous poor law dispensers of welfare as any of the Mottley hold-overs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I may tell the honourable Member that the Committee has agreed that he may carry on with his speech up to the end of debating time of this Appropriation Bill.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: How much time, five minutes?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This means you have approximately seven minutes.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: The problem, therefore, with the delivery of welfare services must be one in which we change the structure of the Welfare Department. Indeed, the Welfare Department is going to be completely restructured and revamped. The name Welfare Department will be completely removed from it and welfare officers, who now perform essentially clerical tasks, will be required to perform social work that ought to be the function of such a department.

I do not have the time to go into any explanation as to how the character and quality of social work will differ from what is now called welfare work, but there will be another occasion for that. It will suffice to say that once the department is restructured – workers retrained, job descriptions changed, a new supervisory system instituted – many of the abuses of the poor law system will be eliminated.

But it has to be recognized that when we brought Mottleyism from Local Government and located it within the Central Government, you may have killed the man, but not the system and it is this system of Mottleyism, Mr. Chairman, over whose funeral rites I intend to preside.

Now, to the question of drugs. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is not here, and it is a pity. He referred to a drug by the name of Stemetil. I am advised that this drug is on the Formulary List and the supplier is under contract to the Government of Barbados to supply this drug, and the monitoring system of the Barbados Drug Service does not reveal any scintilla of evidence that this drug is not available in Barbados.

As Minister responsible for Health, I would welcome any evidence, other than rhetorical evidence, to the effect that there is a shortage of this drug. I will invite Members on the other side to ask their colleague to make available to me such evidence as he now possesses.

In every new Drug Service, Mr. Chairman, there are obviously going to be teething problems, especially a Drug

Service initiated such as the Barbados Drug Service, which has as its objective, the reduction of the cost of drugs to consumers.
7.00 p.m.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the cost of drugs to sick people in this country over the years has been horrendous, and the major purpose of the Drug Service was to ensure that sick people get their drugs at a cheaper price. We are now spending 75 percent of the money that we would have spent before the institution of this Drug Service in getting the same quantity of drugs, and many of the special brand names, whose champion the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is, have been reduced by as much as 70 percent in their price. I think that it is an outstanding achievement of the Drug Service, and you must give Jack his jacket. That is indeed the basic objective which the Barbados Drug Service set out to achieve, and it has been fulfilled.

Clearly, when you begin to disturn monopolistic or oligopolistic situations, there is dislocation and there has been some dislocation in the drug market. People who sold drugs to the Government in the past are understandably disgruntled that they have to sell the same drugs at a cheaper price, or that they are now faced with competition from other drugs which are sold more cheaply.

I am not saying that the Drug Service is free from problems, but a lot of the noise, a lot of the cantankerous behaviour on the part of people who are quarrelling about the changes, must be understood in terms of special interest groups being interfered with. I experienced it in other parts of the Government. At the Transport Board when I started to move on certain special interest groups, they started to complain, to slander and to put pressure in the appropriate places.

It is no secret that there are a lot of parasitic business elements who become fat and wealthy off the state. There is no doubt about that, and the Barbados Drug Service is designed to put an end to these social and economic parasites who grow fat off the sick people of this country.

Just let me make these few points, Mr. Chairman. It is necessary to round it off by making these points to indicate that the problem is a constant preoccupation of the Ministry of Health and the Drug Service. I will not expatiate upon them; I will simply read them in encapsulated form.

The quality assurance programme, Mr. Chairman, involves drugs, the fact that drugs priority listed by the Formulary or Tenders Committee are tested by various overseas laboratories. It is expensive, but we consider it an important step to ensure that the best quality drugs are available for the people of this country.

Manufacturers in-house quality control certifications are required to be on file with local distributors for access to the Barbados Drug Service. Locally manufactured products are quarantined until reports from authorised laboratories are approved. Barbados is a participant in the Jamaica-based Caribbean Regional Drug Testing Laboratory which is coming on stream. Equipment is being provided to the pharmaceutical chemists in the Government Laboratory to better handle routine and spot sample testing, and through the World Health Organisation certification scheme on the quality of drugs moving in international commerce, and Barbados Drug Service now has access to inter-governmental information concerning drug manufacture and their product registration. All of these are the necessary steps taken to ensure a high quality of drug. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The question that the sum of $59 728 974 under Head 36 – Ministry of Health and Community Services, as amended, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 36 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Head 36 – Ministry of Health and Community Services – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $8 675 000 under Head 36 – Ministry of Health and Community Services – 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 AND LANDS

Head 37 – Ministry of Housing and Lands – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $7 271 718 under Head 37 – Ministry of Housing and Lands – as amended 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 EXPENDITURE

HEAD 79 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Head 79 – Ministry of Housing and Lands – was called

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $8 600 000 under Head 79 – Ministry of Housing and Lands – as amended, 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 38 – MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE

Head 38 – Ministry of Information and Culture – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $3 415 093 under Head 38 – Ministry of Information and Culture, as amended, 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 EXPENDITURE

HEAD 80 – MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE

Head 80 – Ministry of Information and Culture – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $5 729 257 under Head 80 – Ministry of Information and Culture – as amended, 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 39 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL SECURITY AND SPORT

Head 39 – Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $3 636 896 under Head 39 – Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport – as amended, 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 EXPENDITURE

HEAD 81 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL SECURITY AND SPORT

Head 81 – Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $800 000 under Head 81 – Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport – as amended, 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 40 – MINISTRY OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY

Head 40 – Ministry of Trade and Industry – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $4 387 741 under Head 40 – Ministry of Trade and Industry, as amended, 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.

7.10 p.m.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 82 – MINISTRY OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY

Head 82 – Ministry of Trade and Industry, was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $8 200 000 under Head 82 – Ministry of Trade and Industry – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 41 – MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM

Head 41 – Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $17 308 673 under Head 41 – Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 83 – MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM

Head 83 – Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $19 594 646 under Head 83 – Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. R. TULL: 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 $36 402 681 under Head 42 – Ministry of Transport and Works stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. R. TULL: 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 – Ministry of Transport and Works, was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $11 020 000 under Head 84 – Ministry of Transport and Works – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. R. TULL: 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 $3 459 309 under Head 50 – Post Office – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 34 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Head 34 – Ministry of Education was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $67 565 222 under Head 34 – Ministry of Education – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 76 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Head 76 – Ministry of Education, was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $13 600 000 under Head 76 – Ministry of Education – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 35 – MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Head 35 – Ministry of Foreign Affairs – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $8 178 300 under Head 35 – Ministry

of Foreign Affairs – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 77 – MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Head 77 – Ministry of Foreign Affairs – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $900 000 under Head 77 – Ministry of Foreign Affairs – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 23 – LOANS AND ADVANCES

Head 23 – Loans and Advances – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1 961 735 under Head 23 – Loans and Advances – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:–

AYES: Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Mr. A. TRUSS, Mr. L. L. SISNETT, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. R. BRATHWAITE – 10.

NOES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. N. K. SIMMONS, Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. L. A. WEEKES – 7.

HEAD 24 – PENSIONS

Head 24 – Pensions – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $9 500 000 under Head 24 – Pensions – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 73 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Head 73 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $24 209 343 under Head 73 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. R. TULL: 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. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $10 614 316 under Head 25 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 26 – COOPERATIVES

Head 26 – Cooperatives – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $94 801 under Head 26 – Cooperatives – stand part of the Schedule.

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

HEAD 27 – METEOROLOGY

Head 27 – Meteorology – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1 067 387 under Head 27 – Meteorology stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 74 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Head 74 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $11 177 152 under Head 74 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs, as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

The Schedule as amended for $396 082 914 was called and passed.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 as amended was called and passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Appropriation Act, 1983.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 8.15 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
7.25 p.m.

On Resumption:–

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this point of the proceedings may I crave Your Honour's indulgence to make a ministerial statement?

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I wish very briefly to announce to the House that the National Advisory Commission on Education has been appointed, and the Commission is as follows:

Chairman of the National Advisory Commission on Education will be the Honourable Sir Alexander Hoyos
The Deputy Chairman of that Commission will be Senator John Wickham
The representative of the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Association – Mr. John Blackman
The representative of the Association of Heads of Government Secondary Schools – The honourable Dame Elsie Payne
The representative of the Association of Heads of Primary Schools – Mr. E. A. Thomas
The representative of the Association of Approved Independent Secondary Schools – Father John Brazil
The representative of the National Council of Parent Teacher Associations – Mr. Andrew Gaskin
The Chairman of the Barbados Community College Board of Management – Dr. Leonard Shorey
The Chairman designate of Erdiston Teachers' Training College, the Reverend Bernard Griffith
The Chairman designate of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic – Mr. Claude Franklyn
The Very Reverend the Dean Harold Crichlow
Senator Enid Lynch
Dr. Keith Hunte
Mr. Coleridge Pilgrim
Mr. Douglas Lynch
Miss Monica Forde
The representative of the Barbados Union of Teachers –
Mr. Victor Hutchinson.
The Senior Education Officer in charge of Planning in the Ministry of Education will be the Secretary to the Commission.

I am obliged to Your Honour.

ITEM NO. 5 TO BE THE NEXT ORDER

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I indicated to my colleagues and friends on the other side that there is a Resolution, of which I gave notice, and I propose to deal with it in all of its stages at this time. I hope the Opposition has not changed their views in any way since last I spoke with them.

Sir, that Resolution would be Item 5 on the Order Paper. I beg to move that Item 5 be now taken.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BORROWING OF THE SUM OF U.S. $7 MILLION FROM THE U.S.A.I.D.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a part of the new initiative of the United States

Government directed towards economic aid in the Caribbean area has been an expansion of bilateral assistance to various countries in the area. Some countries are unfortunate to need bilateral military assistance. Barbados is in the fortunate position of needing bilateral assistance for economic benefit.
8.20 p.m.

Not very long ago, the United States Government informed us that, to make up for funds which had been channelled towards Barbados through the Caribbean Development Facility and the Caribbean Development Bank in the past, there would be lending us a sum of money for on-lending to private enterprise in the non-sugar productive sectors of the economy, through the commercial banks, and, directly, as aid to the Government to finance local currency requirements of priority infrastructural projects in Barbados which are externally financed.

The projects which are identified to benefit, as the Addendum says, are the World Bank Education Project and the World Bank Industrial Estate Project. The Addendum points out that the loan is very fully concessional, as concessional as Barbados can reasonably expect to get. It will carry interest at the rate of 5 per cent a year and there is 20 years to repay it.

We do not have to start repaying the loan for 9½ years. Some other Minister of Finance, I am sure, will be thankful, when he sees how small the amount the repayment is, that the Government has not overburdened the country in the way that the scaremongers of latter day politics would have us believe.

The sum of U.S. $7 million will be a valuable addition to our foreign reserves and will be a useful contribution both to the commercial bank lending for productive enterprise and to the funds of the Government.

Despite the recession, which in economic terms is more severe than we expected in 1982, neither the foreign reserves nor the Government's own finances have been in as bad a position as one could have expected. Indeed, today I was very happy to discover that the Government's overdraft was practically nil this morning, it had fallen under $1 million from $44 million at the start of the Estimates, and that the cash flow position of Government is very much easier than I would have considered it possible a week ago. The Government has therefore been able to release a substantial number of Payable Orders, which it had been holding until the end of this week and next week, and I am sure there will be good news for civil servants in those Payable Orders.

I would like to thank the American Government for this example of direct aid. For many years Barbados received little or no direct cash aid on a bilateral basis from any country. The United States contributed its aid funds to the Caribbean through the Caribbean Development Bank. Britain, for a very long time, did not give any aid funds.

We, it seems, are to be characterized as beggars when we negotiate aid agreements with other countries. We have heard so much about defence and security. The best argument that has been put up, I think I may have heard from the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) or was it the honourable Member for St. Michael North West (Mr. P. M. Greaves), who said that when countries offer aid for defence purposes, the Government should try to negotiate aid for housing as well. I do not think that we can be faulted in this particular matter on the basis of that particular argument.

Honourable Members well recall the furore when President Carter stated that he had made Barbados eligible for U.S. $5 million in military assistance. We have never taken that up. We could have bought the weapons. I do not think the terms were as generous as these, but we could have bought the weapons. I dare say it would even have been possible to buy a helicopter out of the U.S. $5 million aid funds. It is not every helicopter which is a gun ship and which costs £7½ million.

We did not think that the implications of taking that kind of aid for buying weapons, which would have represented a different scale of military expenditure, would have been justified. We therefore did not do it and kept on pressing for this sort of loan.

I well remember that when the Caribbean Basin Initiative was being announced, I observed that there was no cash in it for the Eastern Caribbean. I spoke to Washington, I spoke to Tom Enders – a very unpleasant telephone conversation it was too – indicating that Barbados would be unable to give the sort of endorsement to the Initiative that, perhaps, the United States was hoping for, if the Eastern Caribbean appeared to have been left out where direct cash disbursements for infrastructural projects were concerned.

I am happy to say that better thoughts prevailed, and there was a cash amount in the Caribbean Basin Initiative, although not for Barbados, but this amount has been lent to Barbados, on generous terms, subsequent to the representations which were made on that occasion.

I look forward to the possibility of Barbados benefitting from United States AID programmes in the future. I have been in politics 16 or 17 years in this House hearing the Leader of the Opposition, the right honourable Member for St. John, (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) saying that he is not begging for crumbs from rich men's tables. I regret that however grand those senti-

ments may sound, I do not regard the acceptance of a loan for development as begging anybody for crumbs.

(Asides)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am grateful to the Deputy Prime Minister, however generous the interest, it still has to be paid back in the fullness of time. The sewage loan, which I think is the largest direct Government loan ever negotiated, still has to be paid back. The loan for building the Deep Water Harbour had to be paid back – it is now paid back – and there are other loans which have been paid back.

Apparently, it does not constitute begging if you go to a bank and borrow money to build something, but it constitutes begging if you go to the United States Government and borrow money to build something. And it is even worse than begging, apparently, if you go to the IMF to get back some of the money that you put into it, and to borrow some more to tide you over the very eventualities that your membership of the IMF contemplated!

I do not know if the honourable Member has never borrowed money from a bank but I am sure that I would not characterize his dealings with the Bank of Nova Scotia, which I believe is his bank, as going in there to beg for crumbs from the rich Canadians' tables. And the two things indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are really on all fours.

We are borrowing some money to finish the primary schools and we are borrowing some money to build factories to give our people work. We are accepting some money, channelling it through our Central Bank to put in the commercial banks in Bridgetown, to lend to small business and medium-sized business in the non-sugar areas of the economy. In other words, we are trying to make our economy stronger by giving some impetus to the non-traditional sectors of sugar and indeed to tourism, because we are aiming to build up the manufacturing sector.

8.30 p.m.

I am sure honourable Members will have no difficulty supporting this Resolution. It means $14 million in foreign exchange coming into Barbados within the next few weeks. This is one of the pre-conditions, the passage tonight to get the money before the end of the financial year, and it will be of great assistance to us all round, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Ambassador of the United States, Mr. Bish, has proved a very great friend to Barbados in his single-minded concentration on the economic issues and the economic difficulties which he sees in the country. It was through his intervention – indeed it was directly due to him, I can safely say – that Barbados initiated the housing guarantee loan, and I think it is also due to his powerful advocacy that Barbados has negotiated its first direct drawing from AID Loan Funds.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the Prime Minister's statement concerning this decision on the part of Government to open negotiations with the United States Government in what he says is a direct loan Government to Government with the United States Government....

He sought to counter observations made in the past years, observations which were informed, in my view, more by the desire for Barbados to uphold its stated position on becoming independent, that it would be friends of all and satellites of none. Within that very short statement was a philosophy which could be characterised as being representative of the essence of Barbadian character, that they would in their effort to be independent persons avoid, if at all possible, having to be, in a Barbadian phrase, "beholden to anyone" in the course of their lives.

The position taken by the Democratic Labour Party Administration concerning its relationships with other countries cannot be said, as the Prime Minister sought to suggest, to have been against the borrowing of money *per se*. Evidence of that can be found in the attitude which Barbados has demonstrated with the Government of Canada. We have had a number of loans from the Government of Canada. We have had loans from other Governments, but I have always felt that the relationship between Barbados and Canada was a manifestation of the attitude which we brought to the concept of independence, and the basis on which we would behave with other countries in the world.

The point which has not been made by the Prime Minister, but which it is necessary to remind this Honourable House has been canvassed in the international forums for the past 25 years by developing countries, especially those who felt themselves of independent mien, was that they would concentrate on multilateral assistance, although to the extent that they would accept bilateral assistance, such assistance would not be tied.

I recall that that argument was exemplified even within the Caribbean Community itself, where the so-called More Developed Countries have from time to time sought to lend assistance to the Less Developed Countries, and it has always been the contention of the Less Developed Countries that such aid as they should receive

from the More Developed Countries should not have any ties connected with such aid.

In the international forum, it has always been argued that when country A, a developed country, seeks to tie any assistance which it renders to country B, a developing country, with all kinds of requirements, that country B, a developing country, is indeed in danger of losing its very manhood. That is why the Caribbean Development Bank was created and nurtured in this region. It was felt that if aid for the region was channelled through the Caribbean Development Bank, it would better allow those countries of the region to exist, albeit it poorly, all being in dire straits from time to time, but nonetheless, at least from a psychological point of view, as full and free nations.

It is not fair to characterise the Democratic Labour Party Administration as suggesting that if a country borrows money it was necessarily begging for crumbs, and indeed it is a very poor analogy the Prime Minister sought to suggest, and to have this Honourable House accept, that the borrowing of money from a country by another country was on all fours with a man going to a bank to make a loan in order to develop his business.

The fact is that when a man goes to a bank, he is engaging in a business transaction; he is purchasing money and he agrees at a certain price for that money so that he would be able to use that money in the development of his particular product. After all, the only difference between a bank and any other commercial enterprise is the product which the two institutions actually engage in. In one case it may be corned beef, in the other it is money.

The difference between an individual and a country is that, in the democratic systems where it is assumed that a man is free, each man to the extent that he does not interfere with his neighbour is free to make his own decisions. When, however, the Government makes decisions, it does not make those decisions on the basis of the individual tastes of those who happen to be presiding over the Government at the time.

A Government makes decisions for and on behalf of and in the name of entire people. It is for that reason that when a Government is making certain decisions, it is necessary for it sometimes to eschew the personal feelings of the individuals who run the Government and to embrace the collective view, or the collective wisdom, of the entire population, to the extent that such a view can be gleaned and such a view can be said to exist.

I therefore feel that when the Prime Minister seeks to suggest that a policy of strict independence so far as bilateral aid, especially cash aid, is concerned, is a policy that is akin to a man going to a bank, it is the Government's privilege under the Prime Minister to make the executive policy, and it is the privilege of every other individual in the community to be able to criticise that policy since that policy, in the final analysis, is made on behalf of every individual.

8.40 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the current Administration in Washington has made no secret of its view that any aid which it dispenses to any developing country, especially in this particular sphere of influence as seen by the United States, that is to say the Caribbean, will be made on a quid pro quo basis. The quid is particular cash or other aid which the United States will dispense, and the *quo* is the kind of Costa Rican approach to the International and national affairs, which permeated and indeed dominated the affairs of that particular country over the last 25 years.

So if the particular posture which this particular Prime Minister takes for Barbados brings us closer to that of Costa Rica over the years, then we, as Barbadians, can only say that he is exercising his executive responsibility in the way that he sees fit.

I myself am not going to spend any time raising questions about his right to borrow the money, nor indeed am I going to question whether Barbados can continue forever ignoring United States aid funds. What I can question, however, since he has not told us, is whether there have been any ties connected to this aid, what are the conditions outlined by the United States Government, if any, or whether this is a mere question of a loan from the United States Government in the same way as it could have been a loan from any other Government?

We may never know the actual details of this loan. We are not privy to the conversations which occurred between the Barbados Government and the United States Government. We can only speculate and wait until the time comes when we have access to all of the information before we come to a final conclusion. But what I can say, however, is that when the honourable Member is chiding the previous Administration, he should also take into account that never during the time of the previous Administration, were we in the economic situation which would have driven us, as apparently this economic situation had driven him, to go to Washington; perhaps, he would say not cap in hand, but certainly in a conciliatory mood.

I would like to find out from him, since he said that he has got this $7 million on concessionary terms, we have some nine years before we start to repay it at five per cent, and it has been specifically designated on-

lending through a commercial bank to the private sector.....

Aside

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Only half. Now let me ask you about that half that is to be on-lent to the commercial sector. Presumably the rates of interest at which the commercial sector would be able to borrow these specific funds would take account of the 5 per cent plus the usual spread which would, in fact, make these loans, if they are development loans and if they are to do what I understand the Prime Minister is saying they are to do, would make these loans available at not higher than 7 per cent to those private sector agencies which qualify. And, presumably, the criteria for qualifications would be published, and all will know that when they are going to borrow these particular funds. They will be made available until these funds run out.

I am curious to know in some detail, perhaps at some other time since we are unlikely to hear tonight, what the other half of these funds will be used for. I think I heard him say the manufacturing.....

Aside

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am told that they are for schools and factory construction. Well, in the circumstances this would fall under the same category as the loans we have had from the Caribbean Development Bank for factory construction, and to the extent that the funds are going to be channeled in that direction, then no one can quarrel with the utilization of the funds.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is fortunate that this particular matter has had to come at this particular time, because I know that a number of the things which I would like to say could be said, but would be so said at the expense of the good nature of the distinguished Members of this Honourable Chamber. After all, most of us have been here, including Your Honour, for five days and I think the cup of mercy requires that – my colleague is saying that I should bring my terrorizing to an early close – I only signal to the Prime Minister that we do not accept the thesis. I am signalling to the Prime Minister that we do not accept the indication of the tone of his speech, which suggests that his borrowing this money puts him a cut above the rest, as it relates to the Democratic Labour Party's attitude to United States funds.

I recognise that times have changed. I recognise that the Prime Minister has to convince all of us that what he is doing is sound, and as a result of sage advice and deep thinking, and I would grant at this time he is probably engaged in a lot of deep thinking.

So bearing in mind the circumstances, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just indicate that I reserve the right subsequently, whether in here or outside, to continue my own views on this particular loan in due course.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I just want to be short, Sir. There is really one point that I would like to deal with, and that is the point relating to that part of the loan that goes through the private sector. I think that the time has come that the Government should let the population know more regularly about the tremendous effort that it is making to bring loans at favourable conditions to the private sector.

Through the Barbados Development Bank, we borrowed money from the European Investment Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank, and we got the Central Bank to introduce export finance and discount facilities. Now, we went to AID and again we tried to get money to make available in larger quantities for productive purposes, and yet still we are being accused as being the party that is out crushing the small businessman in the community.

I am going to let the public know the facts about the so-called spokesman for the small business people in Barbados. We have done very careful research, and I wish to say that our tolerance has reached the limit. There is no organisation which purports to represent small businessmen in Barbados that has 40 members; absolutely none.

They came to us on their knees and begged us to give them space at the Industrial Development Corporation. We gave them. They came to us years ago and begged us to allow them to import certain items duty free; we gave them. They came to us and begged us for credit through the Central Bank; we gave them. We set up schemes with the Development Bank. We have done all of these things, and we are going to put it in black and white, and when it is all over it will be seen that what you have is not a genuine association of small businessmen, but a small collection of mischief makers whose aim and object is to be attached to a label purely for the purpose of satisfying their own ego.
8.50 p.m.

They are totally unrepresentative of the 118 mini bus people, they are totally unrepresentative of the some 90 to 100 people who get import duty free facilities under the IDC scheme, they are totally unrepresentative of the 325 people who have been licensed under the National Conservation Commission to sell on the beaches, they are totally unrepresentative of the other 3 000 small people who have registered with the Labour Department. They only represent themselves, and they are going to be exposed for what they are.

I have the greatest pleasure in supporting this Resolution. It is part and parcel of the Government's thrust to deliver to those people who want, first of all, to be honest businessmen, and secondly, who wish to advance themselves, not at the expense of the community but by virtue of hard work and the cultivation of virtues.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just wish to speak very briefly on this Resolution, which, of course, I am supporting. I am happy to see that the Government of the United States at long last has agreed to enter into a bilateral relationship with Barbados, and to assist Barbados with aid of this nature. I think this is about the fourth loan which has been given to Barbados on reasonably soft terms, and this is the first of those loans which has been given on a bilateral basis.

I have heard some talk about Barbados selling out; we must repatriate the Constitution from the IMF and from the White House. That is the typical careless, useless speech of someone who was unable during his tenure of office to even extract a reasonable price for the use of our base and land up at St. Lucy. Therefore, whenever I hear a comment from the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) of that nature, I merely attribute it to his failure to organise a proper price for the use of the Barbados naval facility.

I want to say that the Government's diplomacy has moved to the stage where now we are satisfied and can convince the United States that it has a duty to assist in this area.

The United States is, after all, the biggest exporter of goods to Barbados, and in this regard, it is right that it should take steps to redress the terms of trade not only by easing the conditions for entry into the United States, but by direct concessional loans advanced.

I would only hope that the diplomacy which has enabled us to have persuaded the United States to act in this way will also enable us, in due course, to persuade the Japanese Government to act in a similar way. We do spend a lot of our money on Japanese goods, particularly their motor cars, and they have proven to be less than proper trading partners in their dealings with the Caribbean and with Barbados in particular.

I wholeheartedly support the loan, I do not know what else the DLP can usefully say about it other than admit their failure to have been able to negotiate any such arrangement. I remember when the former Prime Minister went to visit, I think it was President Johnson, at the White House, all he got was a handshake and not a cent for the visit. He has never been able to negotiate properly for Barbados to get as equal treatment as was given out to other countries in Central America, in Latin America, the balance of the Caribbean, in the Middle East and other places, and therefore the Government is to be congratulated on getting this loan. I trust that we can continue to negotiate even to get more favourable terms in the future.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Very briefly in reply, Sir, I say that I thank the honourable Members who have spoken. The main point which, it seems to me, should be addressed relates to the rate of interest and the conditions which attach to the loan.

The commercial banks will not be getting the money to on-lend at 7 percent. It is a condition of the loan that the on-lending by the commercial banks be carried out at normal commercial rates of interest, and the condition attached to the Central Bank is that it lend to the commercial banks at interest rates sufficiently attractive to encourage them to borrow the money. There are only general conditions.

I will let the honourable Member have a look at the loan agreement, that is, the original agreement with the original signatures, so I will be very glad to have it back. I have no copy. The honourable Member will surely see that there are no conditions in it in the slightest way derogatory of Barbados' sovereignty or anything else. It is a short, straightforward agreement without a plethora of clauses and subclauses, without any compromise of dignity. All that is unusual, and will separate it from other loan agreements, is the generosity of its rates of interest and repayment terms.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that item 3 be the next Order.

THE LAND TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

9.00 p.m.

Clause 2 was called.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Just a quick matter here. Will the post of Commissioner of Valuations be abandoned now that there will be a Commissioner of Land Tax? I have not been able to go through this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member has asked this so innocently. In due course, a Civil Establishment Order will come to the House and all will be made clear. I have to delete the post of Commissioner of Valuations and create a new post, but I do intend to create a post of Commissioner of Land Tax at the same salary point as the Commissioner of Valuations.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 3 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 8 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In moving that Clause 8 stand part, I beg to move that the paragraph (b) under the habendum to the amendment, which refers to the repeal of subsection 2 and substituting a new subsection, be entirely repealed; that is, (b) down to "tax demand notice;".

The question that Clause 8, subsection (b) be deleted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There is another amendment, Sir, subclause (e). If for elegance the House would prefer to rename the paragraphs of the amending sections as (b) (c) and (d), I do not mind, but I do not believe it is essential. In the final paragraph which is now (e), Section (6A), which would be (d), if the House wishes to do that -- I believe the House has the power to do that under the Interpretation Act, but if you wish you can do it – but in the proposed subsection (6A), in line 4, I wish to delete the words "the upset" and include the words "any reserve" in their place.

After the word "price", I wish to include the words "fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to Section 39," I hope the Clerks are taking a note of this – and after "shall be" I wish to include the words "not less than."

This is *ex abundantia consilio,* Sir. As far as I am concerned, the present Act does not provide any protection either to the revenue or the owner on a tax sale. There is nothing in the Act preventing the Collector from permitting a sale both under value and under the taxes due.

And if one recalls in an earlier debate in the House when the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) corrected me in my belief that there had been no tax sales under the Act, and reminded us that there had been one in Sandy Lane, on which a profit, I think he said, of $30 000 was made in a single day, honourable Members would consider that some regulation is wise.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) yesterday considered that the drafting might be unconstitutional. I will take issue with him on this. If what we originally had is unconstitutional, then the Act itself would be unconstitutional, because this was included as a protection to the revenue and, incidentally, as a part protection to the owner. In its present form, it is a protection to the revenue and, I think, a more considerable protection to the owner.

There may yet be cases where the reserve has been fixed too high in order to protect the owner at the expense of the revenue, but I think that that can be dealt with by administrative direction.

I therefore beg to move that Clause 8 as amended stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I can support the amendment now made by the honourable Prime Minister, because I think that it protects not only the revenue, but it provides protection for the owner of the land as well.

In the particular case to which the honourable Prime Minister referred, it is a great pity that the owner did not challenge the sale before the court. In my view, if he had, I think the court would clearly have found that there was a duty on the seller to ensure that there was a reasonable and fair price, which would have protected both the revenue as well as the buyer. It is that nobody challenged it; that is right.

Both the mortgagee and the revenue was robbed, and I think those kinds of cases the court may well have set aside the sale, but, unfortunately, the point was not taken. In my view, the amending section provides the adequate protection that I thought was necessary, and I am quite willing to support the amended section.

The question that Clause 8 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

9.10 p.m.

Clauses 9 – 14 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments.

On separate motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this brings us to the end of Government Business, and I would like to pay tribute to the Hansard Reporters and the Clerks at the Table and all members of the Staff of Parliament, and in particular the Chairman of Committees for conducting this sitting in the manner in which he has conducted it.

I would think that we have had a rather interesting debate. There are certain aspects of it that I regret, and I will probably make known to this Chamber on another occasion. We have had five days of good cut and thrust in debate, in which, no doubt, the Government again has shown its capabilities and debating skills.

I would think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I would be also failing in my duty if I did not salute my colleagues, each and every one, both on the front bench and the back bench for the very important role they have played once again in the cut and thrust of debate. I have enjoyed it and it is only a matter of opinion who may have done a better job. There is no doubt in my mind whom I would have chosen.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, April 5, 1983, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.18 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of Tuesday, March 8, 1983 2947

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: 3200
Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of US $7 million from the United States Agency for International Development for the purpose of on-lending to private enterprises in the non-sugar productive sectors of the economy as well as financing of the local currency requirements of priority infrastructure projects in Barbados which are externally financed.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

STATEMENT BY HON. MISS B. A. MILLER RE APPOINTMENT TO NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION 3254

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983 2947
Mr. Adams, 2948; Mr. St. John, 2962, 2976; Mr. Johnson, 2965; Dr. Haynes, 2969, 2970; Dr. Blackman, 2986; Mr. Taitt, 2989, 2991; Mr. Craig, 2970, 2990; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2990, 2992.

HEAD 11 – JUDICIARY – $36 173 2993
Mr. Franklin, 2993; Mr. Adams, 2993, 2995, 2996, 3000; Mr. Taitt, 2994, 2996, 2998; Mr. Greaves, 2997; Mr. Forde, 2997; Mr. King, 2998; Mr. Tull, 2999.

HEAD 12 – PARLIAMENT – $954 588 3000
Mr. Sandiford, 3000, 3026; Mr. Taitt, 3002, 3014, 3018, 3019, 3020, 3021, 3022; Mr. Forde, 3004, 3009, 3018; Mr. Franklin, 3007; Mr. Adams, 3007, 3011, 3019, 3020, 3023; Dr. Haynes, 3011, 3012, 3027; Mr. Truss, 3013, 3021; Mr. Tull, 3015; Mr. Craig, 3020, 3027; Mr. Bradshaw, 3021, 3022; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3024.

HEAD 13 – SERVICES COMMISSION – $256 483 3030
Mr. Taitt, 3030; Mr. Sandiford, 3033; Mr. Forde, 3034; Dr. Haynes, 3036, 3040; Mr. Craig, 3037, 3040, 3041; Mr. Sisnett, 3039; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3039, 3040.

HEAD 14 – ESTABLISHMENTS – $4 614 553 (as amended) 3042
Mr. Franklin, 3042; Mr. Adams, 3043, 3049; Mr. Barrow, 3046; Mr. Sandiford, 3046; Mr. Tull, 3047; Mr. Taitt, 3047.

HEAD 15 – CABINET OFFICE – $1 518 910 3049
Mr. Taitt, 3049, 3060, 3061, 3062; Mr. Barrow, 3051, 3056; Mr. St. John, 3053, 3057, 3062, 3065, 3080; Mr. Truss, 3055, 3057, 3058, 3091; Dr. Haynes, 3057, 3058, 3081, 3093; Mr. Adams, 3057, 3058, 3059, 3063, 3065, 3085, 3101; Mr. Craig, 3059, 3060, 3097; Mr. King, 3068; Mr. Greaves, 3071, 3089, 3100; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 3073; Mr. Forde, 3074; Mr. Sandiford, 3065, 3076; Mr. R. E. Brathwaite, 3078; Mr. Johnson, 3083; Mr. Bradshaw, 3089; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3095.

HEAD 16 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE – $317 366 (as amended) 3102
Mr. Adams, 3102, 3103; Mr. Franklin, 3102.

HEAD 71 – CAPITAL – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE – $500 000 (as amended) 3103
Mr. Adams, 3103, 3106; Mr. Barrow, 3104.

HEAD 17 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY – $14 435 890 (as amended) 3108
Mr. Sandiford, 3108, 3113, 3135, 3161; Mr. Adams, 3109, 3113, 3115, 3116, 3133, 3144, 3148, 3151, 3152; Mr. Barrow, 3110, 3117, 3118; Mr. Taitt, 3114, 3116, 3149, 3152, 3159, 3166, 3169; Dr. Haynes, 3116, 3117, 3150, 3151, 3163; Mr. Truss, 3116, 3139, 3161; Mr. Johnson, 3118; Mr. Simmons, 3137, 3146; Mr. St. John, 3141; Mr. R. E. Brathwaite, 3141; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 3143, 3144; Mr. Bradshaw, 3145; Mr. Sisnett, 3155, 3166, 3167; Mr. Tull, 3157, 3161, 3167, 3169; Mr. Craig, 3165, 3167.

HEAD 23 – LOANS AND ADVANCES – $1 961 735 3172,3253
Mr. Taitt, 3172, 3173; Mr. Craig, 3172, 3173.

HEAD 28 – MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS – $ 3 310 548 3173
Mr. Greaves, 3173; Mr. King, 3174, 3177, 3180; Mr. St. John, 3175, 3176; Mr. Franklin, 3176; Mr. Taitt, 3176, 3187, 3190; Mr. Tull, 3177, 3181, 3182, 3189; Dr. Haynes, 3182; Mr. Forde, 3184.

HEAD 30 – POLICE – $6 583 112 3191
Mr. Tull, 3191, 3206, 3209, 3211, 3212, 3214; Mr. King, 3192; Mr. St. John, 3193, 3205; Mr. Forde, 3195, 3198, 3199, 3211; Mr. Taitt, 3197, 3203, 3205, 3210, 3213, 3214; Mr. Sandiford, 3201, 3209; Mr. Craig, 3203; Mr. Barrow, 3214; Mr. R. E. Brathwaite, 3214; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3217.

HEAD 31 – PRISONS – $1 090 511 (as amended) 3218
Mr. Sandiford, 3218; Mr. Greaves, 3218; Mr. Tull, 3219; Mr. Simmons, 3221; Mr. Taitt, 3222; Mr. Sisnett, 3222; Mr. Truss, 3223; Mr. Johnson, 3224.

HEAD 32 – FIRE SERVICE – $647 396 (as amended) 3226
Mr. Craig, 3226.

HEAD 36 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES – $59 728 974 (as amended) 3226
Mr. L. A. Weekes, 3226, 3241; Dr. Haynes, 3228, 3233, 3234, 3245; Mr. Craig, 3229; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3230; Mr. St. John, 3231, 3245; Miss Miller, 3233, 3235, 3243; Dr. D. G. Blackman, 3236, 3247; Mr. Barrow, 3240; Mr. Taitt, 3241, 3244; Mr. Simmons, 3244.

MOTION RE LAND TAX ACT. 3121
Mr. Craig, 3121; Mr. Sandiford, 3121, 3122; Mr. Adams, 3122; Mr. Deputy Speaker, 3121, 3122.

LAND TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983 . . . . . .3122, 3259
Mr. Adams, 3122, 3260; Mr. Franklin, 3123, 3126, 3260; Mr. Taitt, 3125; Mr. Forde, 3127, 3128, 3130, 3260; Mr. St. John, 3129; Mr. Sandiford, 3128, 3129; Dr. Haynes, 3130.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE BY MR. TRUSS RE ARTICLE IN NATION NEWSPAPER. 3119
Mr. Barrow, 3120

POINT OF PRIVILEGE BY MR. TAITT RE CONDITIONS OF PARLIAMENT 3133

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BORROWING OF THE SUM OF U.S. $7 MILLION FROM THE U.S.A.I.D 3254
Mr. Adams, 3254, 3259; Mr. Taitt, 3256; Mr. St. John, 3258.

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER RE ARTICLE IN NATION NEWSPAPER 3170

SUSPENSIONS. . . . . 2962, 2986, 3001, 3021, 3039 3060, 3081, 3100, 3120, 3135 3157, 3200, 3218, 3238, 3254.
Mr. Craig, 3120, 3121; Mr. Barrow, 3121.

ADJOURNMENT 3261
Mr. Craig, 3261.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)
BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)
BLACKMAN, Hon. Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East)
BLACKMAN, H. A. (St. Philip South)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (St. Joseph)
BRADSHAW, Hon. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)
BRATHWAITE, R. E. (St. Lucy)
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)
GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North)
HAYNES, R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Central)
KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
MILLER, Hon. B. A. (City of Bridgetown)
ODLE, J. G. (St. George North)
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)
SIMMONS, N. K. (St. James South)
SISNETT, L. L. (St. Michael North East)
TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)
TRUSS, A. A. (St. Michael Central)
TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)
WEEKES, L. A. (St. Michael North West).