

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 24, 1984

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock on Tuesday, January 24, 1984.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs
and Leader of the House)

Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime
Minister and Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry)

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education)

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)

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, Sport and Community Services)

Mr. R. E. Brathwaite

Mr. W. O. Franklin, A.I.A.S., J.P.

Mr. A. Truss.

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, December 20, 1983.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG—Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting of December 20, 1983 be taken as read.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am to announce that I have received the following:

Accounts and Statements for the month of November, 1983 prepared by the Auditor General.

The Auditor General's Report, together with the appropriation and other accounts, for the year ending the 31st March, 1983.

PAPERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs, I am commanded to lay:

The Markets and Slaughter-Houses (Amendment) Regulations, 1983.

On behalf of the Prime Minister I am commanded to lay:

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1983.

On behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 11) Order, 1983.

The Customs (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1983.

The Rate of Interest (Exemption) Order, 1983.

Financial Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 4 months ended 31st July, 1983.

Financial Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 5 months ended 31st August, 1983.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 1983.

Resolution to approve of the vesting of land at Bottom Bay, St. Philip, in the Estate of Bonner Bowring.

Resolution to approve of the vesting of certain lands at Charnocks, Christ Church in Phyllis Barrow.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$1 338 100 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983-84, Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983-84, No. 19, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$40 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1983-84, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1983-84, No. 20, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to provide assistance to Caribbean Financial Services Corporation Limited to enable that private sector financial institution to develop financial and commercial opportunities within the Caribbean, and to provide for such other matters as are incidental, ancillary, consequential or related thereto.

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

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A Question from the honourable Member for St. Michael North, re the construction of a highway linking University Drive with a proposed highway at Warrens.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Transport and Works:

1. Is the Minister aware

- (a) that property owners in Lodge Hill and Cave Hill in the parish of Saint Michael have received letters from the Project Execution Unit informing them that Government plans to acquire their property for the construction of a Highway linking University Drive with a proposed highway at Warrens.
- (b) that those districts are residential in character and that several residents will have to be resettled.
- (c) that the construction and presence of the highway in these districts will create environmental problems of dust, noise and toxic vapours for those residents who remain.
- (d) that it is dangerous to the life and limb of persons living there to establish such a highway in a residential district.
- (e) that the value of the neighbouring properties will be adversely affected by such a highway.
- (f) that the said proposed highway is causing the residents much concern and agony.
- (g) that there are vacant lands further to the North of the Lodge Hill district where the highway could be situated in such a way that the environmental and safety problems referred to could be avoided or minimized.

2. Were the residents of the said district consulted about the proposed highway before letters were sent to them about the acquisition of the land?

3. If the answer to 2 is in the affirmative, will the Minister disclose the result of that consultation.

4. Will the Minister investigate the siting of that section of the highway and relocate it on the vacant land aforesaid.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Question from the honourable Member for St. John re Heywoods Develop-

ment Project, the Battaleys By-Pass Road and the completion of the Heywoods By-Pass Road.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Finance:

Will the Minister state the total cost of

1. The Heywoods Development Project.
2. The Battaleys By Pass Road.
3. The completion of the Heywoods By Pass Road.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The other Question from the same honourable Member re the Arawak Cement Plant and related matters.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To enquire of the Minister of Finance:

- (1) Will the Minister state the total cost of the Arawak Cement Plant including the cost of the acquisition of lands.
- (2) The contribution to date of the government of Trinidad and Tobago to the project.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, a Bill to provide assistance to Caribbean Financial Services Corporation Limited to enable that private sector financial institution to develop financial and commercial opportunities within the Caribbean, and to provide for such other matters as are incidental, ancillary, consequential or related thereto, was read a first time.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took his seat.
12.25 p.m.

OBITUARY SPEECHES RE THE LATE SIR DEIGHTON HARCOURT LISLE WARD G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., K.A., GOVERNOR- GENERAL OF BARBADOS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the 9th January, 1984, the entire nation and people far beyond, was shocked at the sudden death of the late Governor-General, Sir Deighton Harcourt Lisle Ward, G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., K.A., a distinguished son of the soil.

During my adult life I have attended several funerals paying my last respects to friends and the families of beloved ones. I have heard eulogies on some of our most distinguished sons and daughters, and I have heard comments made by people around the graveside of their loved ones. But I do not think that, ever, in my adult life, I have heard the fine things that were said about the late Governor-General of Barbados. On no one occasion during that week of mourning, or since then, can I recall that there were not expressions of words of what an outstanding son he has been; and most of all, that he walked with the rich and the poor, dined with Kings and Queens and Presidents, and yet he never lost the common touch.

I first met the late Governor-General almost 41 years ago, when I was a very young boy and his car was at that time looked after by my father, who was his mechanic. In later years, I enjoyed the company of that distinguished son when I would go over to the YMCA. I was then a young insurance underwriter and he was a judge.

I will always recall that the purpose of his coming to the YMCA was not only to associate himself with the young men and women from the lower economic ladder, like myself, but he was always interested in giving a word of wisdom to the young boys at the YMCA. His lunch-break was primarily taken up in playing billiards and talking with the young boys at the YMCA.

His humour and wit were something which we would all enjoy, especially if he had to pocket a ball from a very difficult angle when playing billiards. I recall that he would say: "Pocketing this would take the keenness and the artistry of a surgeon using a knife."

During those years, at all times I have found him to be quiet, dignified and well-mannered. He would discuss with you, in, undoubtedly, very soft tones, almost every conceivable sport that one can think about — football, cricket, table-tennis, basketball, boxing, and sometimes in the evening, when he returned to the YMCA, you would see him engaged playing a game of hearts. He was loved by all of us who went to the YMCA in those days.

He ascended to the highest office in the land, that of Governor-General, and in my capacity as a Member of Parliament and, more so, as a Minister, when I had to attend meetings of the Privy Council, of which I am a member, or any official function or private function which I might attend, I found that the late Governor-General was the same person — humble, dignified and well-mannered.

I believe that he has heard many sentiments expressed in his life-time similar to those which we have heard expressed over the past two weeks. But I am sure that his family can take comfort in knowing that from

nearly every single Barbadian and West Indian, and persons far beyond these shores who he came into contact with there was always one feeling towards that distinguished son of the soil.

I cannot speak of him, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a professional, and therefore I am limited in expressing the sentiments which I have already expressed this morning. The service at St. Michael's Cathedral and the ceremonial procession by the Forces, both the Barbados Defence Force and the Royal Barbados Police Force, was something which I believe all Barbadians would remember, and such a procession and ceremony was more than fitting for such a person, who served this country so well at all times and at all levels.

12.35 p.m.

I have already, extended my personal condolences to Lady Ward and his family. But on behalf of my colleagues on the front bench and all members of the Barbados Labour Party, to his sorrowing wife and his family, I offer my deepest sympathy. I am comforted in knowing that a job has been well done by a distinguished son of the soil.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take it that the honourable Leader of the House is moving a Resolution which I should like to second. The Resolution reads:

"Whereas our beloved and revered Governor-General Sir Deighton Harcourt Lisle Ward, G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., K. A., a most distinguished son of this our country died on the 9th day of January, 1984;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly place on record its appreciation for the outstanding service, dedication and sacrifice of this distinguished Head of State;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House of Assembly extend to Lady Ward, and his sorrowing relatives, its sincerest condolences and deepest sympathy."

I second that Resolution, which I believe that the mover and the honourable Member has circulated to all the members of this House.

Anything that we might say in extension of the very able speech made by the Leader of the House will be more drawing attention to ourselves, the living, than paying tribute to the distinguished son of the soil who has passed to the Great Beyond.

The Opposition, has already publicly expressed our deep feelings of regret, and it is only my duty,

on behalf of the members of the Party to which I have the honour to belong and the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to concur in the sentiments which have been expressed by the honourable Leader of the House.

I do not have pleasure in seconding this Resolution. This is one of the Resolutions which I take no pleasure in seconding. It is my sad duty to concur and second the Resolution which has been moved by the honourable Leader of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I, also, as presiding officer of this Chamber, would like to publicly extend condolences to the wife and family of the late Governor General.

I would now invite the Chamber to stand in one minute's silence in passing this Resolution.

The Chamber stood in one minute's silence.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Order No. 1 was called — To move that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84
NO. 18 \$339 034

HEAD 38 — MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Chairman, Head 38 seeks to supplement the Vote for the

Ministry of Information and Culture. Primarily, it deals with the setting up of the National Cultural Foundation which, earlier last year, was established by an Act of this Chamber.

No doubt we are well aware of the very important role which the Ministry of Culture is playing in Barbados. Under its present Minister, as under his predecessors, when Culture was, I think in the Ministry of Education, it has shown signs of dynamism over the past couple of years.

One only has to look at the putting together of our national festival. I firmly believe that, with the exception of the bands at Kadooment, which is part of the festival, Barbadians can speak highly and proudly of our festival, particularly our calypsonians.
12.45 p.m.

But that is not all to the festival. I have just made that point to indicate how far we have come over the past years, which is, no doubt, to the credit of the Ministry. We are set out to go much further than that and therefore the National Cultural Foundation will be put in place at this time, for the purpose of bringing communities closer together at a cultural level.

We have been through this already. We are well aware of the fact that the management of the theatres and the equipment is too much for the Ministry itself to handle, and, therefore, the whole idea of setting up this Foundation is to make it possible to man the day-to-day operations, and to give Barbadians, both young and old, an opportunity to show off their talents at the cultural level.

I have nothing but the highest praise for the Ministry of Culture. No doubt, when a department like the National Cultural Foundation is in its infancy stage, one must always expect a few teething problems, and I hope that when these teething problems come, they will not run down the institution and be too critical of what I consider a new area in which we are breaking new ground.

I think that some time this year we will be celebrating 150 years of the emancipation of slaves in Barbados and the Caribbean territories. The Government is looking very closely at celebrating this landmark. As a matter of fact, I can go a little further and say that the Ministry of Culture has already commissioned a life-size statue of a slave to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the emancipation of slavery. The statue will be placed at the St. Barnabas Roundabout, overlooking the beautiful St. George's Valley. We are well aware, and our history tells us that the slaves were all brought here to work on the plantations, and if we can celebrate 150 years of freedom,

I have no doubt that all Barbadians will be proud to see that we are conscious of our history.

I am not one of the people who subscribe, Mr. Chairman, to the school of thought that one should take a bulldozer, as I have heard it advocated so often by some people with revolutionary ideas, people who like to pull down but cannot put up, of removing the Nelson Statue from looking down Broad Street. When we look back and see where we had to come from, we can see that the Nelson Statue at the top of Broad Street is part and parcel of the problems which we had over the years.

The Ministry of Culture is also examining, and I can say this with quite a degree of assurance, placing at the roundabout at Halls Road a life-size statue of that late, great Barbadian, Sir Frank Worrell. The Ministry of Culture has also commissioned that statue, and I am told that it is at a very advanced stage.

Mr. Chairman, we have a way of pulling down our people, politicians in particular. I know that politics is power, and when you are out in the hustings, we say some of the strongest things. I have been fortunate over the past 17 years in saying a number of things, but my mouth, on no occasion, has ever caused me to put my hands into my pockets, like some of my colleagues on both sides of the House. I am glad that I have not had to put my hands in my pockets, and I hope that I will not have to do it now, because I am a little more experienced and I know how to couch my language.

But we, as politicians, attack each other to the hilt. This is like a football match, Tottenham Hotspurs and Manchester United playing in a F. A. Cup Final. The spectators would pull daggers, pull guns and burn people's homes down in support of their club. But at the end of the day of that battle which ensued at Wembley, you will see the exchanging of jerseys by members of the two teams, demonstrating the comradeship. I have used that as an analogy to point out to the public of Barbados that politicians are just like those players. You will hear us on the floor of the House trying to score all the political points, cutting each other down — you, Mr. Chairman, at times would have it very difficult in that Chair — and you will hear from the public platforms humiliating each other. But at the end of the day, we have one common goal, and that common goal is to serve our country as well as we can possibly serve.

I would hope that the Debates Committee, which comprises both Houses, the Upper House and Lower House, Members of both sides of the House and independent Senators, would be happy and pleased to know that this Government has again commissioned the Ministry of Culture to put in the courtyard of this august Assembly, the history of which we can be so justly proud, a life-size

statue of the late great Sir Grantley Adams. I believe that Members on both sides of the House will have no difficulty in agreeing, when the occasion arises, to have this done, and we hope to have it done very soon.
12.55 p.m.

I have no doubt that the Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow), like the former Member for St. Peter, Mr. Frank Walcott, General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, has made an outstanding contribution — and I repeat it on the floor of the House — and is still making a valuable contribution to this country. I would like to be alive to be able to participate in a decision to see life-size statues of both of these great Barbadians placed in appropriate places in this country.

I know that one of the gentlemen, on more than one occasion, has indicated that things of that nature do not really matter. But when they leave, unless it is requested of them, I would hope, even if I am not in here, that Barbadians would pay that tribute to two of our finest living sons today.

The reason why I made a reference to Tottenham Hotspur and Manchester United was to let Barbadians understand and see for themselves that for all the attacks we make on each other on the public platforms and in here, at the end of the day, as the late Sir Winston Churchill said, in the tunnel there is darkness, but at the end of the tunnel there is light — there is goodwill.

I recall at the funeral of the late Governor-General hearing comments from people who were shocked when they saw the Prime Minister of Barbados and the Leader of the Opposition actually walking hand in hand.

Aside.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am reminded by my friend and colleague, the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), that they were not holding hands, but they have so much in common. They are both legally trained, both of them have served their country at the highest level, both of them are making and have made their contributions, and I hope the public will recognize these and forget the whole idea of pulling down when they cannot put up.

This Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is primarily for the purpose of putting together the National Cultural Foundation, and I would hope that those people who are to guide it would do as well a job as they are now doing, with that degree of confidence in themselves. I am told that the person who is to be appointed as Director is a man who is committed to that type of exercise.

With those few remarks, I beg to move that Head 38 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I am not going to comment on the statement just made by the honourable Minister, because I am sure that he has good reason for that particular vein of comment. I wish I could join him in that mood on this Resolution, but I would prefer to move away from that and deal with a matter concerning this Resolution that is of very serious import.

It was only in March, 1983, that that Government came to this Honourable Chamber and said they would set up a cultural foundation. They came down here with a Resolution that called for an Executive Secretary and two typists. I stood on the floor of this House and told them that it was foolishness, that the concept of a national cultural foundation had not been thought through, that the policy regarding a national cultural foundation was obviously motivated by some necessity. I went so far as to raise a question as to whether the Ministry of Information and Culture was not really a Ministry of mobilisation, and whether, in fact, an attempt was not being made to mobilise certain sectors of the population in this country while using Government funds for certain political purposes.

Now, Sir, today, the Ministry of Information and Culture is back in this Honourable Chamber and they say, "It is proposed to establish a National Cultural Foundation with effect from January 1984." That is ineptitude. It is not the first time we have seen it, it is not the second time — it is a continuous pattern which we have been seeing from that Government, where they come to this Chamber, they seek money, they go back, and they come back to correct errors. On this occasion, they have come back in January, 1984, to do exactly what they said they would do in March, 1983.

I am going to give them the benefit of the doubt. I am going to say that they listened to the Opposition and that they have now discovered what we told them back in March 1983, that the alleged Foundation they were setting up then could not possibly do the job which they had identified in the Objects and Reasons of the Resolution, and that they have now thought it through a little better, and that they have come back finally with something that begins to approach the staff that is required for a national cultural foundation.

On that occasion, and subsequently in another place, they made all kinds of disparaging remarks about the motivation of the Opposition, when all the Opposition was seeking to do was to carry out its responsibility to assist them in coming with policies that would fulfil the noble and lofty ideals which the honourable Member who just sat down spoke about — the ideals of producing for

this country the best that is possible from the resources available.

Sir, that Government has a capacity to give the people of this country wrong impressions. They have the capacity to make mountains out of molehills, and I have seen them, on more than one occasion, misleading this population in very serious mien.

I am going to attack some of what has been happening in the Ministry of Culture. I am going to state on the floor of this House that I believe that the Ministry of Culture has degenerated into a propaganda arm of the Barbados Labour Party. I am saying on the floor of this House, especially in view of the recent commercials about the levy..... Have you ever seen anything like this, Mr. Chairman? Have you seen one of the commercials where they are saying that the levy is being put to good use for road building?

1.05 p.m.

Why do you not get a Public Relation's Arm of the Labour Party and let the Labour Party do that kind of thing? Do not put the Government funds there for the Government Information Service to make that kind of commercial. It is cheap. But, I mean, that is your privilege. You will tell me you have the numbers.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member for St. Thomas (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams) is saying that the levy is the Government's money and it is not the Labour Party's money. I would now have to ask the question: Who it is is proposing to put the money in the gambling casinos? Is it the Government or the Labour Party?

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is what I want to know, I want to know if the money going into the gambling casinos will be.....

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Same thing, only different. Is it the Labour Party or the Government?

Will the Ministry of Culture now be telling us that the Off-shore Medical College is a desirable thing? Will it be the Government which will be getting the large revenues that the Minister is talking about, or will it be the Labour Party?

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I can always tell when you mash a corn. People that never say a word in

this Honourable Chamber suddenly jump up and come to life whenever you mash a corn in this Chamber. Life is like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: There are certain activities which it will not be right for the Ministry, even in the concept of the Barbados Labour Party, to perform, so there are moving them into the Cultural Foundation, so that those activities can be carried on without any serious examination.

In the same way that the information media, because there are now two, of CBC have been successfully removed from the ambit of this Honourable Chamber, so, too, the Cultural Foundation will be removed from the ambit of this Chamber once we have passed this Resolution giving them the money. In the same way that CBC cannot be debated in here because there is no call for a subvention, we will find that the National Cultural Foundation will not be debated, and questions asked about it will not be answered. Therefore, certain things which cannot now be done from a Government Ministry will be done through the National Cultural Foundation.

They have said that they now need a staff. They have now discovered that what they had planned before is not adequate and they are accepting what we have recommended, or they have taken the words we said then.

I say that if this now happens a year later, that that is a waste of the taxpayers money. It is a waste of people's time. It is a waste of the time of the Honourable Members of this Chamber when we have to go over the same thing a year later, at a higher cost, when they ought to have thought through the programme when they came originally.

But if you read the recent publication by the Government Information Service, under the direction of the Minister responsible for Information, called *Monitor*, you will understand what it is the Cultural Foundation and the Ministry will be doing. *Monitor* would have graced — I have to be very careful — the shelves of any political party as a publication of the political party, and *Monitor* has devoted its entire issue to the north.

Suddenly, the north has become the most important part of Barbados, and the Government is making a thrust in the north. And that thrust appears in a new publication put out by the Government Information Service, which enumerates all the wonderful things that the Government has been doing for the dear people of the northern part of this country.

They are able to go further. They have been able to get the editorial writer in the *Advocate News* — note I said "Editorial writer", not the "Editor" — who is, himself, one of the arch policy-makers in the Barbados Labour Party to then write an editorial in the *Advocate News* saying what a wonderful publication the *Monitor* is.

Certain remarks made at this point by the honourable member for St. James North and the honourable Member for St. Michael West were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I just draw your attention to what I consider to be irrelevant. The honourable Member talked about the Editor of the *Advocate* and an editorial written by a policy-maker of the Barbados Labour Party. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Resolution before us. I just draw that to your attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take note, and I will ask the honourable Member to stay with the National Cultural Foundation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect if what is written in an editorial has no relevance to a Ministry of Information and Culture, then, Sir, I do not know what could. It may be true that in the context of the Ministry of Information and Culture as perceived by them, and as operated in recent times, the whole Ministry might be irrelevant. But the "Information" part, according to the portfolio definition, would, I think, allow me to deal with an editorial which comments on a publication from that Ministry.

I submit that I am within the Rules, and that I am speaking on a relevant matter, because this Cultural Foundation comes out of the Ministry and thus would allow the Ministry, presumably, to spend more time producing the *Monitor*, and the commercials, and other similar bits of information.

I will continue. It is remarkable. That a Government publication has found its way into the homes of a large number of people in the northern part of this country. I would like the Minister to tell me how much money has been spent distributing the *Monitor*, that publication by the Government Information Service. I am told that it can be found in almost any house in St. Peter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Oh dear, my time runs out. I will be back, Sir.

Thank you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution? The honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, in examining the structure of the proposed staff of this Foundation, it appears to me that the functions of the Community Development section has been down played considerably.

If you read the first four sections of the functions of the National Cultural Foundation, you will see:

- (a) to stimulate and facilitate the development of culture generally;
- (b) to develop, maintain and manage theatres and other cultural facilities and equipment provided by the Government;
- (c) to organise cultural festivals; and
- (d) to do anything necessary or desirable to assist persons interested in developing cultural expression.

If you also have a look at the old Community Development staff, you will notice that there was a Chief Community Development Officer, a Senior Community Development Officer, a Director of Women's Affairs and a Research Assistant. But here it only states that there will be 23 Community Officers. There is no indication that there will be any Senior Community Officer for guidance and policy.
1.15 p.m.

You have cut out the post of Director of Women's Affairs, and I can only conclude from the aims and objects and the staff structure that the Community Development section is being downplayed considerably at the expense of the promotion of culture. This proposes to be a very serious development in Barbados, since it is within my further knowledge that the present members of the Community Development section have not been too keen in being transferred to the cultural foundation. I would like the appropriate Minister, in his reply, to remove my fear that the activities and the functions of Community Development are being downplayed, as is being suggested by the composition of this cultural office.

This is a particular time in Barbados, Mr. Chairman, when I think we all should take very seriously anything that would suggest that our community would lose the services of people who have been out there working day and night to bring a cohesiveness to the community of Barbados, and I would want to be assured that the intention is not to downplay all of this.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS (St. James South): Mr. Chairman, looking at the functions of the Foundation, it would seem to me that there is no role as listed here for

the Community Development Officer. To me, this is a very sad day for community development. Those of us who have worked with youth groups and organisations in the community should recognise the great role the Community Development Officer played. He was not only there to advise youth groups as to how they should be formed, but the Community Development Officer worked alongside youth groups in every aspect of the development of the community and the upgrading of groups. From this Resolution here, it would seem to me that the emphasis is placed wholly and solely on culture, whatever you try to define that as, but in Barbados we know that people look at culture mainly as the Arts — dance, drama — and I would like to see that there is a specific role for the Community Development Officers to play.

The fact that all the Community Development Officers have opted not to go to the Foundation would suggest that they are not happy with what is going on, or what has been explained to them, and I feel that, for the benefit of groups and other organisations in this country, an explanation should be given, so that when the new officers go out there will be no antagonism, there will be no rejection.

I know, in dealing with groups myself, that groups are very concerned that these days they do not see anybody at all. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that there is some limbo now in that when you write the Department of Culture, or the Cultural Foundation, nobody seems to know what is going on, and groups are very concerned. We do not know whom we can call upon.

Let me say this as well; there is a practice, since the thought of the Cultural Foundation was formulated, that every other month you have a different officer. I am speaking as someone who is involved with groups and I know the headaches which we have to go through because of this change, and I am expressing the concern of groups in my area. We are concerned that we are left alone, and there is a definite need for greater education as to what the Foundation is all about. Some people have their own views, which I prefer not to express at this time, but my own view is that we should not have done away with the Community Development Officer and the important part he or she used to play. As my friend from St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) has said, it seems as if the Community Development Officer is being downplayed — and eventually, they will go through the door.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I really almost vowed that I would never reply to anything said in here by the honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons). I happened to be Minister of Labour and Community Services in 1976 when we came into office. The honourable Member for St. James South — I was his boss at the time — was attached to it as — you gave a fancy name — Youth Director, Counsellor or something

so, to the Prime Minister. Some big long title you gave him at the time, and there was not a single thing, for all the time he was working with the Party that he now belongs to, on a single file in there that could relate to youth affairs in this country. I have no respect, no regard, for anything he has ever said.

He toys with a group in St. James under the guidance of other people in St. James, but he is the show-piece. I would not deal with his activities in that particular group now, I will deal with it on public platforms and say some things about him and the group and Maple Club that he can go to all the law courts in the world for me.

It is not fair for the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) to say that it is downgraded. There is no truth in that. The officers are now going to be known as Cultural Officers, so when you see in here 7 and 5 and 3, nobody is sending home anybody, and nobody is opting not to go into anything. There is no truth in that. There has been no increase, and there is no decrease, in the staff which was in the Community Development Service, but we have now brought them all together and rescheduled their duties and given them different titles. That is all it is.

Sometimes this youth business bothers me. I heard the President of the Youth Council or something talking about "no political interference". The whole Youth Council was organised as a political arm of the Democratic Labour Party by the former Senator Hunte, with Cleveland Mayers and a lot of old fowls that you ran eventually.

The name Cleveland Mayers could not be an MP. That name does not sound right. You can call a man named Mr. Beckett as a footballer or cricketer. Certain names suit certain people. Cleveland Mayers, yes, in the airline, but not an MP!

And the name Hunte, Senator Hunte! Every single meeting Hunte was at addressing, all you could hear were the wonderful things — as you quite rightly said that we are now doing — that were being done at the time, that gave Senator Hunte the whole idea that he could be a candidate and get water-washed.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: By nine? Why is he not in here then? Do you think you have to get 9 000 votes to beat somebody to get in here? I have some here on my side with a bus load who sometimes have me a bit nervous, I must confess, and not any maxi-bus either, no Seddon... A minibus load sometimes does have me a little concerned, but you have had it on that side too, so there is nothing wrong with that.
1.25 p.m.

However, Sir, nobody is downgrading the Community Development Officers.

The honourable Member said just now that he told us about staff when we came down in March 1983. We are only back here now for money to pay the staff, and to set it up and keep it going. This \$220 000 really has.....

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: No. That is not the reason.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You may only see culture as it is at Crop Over time. The Ministry of Culture sees it as a way of life. You see it at Crop Over time when you have an opportunity of selling some fish cakes and snow cones in the Harbour Road. We see it as an every day thing, as a way of life for Barbadians.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is why you all push down the snow cone man.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And he is still alive?

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is a large snow cone man.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What did you tell us when we came down here? We came down here to have an Act of Parliament passed. We brought the Bill down here, and it became an Act of Parliament. This was in March....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, if the honourable Member would give way.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It was gazetted in March, 1983.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, if the honourable Member would give way. I think he has been misinformed.

When they came down here, they came down here with a Bill that set out the staff of the Cultural Foundation. It had an Executive Secretary and two typists. You have now come back with 76 persons. As opposed to three in March, 1983, in January 1984, you now come for 76 persons. That is different.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Do not ask me about any staff. Do you expect to run a cultural foundation with an executive secretary, a maid and two typists?

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You would have to get staff at some time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We are now appointing the staff.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your explanation was taken. Please continue.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: You introduced it.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We have the Bill here. It does not have anything about staff. It only mentions three people.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Read it.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: It does not have anything about staff.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Apparently you are a bad legal adviser. Who misled him then?)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Nobody cannot mislead me about anything. The honourable Member got up and made this fuss on the floor in his speech, saying that he told us so and we have now come back. There is nothing in this. What we came here to you for was to have the Bill passed.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Take that note.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You did not tell us what to put in.

I beg to move, Sir, that Head 38 do now stand part.....

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, no, no, no, no. No. No tricks here this morning.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: and in so doing, Mr. Chairman,.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,.....

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Point of order.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member did not indicate that he has a point of order. Please take your seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: In so doing, Mr. Chairman, I personally do not -

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: The honourable Member cannot at this point move the passing of this Resolution.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: He can, at any time.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. Please, please!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: At any time! As long as I am in here as a Minister, I can move the passing of anything at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I will teach you one or two things, rather than your talking nonsense, about parliamentary procedure.

I heard just now that there were sixteen community centres, each manned by three officers, and two aides and a maid at fifteen of the community centres, plus the staff from Culture. How are we downgrading these persons, as has been complained of? All that we are really doing is taking the Community Development Service and integrating it into one department, known as the National Cultural Foundation, with certain responsibilities. That is the whole crux of the matter. I really do not see what is this lot of debate over something which is straightforward.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir,.....

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am going to put the guillotine on you.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both honourable Members.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, let him put me in GIS. That would be enough for me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Put you in GIS! Waste the taxpayers' money!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Put me in either one of the publications of the Government Information Service and I would get enough publicity.

The point I want to make is that the honourable Member who just sat down said he does not know what the debate is about, he has only now come back to staff.

The honourable Member, himself, introduced the Bill in March, and here is what he said:

"Today, we are dealing with a Bill to establish a cultural foundation, which comes out of the Ministry of Information and Culture. The foundation, primarily, is set up for the purpose of looking after a number of things, as the Bill will obviously

spell out, rather than having the Ministry itself doing the day-to-day administration of the Foundation."

Then, later on he said:

"The Foundation is going to be managed by a Board of Directors,".

Then he went on to say the Bill is set out to take care of the theatres; all the necessary equipment and so on which is rather expensive in these days; to raise funds where funds are to be raised and to disburse the funds where they are to be disbursed. And it had provisions in the Bill for the full staff of an executive secretary and two typists. Now, he comes down here for 76 people, saying he does not know what the debate is about.

Let me tell you what the debate is about. The debate is about, first of all, the Government is confused. It does not know what it is doing. Far from the information which you gave to my honourable colleague being accurate, the fact is that a number of the officers who are now civil servants have opted not to go to the Foundation, because within the Foundation they will not be covered by the ambit of protection which is given, through Service Commission, for civil servants.

Furthermore, these 76 persons will not be appointed by the Public Service Commission. They are going to be appointed at the whim and fancy of the Minister responsible for Culture. And if past experience is any guide.....

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: They will be appointed like how the staff of CBC was appointed.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The same man appointed them, so it is all right. If past experience is any guide, what we are going to have is a number of.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir: Are you saying that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A Member is on a point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You cannot get a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The honourable Member, your point of order, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Are you saying that the Foundation is going to appoint some 76 persons? Is that what you said just now? I want to get him quite clear, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that, during the last few months, there has been

tremendous pressure put on persons who now work in the Department of Culture of the Ministry of Information and Culture to get those persons to opt to go over to this new organism that is being created. Those persons have resisted the Minister. As a matter of fact, the Director went on vacation while the Minister was away. Now the Minister has come back, a whole new ball game has started.

I do not really wish to go into certain aspects of what has been going on in that department. What is important is that what my colleague said is valid. There are large numbers of persons now working in that Ministry who are afraid that what will happen to them is that, having not assisted the Minister and the Government in their design, those persons are now going to be dealt with in a manner that other similar persons in that department have been dealt with. There are persons in that department who have lost their jobs in a manner that is open to very serious question, given the provisions of the Laws of Barbados. But that is another story, which we will have to deal with when the time comes for that.

The Minister responsible for Culture, therefore, and this is the gravamen of my point, now comes for \$220 339 to meet personal emoluments, Board of Directors' fees and other costs – a very strange approach to Parliament. I do not believe that I have ever seen this phrase "Board of Directors fees" in any piece of parliamentary legislation since I have been in here. That is indicative of the kind of methodology which is going to be used in this new, so-called Foundation.
1.35 p.m.

I wish that the honourable Member who is seeking to get this money will get his facts straight and come back to this Honourable Chamber and tell us precisely how this department is envisaged to be run, because it cannot now be the same thing that is on pages 2857 and 2858 of the Parliamentary Debate of March 1983. I am charging that this is a propaganda arm that is designed to assist the Government in its electoral process. I am saying, furthermore, that the process has already begun, and that the Government Information Service and CBC are being misused by the Government in its quest for re-elections whenever the time comes, if they decide to have elections at all in this country.

There is one other point I want to make to substantiate my contention. Mr. Chairman, if you, Sir, had been paying attention to NIFCA, the National Independence Festival of Creative Arts, which was created at the time when we had the honour to be the Government of this country, if you had been paying attention to the progress which had been made in the development of that festival, you will have noticed that for the last four years in general, but more particularly the last two years, that

particular festival has been reduced considerably. As a matter of fact, I think that since the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) stopped being the Minister responsible for NIFCA, we have seen a diminution of the participation of the population of this country in that festival of creative arts, we have seen a change in the focus, until it reached its nadir in 1983, when the only reason one believes that a National Independence Festival of Creative Arts was on would be the continuous and monotonous advertisement that was run on CBC, with a note at the end that was jarring and offensive. A few school children formed the bulk of the National Independence Festival of Creative Arts in 1983 – and all of that, Sir, when we have spent more money in that department.

We have made more money available for culture in Barbados in the last three years than we have made in the seven years before. But we have had less results in those three years. The reason is, that whereas the money is being allocated for culture, it is being used for other purposes – other legitimate purposes as perceived by the Minister, but, I say, purposes that were not contemplated within the context of the Ministry.

I go further. Unless the people become alive to the methodology which is being used by this Germanic approach to propaganda, we are going to wake up in this country one morning and discover that we have succumbed to a dictatorship, without anybody having to lift a single sword. We are going to discover that, first, we have a dictatorship of ideas – and after the dictatorship of ideas, we are going to continue to fool ourselves that we have a constitutional Government. Then, it would be too far gone, and all the persons who ought to have done something would beat their breasts and say, "If we had known better, we would have not allowed this to occur."

We see it in certain repetition of certain programmes on a continuing basis. I invite you, Sir, to analyse a programme called *Civic File*. Take any ten of those programmes, put them together and analyse them, and see to what extent there is an educational part, to what extent there is an informational part, and to what extent there is an attempt to sensitize the population in a certain direction. I invite you to listen to some of the programmes which can be heard in between programmes on the radio stations in Barbados, where certain statements, some of them non-factual, are being made from the Government Information Service, on the direction of the Minister.

What I am saying Mr. Chairman, is that some people are taking it very easy and saying, "It is only the Government Information Service." I believe that it is grand design; based on the performance of that Minister in this field before, one can only come to the

conclusion that this is a design by the Barbados Labour Party to ensure that it remains in power *ad infinitum*.....

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is saying *sotto voce* that we had a programme, and the title of the programme was "Your Cabinet Minister Speaks." It was designed by the same who has just embarrassed CBC. When you do the audit at CBC and discover what happened to the funds, then you will be able to understand that certain people do take initiatives in certain fields. I do not wish to go any further on that.

Mr. Chairman, the question which we have to ask ourselves — I see that my time is up now and I am trying to finish — is why, suddenly in 1984, it has been discovered that we need 76 persons, where in March, 1983, we only needed three, from the same Ministry. I would like an answer to that from the honourable gentleman over there.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, on this matter of the Cultural Foundation, I believe that it is but symbolic of the Barbados Labour Party's commitment to the cultural advancement of this country that the matter should have been introduced to Parliament by no other person than the honourable Member for St. James North.

Certain remarks made at this point by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I would like just to respond to two aspects of the two speeches which the honourable Member made. In the first speech, the general trend of his speaking was to suggest to the public of Barbados that at the end of the day, all of us are one. I want to make it quite clear that I do not subscribe to that view. We may have started from the same genetic stock, but somewhere along the line there has been, and there is, a distinct cleavage on cultural and moral grounds within the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party.
1.45 p.m.

The Democratic Labour Party is committed to the positive aspects of the cultural traditions of Barbados. It is committed to a way of life that is founded on moral and ethical principles. These are the cultural considerations that inform the policy decisions of the Democratic Labour Party. They are the kinds of considerations which would lead us to reject any situation where a cultural foundation can be established a few weeks before Government plans to bring legislation before this Parliament for the introduction of casino gambling in this country.

We are going to insist at this time that this Foundation should not be used as a cover or a depository for the illicit funds derived from casino gambling. I want to make this point very clear, well, in advance, that we are going to oppose it if, as in the past, attempts have been made to make use of cultural groups in Barbados in the area of sports — sport is culture, Sir — to graft on to it amoral activities in this country under the grounds that the proceeds from such amoral activities would help promote culture in Barbados. I want to say very clearly on the floor of this House that our ethical and moral position makes it very clear that we will support nothing of the kind.

We regard the culture of Barbados not only as a manifestation of the arts. We do not regard it merely as paintings, dancing, theatre and so on. We see culture in Barbados as an embodiment of the specific traditions of this country, whether it be in the legal profession, whether it be in the carpenter's trade, whether it be in the mason's trade, whether it be in the medical profession. All of us, in whatever walk of life, are all part of the culture of Barbados.

Any political party that sets out as an instrument of policy to undermine the cultural traditions of this country, as the Barbados Labour Party has done in many of its policy positions taken over the years, is not in a position to come in here and criticise anyone on the grounds of culture. You find in Barbados today that many young people are lost, and they are lost because they see the cultural traditions of the country being eroded. They see a political leadership not informed by any moral or spiritual considerations, but concerned only with the acquisition of dollars to line the pockets of their membership, irrespective of what damage they do to any aspect of the community of this country.

That is the great cultural departure, Sir, and there could never be any point in that respect at which we on this side will meet with those on that side.

When we think of a Cultural Foundation in Barbados, we see this as an opportunity for cementing the cultural value systems which have not only been a cohesive force in this society over the years, but have been an important vehicle in the developmental process in Barbados.

Let it be clearly understood: we do not develop by the borrowing of money, we do not develop only by fiscal assets. Culture is an important and vital vehicle for the physical, human and spiritual development of the totality of the society, and it has to be rooted, if it is going to go in a positive direction, in fundamental, moral and ethical positions. The moment you depart from that, from leadership level, whether it be in this Parliament, at executive level, in the professions, in the trades, then you

are damaging this society, probably permanently, and you introduce a change that is prominent and for the worse.

I was most impressed at the State Funeral by the call made by Canon Ivor Jones in that particular direction. He was touching on a note in respect of the leadership of this country where many people, particularly those in the Barbados Labour Party are prepared to reject all those great and noble traditions which have brought this country out of what it was before and have projected it over a number of years. They are prepared to reject that on the altar of a few pieces of silver.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the honourable Member is also one of the leaders of this country.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not in an executive position. I stated my position from the time I came into this Honourable House on matters of morals and ethics. Indeed, the Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) has on at least two or three occasions accused me of taking too moralistic a position in relation to public affairs. But I understood the circumstances in which he was making the accusation. They were specific circumstances.

What we see prevalent in the Barbados Labour Party at the moment is that they fail to understand that there are cultural traditions in Barbados which must be linked to moral positions. These people are talking about culture. A major aspect of culture in Barbados is the attitudes of people to their bodies, to their spiritual welfare, whether it be in the church, whether it be in the doctor's office, or whatever. People in Barbados are fundamentally concerned with their spiritual and physical persons, and, indeed, that probably represents the most personalised form of culture. Whether they express it in terms of dancing, in terms of enjoyment of paintings, in terms of playing cricket or whatever, the point is that it is the integrity of the human spirit and the human person that is the final determinant of what culture flows from and whereto it flows.

They are prepared to allow the sick human bodies in Barbados to be used as fodder for a bunch of crooks in return for a few dollars in the pockets of a few people in the Barbados Labour Party. I refer to the St. George's Medical School which is being promoted by the Barbados Labour Party.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, he has to withdraw that. He cannot point over here and say that, otherwise he would have to provide particulars. If not, we will get up in here and say many things about him.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I want to look at another aspect of this cultural foundation. Can you imagine that

they are coming in here for a supplement that is almost twice as big as the original allocation that they came for only a few months ago? Another clear example of gross financial mismanagement! What kind of management is this?

1.55 p.m.

We have seen this whole business of culture being abused and misused by the Barbados Labour Party in the past. Up to today, there has been no proper accounting on the \$20 million spent on CARIFESTA for the promotion of a Barbados Labour Party victory in 1981. Indeed, I go further and say that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has already been dealt with in this House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The money was spent before. All the preparations were made for CARIFESTA before the elections. About \$14 million was spent before the elections, and the other \$6 million after the elections.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: My time is up? I did not speak for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can come back again.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will be coming back, too. There must be an end to this kind of crookedness in Barbados.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We have surely started on a note that I am not particularly happy about, a personal attack on me about how I am an expert on parliamentary vulgarity and morality and integrity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That was withdrawn and I cannot entertain a debate on that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It was withdrawn, Sir, I know that. The Members on that side were condemned in this country on the ground of morality. Do you remember the West Indian Hospital Sweeps? You talk about gambling? You see these tickets? During his tenure of office, he gave a Member of Parliament in here on the back bench, Mr. Patsy Springer, licence to rape this country of millions of dollars. Not a single cent went into the Treasury of this country. And you talk about casino gambling and the morality!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Cultural Foundation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Dems won the first prize, the Dems won the second prize, the Dems won the third prize. On top of that, even when Mr. Springer was no longer a member, do you know that they changed the manager? And you know who became the Manager? A man who just had a fire, Joseph "Happy" Leroy Bryan, a man who contested a seat against the Prime Minister, again a DLP supporter. And you talk about corruption and morality!

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. James North and the honourable Member for St. Michael West were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader can continue with the subventions to cultural organisations. I will entertain that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am going to defend over here; I am going to defend it stubbornly, too.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition will recall the days when he wanted to take up a paper weight in here — you talk about culture, integrity and morality — and hit Mr. Freddie Miller with it, and give the Speaker a cuff in his face outside; all of these things. This is what he brought Parliament to, threatening the present Marshal in here.

He told Lloyd Smith on the floor of the House he would kick him to the moon, and Joy Edwards; then he told the late Sir Grantley Adams that he would kick him in his backside. We did not hear about morality and integrity, then. A nuisance like you!

You talk about gambling? Look here, documentary evidence, rape, under the guise that they would give the Queen Elizabeth Hospital money. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to get up and say how much money, during his tenure as Minister of Finance, the West Indies Hospital Sweeps gave to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Get up and tell us which part of that was handed over, because it is printed here.

I do not know why, when you have a parliamentary meeting, you do not tell them to be careful of what they speak, that they have sharpshooters over here. You should warn them at your parliamentary group meetings to be careful about what they are saying. Tell them to be like you. You do not come out of your crease unless you have good shots to make.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The National Cultural Foundation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: All of this is the culture of the country.

At that time, the Member for St. Michael South Central was renting Sir Garfield Sober's flat. You are talking about culture and so on? I know you backwards. You talk about the Medical School. The St. George Medical School should not want him. He talked out his patients' business on the public platforms. He spoke about my colleague, his brother-in-law. He went on a platform and said what he did to me and for me. As a medical man, you should hang your head in shame.

You do not want the St. George Medical School! What is wrong is that you cannot get into the action. They have you barred out of US \$200 an hour. That is what you are quarrelling about, a money lender like you, a dealer in drugs, prescribing them; inside your own place you have a drug store selling the drugs, at Delaware Clinic; you, a drug dealer!

Sir, I beg to move that Head 38 stand part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This debate is totally irrelevant.
2.05 p.m.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Chairman, I really cannot let the debate.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable Member winding up?

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not know, Sir. I will have to consult the Leader of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Any Minister can wind up. You used to be a Cabinet Minister at one time?

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Not in here.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is true.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the debate has taken a very peculiar turn, and has degenerated in a lot of demagoguery and acrimony. The Democratic Labour Party must make up its mind about whether it is supporting cultural development in this country or not. A National Cultural Foundation was proposed by the then Ministry of Education and Culture in 1978, and it was included in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party in 1981.

I had the good or bad fortune to have been the author of the concept of the National Cultural Foundation in this country to deliver whatever cultural service was required for the citizens of this community. We felt that, in line with developments in many other parts of the world, a statutory private group should be responsible for culture and the development of the arts. It is the type of

activity that fits naturally into a private organisation rather than in the mainstream of governmental planning, and therefore the establishment of this foundation is not at all related to many of the more lurid details or purposes articulated by members of the Opposition. I think it is a little bit of shameless effrontery that the honourable Members on the other side, who have done nothing at all to come out with a well-formulated cultural development policy in this country, can make the kind of attacks that they have made in here today.

A Ministry of Culture was established in this country, for the first time, in 1977. After fifteen years of Democratic Labour Party control of Government in this country, there was not a division or a Ministry of Culture established in this country. I think it was in 1975, they did in fact set up a desk in the Ministry of Education with two officers, a typist and a dancer, but that was the sum contribution of the Democratic Labour Party to the Government's role in the development of arts and culture on a regular basis in this country.

A lot has happened in the last seven years, Mr. Chairman. Not only has a full-fledged Ministry of Culture been established, but there is a move now to set up a number of cultural-oriented groups out of the community, that interact among each other and with the Government and with other private organisations.

We hear words by the archbishop of Philistinism, and I refer to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes). In these days when everybody is concerned about material development and material progress, it is very easy for cultural development to be pushed aside, and particularly in an era such as this, which is a period of austerity and economic difficulty. The first casualties, when there is a cutback on governmental expenditure, is in the area of non-productive activity in Government, and culture in this country in my view, and I will continue to submit, has been starved of funding, both at the governmental and non-governmental level.

Everyone knows, or one would expect so — but hearing some of the fulminations of the honourable members of the Opposition we really are in some difficulty understanding whether they perceive these things — that there cannot be any real social progress in the community unless emphasis is placed on the development of the spiritual and the cultural. A society that disregards that aspect of its being is a society that is heading for disaster.

I have had the good fortune to be a student of Classics, and it has given me a good opportunity to look at two total civilisations and see the impact of adherence to the aesthetic to the development of the mind, or what Professor Rex Nettleford calls 'the product of the

creative intellect." I had an admirable opportunity to see the difference between different civilisations and different societies that appreciated the work of cultural development and a cultural perspective in overall national development, and I have seen the society that did not adhere to that type of principle.

When one looks at classical Greek history, you can see the differences between the development of the nation state in Athens, for instance, and the development of the state of Sparta, two communities; one that was entirely materialistic, that is Sparta, and military, with no thought or feeling or sensitivity towards the aesthetic, the beautiful and the finer aspects of man's nature, and the Athenian society where there was a strong commitment to the development of Arts, art, culture and literature, architecture — the works. We are at the stage of our development in Barbados where we cannot easily ignore that important aspect of our development.

It is important, too, that we get into the question of funding to realise that it is impossible and difficult for the Government to provide all the funds necessary for cultural development in this country. There are cultural foundations all over the world, private foundations and some semi-government foundations that are set up and are heavily endowed by private benefactors, and this is the general rule in cultural development in most countries of the world, particularly the countries in the western world. We have a very unfortunate situation in Barbados where private enterprise and wealthy private individuals, taking the cue from the Opposition, who show this unreasoning hostility to cultural development, and will not pull their pockets to assist in the type of development we are talking about.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) is fretting again. Anytime you make a valid point, he frets. The honourable Member got in here today and said that the policies of the cultural foundation are Germanic propaganda. I think that is totally unworthy of the honourable Member.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member would give way; I said that the Ministry, not the Cultural Foundation, was manifesting Germanic tendencies in its propaganda machinery.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not know how the honourable Member is going to separate the Ministry from one of the statutory bodies under the control of the Minister, but I am not interested in getting into these specious points. I thought that the level of debate was sufficiently low that somebody should try to raise it.

Mr. Chairman, we are on the question of funding. It is imperative that private businesses in Barbados, and private individuals with means, conceive it as part of

their duty of citizenship in this country to make endowments and a contribution of funds to cultural activity in this country. It is not the type of activity that one should leave entirely to the Government. But the Government has multiplied by 10 000 per cent in the last six years the amount of money that is being spent on culture in this country.

I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, who I consider the arch-Philistine. You know, Matthew Arnold, the old English essayist, wrote long ago in his book "Culture and Anarchy" about the devastating cancer that a society faces, and it moves towards anarchy when there is a super-abundance of Philistines, such as the honourable Members for St. Michael West and St. Michael South Central, while the community is starved of culture. I recommend that as useful reading, although it is a bit outdated, to the honourable Members on the other side.
2.15 p.m.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Did you call me a Philistine?)

Hon. L. R. TULL: You are a Philistine, man. You know that, too.

I hear about CARIFESTA all the time. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has got a bee in his bonnet about CARIFESTA.

Let me say, as I have said over and over again, they did not spend enough money on CARIFESTA. That is my view. The Minister of Finance can argue with it. If we are going to be serious about the development of that aspect of our life in this country, we have to find the money and spend it. They find it to spend in other areas.

The strength of this country and the building of our national character were based not on the productive areas of our economy. It is the schools and religion and the inculcation in the people of this country of the eternal verities, truth, justice, honour and dignity, the things that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would not know anything about, but those are the things that make this country great. And culture is, in essence, the culmination of all those virtues I talked about.

Before I deal with the questions raised in respect of the establishment, because I am sure that the honourable Members do not believe what they are saying, I want to reiterate the point that the Ministry of Culture, from its very inception, in 1977, has concerned itself with the interest and development of the school children as its primary target.

We have given a large number of scholarships to people in the areas of the Arts, in dance, literature, drama. These people, as a result of the training they got both

locally and overseas, are now moving through all of the schools, particularly the primary schools, to help them along towards the goal which we have set ourselves.

We have also removed the traditional idea of culture as a privilege of the few, the privilege of the elite, and we have democratized culture in a way that was not conceivable in this country seven or eight years ago. The national festivals in this country are no longer the tea parties and the Green Room Theatre kind of stuff that was so much a characteristic of the Democratic Labour Party's regime. When they are out in the streets in their large numbers, participating, improvising and creating, they are doing that in an environment created by a Government that had a vision, an understanding of where this country should be going.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: And wearing three piece suits.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: I hear they used to have a Crop Over Festival. They used to have some ladies of gentility who would wear some fine clothes and drive with flowers through Bridgetown and titillate the tourists. That was the conception of the Democratic Labour Party of what was cultural. They would dress up a few gentle ladies in some fancy finery, put a donkey cart with a lot of flowers on it, and a man with a top hat and tails, and drive through Bridgetown. That is how they sought to bastardize Barbadian culture.

Now that they are confronted with something that is intrinsic, something deep in the character of the Barbadian people, and which has won popular acclaim, they cannot handle it.

They said that Barbadians could not make calypsoes. They said that Barbadians could not sing calypsoes. They said that Barbadians could not jump up in the streets. That is what the Democratic Labour Party told us, that it was not in our character. I know the hottest thing going in Sparrow's tent is Gabby. And they said we could not do it.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: We have not banned "Boots".)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Do not worry about "Boots". "Boots" is the theme song of the Barbados Labour Party. Go out there and talk about "Boots" and see if somebody does not hang you.

Laughter

Hon. L. R. TULL: "Boots" is the theme song of the Barbados Labour Party. You did not think that within a few months of "Boots" you would have seen the beneficial effect of the song. Take that!

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Play it on CBC tonight, words and music, and you are a man.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: If I were the Minister who had anything to do with it, I would tell them to do so, but I stay in my little corner of the globe.

I know that when the Democratic Labour Party was the Government of this country, and they had a song called, "Mr. B", in the same vein as "Mr. T", you would never hear it on CBC. I could bet my life on that. Mr. "B" has kept quiet about that, because he knows that that is true. He was not going to entertain that kind of thing.

I cannot bother to go on. I made the point I wanted to make. I do not think I am getting through to an Opposition Party whose mind is so closed to anything that is reasonable.

What the honourable Member for St. Michael West got in here and said today, that foolishness that you are setting up a national foundation for culture as a propaganda instrument for the Barbados Labour Party, all that nonsense is unworthy of him. I know that he knows better. The honourable Member must not emulate his less honourable colleague for St. Michael South Central.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: You should not say so.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: He is less honourable than you. Do not tell me I cannot say that. You cannot tell me "Do not say that." I am an expert on that. He is less honourable than you are. Take the compliment and keep quiet.

I was amazed to hear him degenerate into all the demagoguery and foolish comments about propagandizing a Ministry of Culture. A Ministry of Culture and a national foundation of culture is inherently a propaganda agency. Do not put up your hands. It does not disseminate propaganda for the Barbados Labour Party, it disseminates information and details about culture in the community. That is the role of the foundation for national culture.

So to use this *ad hominem* argument, because that is the most unworthy part of the contribution of the honourable Member, is to use the opportunity on an important piece of legislation, vital to the integrity of this Barbadian community, to make a personal attack on the Minister of Information, I consider that beneath contempt. It is part of our cultural tradition not to hit a man behind his back.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: I believe the honourable Member is transgressing the Rules. He said that my speech, which was approved by the Chair, was a personal attack on a Minister. Apart from it not being true, it would be an insult to the Chair. It is not true. I did not attack anybody personally.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is saying he did not make a personal attack on the Minister of Information and Culture. Please continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Unlike him, Sir, I do not run after that.

I am going to wind up. I believe that I have made most of the points I wanted to make. I believe very deeply in the importance of culture to national development. To me, this is not a political thing.
2.25 p.m.

I feel very deeply, it is almost an article of faith with me, that you cannot have any useful social development in any community in the world unless the right amount of emphasis is put on the development of one's culture and the development of one's personal and national identity.

I support this Resolution.

Hon L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that Head 38 stand part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have had the motion already, and had already settled it. Are we going to report progress?

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot put that question.

Hon L. S. CRAIG: That Head 41 stand part?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 38 stand part.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is what I said, Sir, that Head 38 stand part. It was seconded by my colleague on my right.

The question that Head 38 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 41 – CIVIL AVIATION – \$445 124

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

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

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You^o do not have to eat today. Nobody has to eat today. I can talk for the rest of the week.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Head 41 Sir — Civil Aviation and Tourism — General Administration, Air Traffic Control Services. This is the one, I take it, that we are looking for some money.....

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Oh! I see, very well Sir.

The question that Head 41 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Money Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUSPENSION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 3.30 this afternoon for lunch.

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.

2.35 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Item No. 4, Sir.

ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 4 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify the definition of maxi-taxi, which is a new inclusion in the roster of public service vehicles.

At present, we have a problem where vehicles designated to wear the licence tag 'Z' have been plying the routes as minibuses, and this was not the intention when that category of public service vehicle was established.

The purpose of this amendment is to set it out in law in such a way that it will now be illegal for "Z" vans, better known as maxi-taxis, to ply on the highways in a way that a minibus is permitted to ply.

I move, Sir, that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I rise to second the motion and to make a brief comment in relation to the minibuses. One may say they are my whipping horses.

I would like to commend the Minibus Association for the efforts it is making to fall in line with my views. You will probably recall that I have been a very strong critic of the conduct of the minibus drivers, their attire and so on, and I can safely say that I have seen a marked improvement.

The criticism which I have been making on the floor of the House is, no doubt, paying off. It was always in the interest of the operators, the drivers, the commuters, pedestrians and other users of the highways in Barbados. There are still a few loopholes which no doubt will be cleared up, and I am glad to hear that they are having talks with the Minister of Transport and Works and with the Commissioner of Police.

Sometimes people see criticism as being ridicule of people. I thrive on criticism. When I am criticised for doing something, I set out to do a little better. I say that is constructive criticism.

There is a marked improvement in their attire and their conduct on the road, but there is still quite a bit more to be done. I look forward to being able to salute them on the floor of the House when I am satisfied as a Barbadian, not that I am here to judge people, with the standards which I know they are capable of maintaining in the eyes of the public.

I have great pleasure in seconding the motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this amendment in itself does not excite a great deal of debate, and therefore one will not question the wisdom of a definition of maxi-taxi, though one may question the efficacy of the term used.

What I rise to do is to express my profound regret that the Minister on this occasion is able so easily to forget a solemn promise made to this Honourable Chamber. A couple of months ago, we were inveighed not to engage in a long acrimonious debate on the whole question of the Road Traffic Act, 1981, and the Minister gave this Honourable Chamber his word that the Regulations for the 1981 Act would come before the end of 1983.

I believe that all of us who have participated in the administration of Government will know that a Minister can, from time to time, make a commitment in good faith and then the exigencies of the circumstances, or the vagaries of administration, would cause him not to be able to fulfil that commitment. But nothing will excuse him for the manner in which, in the introduction of this measure, he failed to grasp the opportunity to explain why he has given us his word as a Minister of Government and then has not kept it, and does not, apparently, feel it necessary to explain it to us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when one is calling for regulations, one is not calling for those regulations on the basis of any partisan position. You will recall that when we last called for the regulations, or the time before that, about six months ago, that it was the Prime Minister himself....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have allowed the honourable Member to have a say, but it seems as if the honourable Member intends to debate the conduct of the Minister. I would prefer that to be done by a censure motion than in a debate on the Road Traffic Act. If the honourable Member would deal with this particular amendment to the Road Traffic Act, I would be very happy.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As Your Honour wishes, Sir. I am sorry if it may appear as if I am censuring the Minister, because I do not believe that I am ready yet to bring a censure motion against that particular Minister on this particular issue. What I am dealing with is that here it is we have before us another piece of legislation which would further complicate and confuse those who have to use the roads.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I understand it, the gravamen of your argument is that on a previous occasion the Minister promised that he would make a full statement to the House on road traffic matters, and asked not to have a debate at that time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: A little more than that, Sir. That notwithstanding, he indicated that the Road Traffic Regulations would be here by the end of 1983.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I agree with you. Your debate now is about the non-production of the necessary document by the Minister, and why he is still introducing other major bits of legislation in respect of the substantive law. My ruling on that is that you are really dealing with the Minister in respect of his response to Parliament and, therefore, you should take that up under another measure rather than dealing with it under the amendment today.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I take your point, and as Your Honour rules I understand and accept what Your Honour

is saying. What I would crave Your Honour's indulgence to be able to do is to demonstrate that, indeed, the very amendment which we are now debating is going to create further problems in the absence of proper regulations.

Now, Sir, we have a maxi-taxi being defined. Basically, that is what this amendment is about. It seeks to insert in respect of public service vehicles a new category of vehicle, as it were. We already have a large amount of confusion as to the various categories of vehicles in relation to what they may or may not do, what they can or cannot do, in terms of the necessary regulations, because as Your Honour would remember, we are currently operating, and this amendment will be forced to operate, within the context of the old regulations. It is bound, except for those with a keen interest and a keen knowledge of the system, to create further difficulties on the roads of Barbados.

I am suggesting to the Minister that when legislation is being brought to this Honourable Chamber and it is being introduced, and here I am dealing with the introduction of this piece of legislation, I think that this Honourable House is entitled to all of the circumstances and ramifications surrounding the necessity to bring the particular piece of legislation. I am saying to the Minister — and to that extent, if I am admonishing him, then I may be said to be censuring him, but I am censuring him on this particular piece of legislation — that it would seem to me that the Minister owes it to this Chamber to say, "I know that I said to you I was bringing the regulations, but the following circumstances have made it necessary for me to bring this piece of legislation in advance of those". Instead, he gets up and he says this is to define a new category of vehicle, a maxi-taxi, and sits down.

That is not good enough when you are sitting on the front bench, or even if you were sitting on the back bench. It is not good enough to me to have heard two Ministers speak on this issue.....

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Come out of the sun now).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Now, Sir, *sotto voce* he is not even showing the necessary and requisite amount of humility. He is there now demonstrating in the typical arrogance which I have perceived coming from that quarter of the front bench. He is there now admonishing me that I ought not to speak on these matters.
3.45 p.m.

I believe that the whole question of parliamentary integrity requires that when a Minister gives us his word on matters so important as Road Traffic Regulations, we can take his word. When, for example, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John), the Deputy Prime Minister, says that he will do

something, whatever else we may feel over here, we accept that we can rely on that, and so we can go and tell our constituents that in the due course of time these things will happen. The honourable Minister will have, I hope, the good sense to correct the error that was committed while introducing this.

I think that the maxi-taxi operation itself requires some consideration.

Asides

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. James North knows that Standing Order 33 (6) says that an honourable Member must be heard in silence.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, some of the persons who ply these maxi-taxis have recently come in for criticism because they have had 'Airport Taxi' imprinted on the maxi-taxi and then have found themselves waiting in line at the Harbour. I noticed recently that there has been some criticism of those persons who come from the airport to ply their trade at the Harbour.

So far as I know, there are no regulations which preclude a taxi, or now a maxi-taxi, from operating in either of the jurisdictions if he has authority to ply his trade in one. I do not know that you have to have two vehicles in order to operate at both the port and the airport. I would like to hear what is the Government's policy on that, and if, in fact, it is wrong.

Certainly, some of my constituents, who have had great difficulty making a living in the last few months, or the last year, in this business of running a taxi, have had to leave the airport and come down to the Port to see if they can get some kind of traffic. Things have not been particularly bright. Again, I would like to hear the Minister on this.

I know that the airport shops and the Harbour shops are defined differently, and I am not sure that the maxi-taxis operating at the airport are different from the maxi-taxis operating in the Harbour. I would like to have the Minister, indeed, explain whether there is a policy of giving a specific set of taxis the right to operate in the airport, excluding those taxis operating in the Harbour, and vice versa.

The other question, which perhaps Your Honour may rule to be in detail, but which, in terms of the policy of this Act, I would like to get some guidance on, is the whole question of the size and the construction.

The Bill says more than five passengers and less than ten, and I would like the Minister to indicate what is the basis of calculation on which he agreed to a maxi-taxi being at the upper limit of ten rather than twelve.

My understanding is that there are some vehicles, which fall into the category at the moment of what is being described as a maxi-taxi, before this parliamentary definition, which carry twelve passengers. If, indeed, that is so, it means that fixing a limit at ten is going to create a further hardship.

I want to know if there is a particular policy relating to this decision to make maxi-taxis of a certain kind. Does it mean, for example, that a person who has a vehicle that carries more than ten is unable to operate within the category of a maxi-taxi? Does it mean that if such a person so operates that that person would be liable under this particular Act?

My questions about the regulations was not related to his bringing the regulations *per se*, but wanting to know which regulations are going to apply to this amendment. This amendment does not say, but, since it incorporates itself into the 1981 Act, it follows that this amendment will operate under the old regulations.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: According to the logic of the law, they would not be. But the old regulations make no provision for a maxi-taxi, so you see, Sir, we are going to have a tremendous amount of problems.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking your indulgence just to read, I am not discussing the details of the Bill. It says here, in essence, if I remember, when the inserts have been made it means that persons who fail to do what this amendment says will have committed an offence. But the old regulations could have made provisions for a maxi-taxi, so I am curious to hear from the Minister how he would propose to prosecute someone who violates.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A Minister never prosecutes anyone. The honourable Member should be rather careful with his words.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Up until recently I was under the impression that the Attorney-General was the Minister in the Government that would handle these matters. But based on a certain statement alleged to have come from that department, I now do not know, in this particular dispensation, who prosecutes whom at what time. You may therefore forgive my indiscretion when I suggest that.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But I thought the Attorney-General used to be the Government's principal advisor and not prosecutor.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Oh, he used to be! Well that is a reasonable position. Treason and sedition, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I agree, so the honourable Member must rephrase his statement again.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Treason, sedition and piracy!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Piracy? Do you not know that in the taxi business there is piracy?

Sir, I think I have made the point. I hope that the Minister will appreciate that what I am trying to do is not to ridicule him, even though I censured his behaviour. I think he should recognise, if not he should seek advice on this matter, that to have brought yet another amendment to the 1981 Road Traffic Act, without bringing regulations, is to create further confusion in the state of the law with regard to the use of the roads in Barbados.

I say that on authority; not on my own authority, but because judicial notice has been taken of this lapse on the part of the Government. It is my recollection that the Chief Magistrate has commented quite adversely on this colossal failure on the part of the Government, and to the extent that the Minister can correct this gaping hole in the administrative system of law in this country, the Minister should seek to do so. I feel that the bringing of this amendment at this stage is a negation of his responsibility and duty in this regard.

I shall say no more, unless when he responds the Minister does not answer, effectively and adequately, the points which I have raised, after which I shall have to deal with him when the Bill comes to the Committee stage, Sir.
3.55 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, a few comments made by the honourable Member who has just sat down has prompted me to speak for a short time on this Bill.

Honourable Members will recall that prior to the 1981-40 Act of the Laws of Barbados, the definition of "taxi" could be found nowhere in the Motor Vehicle and Road Traffic Act. One had to look under the Hackney Carriage Act to find it, because we were using the old English provisions for the definition of that class of vehicle which catered to public demand for the hire of a whole vehicle with a driver.

When we brought in the 1981-40 Act, after an examination of the *de facto* situation in Barbados, it was discovered that in addition to the traditional five-seater, since the energy crisis in 1973 in particular, a number of taxi proprietors had surreptitiously been using Volkswagon vans and their equivalent types from the United States of America or from Japan. So you had a series of volkswagon vans, a series of Dodge left-hand drive vans and you also had a series of Toyota — or Datsun — or Suzuki-type vehicles.

We decided, then, to follow some of the legislation which was in existence in the rest of the Caribbean in particular, and in some states of the United States, and recognise that the economics of the carriage of persons who wished to have a taxi, particularly from your main ports, would be such that we should allow a number greater than five. But we were in a dilemma — we did not wish to license a vehicle which would compete with the traditional Barbadian minibus. So you had to create a category of vehicle, a category of taxi which was smaller than a minibus but larger than a traditional five-seater. Therefore, the definition of taxi was expanded to include a number of vehicles capable of carrying more than five and less than ten. That is the origin of the amendment.

All of these vehicles were assigned a specific letter "Z". But in the usual Barbadian inventiveness, it struck many people that instead of using it as a traditional vehicle, it could well be used in competition with the minibus, just as the minibus drivers, who were originally assigned to a particular route, decided that they could compete with the buses. So we had to go back to the drawing board, so to speak, and find a definition which would suit the actual situation and would carry out the Government's original intention. The original intention was to allow taxis to carry a greater number of people, but the vehicles could only be used in the same circumstances as taxis.

Fundamental to the definition of a taxi in Barbados, and in many countries of the world, other than in certain city districts, is that you can only pick up passengers if you are called or if you have a specific request from people coming to you at a stand. You cannot roam all around, except you are specifically authorised, as is done in London, where a certain class of vehicle can roam all around and pick up a passenger. But the other thing is that when once you have a person, you are not allowed to pick up other people and put them down. That is all the law is, to make it abundantly clear.

Many of us held the view that, legally, they could be prosecuted when they competed with the minibuses, but the lawyers felt that it was not as clear a case as they would want it to be, and therefore they decided in their minds that they would change the definition in such a way as to categorise it very clearly. The Government took their advice, and we now have it that there is a maxi-taxi, and, very clearly, we set out that they are not allowed to pick up and put down passengers as though they were minibuses. That is the whole object and origin of the law. We have it very clear now, so that we cannot hear people say that the Government is taking advantage of poor people and stopping them from earning a living. It is not a question of taking advantage of poor people and stopping them from earning a living, it is a question of trying to regulate the circumstances under which civilised people can earn a living.

The Ministry of Transport and Works is the agency that determines the carriage of people from the Port of Bridgetown. The Port of Bridgetown comes within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transport and Works. The airport comes within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Civil Aviation, and the Civil Aviation Act sets out very clearly that nobody can solicit any service at the airport except pursuant to permission granted by the Minister. In fact, we have a concession system at the airport.

At the Port in Bridgetown, there was never a concession system, except to the Port Authority within the Port. Outside of the Port itself, they have a call system. That has always been the law, and jealousy arises when a taxi at the Port, particularly those people who are earning their living mostly by staying at a stand, in the Lower Green or here opposite the Parliament Building, have to compete with outsiders. It was traditional that this group of taxi operators regarded the Port as their field, whereas the airport taxis were people who used to operate mostly on the south coast and the airport was nearer to them. This is where the origin of the difficulty is.

It is the intention, as I understand it, of the Government to limit the number of taxis, and certainly the consultations that have taken place between the Ministry of Tourism and the Ministry of Civil Aviation have been very clear. We have made our representations that there is no need for any more taxis in Barbados. The number of licences that have been issued was stabilised, as you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will recall, as long ago as 1980.

What has happened is that in the renewal of taxis, with the exception of those which are ten years and over and can take advantage of the duty free provisions which the Government has allowed, and the Development Bank loans, everybody who had an old taxi, but did not have it for ten years, when he is replacing it, he is replacing it by a Datsun or a Toyota van. They are cheaper than buying a comparable motor car and they can carry more, and also, until this amendment, it was possible to do a little dual purpose work with them — you have your taxi and you could compete with the minibus. That is how it is in Barbados. A Barbadian proprietor always has his head and his brain active to try and see how he can make a quicker buck. That is a fact of life, and that is the origin of the amendment.

I believe that in the future, when metering is introduced, because it is the Government's intention to meter taxis in Barbados — it is the one area in which we are not operating in the 20th Century — when metering is introduced, there will be a zone. Let us be very clear on it. You cannot have metering all over Barbados, you have to have a zone within which the metering will operate. Once you go outside of the zone, you will have to have

the per mile system, otherwise you will never be able to have what is called "an island tour" with a taxi, because in an island tour, they take you all around and you have to stop. So when metering is introduced, the ten seaters and the others will be able to come within this review.

Just the last thing. The reason why we are so confident on this point is that when we were amending the charges at the airport from the existing rates for five-seater taxis, we had to introduce a special rate, a surcharge on the basic rate to allow for the ten seaters. I believe it is 1¼. A ten seater can charge 1¼ of the existing fare, so if it is \$12 from the airport to Oistins, if you come in a ten seater, and you have more than five passengers, you can charge a quarter more so as to do it. The taxis, in their inventiveness, before that law was introduced, used to say that a taxi was 2½ cars, so if the fare was \$12, it was \$26 or \$27. We had a lot of problems in respect to that. This is an attempt to bring the law into a clear situation, bearing in mind our *de facto* position.

The Minister will reply in respect of the regulations, but I know that the honourable Member is not as great a critic of the tardiness of the regulations as I am. I am satisfied that all reasonable effort was made to get those Regulations in time for today, but they are bulky and they are a lot of them, and the Minister's department in Barbados does not have its own legal machinery. I know that tremendous efforts are being made to get the regulations ready. But he will tell you exactly what is the position. Cabinet also has to look at them.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am taking this opportunity, with your guidance, to draw to the Minister's attention, and that of the Minister of Labour as well, a situation that is existing which is dangerous and has been dangerous for a very long time.

We are into the reaping of the sugar crop and, regrettably, we are almost sure that we are going to have some fatalities this year on the roads resulting from the reaping of this crop, and we are almost sure that these fatalities will be the result of tractor/trailers coming down some hill. Nowhere in the amendments am I aware that the trailers that have now taken over the lorries....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is not permitted to go outside the Bill that is before the House. If you can satisfy me that tractors and trailers appear anywhere within this Bill, I will allow you to debate it. But if you cannot satisfy me on that —

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Clause 5.)

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: If you look at Clause 5, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Clause 5(i) has, "Tractor".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. Go ahead.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and if the Minister he has not already observed it, he should have it drawn to his attention, that most of the canes now are taken to factories by tractors and trailers, and you will be surprised to find that the majority of the tractors that are taking these trailers are in very bad condition. Some of them, if they have been tested, have not been tested very well. The braking system of them —

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is going outside what we are dealing with. I am prepared to allow you limited debate on factories in the context of Clause 5 of the Bill, but as soon as you move into inspections, *et cetera*, you fall completely outside of the Bill. You have gone into another section of the Road Traffic Act, and I will not allow that.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I would just like to invite the appropriate Ministry to have a look at the operation of tractors, the part they play in the sugar industry and their conduct on the road, and make sure that they do not contribute to any accidents in Barbados during this present crop season.

Thank you.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am grateful to the honourable Member for St. Michael West for his chastisement. I meant no disrespect to him. I think he is the only person who has taken affront to the fact that I introduced this Bill with only a very short preamble. I did so, Sir, because the amendment itself sets forth with a great deal of clarity what the purpose of the amendment was.

It is spelt out in very great detail that the central purpose of this amendment is to define precisely what a taxi is. A taxi is a vehicle that is licensed to carry five persons per hire. It sets out the meaning of a "maxi-taxi", which is a vehicle which is licensed to carry a maximum of ten persons per hire. Any vehicle, which is a public service vehicle, that is licensed to carry more than ten persons falls into the category of a "mini-bus", and therefore falls under a different set of schedules.

As a matter of fact, the whole purpose, as I mentioned briefly, was to hopefully end the practice where persons who operate "Z" vans, and these are those vans that are licensed to carry ten people, to stop them from carrying passengers for hire. They go into the bus stands display destination signs, and compete with the minibuses and Transport Board buses in a way that has been troubling not only to

us in the Ministry, but to the Minibus Association, which has made very vociferous complaints to me about the piracy of this class of motor vehicle.

The Minibus Association feels that, since they are licensed as taxis, they are offering unfair competition, because they do not have to pay the higher schedule of fees that the minibuses are required to pay, and yet have been observed moving about the streets, with a great degree of freedom, taking up passengers at points along the way.

This amendment clearly sets out that that practice is now illegal and it will be possible for us to deal with persons who break the law in this regard.

With respect to the Road Traffic Regulations, I had indicated to the Chamber that those amendments would be ready. We had hoped that we would have been able to bring them in during the last Session, but this document is a very bulky document, it is extremely tedious going through it to make sure that there are no errors, be they typographical or otherwise. I have had to read them through several times, the Ministry officials have had to read them through several times, and Cabinet has had to consider them — and almost every time we go through to proof them, we find some little devil slip.

We have now gotten to the place where we believe that the Road Traffic Regulations are ready for introduction to the House. They have already passed the Cabinet, and I can reassure the House, the honourable Member for St. Michael West in particular, that they will be coming here very shortly. Their range will be very comprehensive. They will be taking in a whole gamut of considerations and concerns which will, in our view, vastly improve the movement of traffic in Barbados and will bring these categories of vehicles, public service vehicles, under very critical scrutiny.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am grateful.)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I do not believe that I need to say much more on this Bill. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

On motion of Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, seconded by Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 2 inclusive were called and passed.
4.15 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, seconded by Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, seconded by Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

Order 1(b) was called – To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the granting of a sum of money to supplement the 1983–84 Estimates.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983–84

No. 17 \$445 124

HEAD 83 – CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): The ILS at the airport is in need of replacing. It is over 10 years old, and although strenuous efforts have been made to get it repaired, it is impossible for it to be repaired and put back to use in a condition that one would feel safe with it. And having regard to the reputation of the Grantley Adams Airport as being the finest equipped in the whole of this part of the world, including our Latin American neighbours, the Government thought that, rather than wait until 1984–85 Financial Year, they would come to the supplementary now. This will give us authority to order and possibly get the equipment delivered between now and the end of the financial year.

There will be no question of getting the equipment installed before the end of the financial year, but we certainly will order it and have a great part of it well on the way to installation. The usual tenders procedures have been gone through and a short list has been selected and things of that kind, it is all very technical.

I beg to move Sir that this stand part.

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

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Resolution was read a first and second time and passed.

SHOPS ACT, 1983

Order No. 5 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to repeal the Shops Act and make new provisions relating to shops.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW (St. Michael South East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill before this Chamber is one of several pieces of legislation which this Government intends to enact in order to improve the lot of the workers in Barbados. This deals with the shop attendants, with a view of improving their conditions of service and, at the same time, ensuring that they have better working conditions.

There are several salient features of this particular Bill. Among them is the one in which reduces the present working hours from 42 to 40. The Bill also seeks to make overtime voluntary rather than seeing the employers forcing the employees to work overtime.
4.25 p.m.

There is a penalty in the Bill for any employer who seeks to force or impose his wishes on the employee, and the onus of proving that he did not dismiss a shop attendant rests with the employer.

The reason for bringing this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we feel that, like the other proposed pieces of legislation, it is necessary to protect this category of worker. Other pieces of legislation intended to be brought before this Honourable Chamber include the Equal Opportunities Bill and the Unfair Dismissal Bill, and therefore the fine which we see in this Bill is similar to the fine which will be included in the Unfair Dismissal Bill. That fine relates to an employer dismissing a shop attendant because he or she has refused to work overtime.

It is hoped, however, that employers will not condone this type of behaviour, and it is my wish, and the Government's wish, that we will not see these provisions being invoked against the employers. We do hope that the voluntary arrangement will work to the good and

benefit of both employer and employee. There has been a school of thought which felt that the Government should legislate to make shop attendants work overtime. We feel that the voluntary arrangement should be allowed to take place.

As far as the working conditions are concerned, we feel that the shop attendants are entitled to better sanitary conditions, better accommodation and, generally, better treatment. As I said earlier, the Bill intends to improve the lot of the shop attendants. Seating will have to be provided by the employers for the shop attendants, and also included in the Bill is the provision for a first aid kit to assist in case a shop attendant was injured or needed first aid treatment.

The proprietors are also expected to keep records of the number of hours worked by the shop attendants, as well as hours worked as overtime by the shop attendants. The Chief Labour Officer is empowered to enter the shop and demand or request from the proprietor such information as it relates to the number of hours worked by such attendants.

The opportunity is also taken to re-enact parts of the old Shops Act whereby the Chief Fire Officer will have a role in seeing that safety is one of the premises that the shops are opened on. The Chief Fire Officer's role is to insist that fire extinguishers or adequate escape routes are provided in the event of fire or any crisis.

We feel that reducing the working hours from 42 to 40 will be very much welcome by the shop attendants. We feel that it will go a long way in showing the country that this Government intends to take measures in order to improve the lot of workers generally.

As I said when I introduced the Bill, it is one of several pieces of legislation which will be coming to this Chamber. The other two pieces of legislation which I mentioned will shortly be examined by Cabinet, and it is hoped that in a matter of weeks or months, certainly shortly, this Chamber will have the opportunity of debating them to the fullest.

On the question of overtime, what is the accepted standard in Barbados regarding rates of overtime pay remains, that is, on Saturdays the shop attendants will be paid at one and a half times their wages, and on Sundays, if they are required to work, they will be paid double time. I think that arrangement will remain one of the features of this Bill.

I hope that employers will not see this piece of legislation as one aimed at stifling the initiative which the Government expects of them. I am aware that some concern has been expressed as far as the fine is concerned. Some employers have expressed the concern that the fine is too steep and they tend to misunderstand the new drafting of these Bills.

I would wish to point out that the new drafting, unlike the old one which said not exceeding X number of dollars, this says a fine of X dollars. My understanding is that the judges or the magistrates who have to deal with these particular matters will impose a fine not exceeding, but as I said, it is just a matter of the new drafting arrangement. I think that has been the greatest concern that has been drawn to my attention. The other concerns have been explained to some of the employers in the Employers Confederation and they are quite satisfied with the Bill.

With that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): In rising to second the passing of the Second Reading of the Shops Act, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to thank the present Minister of Labour and all his predecessors for finally bringing the Shops Act to the floor of the House.

4.35 p.m.

Few subjects have caused more long, drawn-out negotiations between employers' associations, workers' associations and the Government than the subject of shop opening and closing hours, shop assistants' wages, shop assistants' conditions and the amount of time shop assistants can work. This Act represents, and I am sure Honourable Members will agree, a humane approach to the problems of the shop assistants of Barbados.

Barbados is a country that depends very heavily on the provision of services. We really are a service economy. We have some manufacturing, it is expanding, but Government services, tourism and retail sales dominate our economy. They provide most of the employment, they provide most of the economic activity, and I think it is very important for us to understand what that means.

Economists will tell you that societies go through three stages. They start agricultural, then they become manufacturing and, finally, they become service economies, and it is the service economies that are the richest. Service economies provide the best standard of living for the people who live within them. There is no doubt about that.

In the United States, the areas which have remained in manufacturing and, to some lesser extent, agriculture are not to be compared as well with the service sectors. In Barbados, we could not have the per capita income which we have. We could not have the Government revenue, and the relative, by Third World standards, affluence of the people, were we not maintaining a service economy.

But a service economy is giving a service and, in my view, you cannot give service adequately within the concept of a Monday to Friday 40-hour week in which everything closes down at weekends. You cannot tell visitors to a country and hotels, "This hotel has a 40-hour week, it is Monday to Friday, and so you have to go home on Friday night. We do not give you any service on Saturday or Sunday." And you would be fools to tell tourists, for whom the days mean very little when they are on vacation — every day is Sunday for a tourist — that you cannot go to a shop on a Saturday or a Sunday except under very special conditions.

I am thankful that this has long been recognized by all concerned, and this Bill contains within it exemptions for hotel shops and other shops obviously serving the tourist sector for what are closed days to Barbadians. But we must ask ourselves why should there be closed days to Barbadians? Why should the shops keep the same hours as the Civil Service and the offices? How can civil servants shop under present conditions?

I know it is very popular to say that civil servants take a very long lunch hour, and that they go out for an hour and a half or two hours, when they should only be out for one, to shop. They probably also occasionally take a day off, one in the 21, which they can take off without getting a doctor's certificate in order to allow them to go and shop. That is why I think it was a mistake to do away with Casual Leave. It would have been better to have been more honest and given them a few days casual leave so they would not have to pretend to be sick in order to get a day off. But that is another matter, which I will not pursue at this moment.

The point is that it cannot be satisfactory to all the office workers in Barbados, in and out of the Public Service, to have to scramble half an hour or an hour's shopping at lunch time. People would like an opportunity to go into a shop and look around for an hour, two hours, three hours, and make their purchases.

I will give you another inconvenience which we inflict on ourselves in Barbados. We force the Transport Board and the minibuses to have to put up with a quite unnaturally heavy rush hour at 4:30 in the afternoon because offices and shops are all coming out together at the same time. School children hang around in the bus stand until the rush hour itself is coming on.

I am going to urge the shops of Broad Street, Swan Street and central Bridgetown not to be so stingy with the employment of shop assistants and to extend their opening hours so as to accommodate people that want to shop after 4:30 in the afternoon. I personally see no reason for shops to open at 7:30 p.m. or even 8 o'clock. I must tell you that.

I know it inconveniences some West Indians when they go to New York to discover that the department stores do not open until 10:00 a.m. It is a great inconvenience to people who are expecting to be able to shop early, but that is only a very tiny minority of strangers. After one or two days, you learn that they open from 10 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night, and an early closing night means 7 o'clock.

This Bill will now make it possible for shop assistants to stand up for their rights and not to be pressed to do overtime to maintain late hours.

I am looking forward, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the shops in Bridgetown opening more regularly to 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock. Family shops do it now especially in the country; some, I suppose, in Bridgetown. There is really no reason why Cave Shepherd, DaCostas and Harrisons cannot lead the way by taking on a little extra staff and keeping their doors open to accommodate office workers after offices have closed. We will see the benefits right away at the Transport Board. You would not have the same crush. People would easier get a bus home, even though it may be dark at shop-closing time.

The Government is going to facilitate this process. After this Bill is passed, we are going to pass the new Shop's Order, which will allow shops to open until 10 o'clock at night and make a few other consequential changes. But it is not in our hands, we cannot force anybody when to open a shop.

I believe that there may be some compulsion on liquor shops to open during permitted hours, but we do not even enforce that. If a man want to close his rum shop early, I have never heard that anybody goes and quarrels with him to keep his shop open, and those rules do not apply at all in the case of other establishments.

I am hoping that the same service which is extended to tourists, the facilities of shopping on a Sunday when a tourist boat comes in, the facilities of shopping in hotels, will be soon extended to Barbadians and allow us all to have a little convenience in the way of longer shop opening hours.

Thank you very much Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am indeed very interested in what the honourable Prime Minister has just said. In fact, when I was Minister for Labour, I made a similar proposal. In making the proposal, it was necessary, as we often do, to consult certain interested parties, like the Employers Confederation and the Barbados Workers Union, and the Barbados Workers Union was at that time, opposed to any late opening of shops.

I am very much convinced, like the right honourable Prime Minister that that, in fact, would indeed be an excellent thing for Barbados. But I want to let him know that, in fact, we do already have provision for what one might call late opening hours, certainly later than 4.30 p.m.
4.45 p.m.

Under the Shops Order, the earliest closing time on any ordinary closing day is 8.00 p.m., and for other shops under paragraph 3 (3), it is 9.00 p.m. So already in the existing legislation there is provision for the shops in Bridgetown, shops in Swan Street or shops in any other shopping malls, like the shops in Oistins, to close later. I wonder if the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central knows that. So, in fact, we already have provision for this.

I went even further. When I was the Minister, my proposal was to remove any closing time at all and let the shops operate their eight hours or nine hours, as the case may be, within a 24-hour day. If that is done, it is very possible that one might see an improvement in the employment in this country.

I listened very carefully to what the honourable Minister who introduced this had to say, and I followed, also very carefully, the advanced publicity given to the presentation of this Bill in this Chamber here this afternoon, and if I were not myself familiar with the laws, I would probably fall into the trap of the Prime Minister, as he too has been fooled and lulled into the belief that what we are doing here today is something new. What we are doing here today is absolutely nothing new, except perhaps you are reducing by two hours the number of hours that a shop assistant can work in any one week in any shop. All the provisions that we are here speaking so nicely about are already in existing legislation.

As a matter of fact, the requirement for the provision of seating that we spoke about here this afternoon has been in the legislation since 1937. The requirement for a rest room is already in existing legislation. It is true that it is limited at the moment to female staff, but the requirement for a rest room is already in existing legislation.

The requirement for the provision of fire fighting equipment is in existing legislation under section 12 of the Act. Section 9 of the Act deals with rest rooms and Section 10 of the Act deals with seats for shop assistants. Even before the existing legislation was in the form it is in, that could have been found in the 1937 Shops Act. On closing time there is already provision for that in Section 3 and overtime rates you will find in other sections of the Shops Act. What we are doing in this Shops Act is really not very much new. So what has been the problem? There must be another problem.

If we perceive that there is a problem for better conditions or conditions in terms of health and the welfare of the shop assistants, then the problem is not in the existing legislation, because all we have done is that we have enacted the legislation, in some respects verbatim and in other respects there has been a refinement.

The problem lies in the fact that shops have not been sufficiently inspected. So we can sit here in this Chamber and we can pass all the good legislation in good faith and intending it for the benefit of the shop assistants and other workers. But unless we have a follow-up, unless we have an inspectorate of the Labour Department which is vigilant and alert in order to be able to follow up all the bits and pieces of legislation that we pass here, we can, in fact, make no progress at all.

I have nothing against this Bill. This Bill, of course, will receive my support. What this Act does is re-enact the 1968 Act that you already have on the Statute Book and in some cases it has removed what is already in the Shops Order and places it here in this new Bill. This Bill will therefore be supported by us on this side. But I am again urging the Government to look at the inspectorate, because from time to time we sit here and we pass other legislation, and we place additional burdens on the Labour Department and the inspectors.

It is not that the inspectors are showing dereliction of duty. That is not the case. My belief is that they are already hard-pressed, and we are adding to their burdens without at the same time adding commensurately to their numbers. So I would urge the Minister and the Ministry to look at that aspect of the matter and see if it would not be a solution to the problems of which he has been speaking.

As I said just now, like the honourable Prime Minister, I am all for flexibility in the opening and closing of shops. We all travel from time to time and we observe what goes on when we travel. We have all taken advantage of making our purchases late at night, 10 o'clock at night or 9 o'clock at night, but I believe that we are going to have to educate the businessman, in the first place, that he too can open his shop at late hours without in any way perhaps diminishing the profits, which to him, of course, is the be all and end all, and as people say, is the bottom line. That is all well and good, but I believe the total community would be better served if we had this late shopping.

So let us improve the Labour Department and the inspectorate. Let us urge the shop owners to open their shopping hours, and I believe that we are going to have a better service for Barbadians.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have taken the points made by the honourable Member

who just took his seat, as well as the points made by the Right honourable Prime Minister. It was interesting to hear the last honourable Member declare that he was in favour of a 24-hour opening. I wish to give him and this Honourable Chamber the assurance that, in making the Order, we would be looking very carefully at that particular suggestion. The intention of Government at the moment was to provide an Order which would see the opening hours between 7.00 a.m. and 10.00 p.m., and we felt that that could be accommodated. However, we will look at the possibility of opening beyond 10.00 p.m., so I take that point.

This Bill differs from the present one in a number of ways. It is not really fair to say that this is a copy of the other one. We have been at pains to look at the closed days, we have been at pains to reduce the hours from 42 to 40, and one of the very salient provisions of this Bill is that overtime is now voluntary; and not only that, but the proprietors cannot force a shop attendant to work. If they do force them, or even dismiss them, they can be fined very heavily.

It is this Government's belief that there should be some deterrent for employers who dismiss people for flimsy reasons, and that is why I was at pains to point out that the Government is following up this bit of legislation with the Unfair Dismissals Bill, and the reason for having that clause and that penalty similar to the one in the Unfair Dismissals Bill is because we feel that if an employer dismisses a shop attendant because he or she refuses to work overtime, that is tantamount to unfair dismissal. That is why I say it differs considerably from the present Act, which does not make any provision for that type of dismissal.

As I said, I am grateful for the contributions made by both honourable Members, and we hope that this Bill will go a long way in improving the conditions and the lot generally of the shop attendants in this country.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
4.55 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 do now stand part.

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

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Clause 2, Sir, defines "spouse" as "a single woman who is living with a single man as his wife,"

or vice versa:

"a single man who is living with a single woman as her husband"

Then, Clause 2 (2) says:

"single woman" includes a widow and a woman who is divorced;"

I wonder if I would be talking heresy, but there are several attachments between a man and a woman that are long lasting which do not satisfy a relationship, which means that if a man finds himself in a relationship with a woman for years and it does not fall under this definition of "spouse" — although for all intents and purposes she is his wife — and he employs her in his business, he would be in breach of the law. I wonder if the Minister would look at that aspect of it.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer, but I am sure that the honourable Member is aware of the common law situation, and I think he is well aware that it applies in this case, that if you are married and you have a woman, that woman is not accepted in common law. That is the position. You have to be divorced or you are living with the woman.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: You cannot have two wives.)

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: You cannot have two wives.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 3 to 26 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.
5.05 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this concludes Government Business for today.

I beg to move that this House stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 31, 1984, at 12 o'clock noon.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.10 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of Tuesday,
December 20, 1983. 295

ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: 295

Accounts and Statements for the month of
November 1983 prepared by the Accountant
General.

Auditor General's Report together with the
Appropriation and other Accounts for the year
ended 31st March 1983.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 295

The Markets and Slaughter-Houses (Amend-
ment) Regulations, 1983.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment)
(No.2) Order, 1983.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments
(Exemption) (No. 11) Order, 1983.

The Customs (Amendment) (No. 2) Regula-
tions, 1983.

The Rate of Interest (Exemption) Order, 1983.

Financial Statements showing Net Customs and
Excise Receipts for 4 months ended 31st July,
1983.

Financial Statements showing Net Customs and
Excise Receipts for 5 months ended 31st
August, 1983.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 296

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment
(General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 1983.

Resolution to approve of the vesting of land at
Bottom Bay, St. Philip, in the Estate of Bonner
Bowring.

Resolution to approve of the vesting of certain
lands at Charnocks, Christ Church, in Phyllis
Barrow.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$1,338,100
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at
the disposal of the Government to supple-
ment the Estimates 1983-84, Part II - Capital
as shown in the Supplementary Estimates
1983-84, No. 19, which form the Schedule to
the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$40,000 from
the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the
disposal of the Government to supplement the
Estimates 1983-84 Part I - Current as shown
in the Supplementary Estimates 1983-84, No.
20, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to provide assistance to Caribbean Finan-
cial Services Corporation Limited to enable that
private sector financial institution to develop
financial and commercial opportunities within
the Caribbean, and to provide for such other
matters as are incidental, ancillary, consequen-
tial or related thereto.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Question by Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael
North) of Minister of Transport and Works (Hon.
V. L. JOHNSON) re construction of highway
linking University Drive and Warrens 296

Question by Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St.
John) of Minister of Finance (Rt. Hon.
J. M. G. M. ADAMS) re Heywoods Develop-
ment and associated by-pass roads 297

Question by Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St.
John) of Minister of Finance re Arawak
Cement Plant 297

FIRST READINGS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 297

A Bill to provide assistance to Caribbean Finan-
cial Services Corporation Limited to enable that
private sector financial institution to develop
financial and commercial opportunities within
the Caribbean, and to provide for such other
matters as are incidental, ancillary, consequen-
tial or related thereto was read a first time.

**OBITUARY SPEECHES RE LATE GOVERNOR-
GENERAL, SIR DEIGHTON HARCOURT
LISLE WARD** 297

Mr. Craig, 297; Mr. Barrow, 298.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 298

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 18

\$339 034. 298

Head 38 - Ministry of Culture 298

Mr. Craig, 298, 303, 308; Mr. Taitt, 300, 305;
 Mr. Franklin, 302; Mr. Simmons, 302; Dr.
 Haynes, 307; Mr. Tull, 309.

ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT. 313

Mr. Johnson, 313, 318; Mr. Craig, 313; Mr.
 Taitt, 313; Mr. St. John, 316; Mr. Franklin,
 317.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 17

\$445 124. 319

Head 83 - Civil Aviation. 319

Mr. St. John, 319.

SHOPS ACT, 1983 319

Mr. Bradshaw, 319, 322, 323; Mr. Adams, 320;
 Mr. Greaves, 321, 323.

SUSPENSION. 313

ADJOURNMENT 324

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)

BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (St. Joseph)

BRADSHAW, Hon. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)

CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)

FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)

GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North)

HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)

JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Central)

St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)

SIMMONS, N. K. (St. James South)

TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)

TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)