

---

# THE

## House of Assembly Debates

### (OFFICIAL REPORT)

---

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

---

#### HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, January 31, 1984.*

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

#### PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)  
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House)  
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. 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)  
Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, M.A., M.Sc., (Econ.), (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs)  
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.*

*Hon. L. L. SISNETT entered the Chamber and took his seat.*

#### MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, January 24, 1984.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, January 24, 1984, be taken as read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no observations or corrections to those Minutes, let them stand confirmed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

The Accounts and Statement for the month of December, 1983, as prepared by the Accountant General.

#### PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

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

The Financial (Amendment) Rules, 1984.

Hon. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Deputy Prime Minister, I am commanded to lay the Companies Regulations, 1984.

#### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to approve the amendment of Resolution No. 41/1980.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$399 373 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. 21 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1982.

A Bill to provide for the imposition and collection of a tax on travel tickets.

#### FIRST READING OF BILLS

*On separate motions of the Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the following Bills were read a first time:*

*A Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1982.*

*A Bill to provide for the imposition and collection of a tax on travel tickets.*

*Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took his seat.*

#### CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES

##### SPEECH RE ARCHDEACON F. A. CAYLESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, from this date, and I hope it will not be forever, we shall not be hearing the voice of Archdeacon Frank Anthony Cayless, Chaplain of this Honourable and august Assembly.

Archdeacon Cayless, after serving from 1965 until this date as Chaplain of the House, goes to the United States of America to carry out his spiritual mission. Sad as we may be to lose one of our spiritual leaders, we have no doubt that the people of that big and great country will be gaining from his spiritual guidance.

Archdeacon Cayless, one can safely say, has over the years made a significant contribution not only spiritually but at a public level. Many tributes have been paid and, therefore, it would not be necessary for me to recite many of them here today.

In 1956, or thereabouts, I first met him when he was a young curate, through my work as a life insurance underwriter, and he was one of those persons who, unfortunately, I was unable to get to put his pen to paper to sign an application. I do not know if that was spiritual guidance on that occasion, but surely I have had several encounters with him in relation to my work. Always with a gentle voice, but firm, he would never commit himself in saying: "Yes" or "No"; he would always say: "Give me a little more time to think it over." I eventually gave myself enough time to think out that I would not have to go back to him again.

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

When I became Minister of Labour and Community Services, I had to preside over the Child Care Board, and

it was on that occasion that I came face to face with the work and the dedication of the man. He was active, attending meetings regularly; his advice was sound, his care for children was always clear, and he demonstrated, in particular, one characteristic which was even more touching to me, Sir, the interest he showed in the handicapped children in this country.

12.25 p.m.

I would therefore be failing in my duty today if I did not say that Archdeacon Cayless, as he is today, outside of his spiritual guidance has been a person who we all would continue to remember for his services in public life.

He ventures into North America, and I sincerely believe that he will also be an ambassador for Barbados, though he is English by birth, for he himself has always felt and demonstrated that he is a Barbadian at all times.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are going to miss him for giving us in here, at the beginning of every sitting, his blessings and his spiritual guidance to carry us through our sittings, which at times can be like the turbulent seas.

In many countries throughout the world where people draw guns, and where parliamentarians have come face to face with anger, I believe that on more than one occasion there may be a bit of bloodshed. When tempers rage in this Assembly, his spiritual guidance and his prayers, every Tuesday that we sit, I believe, have been able to carry us through our sittings without such problems.

It is only left for me, on behalf of Members of Parliament and the staff, not to say goodbye, but to say, in simple words; "So long, until we meet again." To Archdeacon Cayless and his family, we wish them a safe voyage, continued health and strength, and I pray that God's blessing will be upon them as they continue their spiritual work farther afield.

With those remarks, I beg to move the following Resolution, with a degree of sadness and yet with gladness, which reads:

"WHEREAS Archdeacon Frank Anthony Cayless has served the House of Assembly as its Chaplain for 19 years commencing in 1965

BE IT RESOLVED that this House extend its appreciation to Archdeacon Cayless for the service he has rendered to this House during those years and its best wishes for success in his future career."

Sir, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution, which has been so ably moved, and moved with such feeling and sincerity, by the honourable Leader of the House, the honourable Member for St. James North.

Archdeacon Frank Cayless, as the Resolution states, has served this House for some 19 years, commencing in 1965 under the previous Democratic Labour Party Administration and continuing into the Administration of the Barbados Labour Party, which began in 1976. During all of those years, he has carried out his duties and responsibilities to this Honourable Chamber with dedication, devotion and reliability.

He has always sought to ensure that the proceedings of this House started on an appropriate and fitting note, and we believe that his constant prayers have helped to bring some measure of serenity, some measure of peace, some measure of concord, to the proceedings of this Honourable Chamber. We hope that those prayers have also, in some measure, in great measure, contributed towards the good Government of this country.

So, on behalf of the Opposition, I wish to express the hope that he may continue his work in another area of the spiritual garden of his world and that he also may find perhaps even more satisfaction in his work in that other spiritual garden as he found here in Barbados.

On behalf of the Opposition, I am happy to be associated with this Resolution, which I now beg to second.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I, too, would like to join in wishing *bon voyage* to Father Cayless and hope that he meets the same success as indeed this Honourable Assembly.

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

#### SPEECH RE RETIREMENT OF MR. LIONEL HUTCHINSON

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, this seems to be the time of words for people who are now leaving us; this time, by way of retirement.

I rise on this occasion to pay public tribute to Lionel Hutchinson, who is leaving us after 35 years of service as a member of the staff of Parliament.

Mr. Hutchinson, who we all know well, was like a parliamentary fixture. Thirty-five years' service in any one job, even that of Speaker, would be considered an outstanding feat; and in these very trying days, to a man

like Mr. Hutchinson, there is no credit, there are no words, that can express our thanks to him. We are sorry to see him go, but Father Time will catch up, and therefore one must bow out and give way to others.

He served, first, as Librarian and Secretary of the House of Assembly for several years, before he was appointed in 1970 to the post of Librarian of Parliament. 12.35 p.m.

I know Mr. Hutchinson rather well. It would appear that I know quite a number of people, but I think my whole life and my chosen fields, either by accident or by design, over the years have brought me into contact with a number of people. Mr. Hutchinson is one of them.

I came to know him as a young boy going to the YMCA, where he was an authority, I say, on cricket. We would gather around him to hear his comments, comparing the present-day players with those of the past — people like George Headley, George Chandler, and others of that era would come to light. He was a firm believer in the cricket formation of Worrell, Weekes and Walcott — until the great Sir Garfield Sobers came on the scene. There would be arguments which would go on from 5 o'clock in the evening, when he would be there to play a game of hearts or bridge, two of his favourite games. I believe he played them very well, but I am not a bridge player and I am not familiar with hearts, although I am familiar with other card games.

Mr. Hutchinson would keep us for hours arguing, especially when he himself had played a cricket match or two for the YMCA in the Set Eleven. I believe on that occasion I was the captain of the YMCA. There was an old joke that I was the first cricketer ever to be dismissed from the team during the season. I think Mr. Hutchinson may have been part and parcel of that movement, Sir, for better or for worse.

As a Librarian, with what little he had at his disposal, we can say that he tried his best. He was always quick to get out the debates for us when we asked for them. He was always quick to give us a word of advice from experience, especially to a young politician when you first came to Parliament. You always looked around for someone to give you a word of advice. I remember the late Joe Broome and seeking his advice, and also the advice of the present Marshal of the House and also the Librarian, so as to be able to understand and to learn the skills in Parliament. Experience is a wonderful thing, and although none of those gentlemen served on the floor of the House, they had the exposure and the knowledge of what was going on, and it was there that Mr. Hutchinson, to my mind, played a significant role.

After 35 years he goes into retirement, but I believe his heart will always be in Parliament, and the Members and the staff he worked with will always remember him as a courteous, hardworking and ever-willing employee. With what little he had at his disposal, he tried to make use of it.

He can have some comfort in knowing that when Parliament is completely renovated, there is provision for a library, a feature which he, for many years, was asking to have made available — I mean a library which all Members of Parliament can be justly proud of. I believe that it may be his only regret, that he is not going to be here to participate in the work in the library and see it open as the Librarian of Parliament.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the staff of Parliament, whom I am quite sure he worked well with over the years, and the Members of Parliament, I wish Mr. Hutchinson a very happy retirement in what can now be considered the evening of his years. I hope that he will be active and that we can still call on him on any occasion for any little advice that will be of some assistance to this august Chamber. I am quite sure that we all will miss him and I am sure that everyone will join in wishing him many years of health and peaceful retirement.

I beg to move the following Resolution:

WHEREAS Lionel Campbell Courtney Hutchinson has served this House and thereafter Parliament as Librarian for 35 consecutive years until January, 1984;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House extend its appreciation to Lionel Campbell Courtney Hutchinson for his long service and offer him best wishes for a long, happy and fruitful retirement.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution moved by the Leader of the House, the honourable Member for St. James North, which is one in appreciation of the long service which Lionel Hutchinson has rendered to this Honourable Chamber, and also one extending to him best wishes for a long, happy and fruitful retirement.

In losing the services of Lionel Hutchinson, Parliament is also losing one of its longest serving members as far as the staff of Parliament is concerned. In this connection, I would like to make a few remarks.

There is no doubt that Parliament should have an efficient library as an important source and tool for the Members and staff of Parliament, as they pursue their task in improving and perfecting our parliamentary democracy. There is no way that Government Ministers, and backbenchers on both sides of the House, can pursue their task without doing some kind of research and

getting some kind of background information so that the opinions may be based on facts and will be well documented.

12.45 p.m.

It was to this area of the work of Parliament that Lionel Hutchinson dedicated most of his life and, also, an important part of his dreams. I can say without any fear of contradiction that he has been most helpful to many Members of Parliament, both in this present Parliament and in previous Parliaments.

In particular, I have found my association with him to be a very beneficial, useful and creative one. When I was in need of a document, he was able to tell me where I could find it, or he would bring it for me. He was able to point out to me the background to debates and to indicate where the necessary related materials could be located. He would identify resources outside of Parliament itself which were most useful to me in my parliamentary duties, and then, whether it was at lunch or dinner, his comments on the flotsam and jetsam of life have been very refreshing and very elevating, and at times very naughty indeed.

I would say that Lionel Hutchinson has been a true member of the staff of Parliament. It is a pity that the work to which he has dedicated so many years has not borne the kind of fruit that he himself may have wished, because our library is not up to the standard at which the library of one of the oldest Parliaments of the Commonwealth should be.

It was not for lack of making proposals, because he himself has put up many proposals for the improvement and development of the library. Some experts from abroad have been called in to look at our library and, more often than not, they refer back to the proposals put forward by Mr. Hutchinson. But as the Leader of the House indicated, he could only work with the resources and the tools available to him.

While I am happy to be seconding this Resolution in tribute to the work and long service of Mr. Hutchinson, I dare say that the best tribute that this Chamber can pay to him would be to ensure that this Parliament gets a library of which all of us can be proud, and which would be most helpful for the building and further development of our democracy.

I beg to second the Resolution, and in this I associate all the members of the Opposition in that regard.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

*Order No. 1 was called – To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the granting of sums of money for the service of the island.*

*On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. L. SISNETT, 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. 20 – \$40 000

*Head 15 – Cabinet Office – Subhead 1  
General Administration*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, this matter arises out of an unfortunate incident that took place some time ago at St. John the Baptist Primary School in St. James.

The children were playing in the yard of the school, between the school and St. John the Baptist churchyard. These are young children, it is an infant school, and the two yards are contiguous. As children unfortunately do, one of them picked up a stone, threw it and struck another child – we are talking about five year olds – in the head, in the eye, causing it eventually to lose the sight of one eye. That happened as long ago as March 31, 1981.

It does seem that the parents of the children concerned, again as parents do, came to some conclusion, but that conclusion obviously could not have been entirely satisfactory in the case where a child had lost an eye. Lawyers were called in at a certain stage, and they made a muted appeal to the Government for assistance. The matter remained dormant for a very long time, because it is the policy of the Government not to seek to negotiate directly with persons who have claims of any sort against the Government if those persons have lawyers.

It seems that the lawyers had virtually forgotten the case, which explains some of the delay. The Ministry

of Education itself picked the case up, another lawyer by this stage had come back in, and although the lawyers had virtually abandoned the claim, the Ministry of Education brought the matter to Cabinet and we have carried out an exhaustive enquiry into the matter.

The Government cannot be an insurer of all damage done to school children on school premises. The Government cannot, within the parameters of legal liability, say that, automatically, once a child is injured at school, or on its way to or from school, the Government is liable. I am going to come to that point in a moment, however. These matters at present have to proceed on the basis of fault. We could not come to any final conclusion as to fault. In any case, by this time, the period set out for suing the Government had long ago expired.  
12.55 p.m.

After investigating as fully as possible whether there was supervision in the schoolyard, whether there was supervision in the churchyard, or whether it was reasonable to allow the infants to play in the churchyard – it is contiguous, but, perhaps, a more dangerous place than the schoolyard – Cabinet came to the conclusion that we should make an *ex gratia* payment of \$25 000, \$20 000 of it to be placed in trust for the schoolchild and \$5 000 to be paid to the parents, with a portion to a lawyer, for the writing of the letters in the matter.

I would like to express my regrets on behalf of the Government to the child and its parents for this very unfortunate incident and accident.

The Ministry has shown sufficient sympathy for the child in pursuing the matter of compensation, even when it might have been abandoned. And although, as Minister of Finance, I am thought to have a hard and flimsy heart, I would like to congratulate the Ministry of Education for unlocking the doors to the Cabinet Office Contingency Vote on this occasion, since it was done on behalf of a poor school child, now handicapped for life.

I have given the matter of insurance some thought. Consideration was being given to it before I was aware of this accident, and increased consideration has been given afterwards, and I have asked the Insurance Corporation of Barbados to prepare a quotation for insurance against injury for all school children in Barbados on their way to school, on their way back home from school and while they are at school. Technically, they are under the jurisdiction of their headteacher from the time they get on the school bus until the time they get off the school bus in the evening to go back home.

I think that we will be spared many of these difficulties if, in the future, the Government takes out not only public liability insurance, which it now has, for

the condition of the premises, but general accident insurance for our children.

No amount of money can bring an eye back, or repair the damage that has been caused by the throwing of stones. Naturally, the Government will step up supervision to ensure that incidents such as these do not happen within our schools, but we cannot cover every possible misdemeanour. There are thoughtless children and there are even wicked children. I think that some protection is owed to the general school population and to the parents, and Government intends to give such protection as it can by way of insurance.

I would only say, in closing, that Barbados should have a look at itself in terms of its attitude to violence and the readiness on some occasions to resort to violence as a way of settling disputes or as an incident of daily life.

I had formed the impression that stone throwing was much reduced over the level of 30 or 40 years ago. I hope this impression is correct, but it is something that we can do without altogether. I would like to live to see the day when no Barbadian of any age — 2, 3, 4, or 5 years old — picks up a stone to throw at any other Barbadian, because though you can say that a 5-year-old child cannot be blamed for throwing a stone, it is only throwing a stone because it has seen adults throwing stones.

The throwing of missiles, a very Barbadian thing — you do not get it in Europe to the same extent — is a danger at all times. They seem, invariably, to be thrown at the head. They can cut and scar faces. They can knock out eyes. They can cause serious brain damage — a hard blow on the head will have the same effect as a stroke, or a passover, as earlier generations of Barbadians call it.

We are soon going to be dealing with the carrying of knives through legislation. We really have to try to make ourselves a less violent society than we are. We are not a particularly violent society, but there is room for improvement.

I particularly note, for example, that there are far, far more murders in Barbados than our general cultural level and the size of the population would suggest. The murder rate in Barbados is much higher than comparable countries in terms of educational levels, the levels of physical well-being and the possession of material goods.

Anybody who sees the court reports will indicate that far too many of the murders result from quarrels, which turn violent and which involve the use of sharp-edged weapons more often than blunt instruments. We really must play down in the society all those factors which lead to a resort to violence as a means of settling disputes.

Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in moving this Resolution, which will provide some assistance to a family who has suffered a cruel blow as a result of childish violence at school.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, in seconding this measure, only yesterday evening I listened to VOB radio station — I always listen to CBC as well — and I heard a very interesting programme. I think it is called "Point of Issue", a very well put together arrangement — I have to be very careful in choosing what I have to say — with a Mr. Ellis, I think he was the interviewer, and a Dr. Richie Haynes.

Now as far as I can recall, this Dr. Richie Haynes is a member of this august Assembly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Member for St. Michael South Central, Sir. I wanted to say that from hearing this person on "Issue", my conclusion was that this person, as I identified the person, is the Member for St. Michael South Central.

What a sorry picture he painted of this country! He painted such a picture that if I had to invest money in Barbados, I would have to get all the experts in the world to come in to see if it is worthwhile because of the Governments mismanagement and inhuman approach to the problems of the people of this country.  
1.05 p.m.

Today, this Resolution demonstrates in a very simple way that the Minister of Education, whom some people refer to as Margaret Thatcher, strong-armed, is the very Minister that demonstrated that love and feeling for people in this country by bringing a Cabinet paper seeking to assist an unfortunate family, which suffered as a result of an accident between two little children playing in St. John the Baptist school-yard. This is the inhuman person!

There are lawyers in Bridgetown whom you know I have no lot of respect for, many of them are rip-offs. One of them just got beaten in Bridgetown, I am told, and I have no doubt many of them will get beaten. I hope my colleague over there does not fall into that category. He does not get much work, so therefore he would not be exposed to these problems.

The parents of the child were pushed here and pushed there seeking some legal settlement, and they agreed amicably among themselves, but the former Minister of Health, the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown (Hon. Miss B. A. Miller), the Minister of Education,

demonstrated that human aspect, sympathy and love for a child in a school, by bringing a Resolution seeking to assist a family by way of an *ex gratia* payment to the child.

This is the bad, inhuman Government, from the sorry picture painted of this country. But the impressions made were not backed up by facts. The interviewer had asked the gentleman he had interviewed on more than one occasion to state his facts, and he said he "made a tally". He is a tally clerk! He worked on the Deep Water Harbour; he is a tally clerk!

He paid the most ungracious tribute to a man whom I am quite sure he would never be able to lace his boots in public life. A most ungracious tribute was paid to the Leader of the Opposition, a man who gave so much to this country with so little, an architect, along with Sir Grantley Adams, whose name must be written in golden letters and on golden pages. Listen to how ungracious he was to the gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition! He said that to win an election you must first command the respect of all the members of your party and its supporters, command the respect of a wide cross section of the society.

My interpretation of that, Sir, is that the members of the Democratic Labour Party, of which he is one, have no respect for the Leader of the Opposition, and that is why they did not win the Government on two occasions. What an ungracious thing to say!

He went on to speak about the sorry state of this country and he made reference to taxi drivers, nurses, hotel owners and Bridgetown businessmen. He said to go out and ask them how bad things are in Barbados. But as bad as they are, we can still come here and find \$25,000 to give a child as an *ex gratia* payment.

Sir, you only have to go on Broad Street an evening. I would challenge any Member in here to go outside and look at the cars. If all 45 000 were to pass up Bay Street, he would see that 98 per cent of them are in good working condition, well painted, and about 25 per cent or 30 per cent of them are all but new.

Sir, let me tell you how sorry this picture is. On mornings when I am out jogging — you see a lot of things on mornings — there is the Sanitation Authority workers sweeping the streets in this day who drive a motor car and park it, take out their broom and their shovel, sweep the streets and then go back to the Mazdas and Toyota Coronas. This is a fact of life! This is the sorry picture that we are in! Go up to the Sanitation Authority Department and you will see a number of motor cars up there owned by Sanitation Workers. Go to the Transport Board!

I am talking about people whom I consider to be at the lowest economic level in the country to show how sorry this picture is and how hard times are, how inhuman we are as a Government and how we have mis-managed the economy — and yet we can still find love in our hearts to provide for that child. That is the text of the Resolution of course, but I had to deal with the management, because it is money which is coming out of the Consolidated Fund.

Sir, you only have to go to the Transport Board, and you would believe it is a used car lot, the amount of motor cars you see parked in the Transport Board yard belonging to drivers, conductors, office clerks who are coming to work by motor car. And I do not consider the motor car in any respect to be a priority. I believe that food, clothing and shelter, the three of them, come first.

The architect of free education was condemned; the architect of free school meals was condemned; the architect of a resurgence of the economic values in this country — the late Sir Grantley Adams, the architect of its constitutional development, who was responsible for the infrastructure of the country. And then came on the scene a man who some people referred to as their Messiah. He was condemned in one sentence, ungraciously; done out of sheer ignorance by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, when he said that to win an election he must first have the respect, not the confidence, of the members of his party, its supporters and a wide cross section of the community.

I can only come to the conclusion that on this side that is what the present Prime Minister has eventually won, the respect of his members, the respect of his party supporters and the respect of a wide cross section of the community. I could not be so ungracious to my colleague, the honourable Prime Minister. I could not be that ungracious to have said something about him in that light, on top of painting a sorry economic picture of this country.

All I could hear is that things are bad in Barbados. I think what is wrong with us is that we complain a bit too much about a number of trivialities, like the fare boxes. We complain about a lot of nonsense. I would say there are certain things, like the water rates, which he mentioned.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is coming up, Sir, but it is not here yet. I am keeping my eyes on you and the clock, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.  
1.15 p.m.

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

I feel very, very strongly about this. I am supporting this Resolution and I am also calling on this Government and any future Government — because we do not know, Sir; in politics you never know, it is a strange business — I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that this Government or any other Government that should come into office would examine very, very carefully the possibility of having some form of insurance — I do not know how to put it together — some form of compensation instead of an *ex gratia* payment for children when playing or going to and from school, who may meet some unfortunate accident, whether they be killed in an accident or whether they lose a limb or other vital part of the body, as this unfortunate child lost an eye. I hope that the Government will find some way of getting the experts in this type of business, the insurance experts, the economic geniuses, the actuaries, the financial wizards, to come up with some sort of plan to be able to protect children in this country from these sorts of unfortunate occurrences.

I want to pay public tribute on the floor of this House to my colleague, the honourable Minister of Education, for the foresight, the sympathy, the humanity and the love for the children which she has demonstrated by bringing this Resolution. It demonstrates clearly that, contrary to what was said about her as being a hard person, she has love and human feeling for people in this country.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Chairman, we have no quarrel, whatsoever with this Resolution, we on this side support it.

The right honourable Prime Minister has made what, to my mind, is a very positive suggestion in dealing with matters of this kind. And I want the Government to know that when they are ready to really and truly handle this matter, they will find an equally positive response on this side.

I was not fortunate to hear the VOB interview, or programme, whatever it was, as the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) was able to do, so therefore I cannot make any passing comments on what he had to say.

I would merely say this. I would wish the Minister of Education and the Cabinet to extend equal humanity and love, respect and understanding to what I consider to be an equally deserving case. This case is not at all dissimilar to the other case that took place also in the parish of St. James at the end of 1981. On that occasion, an unfortunate student of St. James Secondary School also lost his eye in a classroom. One pupil threw a pencil at another pupil and, unfortunately, it landed on the eye

of a third pupil, and that third pupil has now lost the sight of that eye. The name of that student is Mr. Wayne Gittens.

The Ministry has been contacted on that matter. As a matter of fact, the matter reached the Attorney General's Chambers. And on one occasion, the Government has been asked to consider the possibility of making an *ex gratia* payment to the student who also lost his eye in a similar incident.

I do not know how Government selects who to compensate, but I would suggest to the Government to have another look at this case, because it is as equally deserving — one threw a stone and one threw a pencil, one was in the schoolyard and the other was in the classroom. In my opinion, the Government itself was not liable, because there was supervision in the classroom.

I understand that.....

(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I would fight this in court.)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: This one here?

(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: This one here. I would have my day in court.)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Maybe so.

The point is that the Government is making an *ex gratia* payment in this case. It is not that the Government has accepted liability and decided that it is going to settle with the parents or guardians of the student. It is making an *ex gratia* payment.

As a matter of fact, from what I see here, this took place on March 21, 1983. According to the Prime Minister, time has passed for action to be taken against the Crown. I am not sure that that is the case, if in fact the incident took place as it says here, because there is a year in which to bring action against the Crown, and the year has not yet passed.

(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: No, 1981.)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: 1981. This is not correct then. The Addendum says, "1983". Point taken.

But the other one was also a 1981 case. It is nearly as old as this one, it was in October, 1981. I think, too, that the cases are very similar. As I said, there was supervision in that classroom, and, in my opinion, to fight that case, one might have been fighting a losing battle.

I want to suggest to the Government and to the Minister to have another look at that case. I think at

some point I had even mentioned it briefly to the Minister. I hope that before the Attorney General's Department —

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Is it *sub judice*?)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: It is not *sub judice*!

I am asking them, the Attorney-General or whoever is supposed to bring the matter before the Cabinet, to come back to the House again.

As a matter of fact, I would suggest that we raise the amount we are voting here, the \$40 000, so as to take care of the other situation as well. If you are going to compensate one for the loss of an eye in the sum of \$25 000, I think equal compensation should be paid to that other pupil, offer him another \$25 000.

This is a supplementary vote, so it is possible that there can be other funds in that vote. So I am again asking the Minister of Education, the Attorney-General and the whole Government to have a look at that case to which I have just referred.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE (St. Lucy): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Resolution and, first of all, I would like to commend the honourable Minister of Education for her good gesture and thoughts on this matter.

As we listened this morning, we heard it was a stone-throwing accident at the school premises. I would say this is really a bad reflection on the parents, first, and the school teachers.

I know that as a boy at school we could not throw stones at all. People used to warn you that it was a very serious step to throw stones. My teacher taught me that a stone is a gun, and I would not like to pass this by. We have to call on the teachers to be a little more diligent in training the children in the way that they should go.

This matter touched my heart very much. As you know, it would be difficult for a young girl growing up in the world with one eye to get married, and this \$20 000 could be a good help. If it is spent in the right direction, it could be of good use to the young lady.

I am also calling on the honourable Minister of Education, because I had an incident like this about ten years ago in my district, at the Half Moon Fort School. If you meet that girl on the road, she is a beautiful young lady, a beautiful one-eyed young lady. She got absolutely nothing in that case. I would appeal to the Minister, if it is possible, to go back and make an investigation which would help that poor girl from St. Lucy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have much more to say on this Resolution. I think it is progressive and I hope that we will all try to train our children that they should not throw stones, and the teachers would do their bit.

This \$20 000 is a good sum of money from the taxpayers, and this thing could start now daily. I do not believe that anyone would be so lawless as to throw to injure someone to get money, but if someone knows that something is there, they could get a little more careless. I hope that the Ministry of Education will call on teachers to be a little more serious when the children come under their care at the schools.

Thank you, Sir.  
1.25 p.m.

Hon. L. L. SISNETT (St. Michael North East): Sir, the note on which the last speaker ended his contribution is where I want to begin. I am not sure whether the Government is indeed acting correctly in this case, even though I can see the concern of the Minister responsible and the Government. What I am looking at is the chain reaction throughout Barbados, which could see such incidents re-occurring with great frequency.

Kids will always be kids. Children will play school pranks by throwing stones and bottles, perhaps setting pins for others to sit on, kicking and biting. These are all pranks which children at some point in their school careers, have played.

We see from this Resolution that there was a stone-throwing incident, and, as a result of that, a child, at a very tender age at an infant school, has suffered the loss of one eye. The Government has decided, out of its concern of the child's lifespan, to make an *ex gratia* payment of some \$25 000.

What I would like to see in some of these schools would be a greater participation by parents in taking an active role in the various Parent-Teachers Associations. The point is that most of these schools have Parent-Teachers Association, but for some reason they are not functioning as effectively as they should function in a society such as ours, and there is a communication gap between the teachers, generally, and the parents.

A teacher is seen today as the one responsible for the total upbringing of children. In other words, some parents drop their children at school, they are taken home perhaps by the maid, and the parents do not even oversee the child's progress in the course of the term, but expects the child, through the teacher, to be doing exceedingly well, that the progress would be of a very high standard.

The parents' contribution, in some cases, is very little. Yes, lunch they provide, perhaps they provide bus

fare, but the total upbringing is left to the teacher. I feel that parents generally have a responsibility not only to the child, but to the schools in which the children go, to make sure that the school is functioning effectively, and to make sure that there are programmes for the child's upbringing, development and upliftment that their child can participate in.

Stone-throwing will continue in Barbados. I do not think that because the Government has decided to pay this money, or because the particular headteacher might have co-operated with the Ministry and vice versa, and the child who was identified as having thrown the stone, that stone throwing will die.

I would like very positively to see some measures taken to correct these bad practices at these schools. Many years ago as a child, quite often headmasters would take a child to the main platform of the main hall and apply some lashes to that child. I have suffered and under-went that kind of treatment by the headmaster of St. Giles School, Mr. Cumberbatch. Stone-throwing at that time was a common thing. But I believe that the measures he took by a skillful use of the tamarind rod on many of the students who passed through there immediately corrected that.

Today, there are parents in this country who, upon learning that a teacher has had to correct a child with a slight lash, go down to the school with their hatchets and knives, and dare the teacher to strike that child again. That is the kind of situation that is developing in Barbados, and as a result, teachers are a little scared to apply the corrective treatment that some of these children deserve. I think this can be resolved only through co-operation with parents and teachers, by a good Parent-Teachers Association, where the teachers and parents themselves take an active part in the child's upliftment.

The Prime Minister touched on it, where he said that some public liability insurance could rectify the matter and, he would like to see a general accident insurance in schools. But I feel that the headmasters and the various teachers, working through some systematic plan, can effectively bring a system into all of the schools that would help the children to see that once the stone leaves the hand, they have no control over it. I would like to see more of the schools involved in such programmes.

Look at the amount of violence on the streets today involving children. You see young school children, and if you have an argument with them, they go into their bags and bring out a knife. That is the situation that is developing within the schools. We have got to put a stop to that, just as we have got to put a stop to the growing trend of drugs infiltrating the school system. I think that it needs the co-operation not only of the

teacher but the parent, and do not leave it to the Government to be paying *ex gratia* payments to children who perhaps might lose a limb because of an indifferent case of stone throwing.

That is my input. I hope that the teachers and the parents of the various children will understand that it is a very serious problem which is developing throughout the country.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84,  
No. 19, \$1 338 100

HEAD 78 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY  
SERVICES – \$50 600 SUBHEAD 11, BRIDGETOWN  
SEWERAGE PROJECT (NEW)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): This Resolution is primarily seeking money to meet professional services at the Bridgetown Sewerage Project. A sum is also for the continuation of work being done at the General Post Office.

After a number of years, no doubt we can safely say that we are a bit happy to see what is happening with the Bridgetown Sewerage Project. But I would like to make a few comments in relation to a number of the connections, which I would have hoped would have been a little further advanced.  
1.35 p.m.

There are approximately 200 connections already made, and it may appear to a number of people that they are a little slow in making connections.

(I hope my colleagues on the other side would appreciate that when we come to Parliament for a few million dollars for the refurbishing of Parliament there will be no problem, because right here there is a leak and the rain is leaking on us. That means they would not want to get wet, so they would never try to get over here).

I would have hoped that the connections would have been a little further advanced, but there are one or two problems with the ownership of the land. The onus is on the owner, not the tenant, to make sure that these connections are done. Primarily these are places in the Nelson Street area, where some of the land owners cannot be found, and things of that nature. I am advised that by law you must get the permission of the owner of the land to put a structure there to make the connection, since it is a kind of concrete, a permanent structure.

In Bridgetown where exorbitant rents are being charged by some of the business houses, if not all of

The honourable Member for St. Philip North.  
Supply. We are dealing with Head 78.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of

#### HEAD 78 RESUMED

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is one item under Private Member's Business on the Order Paper. I do not now see the honourable Member in whose name the item stands in his seat, so this brings us back to Government Business.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Since there are no answers to Questions, we now move to Private Members' Business.

#### QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

#### ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 2 p.m., and this House therefore stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today. 2.00 p.m.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

*Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this point I must report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

However, Sir, I have no doubt this is the position, and I am equally as concerned about the situation as you are about the environment of the country.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: They have not been suspended. I should have suspended them and you would still be sitting there.

One other aspect of it, Sir, is that the sewage which the septic tanks would be taking to Cowell Street for dumping cannot be taken to the treatment plant to be processed with the sewage that you would have in the plant, because that would be the kind of sewage which would have been building up for a number of weeks or months before someone comes and remove it. So, the laboratory tests were very, very important, and you also had to get a special type of equipment for that purpose. The laboratory tests are now all but completed,

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the answer to that is, (1), the connections to the treatment plant were always estimated to take about three or four years. That is what the experts indicated. They are now in year one, as far as these connections are concerned. Secondly, there is also a manpower problem. It is a very technical job to be done by the plumbers, and there are only approximately three plumbing firms in the entire country that are capable of making these connections. Quite naturally, this would have to be done by way of some contract, and that is one of the reasons why you have this relatively slow process.

My question to the appropriate Ministry is: What is the problem that necessitates, still, the dumping in Cowell Street? That is all. I am only seeking information. I would like to know that it is not a serious problem and that it is going to be rectified almost immediately. That is all I am going to need from this Honourable House.

So, added to this, I would say that I was very disappointed and surprised to have realized that the plant was commissioned, operational — and still we have the old practice of dumping in Cowell Street going on.

It must have been obvious that this was one of the most important functions of that sewerage treatment plant, and I would have thought that, before the plant was commissioned, everything that would have been necessary to facilitate the taking of sewage by septic tanks down to the facility would have been in place from the word "go".

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to be contentious on this matter or to be in any way provocative. What I was saying before this Honourable House was suspended was that when the sewerage system and the plant was conceived, it was very obvious that one of the main functions of the sewerage treatment plant would have been to receive and to process the sewage from septic tanks brought there by the all of the houses on the streets are connected, there are still areas that have not been provided for that would still have to operate on the old system of septic tanks, and obviously these areas would still want to have the facility to be able to dispose waste for treatment at the sewerage plant.

sewerage system and the plant for the expressed purpose of cleaning up the waters in and around Bridgetown and improving the health standards of the people in these very densely populated areas.

We have been told that to date only about 200 connections have been made. Since the commissioning of this plant, I am wondering what has the plant been doing. If only 200 connections have been made, and to my utter disturbance and annoyance I am still seeing septic tanks off-loading in Cowell Street, it would mean that the sewerage treatment plant is operating at five per cent of its efficiency, or less.

1.55 p.m.

The old disposal system is still being used, the septic tanks are still collecting from them, and I was of the understanding that one of the first things to be done was that the sewerage treatment plant was to be made available for the disposal of this collection by the septic tanks. So if you still have these trucks backing up in Cowell Street and discharging, what is the treatment plant doing at the moment? Just handling 200 connections after the millions and millions of dollars that have been spent on the system? Is this an indication that the sewerage plant is not working? If so, I would invite the appropriate Minister to inform this House, because it is very unsatisfactory.

I was the most surprised person two weeks ago to see while driving down there these trucks backing into Cowell Street — and here we have a sewerage plant that is operational! How could it be operational if you are still dumping sewage in the sea? It is not operational, because it cannot be operational with only 200 connections and trucks still dumping in the sea. Something is wrong with the plant, and I would invite the appropriate Ministry to inform us about what is wrong with the plant so that we can tell the people of Barbados. We have spent considerable sums on it, and the very first thing that that plant should be able to do is to remove that unsightly practice of trucks backing up every night from 6 o'clock to 2 o'clock in the morning in Cowell Street dumping sewage into the sea. It is most unsatisfactory, Mr. Chairman, and I invite the appropriate Ministry to let us know about the current situation with the plant.

The Leader of the House must have realised that we were coming down the wicket on this, and he has thrown up a little Yorker outside saying that in three or six months' time we would not see it. We should not be seeing it now. From the time that plant was taken over from the contractors and commissioned, that should have been something of the past, and I want to know how you can take over a plant and still have that situation existing. I invite the Minister to give this House more information on that plant to alleviate our fears.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, today is a bit cool and I think my colleague may have been nodding. If I made reference to the fact that in a couple of months' time we would no longer have what is considered by you, and we will agree, an "unsightly" situation, and no doubt that is why we had the birth of the treatment plant, you must also take into consideration that I made mention of the difficulties — there is nothing wrong with the plant — of people not making the connections, and if they do not make the connections, the septic tanks will have to be operational until they make the connections. What you are actually saying is that you have the treatment plant and that you should get the sewage going straight to the plant, but you have not got the connections because of the problems which I mentioned earlier, so you are still having these tanks operating (a) for the time being and (b) because they are carrying out a number of laboratory tests. When that is finished, this unsightly atmosphere would no longer be there.

As far as the corrective measures, which my colleague made mention of, are concerned, the contractors defaulted on this, not carrying out the work during that time. They are operating at 25 per cent capacity at this time. As I said earlier, you put down the plant and then you have to make the connection. You do not make the connections and then put down the plant, so if the plant is not 100 per cent operational yet, it is (a) because of the landowners, who are a problem, and you heard my colleague speak of this just now, and, secondly, this is not a job which can be done overnight by a surveyor. It has to be done by health engineers, it is a specialist field.

I remember that a colleague of mine came in here many years ago and made mention of how to build a stadium, and the Leader of the Opposition asked him if because he happened to pass through White City Stadium going to athletics he was an authority on building a stadium. You may be a surveyor for surveying land and so on, but you are not an authority on this. This is a highly specialised field, and I can only give you the information.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This is not fifteen minutes yet, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must inform the Leader of the House that it is now 2 o'clock, and I would like to ask if he can finish within the next fifteen minutes.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. That is why I like to suspend the Standing Orders, so that you would not be able to get up in a hurry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: They have not been suspended.

of Bridgetown to properties which they do not own. It is essentially a matter for landlords. Many of the landlords of the City of Bridgetown, certainly landlords of residential areas, are not disposed to make that kind of investment in their tenancies. Many of them at this stage want to be rid of those tenancies, and that is why, despite the fact that the Barbados Water Authority goes on making public calls to residents to link up to the Sewerage Project, that the response has been very poor indeed.

It is not a problem which has an easy solution. The Government is not now in a position to begin to acquire all of those tenancies all at once. Landlords are not financially able, certainly not out of rents received out of those properties, to invest in sewage connections, and the tenants themselves are the least able.

This was anticipated by the Government, and a special fund exists within the project so that very soft loans can be made for persons to make connections. Naturally, we would assume that landlords would be those willing to take the first initiative.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that very few applications to the loan fund have been made. The money is there, and I do not think that it is sufficient for the Barbados Water Authority to simply put notices in the newspapers or notices over the other news media warning people and threatening people about what may or may not happen if they do not make their connections. I think there is a need for individual treatment.

I have written the Barbados Water Authority on this. I have even offered to come before the Authority's Board and speak to the subject. I have written the Manager of the Authority on this on divers occasions offering my opinion. I do believe that the Barbados Water Authority will have to appoint one or two people whose especial duty it will be to go out there on a house-to-house basis and explain to people who live in these houses what the possibilities are, about the availability of the funds and what the procedures are to go about the business of linking up and connecting to the project.

It is possible that the Ministry of Community Development has officers, who are experienced and well-versed in this sort of exercise, who might be able to offer either advice or services to the Barbados Water Authority. But I am afraid that I am coming to the conclusion that it is a matter that the Water Authority is not disposed to treat on the basis that I have recommended, and I do believe that that, really, in the end, is going to be the only way.

The Authority can call forevermore for people to make connections. This is symptomatic of something

which exists in many other spheres of Government in Barbados, where there are services available, there are funds available, but people do not know what is available to them and, most particularly, the people who are in the greatest need of those services are the people who will make the least effort to discover what is available to them.

And so, I should like to use this occasion, Mr. Chairman, as yet another opportunity to appeal to the Barbados Water Authority to make a special effort, and the initiative must come from them, to go out along those streets which are sewered – it is not every street which is sewered, and it is only those people who are living on the sewered street who are expected to link up – to send their agents, their servants, whoever they select, out into the streets on a house-to-house basis to explain to the people the importance of linking them to the project, and particularly to let them know that there is a fund available.

You see, Mr. Chairman, in many cases in the residences in the City, there are no waterborne toilet facilities, and in order to link up to the Sewerage Project, people are going to have to do major structural repairs and additions to their properties. This needs to be explained to them, and they need to understand that there is a fund available, to which they can have access, and certainly in the case of old age pensioners grants will be made available, so that their properties could be formally linked up to the system.

Mr. Chairman, in the end it is hoped that the sewerage of Bridgetown will do much to decrease many of the health hazards which still exist, especially in those areas which are densely populated and where the housing is not to a standard that the Government would like to see, and about which, of course, the Government has embarked upon a serious housing policy.

I have lost count of the number of appeals and the letters that I have made to the Water Authority, and I am hoping that this latest appeal will not fall again on deaf ears.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, the second part of this Resolution reads:

“38 000 for fees payable to the Barbados Water Authority, on behalf of the Contractors, for corrective work to the Sewerage Treatment Plant, and to the consultants for second process evaluation of the operation of the plant.”

From listening to the few remarks made, and from my observations, it would seem as if there has to be a lot more corrective work to the plant than appear to the eye. We have spent considerable sums of money on the

them, I would hope that these business houses would examine this very carefully — though I am told that the plumbers making the connections are charging what the business houses consider to be very exorbitant sums of money. I believe that at the end of it it would be of greater economic value to the business houses, because they spend millions of dollars per year having their places served by these septic tanks that dump the sewage out on Cowell Street.

Government has taken the lead in making these connections. Government Headquarters, the St. Michael's District Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have all been connected, and because of the sewerage of these places you are now having signs of marine life and coral once again in the areas where the sewage once went out into the sea. If as Barbadians we are proud people, "Pride and Industry" being our motto, I do not think that we can measure in terms of money what a connection would cost as against making sure that our environment is a healthy one.

There have been a few problems, and laboratory tests are being carried out now at the sewerage plant in relation to these septic tanks taking the sewage to the sewerage plant. You cannot put the old with the new, so you have to get these tests done so that there will be no problem at the sewerage plant.

I am informed that within another three or four months the problems of sewerage, where these septic tanks collect the sewage and put it into the sea behind Cowell Street, will no longer be. We can look forward to having a clean Careenage and seeing marine life once again in the Careenage.

Let me warn you very early. I do not get up in here talking about water rates out of this. I know I heard a hint about this, but let me warn very early that I have here with me Agreement 509 signed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in April 1976, where it made it very clear that, to have the agreement to put down the plant, water rates would have to be increased to the acceptable limits of the donors, the World Bank. I just want to get this out of the way, because I hear repeatedly about these rates.

I have no doubt that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance might be showing some concern, and I have no doubt, humane as he has been, that he himself should be examining some area — I do not want to say it is going to happen this year, or next year, because we always hear that something is done at election time — but I hope that he is giving some consideration to reducing the water rates at some level.

The point I am making is that I am not prepared to stand up here and hear the Opposition repeatedly

charging this Government for increasing water rates. They are the ones who committed the country by way of the agreement with the World Bank so as to have a loan to put down the plant. I hope once and for all that goes under the carpet.

There is not very much that I would have to add to that aspect of it, apart from the fact that I am happy to inform the House that within a year to eighteen months the Careenage should start cleaning itself up and that we will once again — though we have the yachts there, I think a little control can be put on them — be in a position to see the Careenage with marine life, as it was before, when people used to fish there as a pastime.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a particular point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you seconding the motion?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Oh, yes, Sir.

My remarks have to do with the connections within the City of Bridgetown. The sewer pipes have been laid. We have a sewage treatment plant at Emmerton, not a sewerage plant — the sewerage of Bridgetown was the project, so we now have a sewage treatment plant and Bridgetown was sewerage.

Business houses and residences have been asked by the Barbados Water Authority to get on with the matter of connections. Many business houses have had time, over a year, to budget for it in their annual budgets, and I am aware that they are getting on with the business of sewerage. It is not such an easy matter for those people who live and have their being in the City of Bridgetown, the people who I represent.  
1.45 p.m.

Both in the Nelson Street area, which is known to us as "Uptown", and in the Lakes Folly-Emmerton area there are many urban tenancies. Many people may not be aware of this, but the land in Chapman Lane, the land all around King William Street, Queen Street, Vine Street, Wellington Street is mostly urban tenancies; some quite sizeable urban tenancies.

It is not, I think, likely that the tenants who inhabit these urban tenancies, many of them paying very small land rents, and some of them paying house rents as well, very small house rents, are going to be in a position to do connections themselves.

Nobody is going to be persuaded that it is in his or her interest to pay for a connection to the sewers

the equipment is in the process of being installed, and when that is done, that and sundry problems which you have been querying, and which I myself am equally as concerned about as you are — and for that matter, as all of us here should be concerned about — should be rectified.

This is the information which I have from the very competent, I have no doubt, health engineer and other authorities. That is the answer that I can make available. But I would think that in another three to four months, most of the problems, if not all of the problems, should be rectified.

I said earlier that there are only about three or four plumbing firms working on the connections. There are a number of approved applications where connections are to be made by the property owners, I said that already. The Water Authority is operating on the basis of using the minimum energy required for treating the volume of sewage reaching the plant. I think I have mentioned already that it would take three or four years.

I see the Shadow Minister of Health has now arrived. He was paid public tribute only last night on "Point of Issue", Sir, for the outstanding contribution he is making in shadowing the Ministry of Health, my good friend there. He has just arrived. I am sorry to see that we have not got in his place today the Shadow Minister of Finance. I do not know if he was in consultation with the Shadow Minister of Health, who is doing such an excellent job. I really think his colleague remembered his name!

Sir, those are all the answers that I can possibly give, and they come from the authorities.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, I wish to make just a brief contribution on this particular matter. I do not think that from this side we are quite satisfied with the explanations that have been given so far. We would like to press the Minister a little more on this particular matter.

The public is very concerned at the fact that the dumping of sewage still takes place at Cowell Street and perhaps at other points in Barbados. What we are concerned about is that one of the main reasons for the establishment of the sewage plant was to ensure that those types of practices would be a thing of the past, and here we are today, after having been told that the plant has been open for a considerable period of time, after one year, still being told that the plant cannot receive the sewage from the commercial vehicles or other vehicles which draw off sewage from private or commercial places of residence. We are very concerned about that, and I do not think that we have had a satisfactory explanation, so far, on this particular matter.

If it were part of the original plan, and I am saying that it was, that this was to be one of the functions of the plant, why at this stage, one year after the public has been told that the plant is in operation, and also one year after continual requests on the part of the authorities for commercial houses and other people in the city to connect as though the plant does not have enough work to do, why is it that the commercial operators either do not deposit their sewage with the plant or why does the plant refuse to take that sewage from those commercial plants?

We are very concerned about that and I wonder if the Minister could give a further explanation on this particular point. I will pause here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is himself raising essentially the same point which was raised by the honourable Member for St. Philip North. It is exactly the same question which the Member raised.  
3.00 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, his argument would stand up and would be very logical if after four years this problem was going on. Note carefully, I said that the experts said that it would take three or four years to make all the connections — that is the expert, not me — and to make the plant fully operative — three to four years. Now, one year has gone by, so you cannot come in here and say why you are still having dumping there.

I would agree with you that after three or four years and you were still carrying out the dumping at Cowell Street, you could say then that something is wrong. But it would take three or four years to make the 2 000 connections, approximately 200 connections have been made to date, so you cannot come and be critical of the authorities saying that you are still having this problem of the dumping up there. Yes, we know that was the idea of having the treatment plant, but it will take four years to be fully operative.....

*Asides.*

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of explanation, Sir: I just mentioned the connections from the properties in the city. But we are talking about the commercial operators. It cannot take 2 000 connections for Antiseptic, or whoever it is. It cannot be 2 000. The 2 000 would relate to the different properties in the City, but we are talking about a commercial operator with a truck.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader of the House, if I had heard correctly, pointed out that in about four months' time, when the laboratory tests have been completed, he believes that will bring a solution to the problem. I wonder if the honourable Member who has just step down understood that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I really do not know what further explanation I can give. Personally, I would say that after four years' time and the trucks were still going down there, then you could at least bring in a question or take us up on this. But not if we say in four years' time the plant should be fully operational, and in one year's time the trucks are still going down there.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

*The question that Head 78 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

## HEAD 80 – MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE

### SUBHEAD 11 – CONSTRUCTION OF NEW GENERAL POST OFFICE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this deals with the work at the new post office, which I believe is on schedule; hopefully, everything will go right. The scheduled date of the opening of the new post office should be August 19, 1984. We are seeking a supplementary of \$1 250 000 to meet the expenditure to carry us out through the financial year. This is necessary due to the fact that the contract which was awarded to S.A. Nabi and Sons is not enough to take us through.

The complex there, no doubt, should be another landmark in our country. The building, I am told, is aesthetically interesting. It is going to have a basement to accommodate 75 vehicles, the parking of delivery vans and the cars and cycles of the staff. They are also going to have an amphitheatre to seat about 250 people for open-air performances and meetings which can be staged there, and there is going to be a stamp museum. The administration building, which is on 30 000 square feet of space, will have three levels. You are going to have your sorting section, your general administration office and such facilities.

We have had problems with the first contractors, Sir Robert McAlpine and Sons Limited. But now everything seems to be going quite smoothly, and if we have no unforeseen circumstances which would more or less set back the completion of the project, I am quite sure that your Christmas mail should be coming from the new post office at Cheapside.

In relation to all of these economic problems which we heard about, the mismanagement of this Government and how it cannot get things done, I remember sometime in 1967 or 1968, there was a former Minister of Communications and Works, Mr. Neville Boxill, who was at the time in Japan or China and asked Mr. Russell Lowe to move the Resolution. It was a token vote of \$1.00, and the late Sir Grantley Adams, then Leader of the

Opposition, did not even allow Mr. Lowe to say a word. All he got up and said was, "I beg to move the Resolution....."

*Aside.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, he said "I beg", Sir. That was the standing joke on Mr. Lowe. He said; "I beg" and Sir Grantley asked, "Beg what?", and he sat down and that was the end of it. He was a seat warmer. But he was a gentle man, like my colleague over there, who is doing an outstanding job – a very gentle seat warmer. I believe that he will go down in Parliament as another seat warmer. Although his colleague condemned the Leader of the Opposition, he praised him as doing an excellent job – and could not even remember his name!

We have not heard a single word from my colleague over there, the Shadow Minister of Health. Imagine we are dealing with a health matter here today, and he would not even sneeze to let us know that he is in here.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What is his name?)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I cannot call his name. He may be weeks, months, or years.

I do not think that this is in any way a contentious Resolution, and I beg to move that Head 80 stand part.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Just to enquire, Mr. Chairman, of the appropriate Ministry: At what stage is the arbitration between the former contractors and the Government at the moment? Is it likely that it will be settled very shortly?

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): It is on the way. That is all I can tell you.

*The question that Head 80 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Money Resolutions in Committee, 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 Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.*  
3.10 p.m.

VESTING OF LAND AT BOTTOM BAY, ST. PHILIP,  
IN THE ESTATE OF BONNER BOWRING

*Order No. 6 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the vesting of land at Bottom Bay, St. Philip in the Estate of Bonner Bowring.*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the passing of this Resolution I just wish to mention that this Resolution seeks to settle a matter which was hanging fire from 1973, when a number of parcels of land were bought by the Government for the building of a road leading to Bottom Bay and the provision of a car park.

Unfortunately, at the time when the lands were acquired, the car park area was put immediately on to the boundaries and actually blocked the entrance to the residence on this property, and it created tremendous confusion and a lot of irritant for Mr. Bowring. The Government thought that, in an effort to settle the matter, there should be an exchange of lands whereby Mr. Bowring's property could be private and the area for the car park would be on the other side, which would not create any problem at all for the public who use the beach at Bottom Bay.

What the Resolution seeks to do is just to exchange one parcel of land for another, and to acquire a small portion of land at the same time. It is simple and straightforward. Mr. Bowring did not receive his money ever since that time for the land, and we are trying to address all these problems at one and the same time.

With those few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this matter is not as simple and easy as the mover of the Resolution has made it.

For some considerable time, going back 40 or 50 years ago, the people of Merricks used a track to get to Bottom Bay. They were accustomed to using this track and they had established, in my opinion, the right of use over this track – until about 1973, when the owners of this parcel of land sought to stop the people from using this track. What they have since done is that, contrary to the town planning rules and laws in Barbados, they have built a wall right out to the ridge, the cliff; and as if to make sure that nobody comes along there, they have formed a T, so the wall is now at a T junction, making it

impossible for anybody to use that track to get to Bottom Bay, which they have used for well over 50 years. My only regret on the construction of that wall is that the mason who sought to deprive the people of that use they have had for so many years did not fall into the sea when he was building it. It is right on the cliff by the sea.

The exchange of that portion of land is also going to create a further problem. Where the land originally was is the only level portion of land at the moment. I examined this up to yesterday afternoon. I am not saying it is impossible, I am only going to ask the appropriate Ministry to make the necessary arrangements for the people to have the use from the new car park they are now acquiring.

The existing road stops at the boundary of Mr. Bowring, so in order to use the new car park you are now acquiring, you have to look at the following:

- (1) you are going to have to construct at least another 120 feet of road to get the buses on to the new car park;
- (2) it is going to entail the levelling of that section that is now allocated for parking of vehicles, and that section should also be paved and made good for the vehicles to have access to it;
- (3) this is very important to the people of St. Philip.

At the moment, because of erosion, you cannot get down to Foul Bay. A similar thing happened at Crane, so the only beaches available to the people of St. Philip at the moment are Bottom Bay, the smaller one, Peak Bay, and a little one in the back of Hill View off Marley Vale.

I would hope that the appropriate action would be taken very quickly to have that piece of road done, because if I know how Mr. Bowring operates, it is just going to be a matter of days after this passes the House when the wall will be going up enclosing the portion that is being exchanged. And as soon as that wall goes up and you do not have the piece of road done, the people will not be able to get vehicles on to the parcel that is now being exchanged to construct a car park, so it is absolutely necessary for that road to be done immediately. Otherwise, you will deprive the people who now use Bottom Bay, which is a very nice little bay, with a nice little cove that has attracted a lot of excursionists and residents of St. Philip on weekends, who go down to relax and

have a bath. So I would only hope that the Minister will take the appropriate action very, very soon.

A lot of very disturbing things have been happening in that area. There is a resident over on the right hand side who does not even have beach rights or any rights, but who has been actually loosing his dog on people using the public road going to Bottom Bay. There has been, in my opinion, a lot of indiscriminate action. Although it is private property, they have not shown any regard for the use of that particular beach by the public, which has been using it for years, long before the Bowrings or anybody had put a house up there. Now, the people coming from Merricks have to go right around Mr. Bowring's wall, because the wall is now about eight to nine feet, the grass is about four or five feet.

Sometime ago, I took members of the Parks and Beaches Commission up there and I asked them, since Mr. Bowring has now built wall effectively stopping the existing track, if they could not arrange to have a foot-path prepared coming around the perimeter of Mr. Bowring's wall to allow those people the use of Bottom Bay that they have had before. In order to use Bottom Bay now, they have to walk at least two miles now, coming down Highway 5 and through Apple Hall, when before they just came through the back and came into Bottom Bay from Merricks and those areas in St. Philip.

I do agree that a certain amount of rights are attached to private property in Barbados. On the other hand, I am saying that use and rights that the residents of Barbados have had for years over facilities like beaches must not be eroded overnight. We have to be very careful that if we continue to erode these rights overnight we do not get the people in the kind of mood that would bring about the exact opposite of what we want to have in Barbados, that is, to develop a kind of warlike affair between the owners and the users of these beaches and the more privileged few who are able to acquire them under the laws of Barbados.

In speaking on this Resolution, I am beseeching the appropriate Ministry to make sure that that piece of road is done quite early and the new car park is prepared and made in a way that the cars can use it. Otherwise, you are going to create a problem for the other users and the people of St. Philip of this nice, little, beautiful parcel of land.

3.20 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): I am very glad, Sir, that the Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) called on the Minister of Housing and Lands to do whatever he can to preserve the beach lands. Now I hope that he would also join with me in my call to make a few Barbadians understand, in no uncertain terms, that the beach does not belong to Jack or to them. It

belongs to all of us, and they have not got the right to treat people, Barbadians and visitors, as they feel like when they set about to enjoy our beach, not Jack's beach or Gabby's beach.

It is unfair, it is unreasonable and it is distasteful to see a handful, just a handful, of young men roam the beach and terrorize visitors and Barbadians alike for using the beach. I join publicly with the Chairman of the Barbados Tourist Board in calling on this Government to introduce whatever severe penalties there are to make sure that all and sundry, visitors and Barbadians alike, would be able to use the beaches free from molest and harassment.

For too long too many of us have been afraid to speak out on issues because we are afraid that we are going to offend people and not get a vote. The beach bums do not vote, that is the first thing. They are too busy at night hustling white women.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would not allow the honourable Member to move this debate into a debate on the beaches of Barbados *per se*. The debate is going to continue in the light of acquisition of land at Bottom Bay. I am not going to allow it to develop into a debate on beach bums or anybody else.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Thank you kindly for your guidance, Sir, and beach bums walk along Bottom Bay beach where Barbadians.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With all due respect to the honourable Member. I have not heard that, and I am not going to permit this debate to stray into those avenues.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, you can rest assured. I may rephrase it. I will not say beach bums, I will say 'Barbadians' then, 'people'.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is a debate on the acquisition of land. The honourable Member for St. Philip North raised an issue about access to the beach. I am not going to allow this debate to develop in that way.

*(Certain remarks made at this point by the honourable Member for St. James North were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.)*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I will look at the Resolution, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you would check the Resolution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. It says: "All that certain piece or parcel of land the property of the Crown situate near Bottom Bay....."

And from the file, I understand that at Bottom Bay there is a beach in the parish of St. Philip, and the Government is setting out to acquire this piece of land — and they set out the terms and conditions —

“belonging to the estate of Mr. Bonner Bowring lying to the South of the footpath access to the beach.”

Therefore, with great respect to Your Honour's ruling, and I am going to abide by it, my simple view is that, as long as this Resolution speaks of access to the beach, I think I am within my province to discuss the use of the beach by the people of this country and visitors.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not rule that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, at this point I will take my seat, since I am unable to develop my point, due to my own ignorance.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) gave an historical outline about the situation concerning this property and the reason for the original acquisition, I suppose. He said he went to that area last night or sometime, but I went to that area quite some-time ago with a view to arriving at a decision with respect to what should be done since this matter was hanging fire for a very long time.

The attorneys for the late Mr. Bonner Bowring wrote the Ministry, and have been writing for a very long time, before my time, seeking to have this matter brought to a head. I thought the time had come when this matter should be taken off the books and dealt with and, therefore, in this light I decided that I would get ahead.

I do not recall from my memory at this point, but when I went there I saw what is known as a car park. The place was surrounded, I think, with a wall going towards the ridge of the property, and the honourable Member might be quite correct in saying this. But what disturbed me particularly was when he said that the one thing he was unhappy about was that the mason who was building the wall did not fall into the sea.

I would hope that there would be some human sympathy within the breast of people. The poor mason, I imagine, who was building this wall, was only working for his bread, and he had no command over his service beyond to work. I take it that even if you are a land surveyor and you are called into a dispute, you perform your task, even though it is unpleasant, like a policeman who has to do his duty, an attorney-at-law or what have you.

That is an unfortunate statement, and I deplore the fact that it was made at all. I would hope that people

are not insulted because of the work which they have to perform.

With respect to this, I do not recall that I did see a paved area for people to park. People park anywhere, and they park in the entrance leading to Mr. Bowring's place. I saw it myself. Mr. Bowring, I was made to understand by the man who is the caretaker for the property, and who, incidentally, is a man from St. Philip, could hardly get his car out. I thought that in the circumstances, so long as there is a guarantee, because of the rights of use by the people and the fact that you had acquired the road and the rights to the beach, that the man should not be denied the right to get into his property.

No man should be denied that right. Therefore, I took it upon myself to recommend that an exchange of the land should take place, and the acquisition, as recommended, be done. This Resolution is proof of that action.  
3.30 p.m.

We have got to respect the rights of people's property. The honourable Leader of the House put it forward very plainly and bluntly, and I support him and take his remarks as my own. The beach is neither Jack's nor any one man's own, the beach concerns all of us. We have got to have the moral authority in this country to tell people what the facts of life are, and people must recognise that if you are using a man's property or you have to park, you should not block his entrance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the beginning of 1964 when I was under house arrest — this is incidental to this case, but it has relevance — my yard was blocked for a long time and I was advised by an eminent lawyer in this country, no less a person than Mr. Keith Walcott. I did not seek his advice. He sent to tell me when he heard, what was happening. This was done under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party. When I was virtually under house arrest during the whole of January and part of February, 1964, he said, “Bring out your car and knock down anybody you see in front of your house, in your entrance blocking your roadway or lick up any police vehicle you see there.” He said that there was no declaration of a state of emergency.

Mr. Bowring has no right to be under arrest in his own house. He must be able to get access to it and to leave it freely. He is no longer with us, but his heirs and assigns, his successors to the property are entitled to such rights, and therefore this Government, bearing in mind its attitude to property rights and the rights of individuals, considered that Mr. Bowring is entitled to have those rights of egress and ingress to his property. This Resolution seeks to do just that.

That the honourable Member for St. Michael North could come here in his righteous indignation.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: St. Philip North.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): I made a mistake, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The honourable Member for St. Michael North would not have said that. He is too modest a man to do it that way.

That the honourable Member for St. Philip North should come here and put it forward that a humble mason building a wall should be in the sea because he was building a wall probably to get a few dollars to feed his family is certainly not befitting an honourable Member of this ancient and dignified Chamber. We are seeing this too often in here, and it is time that we come down on our feet; stop travelling on our heads and come to earth.

Mr. Bowring is entitled, be he a Barbadian or a person who came here and bought property, to the rights that go with that property. I have no apologies to make, or do this Government, for bringing this Resolution here.

I, however, assure the good people of St. Philip North and South that this Government is very understanding of the problems not only at Bottom Bay, but at the Crane Beach, Long Bay and all the bays in St. Philip, and will take all steps that are necessary to arrest the erosion. And when they are prevented from trespassing to enter into the beach for a bath, which they are entitled to, this Government will have the courage to compulsorily acquire the lands to permit them to do so.

If it is an assurance he wants, I give the people of St. Philip this assurance rather than the honourable Member, that everything will be put in hand immediately to ensure that a proper car park is laid out on the area decided upon, and that all necessary action will be taken to make sure that the people move freely from the respective districts into Bottom Bay and out of Bottom Bay at all times, free of molestation.

These are my few remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

#### VESTING OF LAND AT CHARNOCKS, CHRIST CHURCH IN PHYLLIS BARROW

*Order No. 7 was called – to move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the vesting of certain lands at Charnocks, Christ Church, in Phyllis Barrow.*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is another piece of land which Government is exchanging with the original owner of a piece of land that was taken over in the development of the Grantley Adams Airport.

A proposition was put to Miss Phyllis Barrow as to whether or not she would wish to have the land acquired outright or if she would want to have an exchange deal done in this matter, since the Government owned land in that area. She opted for an exchange.

This area of land is land that she identified herself. The Government had no hesitation in agreeing with allowing her to have the piece of land of her choice. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the purpose of this Resolution.

There are no problems in respect of any difficulties on the part of Miss Barrow or with the Government in its willingness to deal in this matter. It is pretty straightforward.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

#### THE CARIBBEAN FINANCIAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT, 1984

*Order No. 4 was called – To move the Second Reading of 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.*

Hon. L. R. TULL: (St. George South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Caribbean Association of Industry and Commerce has proposed to the Governments of the Caribbean that they establish a private sector development bank that will undertake the promotion of private sector development in the English-speaking Caribbean. CAIC was of the view that the Caribbean private sector saw viable opportunities for the existence of private sector expansion in vital and productive areas of Caribbean economies, and they felt that the new regional financial institution was needed to promote term credit, venture capital and other financial services.

They were also of the view, and we share that view, that existing financial institutions were inadequate to carry out the role for private sector development that was

necessary. With commercial banks, they operated under the constraint that they were not equipped for the short-term nature of lending required for the type of development that the private sector needed, and they also had the traditional restraint as promoters and initiators of new business. In other words, that has not been a traditional role of commercial banks.

3.40 p.m.

Other financial institutions in the Caribbean have also proved to be inadequate to meet the new demands of private sector development. It has therefore been decided that a new company should be set up to provide a source of credit which would address the pressing demands and needs of the private sector in the Caribbean. They have been assisted in this venture by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), which has offered to set up US\$12 million as an initial loan to set up this private sector bank.

I understand that the private sector organisations of the Caribbean would put up \$2 million in venture capital at the formation of the company. I am also advised that US\$300 000 will be advanced by the World Bank as initial equity in this company.

The company's objectives are to act as a catalyst for private sector development in the Caribbean and also to foster economic development among English speaking Caribbean countries, through private sector ability. Further, it seeks to develop entrepreneurial skills in the Caribbean and to broaden and widen the base of entrepreneurial activity in this region.

The promoters of the new financial institution to aid the private sector considered that the company would need the support of all the Governments of the English-speaking Caribbean countries if the institution is to be a viable one. They also feel that, initially, there must be a number of concessions made to the company to make it viable, and these are mainly in the area of taxes and duty free concessions. Indeed, they stretch beyond that, because they also involve certain exemptions from exchange control legislation in this country. That, in sum, is what this particular piece of legislation is all about.

We had some consultation in the Attorney-General's Chambers as to the way in which this Bill should be introduced in Parliament. We held the view initially that it should be a Private Member's Bill because it sought to address the needs of a private organisation. A more mature reflection persuaded us to the view that, because of the public interest and service that it was making, it should be brought in the form of a public Bill.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

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

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

#### COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This House is in Committee.

*The Preamble was called and passed.*

*Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.*

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, with the concurrence of the House, I would like to move that the remaining parts of the Bill be taken in Parts.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection on the part of the Opposition?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Go ahead.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is agreement.

*Part 1 was called*

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to move that Part 1 do now stand part.

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

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Chairman, there is a question I have to raise in relation to Clause 8. It does seem to me that the two subsections of Clause 8, to some extent, seem to conflict. It starts by saying that:

"Subject to subsection (2), the Company shall not carry on or continue to carry on any business or any of its corporate affairs in any other country in the Caribbean unless under the laws of that country the Company receives similar incentives, benefits and exemptions as are granted the Company under Part II of this Act."

So in 8(1) you have, on the face of it, an absolute prohibition against carrying on business by the company in any other country in the Caribbean, unless there are, so to speak, reciprocal arrangements in relation to incentives and benefits in that other country in the Caribbean.

Now 8(2) says:

"The shareholders of the Company may, by extraordinary resolution, authorise the Company to carry on any business or any of its corporate affairs in a Caribbean country in which it does not receive substantially similar incentives, benefits and exemptions under the laws of that country if the directors reasonably believe that it is in the best interest of the Company to do so."

What the second subsection does, is, in essence, to give the shareholders of the company the right to authorize the company to carry on business in another country in the Caribbean, even although the appropriate reciprocal benefits and exemptions do not exist in that country.

It does seem, Mr. Chairman, that if you have an absolute prohibition in (1) and say that that prohibition is subject to (2), and in (2) you give the shareholders the absolute right to permit the company to carry on business in another country in the Caribbean, although reciprocal arrangements are not made, it seems to me that the absolute prohibition in 8(1) does not make any sense at all. What you are in essence saying is that the shareholders of the company have got the right to determine if that company will carry on business in another Caribbean country if the carrying on of business in that country is in the best interest of the company.

You are talking about private sector interests, you are talking about creating a corporation to stimulate private sector business activity, and one would imagine that the purpose of operating in any country is for the benefit of the corporation. So I wonder if the honourable Attorney-General could explain what is the purpose of 8(1) in light of the wide discretion which is given to shareholders in 8(2).

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the point made by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) is taken. I believe the point has some substance, but I am not entirely in agreement with his conclusion.

3.50 p.m.

Section 8(1) cannot be as mandatory as the honourable Member suggests, since it is contingent on the condition of its subjectivity to 8(2). What the Bill is trying to do is to encourage all the countries of the English-speaking Caribbean, which are going to be within purview of the CAIC and the people who are involved in the private sector bank, to give similar privileges, exemptions, and immunities in each country.

This is a regional banking institution, and we have several precedents for this kind of arrangement. Whether it is the University of the West Indies, the Caribbean Examinations Council, or the Caribbean

Development Bank, it is important that in each one of the territories that are members of the regional organisation the same privileges and exemptions are granted in each country so as not to create any imbalance.

I have no difficulty at all. The Bill seeks to encourage all member countries to make the same exemptions, currency arrangements and Customs exemptions and so on, so that there will be uniformity of practice in all of the territories. On the other hand, although the Bill seeks to encourage that, it also gives the private sector bank, when some action is required in the best interest of the bank, to ignore, by an extraordinary resolution, the fact that any particular territory does not have all the rights and privileges which are granted by the other countries.

I want to add at this point, that the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), who acted in his private capacity as an advisor to the CAIC, was responsible for drafting the initial Bill. In fact, two Bills were drafted, which we ultimately considered and chose one as a direction. The Bill started as a private Bill, done by a private attorney-at-law for CAIC. The honourable Member for Christ Church West acted in his private capacity for CAIC, and he would be in a position further to add to the initial thinking of his clients as they considered putting up to Government the proposal that we support the establishment of this bank in the terms of the existing legislation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Let me first begin by declaring an interest because, as I understand it, if you are a legal advisor in relation to the drafting of a Bill in any way, you ought to declare the interest to the House or to the Committee of the whole House, and I now so do.

The philosophy which inspired Clause 8 of the Bill was the need to ensure that similar conditions in relation to privileges and the tax incentives being given by this Bill will apply to the operation of the company in all of the countries of the Caribbean.

Since this private sector bank is a successor to the Caribbean Investment Corporation, it is felt that the privileges and incentives which it must obtain in those countries in which it is carrying on its business should be identical to those which will be given by the Parliament of Barbados. It is recognised that it may not be possible for all the territories to pass the legislation at the same time, although an indication has been given at the governmental level in the territories that they are amenable to similar legislation, and hence the need to have a section similar to Section 8(2), to which the honourable member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) refers.

The CAIC was obviously a CARICOM concept, and the draft legislation passed by CAIC was implementing an agreement between the various Governments of CARICOM, although that bit of legislation was more relevant to private sector activity. Since this concept does not originate at the CARICOM level, but at the private sector level within CARICOM, it would have been necessary for the participants to first obtain from one territory the relevant legislation, consult with the others thereon, and then get similar legislation.

It is not intended that the new body will limit its operations only to Barbados. In fact, it is really going to operate within the Eastern Caribbean countries, once its stated capital of US \$2 million, has been subscribed. It is my understanding that that amount has been over-subscribed already and that a loan of US \$12 million from the USAID is already available.

The honourable Member can be well assured that Section 8(1) and (2) will pose no difficulty for the operation of the Caribbean Financial Services Corporation.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, I am aware that you have sections like Section 21 in other Bills, such as Off-Shore Bills, etc. But I am beginning to believe that the time is right where sections like these should have a review section. My feeling is that under Section 21, the Minister has the right to grant special concessions to specialists coming into the country to carry out functions not being able to be carried out adequately by Barbadians. My concern is that this is an open admission, and as soon as you allow people to come in under that section, the company has nothing to encourage it to make sure that local personnel are trained to take over these functions.

I think that in clauses like these there should be a review clause in which the Minister has a right to grant, let us say, 10 years and the right to review it at the end of 10 years.

It might cause the bodies to consider, having got the concessions on the first occasion, to seek out Barbadians for training to take over at the appropriate time. As it is now, the moment the concession is given, they can stay for ever so long, and all they have to do is to come and ask the Minister again. There is no incentive to encourage these corporations to train Barbadians for these specialties.  
4.00 p.m.

I draw this to the attention of the Government, because it is cropping up in all the Off-Shore Banking Acts, and if there is no review clause, unless these bodies have some civic responsibility or any commitment to the locals, you could well find that they will use this

as a loophole for bringing in expatriates time and time again to fill these specialist positions on the excuse that there is no Barbadian, but they have done nothing to train Barbadians for it.

I would like to see in future drafting legislation like this a review clause stating that the Minister would have the right, after a ten-year period, to review the company's situation to see whether or not they should continue to have this right of bringing in people on special concessions.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel at all with the point made by the honourable Member. I do believe that he is proselytising to the already converted when he feels that jobs should be made available to Barbadians, provided they have the necessary skills. But I do think it is most inappropriate that in a piece of legislation such as this that you should import that type of condition.

There are other areas of the law and other executive Ministries that should deal with these things, like the Ministry of Immigration, which deals with work permits and determines the whole work permit policy. I think that rather than importing that type of condition into individual Acts, the whole question of regularising the practice of employment of Barbadians in jobs in Barbados, where they have the necessary skills, should be done within the ambit of one single piece of legislation — immigration, the immigration rules and so on — that deals with work permit questions.

There is also another question here that naturally comes to mind in relation to the point raised by the honourable Member, that is, that this is a regional organisation. This is the setting up of a private sector financial institution for the English-speaking Caribbean, and therefore it would be invidious to import any clause into it that would limit employment to Barbadians or persons resident in Barbados, when there are a number of eastern Caribbean countries that are involved in the operation of the institution.

I understand there is an "a" left out in Clause 12, which refers to residents in Barbados. In 12(1) it says:

"For the purposes of this Act, the following are residents, namely:

- (a) a natural person ordinarily resident in Barbados or a citizen with residence in Barbados;...." I am asking for the insertion of "a" between "with" and "residence".

I beg to move that Part II, as amended now stand part.

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

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

*Part III was called and passed.*

*Part IV was called.*

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 29(d) of Part IV, the words there are "generally to give effect to the provisions of this Part." I would need the word "Part" deleted and the word "Act" included, so that it would read "generally to give effect to the provisions of this Act."

I beg to move that Part IV, thus amended, now stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, one other question which I believe may have been raised from time to time in this Honourable House, I am not sure what the reply has been from time to time, is the question as to what happens to regulations which are made by Ministers — we are dealing with this Act, so we are talking about regulations made under this Act — whether those regulations should not be required to be laid in Parliament so as to maintain the usual supervision of Parliament over delegated legislation.

My feeling is that all regulations made by Ministers, or any subsidiary orders, should always be laid in Parliament and be subject to either affirmative or negative resolution. I am not sure what the honourable Member's position is on this. I am saying that the Act should contain a provision requiring that regulations made by the Minister under this Act should be required to be laid in Parliament.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member has raised this point in this House on at least one previous occasion which I remember. I myself am not a draftsman, and I have referred it to the Chief Parliamentary Counsel for advice thereon. I am advised that the present practice, as is contained in this particular piece of legislation before the House, is perfectly all right. It has happened in a number of pieces of legislation that have already gone before the Chamber over the last few years.

I can give the honourable Member no more assistance with it than that I have sought advice from the people in my Chambers who are more trained and *au fait* with this type of drafting, and they told me it is perfectly all right.

Sir, I have a little problem as to whether 29(b) and 29(c) in the case where it adverts to "Part" should not in

fact be "Act". I know that in 29(d) it should be "Act" rather than "Part."

I am now moving that both in 29(b), (c) and (d) that the word "Part" be deleted and the word "Act" be substituted therefor.

With those three amendments, I beg to move that Part IV stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

*The Schedule was called and passed.*

*On the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill, with amendments, in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*  
4.10 p.m.

*On separate motions of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

#### CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1983

*Order No. 5 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1983.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: (St. James North): This is not a matter which should engage the attention of the House. It deals primarily with the Civil Establishment Order of 1983, which makes provision for that part of the Schedule to be brought into operation in November of 1983.

It has been necessary, however, that that date be changed by another Order so that it can be gazetted, and that the Civil Establishment Order (No. 2) should make provision for the Minister to appoint a date on which that part of the Schedule should come into operation.

The only persons included in this are in the Department of Printing where the titles of those officers currently employed in the Printing Department would now be replaced by the new titles. Nobody is getting dismissed, we are not reducing employment. We are only giving the posts fancy names. As soon as you hear "dismiss", you start to jump. This only means that the posts of "Manager", "Deputy Manager" and "Assistant Manager" will be established in the Civil Establishment (General) Order of 1983.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this brings us to the end of Government Business for today. There are no other matters on the Order Paper apart from a Private Resolution under my colleague's name, which I have no doubt is going to be done next week. There is no business under Private Members' Business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the honourable Member is really out of order at this point. We have already passed those two stages in the proceedings of this House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What proceedings Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are dealing with Private Members' Business, which we passed since 2.45 p.m. today.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, and I am dealing with the adjournment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With all due respect to the honourable Member, if we are to follow the proceedings of this House in the order in which it is laid out, immediately after lunch we come to Question Time and to Private Members' Business. We have passed those stages already.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Seventeen years in here, Sir, would, of course, teach that we have passed those matters at such time, but in moving the adjournment, I am entitled to make a comment — am I out of order or am I in order, Sir? — and that comment is that it is unfortunate that we have no Private Members' Business today, so that we could have a good exercise by the Opposition.

I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until February 7, 1984 at 12 o'clock noon.

I will have your attention, Sir, I am quite sure, with your pleasure, in your Chambers after the sitting.

*The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, February 7, 1984 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*  
4.16 p.m.

## CONTENTS

## MINUTES

|                                                                |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Confirmation of the Minutes of Tuesday, January 24, 1984 ..... | 327 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

|                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER ..... | 327 |
|--------------------------|-----|

Accounts and Statement for the month of December, 1983, as prepared by the Accountant General.

## PAPERS

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| Hon. L. S. CRAIG ..... | 327 |
|------------------------|-----|

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The Financial (Amendment) Rules, 1984

|                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Hon. L. L. SISNETT ..... | 327 |
|--------------------------|-----|

The Companies Regulations, 1984.

## GOVERNMENT NOTICES

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| Hon. L. S. CRAIG ..... | 327 |
|------------------------|-----|

Resolution to approve the amendment of Resolution No. 41/1980.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$399 373 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. 21 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1982.

A Bill to provide for the imposition and collection of a tax on travel tickets.

## FIRST READINGS

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| Hon. L. S. CRAIG ..... | 328 |
|------------------------|-----|

A Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1982

A Bill to provide for the imposition and collection of a tax on travel tickets.

## CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES

|                                                      |     |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Congratulatory speech re Archdeacon F. A. Cayless .. | 328 |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----|

Mr. Craig, 328; Mr. Sandiford, 329; Mr. Deputy Speaker, 329.

|                                                                                             |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Congratulatory speech re retirement of Mr. Lionel Hutchinson, Librarian of Parliament ..... | 329 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

Mr. Craig, 329; Mr. Sandiford, 330.

## GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

|                                                         |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 20 - \$40 000 ..... | 331 |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                                         |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE - GENERAL ADMINISTRATION ..... | 331 |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----|

Mr. Adams, 331; Mr. Craig, 332; Mr. Greaves, 334; Mr. R. E. Brathwaite, 335; Mr. Sisnett, 335.

|                                                            |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1983-84 No. 19 - \$1 338 100 ..... | 336 |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                                                                                       |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| HEAD 78 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SUBHEAD 11 - BRIDGETOWN SEWERAGE PROJECT (NEW) .. | 336 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

Mr. Craig, 336, 339, 340, 341, 342; Miss Miller, 337; Mr. Franklin, 338, 340; Mr. Sandiford, 341.

|                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| HEAD 80 - GENERAL POST OFFICE ..... | 342 |
|-------------------------------------|-----|

Mr. Craig, 342; Mr. Franklin, 342; Mr. Tull, 342.

|                                                                                             |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| VESTING OF LAND AT BOTTOM BAY, ST. PHILIP IN THE ESTATE OF BONNER BOWRING .....             | 343 |
| Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 343, 345; Mr. Franklin, 343; Mr. Craig, 344; Mr. Deputy Speaker, 344. |     |

|                                                                     |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| VESTING OF LAND AT CHARNOCKS, CHRIST CHURCH IN PHYLLIS BARROW ..... | 346 |
| Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 346.                                          |     |

|                                                                                      |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| CARIBBEAN FINANCIAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT, 1984 .....                             | 346 |
| Mr. Tull, 346, 348, 349, 350; Mr. King, 347, 350; Mr. Forde, 348; Mr. Franklin, 349. |     |

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMEND-  
MENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1983.....350  
Mr. Craig, 350.

SUSPENSION.....340

ADJOURNMENT.....351

Mr. Craig, 351; Mr. Deputy Speaker, 351.

#### SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)  
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (St. Joseph)  
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)  
BRATHWAITE, R. E. (St. Lucy)  
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)  
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)  
FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)  
GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North)  
KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)  
MILLER, Hon. B. A. (City of Bridgetown)  
SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)  
SISNETT, Hon. L. L. (St. Michael North East)  
TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)