
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981-86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday October 30, 1984

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Speaker)
His Honour R. E. Brathwaite, (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House)
Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry)
Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.
Mr. L. E. Sandiford, Esq., M.A. (Econ.)
Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education)
Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)
Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)
Hon. L. R. Tull, Q.C., M.A., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign Affairs)
Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour, Social Security, Sport and Community Services)
Mr. L. L. Sisnett, (Parliamentary Secretary)
Mr. A. Truss.

Prayers were read by Father D. Stapleton.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

The Minutes of Tuesday, 23 October, 1984.

MINUTES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of Tuesday, October 23, 1984, be taken as read.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk has drawn to my attention that two items from the Order Paper were inadvertently left off. These have been corrected, so the Order Paper should have two more items than is currently listed for today.

MESSAGES

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in possession of Message No. 4/1984. It reads as follows:—

HIS EXCELLENCY THE ACTING GOVERNOR-GENERAL TO THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Acting Governor-General has the honour to refer to the Address passed by the Honourable the House of Assembly in accordance with the provisions of section 5(2) of the Representation of the People Act, Cap. 12, requesting the issue of a writ for an election to fill the vacancy in the constituency of St. Peter; and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that, on the 29th October, 1984, he issued a writ in accordance with the provisions of section 47(2) of the Constitution and section 36 of the Representation of the People Act, for the election of a member to fill the vacancy in the House of Assembly for the said constituency of St. Peter.

The day of nomination of candidates has been fixed for Wednesday, 7th November, 1984, and the day upon which if necessary, the poll shall be taken has been fixed for Thursday, 22nd November, 1984. The writ is returnable by Saturday, 24th November, 1984.

A. S. CATO
Acting Governor-General

PAPERS

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

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados National Bank for the year 1983.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

Recommendation No. 169 concerning Employment Policy adopted at the 70th Session of the International Labour Conference held in Geneva on 26th June, 1984.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question 11 by the honourable Member for St. Michael Central re recreational facilities for St. Michael Central.

Mr. A. TRUSS: To ask the Minister of Transport and Works:—

1. Is the Minister aware that, in 1981, 4 acres of land at Waterford Bottom, Saint Michael were compulsorily acquired by Government for the development of recreational facilities for the people of St. Michael Central?
2. Is the Minister aware that 3 years have passed since the acquisition and the building of these facilities has not yet started?
3. Will the Minister state when construction is proposed to begin?

Mr. SPEAKER: Question by the same honourable Member re road repairs in St. Michael Central.

Mr. TRUSS: To ask the Minister of Transport and Works:—

1. Is the Minister aware that roads in the constituency of St. Michael Central, especially at Deans Village, Goddings Road, Park Road, Savannah Road, Waterford Housing area, Sealy's Land and Station Hill Main Road are in a terrible state of disrepair?
2. Will the Minister state if and when Government proposes to start repair work in these areas?

Mr. SPEAKER: Question by the same honourable Member re street lights in Bank Hall and other areas.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Transport and Works:—

1. Is the Minister aware that there is a lack of street lights in the areas of Bank Hall, Bush Hall, Waterford Housing Area, Goddings Road and Deans Village, Saint Michael?
2. Will the Minister state what plans he has for the installation by Government of street lights in these areas?

Mr. SPEAKER: Question by the same honourable Member re traffic congestion and proposals for road improvement for St. Michael Central.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, to ask the Minister of Transport and Works:

1. Is the Minister aware that
 - (a) Bank Hall Main Road, Saint Michael is one of the main arteries used for the flow of traffic to and from the City of Bridgetown,
 - (b) that there is frequent traffic congestion along Bank Hall Cross Road, and that
 - (c) 2 parcels of land on corners of Bank Hall Main Road have been compulsorily acquired by Government for road improvement in the area?
2. Will the Minister state:—
 - (a) what plans Government has for road improvement in the Bank Hall Main Road/Bank Hall Cross Road area,
 - (b) whether Government plans construction of a roundabout in the said area and, if there is such a plan, when will construction begin,
 - (c) if there is no present plan for such a roundabout, whether the Minister will indicate whether Government will consider the feasibility and desirability of such a plan, and
 - (d) whether Government will treat St. Michael Central as a priority area for the implementation of general road improvements?

**ORDERS OF THE DAY
GOVERNMENT BUSINESS
SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

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

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

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SIX MEN'S
ST. PETER, FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE
SPEIGHTSTOWN BY-PASS ROAD (PHASE 3)
AND FOR HOUSING RELOCATION**

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Six Men's, St. Peter, for the construction of the Speights-town By-Pass Road (Phase 3) and for Housing Re-location.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is very simple and straightforward. What it seeks to do is to acquire lands which will be used in Phase 3 of the Speightstown Road Development in the Speights-town area. We are hoping that with the acquisition of these lands we may be able to resite some of the houses that were moved, just to marginally shift them away from the road construction.

The Resolution is simple. It seeks to acquire these portions of land in order to carry on development in the area in which the road is supposed to be constructed.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the honourable Minister could indicate whether greater care will be taken to protect the interests and security and probably the lives of citizens residing in the area now that Phase 3 of the by-pass is being done. I say that out of concern over the problems of safety which many residents in the area now face because of the placement of the road. During the last by-election I witnessed a situation where a child came across the road and narrowly escaped being killed. I picked up the child and examined the child briefly and the police came along and took the child to hospital. That was the day after a similar situation arose around the same spot.
12.30 p.m.

The Minister should seriously consider whether or not something should not be done in order to protect pedestrians, particularly children, in that area because there seems to be a problem of safety of pedestrians as a conse-

quence of the siting of the by-pass road. I think this is of considerable importance and it is something that should be looked into. Our headquarters was pretty near the spot where these two accidents took place, and, as I understand it, it is a constant threat to children, particularly during the school period. So I would urge the Minister to see whether or not anything could be done to improve the safety of the Speightstown By-Pass Road in respect of pedestrians, particularly children.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Speaker, knowing the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), if such an accident had occurred anywhere in St. Peter during the by-election, he would have had the *Nation*, the *Advocate* and C.B.C. on the spot to let the country see what a humane person the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is. Therefore, knowing the honourable member as well as I do, I do not believe it.

That matter was raised in here before, and I took time out to call District "E" Police Station – I was directed to call Hometown, which apparently is the headquarters for the northern zone – and I was informed that only two accidents had been reported on the Speights-town By-pass. One involved a police vehicle which was written off and the other involved a motor bike.

It is more than a year that the Speightstown By-pass has been opened. I believe it is a problem of attitudes where people are concerned, particularly since highways in Barbados are a new thing. When the Spring Garden Highway first opened, you found young men and women skating, you found bicycles being ridden along the highway – to the point where the Minister himself had to bring in regulations, if I am not mistaken, to protect these very people, and I remember the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. E. M. Taitt) putting a case as to how the fishermen and people living at Pile Bay would get home from off Fontabelle. There were a few accidents on that highway like an highway any part of the world through people not caring and not taking into consideration that there are other users of the road; parents leaving their children unattended when they are swimming off Brandons. I pass there very often, and nearly every day you encounter a flock of sheep crossing the highway, and motorists speeding and often called upon to bring their vehicles to a halt suddenly.

I believe that one of the problems which one could have not only on the highways but on our narrow and winding roads that were built not for high-powered vehicles, but were designed and built in the days of the trams and donkey carts, is that now you have large buses, large trucks with ten wheels, tractors and py-loaders all using these road systems that were designed and built many, many years ago. That is why I believe the Government is on the right course in providing high-

ways and highway improvements so as to protect the pedestrians and the motorists on the roads.

I would appeal to the motorists, as I hear every morning on radio coming from Police Headquarters control, to use the highways carefully, to remember that there are children crossing the road, and to pay heed to the traffic wardens so as to reduce the problems which you have on the highway. I do not believe that there is any greater problem on the bypass road in Speightstown than there is on the Spring Garden Highway or there is on Belmont Road, Collymore Rock or on Highway 7, but what we need is to recognise in this day and age that roads which were built for donkey carts and tramcar drivers are the roads still now being used by vehicles of higher technology, and therefore vehicles developing more speed. I should like, and I hope I am right – and the Minister of Education will be in a position to correct me if it is being done – children in schools to be taught how to use the highways in these days that we are now living in.

When I was in the Ministry of Housing, I had agreed with Mrs. Bannochie, when she was chairlady of the Parks and Beanes Commission, that we should find some way to take care of the sheep and cows that you found crossing the road unattended by people. It is a very dangerous thing to both motorists and to pedestrians, and I am going to make an appeal again that something be done.

There has been a great deal of improvement by the minibus drivers. They carry themselves tidier, despite all the criticism I receive from the President of the Association when I call them road hogs and said that they did not carry themselves as well as I believed persons who are serving the public should carry themselves. I was severely criticised in the Press, but I have lived long enough to see and to read that the very president came back and agreed with me, and I want to salute the minibus drivers today on how they are conducting themselves as against what they were doing in the past. No doubt, though there is room for improvement.

12.40 pm.

It is a very, very sad thing to see that we have to write regulations calling on Barbadians to be courteous and to recognise that when they are using the highways, there are other people using the highways apart from them. When it has reached the point where we have to write it in the regulations and put it on television asking motorists to dim their car lights something is seriously wrong. I did not think that that would have to be written in the Regulations. That is a common courtesy which Barbadians are used to; they are used to being polite.

There is a penalty now for failing to dim car lights while travelling on the highways. That is a waste of pen and

paper. I have to ask myself this question, where are we going if we have to do such things to bring simple road manners to the attention of the motorists on the road? If I am driving on the road and you are coming in the opposite direction and you are going to blind me with your headlights, and in order to enforce simple, common courtesy it has to be written in the Regulations that there will be a fine for not having road manners, it is a sad reflection on this society.

I want to reiterate that I do not believe the Member for St. Michael South Central. He is too much a person who likes to be noticed. He is an impressionist. If he is not doing something or saying something, whether it is true or false, he becomes mentally ill. He admitted in here last Tuesday that he visited a psychiatrist. I knew that the Member was all but mad because of the things he says – and we had his admission eventually that he had to see a psychiatrist. Up to now, I have not seen any improvement. I believe he is not taking the medication, but I would advise him to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us stick to the Resolution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am sticking to the Resolution, Sir. That is part of the Resolution. The conduct of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and his using the roads in this country is part of this because when a person has to be noticed all the time – I believe the Regulations were written for him to at least dim his lights – it would not be beyond him to drive without lights. He has to be seen. If he does not do anything to be seen, nobody would pay him any attention. He has demonstrated it publicly and privately before, and will continue to do so in his own professional life.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Speaker, motorists generally seem to believe, it appears, that by-pass roads are built for speed. The road surfaces are smooth, the roads are wider and I believe this is why they feel so – the Spring Garden Road has a much greater speed limit than any other road in Barbados – but it is also for this reason that I believe that some of these roads can constitute some danger.

The Speightstown By-Pass Road at the point where it meets Church Street is a particularly dangerous road at that junction. I missed, only by a few minutes, an accident at that junction, during the last by-election. There are structures at every corner. The home of Mr. Kenmore Husbands obscures the view of motor vehicles coming from the direction of Road View going towards Six Men's. Any driver, even though he may observe the "STOP" signs, who is attempting to move on from the "STOP" signs on Church Street to turn right or left on the by-pass road can, for that reason, be in danger.

However, Sir, I did not rise, to speak about this. My concern.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am happy to hear the honourable Member say that, because it looks as though we are moving from acquisition of land into a debate on road traffic.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: No, Sir. I do not know what is what. I came in here and I found debate going on and I am responding to the debate that I heard going on. The resolution is to acquire land at Six Men's, St. Peter for the construction of the Speightstown By-pass, (Phase 3), which I believe is an extension of the by-pass road as it stands at present, also called the Speightstown By-pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not deal with road traffic. I allowed a certain amount of debate on it because it was taken out of land acquisition into road traffic by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I would have to be guided by Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Sir. You did say you allowed a certain amount of debate. Debate implies that someone from one side may say something and someone from another side may say something. I think that inasmuch as you allowed a little latitude, you could keep the Members within the framework of the debate, as you are intending to do, Sir, and allow the Member from this side to develop his point a little.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable Member has heard the phrase, "Where Thou leadest, I will follow." The honourable Member from that side moved it out of land acquisition for housing relocation and the construction of the by-pass road. The honourable Member led off by talking about accidents on the highway.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I want to end this aspect of my contribution on this point, that when the Government is constructing a highway, or extending a by-pass road, as it is now seeking to do, it takes into account all the factors involved in constructing highways, including safety.

I am not quite sure what is the precise route that this extension to the by-pass road is going to take, but I assume it is an extension to the by-pass road. Beyond the Heywoods Holiday complex, you find that the road reserve on the west side of the by-pass road is overgrown with a tremendous amount of shrub and bush. The open area leading up to Six Men's is in a disgraceful state with that shrub and bush. I should like the Government, before it constructs the extension to the by-pass road, to do some clearing of the bush that is very unsightly on that Speightstown By-pass Road and going on to Six Men's.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): We have new roads that after the very slightest rainfall are subject to flooding and become dangerous. Only yester-

day, on one of the most recent roads constructed, the St. Barnabas Highway, there was a large pool of water, there by the Pine Hill Dairy. There is also flooding around the Globe, and I can go on. I have also noticed that on these roads the designed speeds are a little higher, but there is very little super-elevation on most of these curbs to combat the outward centrifugal force.

12.50 p.m.

I wonder from what point of view the Ministry is supervising and making sure that the designs of these roads are appropriate to accommodate the increased designed speeds, and to make sure that the drainage is properly taken into consideration, such that you would not have the deterioration, danger and people going to work wet. It is certainly not good enough for new roads, after paying tremendous sums of money for them, at the slightest rainfall to be completely flooded at the inconvenience of the people. I want to be sure that the Ministry has the technical know-how to check the designs of these roads, and to make sure that the designs are executed for the safety of the road users of Barbados.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE (St. Lucy): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that you do not have the authority to stop people from wasting time. When I was in the Other Place, I remember that while the honourable Member was putting his points about the Speightstown By-Pass Road he asked me, "Roy, is that the place where the Salt Pond is?" Today, it is one of our outstanding roads. The Barbados Labour Party had the wisdom and judgment to build the road, but we hear all this talk.

We realize now that since we have the Speightstown By-Pass Road there is a lot of speed and I agree with the honourable Member that he should acquire this land on the north side of this road, at Retreat Corner, which will make it easier to get to the cement plant, because we have big, heavy-duty trucks transporting cement.

I did not like the remarks from the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes). It is more than ridiculous to say that a child passing the road may cause an accident. There is no road in Barbados across which you would allow a child to cross and not cause an accident. It is time that Members on both sides start congratulating the Government on building the Spring Garden Highway, the Speightstown By-Pass Road and the St. Barnabas Road and stop making silly remarks about the roads. The people of St. Peter will not be very happy to hear people trying to mislead them.

I thought that some Members would have said they would like to have street lights on the by-pass road around the Heywoods Project, because we realize it is a hotel and we have workers and tourists walking around there at night. I should like to appeal to the honourable Minister to do all in his power to have lighting around the Heywoods Project. Apart from that, as far as I am concerned we all should

commend the honourable Minister for his stand. We in the north are all very happy with the road and welcome the planned extension.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Let us get it clear that we are not voting against the acquisition of this land for the extension of the Speightstown By-Pass Road. What, in fact, we have been doing is drawing attention to what is a patent fact, that the road has presented considerable dangers. That is exactly what the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) was pointing out, that the by-pass road is a dangerous road, because of a number of factors he was drawing to the attention of the Government. It is a fact that several accidents have occurred on the road, that there have been more than two accidents which have occurred on that road, and that they have occurred at certain intersections of that road.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I stated as a fact that the information which I received from the headquarters of the Northern Zone when I queried the police was that there were two accidents reported, and neither of the accidents was the one to which the Member for St. Michael South Central referred. You may know about many. I know about two which the police said was reported, and those are the facts.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am saying that it is also a fact that many more than two accidents have occurred on that road. It may be that you asked the police after two accidents had occurred. I do not know what they reported to you or when you queried them. I am saying that what the Member has pointed out is that there have been more than two accidents.

Certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) at this stage were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. Speaker at this stage.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: It is patently wrong for any Member, simply for pointing out as a contribution to a public debate that there have been dangers on the road and asking for care to be exercised in the construction of the road, to be held up for the kind of ridicule which has been attempted to be made of the Member for St. Michael South Central. We reject any such implications and imputations. It is not fair and it is not right.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): I am deeply conscious, and I am sure that this Government has always been deeply conscious, of the dangers that new high-speed roads impose. In fact, I believe that this Government is completely aware that any road poses a measure of danger to pedestrians and other persons who have to use them. This is axiomatic; it is inescapable and

ineluctable. If you have roads, you also carry along the danger that persons are likely to be injured during the course of the use of those roads. This is not peculiar to Barbados, it happens in every place where roads are, therefore, it is a bit melodramatic for someone to come in here and say that the Speightstown By-Pass is a dangerous road because a child almost got killed on it. That does not point to the character of the road as much as it points to the character of children. Children have not yet developed the responsible kind of approach to these matters that adults would be expected to have. Children are children, and they will run across traffic at the most inopportune time, unconscious of the danger that is inherent in that. So any child who runs across the Speightstown By-Pass is bound to be in danger, but that does not constitute an inherent character of the road itself.

The Speightstown By-Pass is a modern highway. It was designed for the purpose of carrying traffic around the central area of Speightstown into the northern part of Barbados with as much ease as possible. The Democratic Labour Party has repeatedly, in here and outside, engaged in the most unbridled hypocrisy imaginable when it comes to this subject, by stating that the Spring Garden Highway, for instance, should not have been built; if it had to be built, should not have been built in that area, it is dangerous; people get killed on it. All of these things I have heard, particularly from the mouth of the member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt), who paraded in here saying that it went through his constituency and brutalized the geography of St. Michael West. I heard him in here on that subject, and I have heard other Members talking about the fact that these roads are dangerous.

1.00 p.m.

I believe that in this particular case you are damned if you do — and you are damned if you don't. If you build a road, it is dangerous to children. When you do not build it, the Barbados Labour Party is failing to take advantage of development opportunities available to it, the people of Barbados are not being served, and in a modern industrialised society the infrastructural development that should go on is not going on. What we are deciding to do, after careful consideration, is to do what we have to do and disregard the noises that come from the other side, because we are not yet convinced that the noises that come from them are sincere noises. I do not believe that anybody on that side has ever got up and genuinely made a contribution from their heart with respect to any development project initiated or done by the Barbados Labour Party. It is always grandstanding and looking for opportunities to talk standard and undiluted nonsense on these matters.

I believe that it is time enough that a politician ought to be able to get up and say when something is good and when something is bad. I cannot accept that the Spring

Garden Road is inherently bad. I cannot accept that the Speightstown By-pass is inherently bad. I cannot accept that the two of them constitute the greatest hazard in the life of Barbados. People get killed all over Barbados on the roads that have been built since 1900, and it is really undiluted hypocrisy in the extreme for Members to come in here and find nothing more to say but that the roads that are being built are dangerous.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W.O. Franklin) talked about flooding, and I believe that in some cases these new highways that have been built have retained water for longer than we would like. We have investigated all of these new situations, and one that particularly comes to our minds is the one at the round-about at the bottom of the University hill. The water eventually goes off, but whenever you have new built-up areas, this is a condition that goes along with modern road development. The more smooth barber-green road surfaces you have, the greater the run off. The acceleration rate of the water flows sometimes poses danger to the storm drains to take them off, and some flooding after heavy, heavy downpours would occur.

The roads are designed to deal with the routine cases, but whenever you have heavy downpours of two to three inches of water, the run off, together with the debris that floats around, reduces the capacity of the drains to carry the water. It is not that they were not built with drains, it is that the drains are not capable of running off the water at the speed that would keep the road free of any settlement. I believe that as we go along from time to time we will be able to pay attention to these matters, but it is not an oversight in the planning of the road construction that has led to this situation. It is that extraordinary cases sometimes cause more settlement than we would like.

The Speightstown By-Pass Road is said to pose some problems with respect to road safety. I recall when the Spring Garden road was first opened all of the noises we heard about depriving people of free democratic expression by telling them it was not in their best interest to ride bicycles along the Spring Garden Highway, and that it was not a safe practice to use skate boards along the highway. What we heard was that people had lived in the area all their lives, and how do we expect now to come along and interrupt them in their pastimes?

A highway is not a playing ground, and I believe an Opposition party would serve its constituency better if it would help the Government in educating people in the way our highways are to be used. It does not serve anybody at all for any Opposition member to come in here and say that the Government is curtailing people's freedom by telling them they are not to ride a bicycle or use a skate board on Spring Garden. But that is exactly what the Democratic Labour Party did, made a hue and cry. First, we should not have put the road there. Second, we should not have made

the speed limit so high so fast. Third, you should let people ride on it. I cannot figure out the argument.

As Minister responsible for Transport, one of the things that I thought was in the interest of public safety was to publish a special code of regulations for the Spring Garden Highway in order to protect the lives and safety of people. It was for that reason, and that reason alone, that we sought to introduce those regulations, to help to educate people in the proper use of a road like the Spring Garden Highway. Again I invite the Opposition to take whatever opportunities are available to them, like now, to help to educate the people of Barbados so that their lives would be protected and that the purpose for which the roads were designed can be filled without any tragedy to anybody.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) talked about the Speightstown By-pass and made a useful contribution when he talked about the fact that the western verge is largely overgrown by bush. I happen to travel that area daily, and if he had passed there this morning and yesterday morning he would have seen that there is an MTW crew at the moment exercising themselves in the clearing of the bush to which he has referred. So that matter has not escaped attention, it is being taken care of at the moment. We are grateful at least that he made the only sensible contribution for the morning. However, we had anticipated him and that problem is already being solved.

The comments on the junction at Church Street by the member for St. Michael North was another sensible and worthwhile contribution. I believe that the Church Street junction is dangerous. I also believe that if I had been Minister responsible for MTW at the time, the property to which he has referred would have been put up for purchase. I do not believe that because certain people — Doc Husbands.....

Asides.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: It is because the Government bent over too far backwards to spare his house that it is possible for people to come in here now and talk about the road being dangerous. If I was Minister then, I would have put forward that that property be acquired, and put Doc Husbands in some place else to live so that we would not have to put people at risk by trying to spare him. I tell you that straight from the heart.

Because a person lives in an 18' x 9', you feel that you can go and climb all over him and acquire his property, but when a man has a house built out of wall, and his name is Doc Husbands, you have to dance all around the moon and through the stars because you cannot touch him. You are damned if you do and damned if you don't. I prefer to be damned doing what I believe is

right, and what would have been right in the circumstances in that particular alignment, because you cannot come through there without touching somebody, would have been to remove Doc Husbands, and I am telling you I would have touched Doc Husbands, period. I do not make any apologies for saying so either.

We have an industrial access road going to the airport now, and substantial properties are being touched. We are acquiring people's homes because the road has to pass through an alignment. I do not believe in this discriminatory practice of favouring some middle class people. Poor people get touched daily, and I believe that all of us have got to come to the point where we learn what sacrifice is all about. We would have compensated him for his property. He would have gone and found some place else to live, that intersection would be safe for all of us to use now, and we would not have people coming in here talking nonsense about the intersection is dangerous.

1.10 p.m.

We propose to put up traffic lights to make that intersection safer than it is now. This has to happen now because we just did not exercise ourselves in the way I think we should have done in the first place.

One of the difficult things for a Government is that, whenever you have to govern, you are bound to take decisions that are going to upset someone, and any Government that attempts to please everybody is not worthy of governing in the first place. We have to make sure that what we are doing is in the best interest of the people that we serve, but some of us have got to sacrifice some of what we regard as our own individual rights in order that the rights of the greater majority would be served. These are the points to which I draw the attention of Members on the other side. If the people of Barbados ever decide to let them run the destiny of this country again, that is the lesson that they should learn and master before they feel themselves competent to carry on this difficult task of governing.

The section of the Speightstown By-Pass Road to which this Resolution is referring is at the northern end. We are going to straighten the road, the dangerous bend around Six Men's where the big Sugar Bond used to be is going to be taken out. As soon as this Resolution has gone forward enough and Section 3 has been published, we will be able to start on that project. The road will be straightened so that it will be a fairly smooth run from the Heywood's Resort straight on to the corner by Colleton.

The properties in question are going to be slightly resited. They do not have to be moved too far away from the area. They will just be shifted out of the present alignment to make it possible for that road project to go on. This is something which we have talked about at great

length in other places and at different times, and I do not think we need to spend a lot of time outlining the critical natures of the exercise, because it only involves a straightening of the road at the northern end to provide for the execution of the plans as they were formulated at the beginning. We had to stop where we stopped because of those special problems.

I believe that when all the work is done, reasonable people will be able to express the fact that the Speightstown By-Pass Road is only one other example of the Government's forward planning and its foresight in the area of development planning, because when we are finished with it, the industrial access to the north will be strengthened, the traffic congestion in Speightstown will be eased and Speightstown will be able to develop more fully into a second town in Barbados, as it should develop, and give many many more opportunities to persons resident in that general area to enjoy the amenities of the north.

I have no difficulty at all in supporting this Resolution.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): The problem of the By-Pass Road at Heywoods, I would have hoped by now would not have generated any partisan political debate. It is a *fait accompli*. One of the difficulties the honourable Member on the other side has is that these projects have come to fruition and the fruits of these projects can now be seen. The honourable Member for St. John, the Leader of the Opposition, is well aware of these facts, and that is probably the reason why the honourable Member now, all of a sudden, is in the frame of mind in which he is constantly saying that every project is a waste of money. So many have been completed that he does not want to see anymore started. That is his problem.

There are some problems on these roads, and we, the engineers and the opinion formers of the country, have to make up in our minds as to whether, for instance, we are going to do what some other countries do and have overhead passes for pedestrians on a number of these major highways. A decision has to be taken.

I have heard at Planning and Priorities Committee over the last eight years conflicting engineering opinion as to whether zebra crossings are better than the overhead passes and things of that kind. Common sense tells me that an overhead pass is better than a zebra crossing. I believe that and I do not care what the engineer specialists write in the newspapers. It appears to me as a matter of common sense because I have seen it in Latin America and in Venezuela. I have seen it in Trinidad in the Caribbean. I have seen it in Europe. I have seen it in North America. I have seen it in Canada. Why are we so different?

I always thought that on the Spring Garden Road at the junction of Brighton there was going to be an overhead pass. I know that when you were in another place you strongly advocated that. I remember that very clearly at the Planning and Priorities Committee. But because a few people may tell you that it is a waste of money to to have an overhead pass, that should not deter a Government. I really believe that we have to have a few.

At the junction at the corner between Shamrock and the former Speaker in this House, the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party.....

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I agree with you, "sensible". He was so badly off that he said on the floor of this House that crossing the floor was the difference between starvation and being able to fill the pot.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He was bought, but for a few bucks. The principal buyer was over there.

It is still not too late, if the proper solution to that junction is the acquisition of the property on the left and the property on the right, to acquire them. There was a lot of controversy again among the engineers on this point, but people who do not have to take these decisions, people who are not in a position to understand how decisions are taken and the difficulties sometimes that you have with the conflicting advice, cannot appreciate how these things in fact happen. We must be men and women enough that when one viewpoint temporarily succeeds and therefore you only do a partial acquisition, if subsequent events show that the former rejected viewpoint should have been the correct viewpoint, there is no harm in completing and accepting that viewpoint.

1.20 p.m.

I also want to congratulate the Minister on the fact that the other jobs on that road appear to be starting. A bus stand has to be erected there. I hear the architects are now drawing the plan. They should have been finished by now. The Speightstown Development Plan envisaged a bus stand to be put on the by-pass road. We have to have the bus stand completely off the lay-by. Between that junction and the other junction there is a short space of land, and the way how the bus stand has been designed, it would not interfere with the passage of traffic at all. It is a complete lay-by, because the area between where the existing bus stand is and the other area is going to be connected to a pathway, and the drainage is going to be completed. Honourable Members have not walked in there lately. A large part of the drainage is completed but there is still a small area to be drained properly and to be made into a recreation area, I believe. That is what it is zoned for.

We also have three more houses to be moved in the Speightstown area because there has to be a pedestrian path coming from the junction access at Heywoods into Speightstown. There is one house on the sea left and two on the land side. There are three house spots at Battaleys which are awaiting the movement of those houses and then there are three houses at Battaleys that the people will live in.

I must tell honourable Members these things, because contrary to what they say on that side, this is not a heartless Government. You only have to go and see the great improvements that take place in people's houses when these highways are built. We build some temporary houses and we invite the people when they give up their houses while they are being moved to go and live in these houses which are usually nearer to where they used to live before. All this is happening. I am doing this for the edification of honourable Members because they will catch at all kinds of straws. There are three houses at Battaleys which will be used temporarily by the people at the corner just as you pass Speightstown and you turn into the crossroads while their houses are being moved.

I also want the honourable Member to know that he is holding up some other development on the northern end by Phase 3. On Phase 3 again there was a difference of opinion between the engineers as to whether Phase 3 was to go near to the road or further inside. The consensus was that you take a middle course and that is why we are acquiring this land. With regard to the houses on the seaside and on the landside, the people want to know exactly where the road is going to come, and I caution the honourable Minister of Transport and Works to let the surveyors go down and stake out the road early so that people on the other side will not go down there in the coming weeks and mislead the people.

I see the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central smiling. He wants to go down there and mislead; he could not help doing otherwise. I was very indebted to the honourable Leader of the House today. I was not in here last week, but I understand a great confession was made. I now understand. The honourable Member is in company with a lot of politicians. Hitler had the same problems. I believe though that nowadays there have been advances in the field of understanding the difficulties and the medications, and if you take them regularly you will be able to control yourself a little bit more. Ask the Leader of the Opposition; he understands these problems.

I want the Minister to go and stake out the road early so that the people will know how their houses are affected. I am very glad to hear that the solution to the problems that you talked about only involved the removal on the land side of very few houses and the shifting around of more. On the seaside we know that a number of these houses, because of the encroachment of the sea,

will also be moved on the land side. I hope it is now recognised by all and sundry that the development of this area is taking place against the background of a Government trying to improve the physical conditions in the area for people who live there, and at the same time trying to facilitate the economic development of Barbados by bringing our road system into the 21st century.

I cannot share the view of those who feel that it is a waste of money to improve the highway system in Barbados. I am astounded when I read newspaper reports that responsible Members of the Opposition say so. A road system that was designed basically to carry sugar cane and a few motor cars because of the phenomenal economic development that has taken place particularly since 1976 now has to carry tanker trucks of significant sizes with oil daily, it has to carry 40 foot containers, and do not tell them that 40 foot containers are not being used in Barbados increasingly in relation to other tankers, because if they do not see that, they are not living in this century.

You have a situation in which all of the minor bridges, because they are minor now, are collapsing. Sir, you will remember the first one, because you were the Minister then when you came to Cabinet and told us that nobody knew what was happening in Bay Street, that a major accident could have occurred, and then we had to do a crash programme to build that bridge. It was the same thing at Bridge Road, and there are countless other bridges all around the place, but some honourable Members who call themselves responsible are going to come in here and mislead the public of Barbados and say that the road system does not need improvement. Of course you know the public is not going to fall for that. They know a hypocrite when they see one, and especially when they hear one. The hypocrisy is very self-evident when an honourable Member can say that they planned all of them. How can one person say that to spend the money is a waste of time and the other one say that they had planned them. That kind of two-headed hydra approach is not unknown on the other side.

1.30 p.m.

Whether you think of it as having to widen the bridge at Portvale or the works being done in other areas, it is a fact of life that the increase in the number of vehicles in Barbados and the size of the vehicles dictate that a major reconstruction of our road system takes place. And it will be done, because you have a Government that has the courage to undertake these major projects. We shall not be diverted by any obstructionist fascists on the other side.

Applause.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: With all the obstruction we had, we still opened the post office – yesterday. With all the obstruction we had, we still opened the other facilities. Go and see them. The Cement Plant was obstructed from

the day it started by the former honourable Member in here who castigated the Government although time after time, it was explained that there would be no dust, and that the people in the areas surrounding Checker Hall would not be affected, they still in their lying ways went all around Barbados trying to mislead the public that the whole of that area would be littered with dust because of the cement plant.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us keep on the roads.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir. There has to be a road for the cement plant trucks to pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is why I am saying, let us keep on the roads.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is a difficult task to bring Barbados into the competitive position that we need to be in if we are to continue to be able to support the standard of living that we have and to enhance it, which is our aim, and which has been our achievement, much to the annoyance of the other side. I hope that the Minister will not allow himself to be deflected in any way because of statements made in here today, and that he would continue to bring to full fruition this project for the people of the north, for whom the Barbados Labour Party has done so much, and for whom the Barbados Labour Party will continue to do very much.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As the honourable Member who just sat down said, the hypocrisy is self-evident. I find it strange that when the Minister responsible for Transport and Works discussed this acquisition Resolution he made the comment that he does not believe that any honourable Member of this side has ever genuinely made a contribution from their heart on any development project, and then, in the same speech, acknowledge that the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) made a worthwhile contribution in the same debate when he spoke about the bush and the shrubbery which impedes the vision of motorists as they seek to come onto the by-pass road coming from the north. He went on to praise the honourable Member who drew attention to the fact that the corner of Church Street and the by-pass road is dangerous. But, as his colleague said, the hypocrisy is self-evident, and the same honourable colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister, then got up and said that the by-pass road has a dangerous corner at Church Street.

I do not understand why the Members on the front bench on that side continue to believe that noisome fulmination is going to be a substitute, in the view of the people of this country, for commitment, dedication and serious understanding of the sensitivities required for the development of this country. The Member said without missing a beat that if he were.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the honourable Member speaking on?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On the acquisition, Sir. I am responding to the debate of the honourable Member on this acquisition.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you are commenting on the speeches, do so.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, because he spoke on the acquisition and I am trying to diffuse much of what he said concerning this acquisition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us deal with the acquisition.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. I am dealing with the acquisition.

The Member said that if he were the Minister responsible for Transport at the time when the land was acquired for the by-pass road as it crosses Church Street that he would have taken certain steps. He will give the impression that a Minister on this side was the Minister at the time who was bending over backwards to accommodate a particular individual. It is an indication of the confusion concerning acquisitions which exists with that Government.

There is not a single person who has ever driven a motor car, a bus, a trolley, or a scooter who has driven on the by-pass road who would not agree that, especially after 5.00 o'clock in the afternoon, there is an element of danger in the by-pass road. If the honourable Member wishes to make a contribution that is worthwhile to the total development of this country, he would acknowledge that, basically, the by-pass road requires some further improvement. That is the gravamen of the contributions that have been made from this side every time the issue has come up.

The honourable Deputy Prime Minister talks about the difficulties between different opinions from the various engineers who inform the Government. Can anyone doubt that the absence of proper lighting on the Speightstown by-pass road, as well as the absence of proper lighting on the Spring Garden Highway is detrimental to life, to limb and to safety in this country. I have no doubt that engineers have advised the Government to use the cat eyes on the Spring Garden Highway and on the Speightstown by-pass road. I wish to say that I consider that to have spoilt completely the work that was done. I believe that putting the cat eyes on those two roads has spoilt the beauty of the roads and has not contributed significantly to increasing and improving the safety of the roads.

We have to put a certain kind of lighting along highways. All the honourable Members on that side have travelled outside of Barbados on highways and they must know that it is absolutely necessary to have a certain quality of lighting that will allow the visibility of the road to be reasonable. It is still a difficult proposition to drive on the Spring Garder Highway when the sun has gone down. Sometimes there are illusions when a motorist is coming from the north and you are travelling from the south, especially after you move out of the lit part of the highway on to the unlit part. As a result, sometimes one gets an illusion that the motorist who has his headlights on and who is coming from the north is going in one direction when in fact it is coming in the other.

These are matters which are or ought to be non-partisan. But what is happening in this Honourable Chamber, and indeed in this country, is that certain people either believe that all knowledge resides in their particular heads or that it is impossible for a good idea to come from anywhere else.

1.40 p.m.

This acquisition of the land to do Phase 3 of the by-pass road in Speightstown should have been accompanied by a recitation by the Minister of what precisely would be involved in Phase 3. After an hour and a half of debate I do not believe that this Honourable Chamber has any idea what constitutes Phase 3. It is safe to say that no honourable Member on this side sits on the Planning and Priorities Committee and, therefore, would not be aware of what the plans are for Phase 3. We are told that we are acquiring land for Phase 3 of the by-pass road. Instead of the honourable members enlightening us and the public as to what constitutes Phase 3, they get up and accuse this side because the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central made a statement of fact that he observed a particular accident.

I do not wish to get involved in delineating which accident occurred on which highway, but it is a fact that the Speightstown By-Pass Road passes through an area that has at least four schools feeding on to that highway. Those four schools account for almost 2 000 children who are chock-a-block next door to a highway which every single honourable Member who has spoken agrees induces fast driving.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. TAITT) were ordered expunged from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not dealing with schools. We are dealing with the acquisition of land.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I would like to think that Phase 3 of the building of the by-pass road will embrace a policy

that has as a priority the safety of the nearly 2 000 children who feed on to that road from one or the other of the schools on that road, licensed or unlicensed.

The honourable Minister who has the responsibility of carrying out these works, not the one acquiring the land, cast aspersions on comments which have been made about previous acquisitions for the improvement of roads, such as the Spring Garden Highway. Having been one of the persons who uttered words concerning the Spring Garden Highway, I say that it is patently dishonest for anyone to say that the Democratic Labour Party has said that the Spring Garden Highway should not have been built, or that the by-pass should not have been built. They could not have said that, because the Spring Garden Highway was formulated by, conceived by, and prepared for execution by the Democratic Labour Party.....

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: On a point of order, Sir: I understand the honourable Member to be stating explicitly that I was dishonest in reciting certain statements which he made with respect to the Spring Garden Highway. I believe that it is improper for any Member to cast those kinds of aspersions on the character of other Members, particularly when he knows that they abandoned the plans for the Spring Garden, and, furthermore, that he led the vanguard of persons resisting and criticising the Spring Garden Highway saying that it should not be built — he and Mr. Jimmy Springer.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member will have to withdraw the word "dishonest".

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I never made reference to the honourable Member. The Record will show that I said that it would be "dishonest for anyone to say".

Mr. SPEAKER: The Record shows that the statement made by the honourable Member is as follows:

"I wish to say that it is patently dishonest for anyone to say that the Democratic Labour Party has said that the Spring Garden Highway should not have been built."

The honourable Member may proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am grateful to you, Your Honour, I can only say, like Bob Marley "Who the cap fits, let them wear it."

The point I was going on to make is that one did criticise some aspects of the Spring Garden Highway, which the honourable Deputy Prime Minister confirmed today. What we have always said, and what we will continue to say, is that where we in Barbados, for all the reasons that are given, move to larger and wider roads, we

have to include in our total planning consideration not only for the motorists, but for the pedestrians. We are a small community of 250 000 people with an influx of visitors from time to time, when the Barbados Labour Party is not in power. We ought not to be planning in terms of a society the size of the United States, which has 230 million people and where ten or 15 people in a community may not matter. We cannot have the situation where a Minister is saying that if six, eight or ten persons have to be touched when you are building a highway, they will have to be touched.

We have a community where people's relationships with one another have been more important in many ways than economic development. Therefore, when we are going to have urban renewal or economic development, we cannot have it at all costs at the expense of the citizens in the community. When we are building highways that pass through traditional communities like Land's End and the other areas through which the Spring Garden Highway passes, we have a responsibility to ensure that the traditional way of life of those persons is not interrupted unnecessarily, disastrously and callously. I have said, and I continue to believe, that a bicycle path and an overhead pass for pedestrians are things which we ought to have included in the general plan for the development of the road.

1.50 p.m.

Riding a bicycle is not something that is reserved only for the poor. Sooner or later the fat cats, whether they became fat by one form or another, discover that riding a bicycle is necessary for their continued existence as part of their exercise regimen. It is therefore desirable that when we are planning we plan for the pedestrian, we plan for the bicycle rider, we plan for the handicapped person. All of these are matters which come to the fore every time someone drives on either the Speightstown By-pass Road or the Spring Garden Highway.

Every single day one observes even a motor vehicle trying to get from the Brighton Road onto the Spring Garden Highway, furthermore a person who is trying to cross that street, one realises that some kind of overhead or underground path for people is necessary. One sees it again as one drives on the Speightstown By-pass Road. As the Speightstown By-pass Road loses what appears to be its elevation soon after you enter it going north, and you see a community on the left by the breadfruit tree, and a community on the right that has been created, there is a point at which vision is almost completely lost, and it is also a point at which many of the good people of St. Peter cross that road.

There are marks in the Speightstown By-pass Road which may be familiar to people who drive but are totally meaningless to a large number of people who walk. There are young people who cross the street casually in much the same way as they did when they only had to cross an eight foot highway. It is clear to me, and I believe it is clear to some of the honourable Members on that side, that we have not only to have an education programme but that we need to improve the marks along the road. That will include the lighting and the signs. There is not a single sign on that highway that could tell a pedestrian what to do.

You are aware, Sir, that here in Bridgetown by the St. Michael School attempts have been made to give the pedestrian a capacity to control the movement of traffic by pressing a button on a pole that would change the light to red. I want to suggest that these are some of the measures which ought to have been taken, and presumably will be taken in Phase III of this Speightstown By-pass Road.

I find it passing strange that at this time when we are concentrating on development, Ministers can become concerned, angry and up-tight when suggestions are offered by citizens who actually use a road. The honourable Members on this side who have spoken, in my view have made constructive criticism of the Speightstown By-pass Road. The honourable Deputy Prime Minister admitted that even the engineers differ, and I would go on to say that for the length of that road, it has too many curves. anyone who drives on that Speightstown By-pass Road would agree with that.

I have no doubt that we will soon hear that there is an engineering reason why that road has to take on the appearance of a meandering stream. A by-pass road ought not to have the same kind of curvature as a meandering stream. A by-pass road, generally speaking, both from an engineering point of view and from the efficiency of the road, ought to be as straight as is humanly possible. I am not going to criticise the road from that point of view only because I have not been privy to the information which must have been given to the engineers, or, conversely, which the engineers may have given to the Government. But no one can deny that when you approach what had been advertised as a by-pass road you are surprised by the number of literal curves in the road as it goes from Highway 1 to the link up beyond the Heywoods Holiday Project.

The honourable Member for St. Andrew, I believe in his capacity as Minister responsible for Transport and Works, once indicated to us that the installation of the lights along this highway, which really is the only major criticism that one can have of the highway, would only take a short time. That is my recollection, and if it was not him I will apologise, but I am fairly certain that during a debate

in here he indicated that the lights would soon be installed. We are now at the end of October 1984. The Minister should tell us and tell the people of Barbados that he expects to have the lights on the by-pass road by a particular time. We should not be now debating that and going on as if this is a major issue merely because a by-election is coming up. We ought to be in a position to hear from the Minister specifically that we recognise that there are still some dangers on the road, we acknowledge that we have had some accidents which may have been avoided if it were not for certain difficulties in the road, and we are taking steps to correct those difficulties.

The road does not belong to the Barbados Labour Party. Why do the Ministers behave as if the road is something belonging to the Barbados Labour Party? The road is something which is of interest to every single person in Barbados. It is not used only by politicians or only by the Barbados Labour Party, it is used by every single person in Barbados whether he is a "B" or a "D" and therefore the Democratic Labour Party can have no interest in trying to ridicule the Barbados Labour Party's building a road which the Democratic Labour Party conceived. The Speightstown Development Project is a Democratic Labour Party project.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. TAITT) were ordered struck from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.
2.00 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, that gentleman, who is even now *sotto voce* being attacked, sat as part of the committee that had to set out part of the Development Plan, that gentleman who sat in that honourable, distinguished and venerable place where Your Honour now sits as Speaker in this House.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That does not mean that he was not Speaker and therefore ought to be treated like a person who did not sit as Speaker. But the Barbados Labour Party is well known for its vilification and ill-treatment of Speakers. The Barbados Labour Party is well known for treating Speakers badly. It is nothing new.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order: Is he referring to Mr. Neville Maxwell or Mr. Eyre Hoppin that they said a man called Haynes bought?

Mr. SPEAKER: What is that?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: A point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order. It may be a point of elucidation.

The honourable Member, please continue. You have two minutes more.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am very glad I have two minutes more. I know, that this is going to get hot outside of Parliament during the next few days and I will promise the honourable Members faithfully that they will get *quid pro quo*, tit-for tat, word for word.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us deal with the roads. Please do not warm up in here.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: When these acquisitions come to this House and we finally go outside, we are going to be able to deal with them more fully where the Speaker will not be called upon to rule and keep the quorum, where the people will be the ones who will choose in the end. They can fool some of the people some of the time, they can fool all of the people some of the time, but they cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Sir, I have listened to this debate with an unhappy heart. We are here debating the acquisition of land to straighten out the end of the Speightstown By-pass, and I have had to say that once again I have seen the Opposition appeal to one of the lowest denominators of public judgment in the matter. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) is accustomed to appealing to the lowest common denominator of public emotions, emotions of hate and violence, but he seems to have backed off that now, and in the anecdotes that owe more to imagination than to fact, in seeking to emulate the President of the Democratic Labour Party by a comparative whisper in the last presidential election, the honourable Member and the others, are now appealing to the same emotions as were stirred in 1895 when the first motor cars entered upon the roads in the world and they were told that unless a man with a red flag walked in front of a motor car there would be slaughter among the pedestrians in every city in the world and no child could ever be allowed out.

It is obvious to anybody who is a pedestrian that it is more dangerous to walk on the narrow roads of Barbados with a bus coming in each direction that to cross the Speightstown By-pass. It has to be obvious that where we live in an island with narrow roads and big vehicles, pedestrians take their lives in their hands every day in the absence of sidewalks or verges. It is only because pedestrians are accustomed to walking along the roads that there are not more injuries.

Senator Griffith and I took a walk on Road View Road as far as the St. James border, Greensleeves, a couple of months ago, and my heart was in my mouth every minute. I am not accustomed, I must say, to walking on the roads in Barbados. I have not walked on them very much since I was a boy. I am accustomed to walking on roads with pavements, and I believe that if I had been walking on the same side as the traffic was

flowing that I would have been in very grave danger of being knocked down if I had not been taking precautions like stepping down in the gutter all the time.

The roads in Barbados are hazardous to pedestrians, and this is one of the reasons why the Government is undertaking a programme of road improvement. I am expecting a reply very shortly from the Ministry of Transport and Works to directions that I have given them to formulate proposals for general paving of all the streets in Bridgetown. We are fools if we believe that Beckles Road, Belmont Road, Tweedside Road and Pine Road are not streets in Bridgetown. Because we call them roads and they were once roads leading from one place to another, it does not mean that they have not now become streets which are hazardous to pedestrians and which need paving. If honourable Members want to talk about the hazards to school children they must talk about the Pine Road and the St. Winifred's children, about Government Hill and the Children from Springer Memorial — they are the roads that they must worry about that are dangerous to children — and not seek to pursue cheap sensation in discussing the new by-pass roads.

The new by-pass roads present a challenge for people to handle the increased speed. The fact that there have been no accidents on the Spring Garden Road involving a pedestrian now for many many months reveals that the pedestrians have learnt to handle the Spring Garden Road. It is a pity that one child was misled by his father in crossing the road and in turning back in the middle of the road was killed. It was a grave human tragedy, but the fact that that happened should not blind us to the reality of the situation, which is that without an overpass, underpass, zebra crossing, traffic lights or anything, no pedestrian has been struck on the Spring Garden Road perhaps for over a year, because people have learned to use the road.

If you can learn to use Government Hill with the volume of children on it — there is Government Hill Primary School, the private school and Springer — you can learn to use any road. But we have the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) making a long speech about they are making Speightstown By-pass a by-election issue talking about the road in Speightstown. What is he and his side making it when they talk about the potential danger to pedestrians?

There is a lot of good sense in what the honourable Member said about the curvature of the Speightstown By-pass. Honourable Members have forgotten how that curvature came about. It is worse at the joint immediately approaching Heywoods from the south. Honourable Members have forgotten that the Golden Mile Corporation, a corporation with which the former Prime Minister was connected as the Duffus Commission revealed, as a condition to get town planning permission to cut off what is

now Heywoods, had to build a road along the cut off portion, and that road along the cut off portion is the part of the Speightstown By-pass that runs from Speightstown along Heywoods and into the depression that honourable Members are talking about.
2.10 p.m.

I was at the meeting with Mr. Gray Wilkie and others at which I told him that Government was not paying one cent for that land until agreement could be reached on rebuilding the road to the standards which the planning permission required. Mr. Harold Griffith, the then Chief Technical Officer, said that the road was so badly built that a very substantial programme of rebuilding, which he costed at around \$900 000, would have to be undertaken. But the land had already been cut off and the road was the boundary, so you could not change the curvature of the road. The road was rebuilt, an agreement was made, Mr. Wilkie and the other associates of the right honourable Member for St. John accepted the reduction in the purchase price of the land, which is now Heywoods, by an amount which represented what the MTW had to spend on trying to rebuild the road.

I negotiated it, so I am not saying anything that I do not know. Meetings of Golden Mile were held in my office before I was Prime Minister. Ask the Ambassador to the UN who was counsel and in a very embarrassed position because he had Minutes which had been kept by the former Prime Minister of meetings held in the Prime Minister's office about the same Golden Mile. So blame his associates for the bad conditions that you see in the Speightstown By-pass.

We carry some blame too, because we should not now be coming for this land. We should have built that by-pass straight into Six Men's by passing the bad corner right there which now is to be by-passed after this acquisition. We should have done this when we were finishing the by-pass road. I thought we had decided to do it at the Planning and Priorities Committee. I remember we went down there and we looked at the point on Maynard's Road where the by-pass would come. It would come over on to the concrete strip that is still there and it would join up Six Men's Road. You will remember that, Sir. I was very surprised — I think I was out of the country and certainly I was out of St. Peter for some time — when I saw that the by-pass road had been brought down at too southernly a point instead of by-passing the corner.

No Government is perfect. Mr. Speaker, you, the Deputy Chairman responsible for Tourism and me as Chairman of the Planning and Priorities all took the decision that a proper by-pass going through Six Men's should be built, but for one reason or another the engineers were able to pervert that decision with the result that we have to come to the House today for this extra piece of land

to improve the road. I thought that it really was my duty in respect of all that was said just to settle the facts on that portion of the by-pass road.

I really must say that we must be doing marvellous things in Government if all that can be found on the day after a by-election is announced to criticise us for is that there are no traffic lights by Doc Husbands' house. I have made a calculation that between two and three quarter million and three million people have driven on the Speightstown By-pass since it opened. Journeys have been made, and out of all those journeys and God knows how many pedestrians, somebody said he saw an accident. Do you mean we have not done anything worse than that? Do you mean all you can say about the road programme is that a little child is liable to get knocked down on it or people passing Doc Husbands' house have to push the nose of the car out a little too far because of visibility or because they do not know that a by-pass road is there — it is not signposted? For if they are only our sins of commission and omission, the Opposition would have to be passing the greatest vote of confidence in the Government that it has yet passed these eight years. Do you mean that all that is wrong with the road programme is that we did not repair the Grey Wilkie Road when we took it over, and that out of deference for Doc Husbands, who did not want to move from the spot, an old gentleman that we did not want to disturb — do not mind I had to call him Judas once or twice on political platforms; even Judas is entitled to his own Potter's field — and because we did not wish to purchase the Potter's Field, you have a situation there where you have the choice between traffic lights or a major road? Maybe we will choose traffic lights, maybe we will let driving discipline deal with the problem.

The basic fact is that the roads in Barbados are too narrow for the amount of traffic. They present a hazard to pedestrians, and expanding hazard in the St. Michael area and a considerable hazard in parts of the country. We need a programme of new highways and a programme to improve all the existing roads where people live, the existing roads in the parts of St. Michael which have become streets because of the density of the population that has grown up around them. When we do all that, we will expand the programme of building subsidiary tenantry roads and improving tenantry roads all over the country. We have not expanded that programme. In the first five years we actually built twice as much tenantry roads than were built in the previous five year, but we have not undertaken any major new programme of tenantry roads. There we are building at a certain level. When we have finished our programme around June 1988, we will have a road programme that will be adequate for what I assume will then probably be 70 000 motor cars on the roads of Barbados.

I am obviously very keen to support this Resolution, because it should have been done long ago.

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the House is requesting to give notice of two Resolutions. He may now proceed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:—

Resolution to grant the sum of \$3 487 555 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1984–85, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984–85, No. 14, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$35 322 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1984–85, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984–85, No. 15, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

2.20 p.m.

Sir, I may be seeking the leave of the House to deal with both of these Resolutions in all their stages today if possible. I should just like to give that early notice that we may deal with them later in the day, depending on how we are able to get through with Government Business. I should just like to inform the Members on the other side in advance.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for lunch until 3.20 p.m. today.

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

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

2.21 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Order No. 1 was called – To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. 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.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE EXPLANATORY NOTE TO SUBHEAD 3 – PURCHASE OF EQUITY BY GOVERNMENT IN COMMERCIAL VENTURES OF CAPITAL HEAD 73 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, this has Phase 1, 2 and 3 and unfortunately, we are doing it as Phase 3, 2 and 1 because the first item really is Order No. 2 on the Order Paper, which is to get a sum of money, the second item would be to appropriate certain funds and the third item would be to permit those funds to be dealt with. It really does not matter. They are interconnected, and I hope that honourable Members would take one argument on the subject.

Aero Services was a company that was owned in the main by Barclays Bank, with an outside shareholding consisting of a number of persons interested in the light aircraft business in this country. The company was not a commercial success and Barclays Bank was seeking ways and means of winding it up.

A calculation was made, as a result of which it appeared that if the Barbados Defence Force had to hire the necessary staff and pilots to service its own aeroplane, it would cost more than the projected losses of Aero Services as a company which was already doing the work. It was possible to make a fairly accurate arithmetical calculation. The Defence Force was paying Aero Services so much and so much for the provision of pilots on a twenty-four hour basis the provision of mechanics and avionic services necessary to maintain the aeroplane. Aero Services was losing so much and so much. The two sums added together were not equal to what it would have cost the Barbados Defence Force to hire the number of pilots, mechanics and avionic experts necessary to fly the aircraft and to maintain it.

That arithmetic still holds good today. Effectively, the cost of maintaining BDF 1, the Defence Force's aeroplane, is spread over the whole structure of Aero Services, and the overheads of running it are divided between running a commercial operation, albeit at a loss, and running the Defence Force's plane.

The situation now is that the present aeroplanes belonging to Aero Services have become less serviceable than before. There are two Trilanders, there is, I think,

an Islander and another aeroplane. Aero Services has a number of firm contracts for the provision of small air charter services. There are contracts with some diplomatic missions, contracts with a charter tour business that takes persons on day tours of neighbouring islands, there is, I believe, a mail contract and there may be one or two smaller contracts for the carriage of cargo. I have some files, but I am not really in a position to give every detail of all of Aero Services' business since the Government formed a company and took it over.

The present shareholders in Aero Services are the Government of Barbados and the Tourism Investment Corporation, which has purchased the former shareholding of Barclays Bank, for a purely nominal sum. The Board of Management has decided that the fleet should be rationalized, that a slightly larger aircraft than any of the present fleet, with superior fuel using capacity, should be bought. Two of the present fleet disposed of are indeed being taken for an exchange. We are handing them in as second hand and getting a new one. When we come to see number two, we will see the cost. The cost is around £2 million and we are asking for the guarantee of a loan of £1.85 million.

We are getting suppliers' credit for the purchase of the aeroplane. Aero Services is seeking to have to make a down payment from its own resources. These resources are somewhat limited because when the Government started Aero Services, basically, it did not put any money into the company. What we did was pay off an agreed sum for the outstanding indebtedness to Barclays Bank. Monies appropriated by the House on that occasion went to pay them a debt rather than into equity, so Aero Services now has a very poor debt equity ratio. There is really hardly any paid up capital in the business in any real sense, because it has all been disposed of in purchase in the goodwill from the earlier company, of which goodwill is quantified in the amount of an agreed sum for debt.

I have decided that if Aero Services is going to borrow money to buy an aeroplane, it should have an equity structure sufficient to support the borrowings. In fact, I must say, that we make decisions and we hand them down, the Cabinet agrees, but they do not always come over exactly as we wanted. What basically I wanted was to put in \$500 000 in equity and \$300 000 by way of subsidy, but it is all about equity in the Resolution. I have been debating whether or not to change this, but I think that on the whole, since we have entered into the debate on this basis, the short, medium and long term in debt is the same — it will be \$800 000 in the taxpayers' money and it will be paid to Aero Services — in the circumstances, it may be better this year to increase the equity over and above what I had originally envisaged and put the whole \$800 000 into equity, rather than vote the \$300 000 for subsidy and put half million

dollars in equity. I really do not believe that it will make any difference in the long run, because the \$300 000 is not a loan — it is a subsidy.

Experience suggests that with the tourist business in its present state, Aero Services will require a subsidy. Before the last Estimates, Cabinet quantified the subsidy at \$300 000. It was what Barclays basically were putting, what they offered as an overdraft, and it is what we have come to believe on the basis of experience would be necessary. So there will be a subsidy in future years of the amount of \$300 000. It was virtually only an oversight that it was omitted from the Estimates this year, and therefore, it now falls to be added to the equity contribution.

3.30 p.m.

The Explanatory Note has to be amended in order to make Aero Services a beneficiary of the vote for equity investment, purchases of Equity by Government in Commercial ventures. The second thing to be done is to move in Sub-head 2, under Head 73, the addition of the total sum of \$800 000 support for Aero Services.

A salesman visited the island, a Mr. Wilson I think he is called. I really do not know the gentleman. His contacts appeared to be with the Opposition. I hear he lives in Rockley, which, I suppose, means that he lives near the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central's jogging circuit. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is always trying to get information which he can misunderstand and misrepresent. Mr. Wilson, who I hear the Leader of the Opposition saying from his seat lives in Rockley, is apparently a salesman for a short company or a local agent. I do not deal with these details; they are dealt with at the lower level than Prime Minister. I do not know that I got a number of cables about this matter, because the Government has been taking its time about completing this, we have wanted to be absolutely sure that the economics of the whole deal were correct before we went ahead. But in their excitement it appears that Short Brothers have actually appropriated a Skyvan aircraft to the service of the Barbados Defence Force or Aero Services, and they have painted it in our colours and flew it at the Farnborough Air Show. I thank them for the confidence that they have showed in the word of the Government of Barbados and the assurance that they would be paid for it in due course, that they will accept their supplier's credit or perhaps pay for it in cash with the fullness of time.

The Leader of the Opposition has joined the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in some of these scare stories about the capacity of the Barbados Defence Force to seek out exotic aircraft for military use. The first of these exotic military aircraft brought to the attention of the House were two helicopter gunships, and I believe that the honourable Member for St.

John not only had the information, but he even had brochures showing the military capacity of these weapons of war. I heard the honourable Member for St. John say last night that History was not his strong point. With great respect,.....if he had said "facts", I would have no disagreement with him, because history is perhaps not the honourable Member's strong point since, essentially, a proper study of history depends and rests upon sure foundation and grasps of facts, and the honourable Member's grasp of facts has owed very considerably more to fantasy than to historical scholarship and basic research. We never at any stage ordered any helicopter gunships or even considered them. I do not know if somebody in his wildest imagination may have possibly thought that the Barbados Defence Force needed a helicopter gunship. But, equally, we have the latest fantasies about the buying of an airplane - to carry a tank?

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member should not have stopped. I believe it can carry a tank. Why not say a tank? Why stop at a Land Rover? It depends how you define "tank". Whatever, buying this airplane which can carry a Land Rover or tank, or whatever, that is the latest fantasy.

The Short's Skyvan is undoubtedly a civil military aircraft. It carries twenty people. It can carry a jeep.....

Asides.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Honourable Members are very familiar with the information which can be read in Short's brochures or in *James Aircraft* of the World. If the honourable Member wishes to enter into a study of what any given ship or airplane can carry, I will lend him my copy of *James Aircraft*.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Far from being out of debate, the editor of *James* is being prosecuted in the United States for releasing classified information. Out of date? Well, well!

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member says he has his information. He will not be able to call on me to hand them around the House, he has them. Maybe you will send them over for me to look at. I am the one interested in military affairs. I did not know the honourable Members over there are really interested in the performance of Shorts' Skyvans.

The important concern of the Barbados Labour Party is that the Short's Skyvan will be able to carry

some cargo down the islands. It will be able, for example, more expeditiously carry out the breadfruit contract, bringing breadfruit from St. Vincent to Barbados, that was negotiated at one stage with Aero Services. It will be able to carry packages of cargo down the island which lies within its range, and it will be able to carry a larger number of tourists on those day trips to Martinique, Tobago, Grenada to Point Salines, the airport we helped liberate, St. Vincent, and St. Lucia than the previous aircraft could carry. It will also be a more comfortable aircraft than the Trilander. The fact that the Skyvan can also carry 20 armed men plus a Land Rover, or plus a military vehicle, a small armoured car, is as irrelevant as the fact that the Pam Am Boeings, in the event of war, are liable to be commandeered by the United States Air Force for the purpose of carrying two companies of troops to the Middle East. Pan Am buying a Boeing or Airbus, which in time of war everybody knows will have to be part of carrying the Americans Strategic Reserve overseas, is no more a military action than this one, and honourable Members really must be bankrupt in criticisms and arguments if because they read in a brochure, which one Mr. Wilson in Rockley has provided to the Opposition, that it can carry soldiers, if that is all they have to talk about, that I repeat we must really be doing a good job.

We are buying one Skyvan, but if we can get two for the price of one, we will take two. The Prime Minister has got two cars, for him and the Deputy Prime Minister, for the price of one that was written off. So if we can get two for the price of one, we will get two but we are paying for one.

The Skyvan will be able to carry passengers. If at anytime it is necessary to put soldiers in it, just as the soldiers had to go into the Trilanders to go down to St. Vincent, soldiers will go in it. I believe I will go in it, Mr. Chairman, at some time or another, and it may be that one of these goodly days perhaps the whole House of Assembly, or nearly the whole House of Assembly, may choose to travel in it to get a demonstration if honourable members would like that.

3.40 p.m.

The Skyvan is being bought as an all-purpose aircraft which will be used day in day out for commercial purposes, but will be part of the reserves of light aircraft in Barbados, virtually any of which are liable to be called on in a serious emergency that might involve the movement of troops. I hope that such emergencies would not happen again during this century. The justification for buying this aeroplane is commercial. I defend it upon that basis, but I am not in any way going to prevent honourable Members from having their day in court by revealing that they too can read a brochure and feel excited about it.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution to amend the Note do now pass.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to what the honourable Member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Finance, had to say. I do not know what the Government's aviation policy is. I do not wish to reflect on a vote of the House, but some time ago we bailed out Barclays Bank, whose Managing Director was about to leave Barbados and who wanted his books to look good before he left. The gentleman was Mr. Lloyd Roberts, and the history of Aero Services was really a history of the interference of Barclays Bank in the aircraft industry in Barbados.

For very good reason I did not take part in that debate. I do not have such a reason restraining me now from taking part in this debate, because for about ten years I was President of the Barbados Light Aeroplane Club and the Barbados Light Aeroplane Club had on lease to Aero Services Limited the hangar which is currently occupied by Aero Services Limited. Barclays Bank International was a major shareholder in Aero Services Limited, and the Barbados Light Aeroplane Club was a minority shareholder as well as owning the hangar. So was the President of the Senate and the late Mr. Maurice Jones, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Charles Emtage, who was one of the advisers to the Defence Force, and one or two other members of the Light Aeroplane Club, and the former Managing Director of Barclays Bank.

Aero Services Limited found itself in a debt of over \$3 million, most of which was owed to Barclays Bank. (Aero Services, also happened to have on lease for me at one time an Air Commander 560A, so I know a lot about the operations. Therefore, I had to keep out of the discussion because it would have been embarrassing for me at that stage.) The present Government was persuaded to take a loan of exactly the amount of money that was owed to Barclays Bank from Barclays Bank — that is, the loan came from Barclays Bank — in order to acquire a major shareholding in Aero Services, and the new Aero Services was formed.

The Government of Barbados some time ago bought without any debate in here a Cessner 402 — they are both priced at about \$600 000 — then all the avionics and everything was on top of that, and that ostensibly was bought for the use of the Defence Force which at that time had no trained pilot whatsoever. There was a Beech A 200, there was a Barclays Bank aeroplane, there were several other light aircraft managed and some owned by Aero Services, there was Tropic Air operating Tri-commanders and Aero-commanders, and at that time one

C.47, and all of these were available for charter and for use of the Government of Barbados in case of emergency for search and rescue operation. That is the background.

When it was suggested by certain advisers to the Government that perhaps one possible solution was not to take over Aero Services but to lease from Aero Services from time to time as the Government required aircraft, and to pay on an *ad hoc* basis at cost for any search and rescue operations carried out, the Government was advised by one of their military personnel that security was at stake and therefore they should spend \$3.3 million for the purpose of securing one aircraft. If you want to have security for an aircraft, we found that the best way to do that is to pay a watchman about \$180 to sleep under the wing of the aircraft at night. But the Chief of Staff apparently felt — this is the story that was put out in some Government circles — that the only way to safeguard the Cessner 402, which the Government had bought whether ill-advisedly or not, was to buy the whole company.

There was another alternative, I think, which you are aware Mr. Chairman, was open to the Government, that is, to let another private company — at least, you and I were of course not one to enter into the pros and cons of that particular exercise — take over.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You are saying you had vested interest).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I had no personal interest whatsoever, but I knew the parties as His Honour the Chairman knew the parties, and we have known the parties for years and years.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You are responsible for some of the parties).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, no, I am not responsible. Mr. Chairman will set you straight on that. I was aware of the formation of a private company owned by Barbadians who were willing to enter into negotiations with the Government to look after their aircraft. They were all *bona fide* Barbadians and had nothing to do with any political affiliation. If so, they were on your side and not on mine. I deliberately kept out of the debate for that particular reason, and I am sure the honourable Member for St. George North (Mr. J. G. Odle) was aware of the circumstances. But I am not really concerned about that, the Government made a decision.

We have to be very careful about these military people causing us to spend taxpayers' money building up facilities and building up and building up. The honourable Member for St. Thomas suggested that the information which we were aware of was false informa-

tion, that the Government was negotiating for a helicopter or helicopters. When the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) mentioned the helicopters in the course of debate, without even rising from his seat the honourable Member for St. Thomas said — I am not attempting to quote him accurately, I am trying to quote him from my memory — that some disloyal employee of Barclays Bank had leaked the information to the honourable Member, the Government was only negotiating to buy the helicopters, and that he would report the matter to Barclays Bank. Now he is saying today it never happened, they were never negotiating for any helicopters — they never even considered it. And the exact price of the helicopter was quoted inside of this House!

3.50 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the honourable Member would allow a point of explanation, the honourable Member knows that his words there have expressed a whole multitude of perhaps innocent misrepresentations.

First of all, we were never negotiating to buy any helicopter gun ship. We were never negotiating to buy any helicopters at all for Barbados, but the Regional Security Service asked for a quotation on a helicopter. It was the Regional Security Service, not Barbados, and therefore all the statements are true.

We, the Government of Barbados, never negotiated for any helicopter, but there was a meeting in St. Lucia about equipment which the then English Loan Officer, a Commander in the Royal Navy, a most abled man, if I may say so — I do not know if he will read this in what ever distant ship he is serving but if he is not promoted Admiral, I think the Royal Navy would be the worse for it — was presenting all options to the Regional Security Service, and it was as a result of discovering that helicopters cost more than ships that the Regional Security Service rejected any idea of building a helicopter force. But the Government of Barbados as such was never negotiating for one and nobody was negotiating for anything to be called a helicopter gun ship.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have been around airplanes too long — I left school and went straight into the business — to be misled by the honourable Member. There is no airplane in the world which is built as a gun ship. A gun ship is a journalistic term to describe any airplane which has been converted by putting in cannons, like the one recently ordered for the Defence Force costing nearly one million dollars. We have not been told in the House about those yet. You had better ask your procurement officer about that.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the honourable Member is in charge of Defence and Security, there are people doing things behind his back that he should be aware of, because he will wake up one morning and find that there has been a coup and he will see these cannons at his door. They have ordered cannons. I am telling you. They cost £60 000 each. He knows nothing about it and these cannons can only be used as anti-tank weapons.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You do not know about it either? I have the information, and nobody lives by me.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation. A moment ago the honourable Member said we are ordering a cannon to put in an airplane for \$1 million and now he said we are ordering cannons for £60 000 each?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There are other people in here who have ears to hear. I said cannons costing £60 000 each; six by £60 000 is £360 000. Today's rate of exchange is \$2.41 — I checked it in the *Advocate* a little while ago — and I know you can do mental arithmetic.

They are German 20 millimetre cannons. Ask your procurement officer about it, because when the order was received in England, they wanted a confirmation — these are the people who are making money out of it — they said that they could not believe that a small island like Barbados would want cannons.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you want to know who told me? Do you want to see the order? How much are you going to pay me?

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: *I do not pay for information*).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well, you cannot get it. I will produce it in court. You always tell me to produce it in court and I will produce it in Court. I am giving you the details.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You had better check. After the Minister has gone to the telephone you had better check with him and ask him if what I say is not true.

What about the 250 gas masks? What are you using them for? They are on order this week. When

you use gas masks, it means that you are going to use tear gas against the populace?

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I see, you hear that I will be promoting a revolution.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member is suggesting that they are going to put me in preventive detention.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I believe those words should be withdrawn. It is imputing improper motives to the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. John. These are very serious charges. This is no laughing matter.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You rose on a point of order but it is not a point of order. The right honourable Member for St. John, please continue. Let us deal with this Resolution.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am drawing to your attention that one honourable Member on the Government side has said that the Leader of the Opposition would promote a revolution in this country and therefore they have to get gas masks for that. I am saying that that is contrary to the Standing Orders of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An honourable Member made an aside. The Chairman did not even hear it. The honourable Member has risen on a point of order and the Chairman has ruled that it was no point of order. I beg the honourable Member.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, you are saying that you did not hear it?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I heard it from the honourable Member who is on his feet and who I ask to please take his seat.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You are saying now that it is not true, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order on both sides of the House, please. The right honourable Member for St. John.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand now that the gas masks which the honourable Member has admitted are on order and are about to arrive in Barbados are being ordered because the Government of Barbados fears that there is going to be a revolution instigated by this side of the House, and the gas masks are going to be used against us as law-abiding political representatives of the people of this island. That is what I understand, and I want it on the Record so that I can repeat it outside. I want to know what this country is coming to!

A few years before the 1976 election, the Government of Barbados bought 51 per cent of the shares in a freight carrying service called Carib West for the sum of \$550 000. Not only did the then Opposition, the Barbados Labour Party, harangue the Government about it and spread its despondency and alarm and said we were doing it to bail out our friends, but this freight carrier, which was the only one in the whole Caribbean that had a 402 licence to operate out of the United States, was the subject of an enquiry which cost the taxpayers of this island over \$183 000. Subsequently, the same airline, Carib West, was expropriated and converted into a company called CARICARGO in conjunction with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, still operating under the same 402 licence.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member said it is not true. I said it was expropriated then and it was still operating at that time under the 402 licence.

They entered into an agreement with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to form a new company called CARICARGO, but did not compensate any of the previous shareholders in the same way that they only shook hands with Barclay's Bank and Mr. Lloyd Roberts, a golden handshake for Aero Services. They then agreed to take over the Boeing Aircraft 320-C, "C" for cargo, with a cargo floor and cargo doors for a sum of money which at that time was about three times the market value of the same aircraft in the United States of America. The going price for a Boeing 707/320 C — and you cannot tell me otherwise, because I get the quotations every month, month by month, direct from Seattle; I have to, do not ask me why, but honourable Members on this side know why I have to — was \$1.8 million. I would say that at that time the Government of Trinidad pulled a fast one on the Government of Barbados because they do not know much about the aircraft business. That aircraft was over-valued, but what was worse is that at that time there was an injunction, which should have taken effect last year, that all of these Boeing 320C aircraft had to undergo conversion or be prohibited from landing in the United States of America. So from \$1.8 million we have a figure now of approximately \$7 million

for an aircraft that you could have picked up in Wichita, Seattle, for \$1.8 million.
4.00 p.m.

I do not know whether that was given as a credit to the Trinidad Government or money actually passed, but I think that the Trinidad Government got away with something when they did that. I am putting it at the highest level. I am not going to make any aspersions or anything. But at the time when they were bought I do not think that the Barbados Government was informed by their Trinidad counterparts that every single Boeing 707 had by the middle of 1983, this is 1984, to have a hush kit conversion to all four engines or they would not be allowed to land, according to the Federal Aviation authorities, because of the environmental factor. Not only did they acquire this 320C, but when B.W.I.A. had finished their conversion on all Lockheed 1011s, which is another obsolete aircraft, they went and took over the second 707 but at a slightly reduced price from the first one they had taken over from B.W.I.A., and that needs to have a hush kit conversion.

Let me tell you what is going on and warn you, and you had better check it out with the Trinidadians and ask them what they are trying to do with the Barbadian taxpayers. Every single 707 that had been converted up to last month in the United States was converted at a maximum cost of US\$1.6 million to US\$1.65 million. The conversion on the first Caricargo 707 — ask Mr. David Simmons, he went up — is \$3 million, which is the highest paid — and it has not been carried out yet — by any airline, any cargo airline, any passenger airline for any conversion for the hush kit. This is a standard thing carried out by any of the big air workshops in the United States at a standard peak, and it is now a standing joke throughout the United States aviation circles that CARICARGO is paying approximately twice as much for the hush kit conversion as any other airline in the United States. Check it out before you attack me. I do not get up here and make statements.

It is your duty as Minister of Aviation to make sure that your partners in CARICARGO in the country south of us do not try and pull a fast one on the Government of Barbados.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have trust in Mr. Kingsley Clarke.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You have got more than I have got. You say you have got trust in Mr. Kingsley Clarke, but Mr. Kingsley Clarke does not make the financial decisions. He does not know anything about this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us not bring the civil servants and the workers into this debate. Order on both sides.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you mean when you drove the car that you had not paid the duty on, the red car?

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You have not paid the duty on that one either.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On the East Coast Road? You stopped too, and you had a drink or two the same time. I was not down there with anybody, I was down there on my own.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You were down there frying chicken)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Nobody fries chicken on the East Coast Road.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is not part of the debate on Aero Services, and honourable Members must address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Let us get back to Aero Services. Not satisfied with that, we then go and bail out Barclays Bank. To me it was most inequitable. I said I did not take part in the debate because I was president of a club that had shares in the company, and I did not want to make it appear as if my contribution was due to the fact that the Light Aeroplane Club and the other shareholders in Aero Services were not paid and only Barclays Bank were paid. The Government of Barbados has to make up its mind whether it is going into the business, in a legitimate, calculated and planned manner, of air charter services, of running military operations with aircraft, or whether they are just interested in bailing out, succumbing to the blandishments of people like Mr. Lloyd Roberts and bailing out Barclays Bank because they have a military component behind all the movements that they make in subsidising Aero Services or any other company other than CARICARGO.

We understand CARICARGO because we think that a freight carrier is necessary for the movement of goods, both perishable and non-perishable, between this country and North America particularly. But when you get involved in air charter services which can be done by other people, and which other people are losing money in, and when you go into that deliberately, then we come to the conclusion that there is some motive other than the purely aviation policy motive one based on military considerations as adumbrated by the Chief of the Defence Staff himself.

For the purpose of search and rescue operations, a Skyvan would be the most unsuitable aircraft that you could imagine. Air/sea rescue calls for very fast sea-going vessels. For the purpose of search you need fairly slow radar-equipped aircraft, which could be done by the private sector as is done all over the world, sometimes by the Coast Guard in very big countries, and in other countries all equipment is called into operation in case of an emergency of that kind.

I have taken part in search and rescue operations in Barbados. Every time I mention anything that I did before, it never happened. Anything that they do not know about never happened. If I say I was trained in naval reconnaissance, it is a laughing matter, it never happened. If I say I was trained in coastal command, it never happened. If I opened or closed an airport or park, it never happened. Nothing at all has happened before they were born, although they have done nothing themselves. Nobody else has done anything, so I am not worrying to go into that, but my experience has got to be worth something, and I say it is a complete and utter waste of money unless you plan an invasion with your cannon and your gas masks and dropping paratroopers. I do not think a Skyvan can hold a tank.

The Prime Minister accuses us on this side of reading something in brochures. The only people who send me brochures are Air Spetiale in France, and I hardly read them. But I contribute to every single aeronautical magazine that there is in England and the United States of America. I get every single issue of Aviation and Space Technology every time it comes out. Some of them are down in my office now. Everybody is free to come in there and look at them.
4.10 p.m.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am speaking about *bona fide* aviation people. There are about half dozen of them that I contribute to. I am not speaking about the other foolish periodicals. I am not speaking about the trivialities. I am speaking about the important ones that are recognized. It is one of my interests.

I do not know Mr. Anthony Wilson. I know from my enquiries. When they discovered that they had offered the Member for St. Michael South Central a trip on the Barbados plane when he was in England a few months ago, I heard that the name of the agent was Mr. Wilson. I began to make some enquiries and discovered that he lives in Rockley. I am not concerned with Mr. Wilson. If the Barbados Government buys an aircraft and he is the agent for Short Brothers, I suppose that he would get a commission; he is entitled to a commission.

I do not think that he did anything actively to promote the sale of the aircraft to the Barbados Government. That decision was a decision made off the tops of their heads by the military, and I presume by the Minister of Aviation, and/or the Prime Minister, to buy a Short's Skyvan. It used to be called at one time, the Bristol Freighter. It traditionally flies across the English Channel. You could charter the Skyvan and fly your car across the Channel if you are in a big hurry. I do not think really that it has the strength — it is a boxish looking contraction — to carry anything like the Sherman or the Tiger or any of those troop carriers that are popular nowadays.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Popular in the Museum.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: They could probably carry a half track. I do not know, because I have never seen one boarded into it. I know they can carry between twenty and twenty-six persons, certainly twenty personnel with parachutes and everything else. When you add this up, what is going on in this country, you have to ask: "What are the priorities of this Government?"

There is no point in cursing us. We come in here with positive information. The Members on that side did not even know that a ship arriving in Barbados has a manifesto which is available to the general public, and that it was in that way, when I was looking for the ship that my second hand car which my son bought was supposed to arrive in, that I discovered they had ordered all these abdominal bandages and stretchers.

Do you know what they did, Mr. Chairman? Shortly after that they approached a certain captain and asked

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Hearsay!)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Hearsay? I can give you the time, names and everything.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: And the name of the man at Cable and Wireless who sent the telex.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Nobody at Cable and Wireless sent me any telex. Was there a telex about the abdominal bandages as well? It was a telex about two people, one a semi-Barbadian going to Bay Street and asking a gentleman if they could buy a ship in his name

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am getting on with it, Sir. because the Government did not want the public to know what they were bringing into this island. He

said that he was only married to a Barbadian and, therefore, they would have to give him an undertaking in writing that it had the approval of the Barbados Government because he was not doing anything illegal. He lives in St. George, not far from where the Right Honourable Prime Minister used to live.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Give us the name.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Would it be of any benefit to you?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We cannot have all this cross talk.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: A speaker must be heard without interruption.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You should tell the honourable Member that if he asks me questions, I will give him appropriate answers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair. Order, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Carib West was the foundation and the linchpin of the air cargo movement that is taking place in the Caribbean today. I am not against CARICARGO. I am against the Government of Barbados being hoodwinked by any officials in Trinidad — maybe the Trinidad Government itself does not know about this — to pay more for hush kits and more for aircraft than those things are actually worth. I am against the Government of Barbados taking over a whole company, whose shares were worth virtually nothing, and bailing out Barclays Bank with \$3 million — and then coming back to us and telling us that they are going to give an annual subsidy to that same company, which is not going to have any profit, and that they are going to buy a Skyvan and ask us to guarantee a loan of \$4.4 million for the first aircraft, because my understanding, and the understanding of Short Brothers, is that there are two. That is increasing the National Debt by \$4.4 million. For what purpose?

Barbados is twenty-one miles long. By the time the Skyvan took off from the airport and circled the island and got back down, the total elapsed time block to block would be thirteen minutes. So what would you need a Skyvan for? It cannot land in the sea, it is not an amphibian. Do you need it to go to Canouan? The runway there has deteriorated. It is impossible to land on Carriacou. Whose country are you invading now, Mr. Burnham's country?

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Burnham does not have anything up there.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Venezuelans do not think so. The Venezuelans think they have a lot.

(*Aside:* Not when you are the consultant.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, but he did not like the advice I gave him. I told him he was wasting money.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I agree with you.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Would you spend \$3 billion to build a hydro-electric plant next to the Venezuelan border? Do you think I could give him that kind of advice? There are no jokers on this side. We have some serious people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You told me I have fifteen minutes. Is it time for the House to adjourn? I am the first speaker on this side of the House. Is there a time limit on the first speaker?

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You look good today but you sound bad like Sunday night.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: How do you like the tie? They are my party colours.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your fifteen minutes are up. You can sit down, You may speak for fifteen minutes at any one time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The person first replying on the part of the Government can have fifteen minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are in Committee. You can come back again.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The main point I wish to make clear is that we are against further military expenditure, even if we are told that they are getting the gas masks and this, that and the other because they expect a revolution on this side. I should like to assure the honourable Members that they can send back the gas masks, the Skyvan, the parachutes and everything else, because there is going to be no revolution from this side.

As far as I am concerned, do not worry to come back with the second Resolution, because we are not even supporting the acquisition of the first. You have the numbers. If you want to vote for a Skyvan, vote for it.

I am asking the Government here and now to try and get their priorities right. Your priorities are housing and jobs for the people, primarily for all the young people leaving school. By jobs, I do not mean the concealed

unemployment that you have in the Defence Force of this country, because the Government will not even tell us how many people are in the Defence Force. We know what is the size of the military establishment in the United States and in England, but we do not know what it is in Barbados. So in that respect, we could never support this.

4.20 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: When you hear some things in here, you can only shake your head. The honourable Member said that six 20-millimeter canons of German origin have been ordered by the Defence Force. The truth is this. The Defence Force already has six 20 millimetre canons of German origin and they were fitted to the ships, including for all I know the *George Fergusson*. They have been owned by the Defence Force for a long time. This has been investigated. The Defence Force sent a telex to London asking by part number for a manual for the canon costing maybe £10 — I do not remember; not £60 000 anyhow, not even £60 — showing where to fit the spare parts, how the guns could be disassembled and reassembled.

I do not think that the telex was ambiguous, but it appeared a bit ambiguous, and the factory in England, knowing that the Defence Force could not need six canons, asked for a clarification. They knew that because the number of vessels in our Defence Force is known to every defence factory in the world. Our defence vessels are in *James*, all the ships in the world, and you only have to turn and you will see the full specifications, the day they were lodged, the names, and perhaps even the name of the commanding officer. Just as the Russian Navy have their details, so does the Barbados Navy has its rather more modest details. The fact is, the company, knowing that we could not need to replace the 20 millimeter canon, asked for clarification of the telex. It seems to have been established that this was the occasion of comment at Cable and Wireless. What the honourable Member said at first was perfectly true, and I did telephone the Brigadier, and the Brigadier told me right away that somebody at Cable and Wireless apparently had made some comment about these telexes. What I would really suggest to the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) is that he warns his colleagues — I am sure that he would not do it, because it is too near home for him — not to leak out the information that comes on telexes.

The Government monitoring station has the means, I suppose, of monitoring any communication that goes out by wireless from Barbados, and I have only on one occasion known anybody in the Government monitoring station repeat the contents of a telex. I am aware that on one occasion a matter relating to international security was supplied to the police, not even the Defence Force. It was not supplied to me and it had nothing to do with

Barbados. It was an event that took place outside of Barbados relating to another country. But it is a disgrace if Barbados External Communications, as it is now, contains people who are prepared to repeat to Members of the Opposition, or Members of the Government, the contents of cables sent by the Barbados Defence Force or anybody.

I remember that in 1966 we benefitted from somebody at Cable and Wireless who overheard a conversation between the honourable Member for St. John, then in Canada, and Sir John Stow, then Governor, relating to the election of 1966. We benefitted from it, but I knew then that it was wrong to listen to anybody.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I should like to tell the honourable Member that he must not measure me by his last statement. Last night he mentioned that I should listen behind the door at one of their political meetings. I am not a pimp. He may have pimps — I do not have any.

I should like to assure him that he is looking in the wrong direction. My information came from England, and the people in England said they could not believe that Barbados would really need these things. Somebody in England asked, "What are you doing down there? Are you starting to invade Grenada again?"

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Then if what I say is untrue, why do you consider it a disgrace that somebody should say the same thing that I accuse you of? You said that it is a disgrace. If it is untrue, then you have nothing to worry about.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member has missed the point. I do not believe that the honourable Member got the information from England. Maybe he thinks that he got it from England. The point is that the telex asked for clarification because the suppliers did not believe that we needed the cannons. You would not have to go to England for that. The telex was asking to have that point cleared up.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not seen any such telex at all. My information came from the United Kingdom, and I am not going to tell him anymore. Up until now he does not know where my information about the bandages that they were going to use during the hurricane season — at the end of the hurricane season — came from. But I told him that. Anybody can get the manifest of a ship and therefore he does not want things landing here to come through the normal channels.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now we know where the information about the bandages come from!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Where did it come from?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Not from within the Defence Force. The point is that nobody said that the honourable Member necessarily saw the telex that went to the Defence Force from England. But it is the telex that came from England to the Defence Force that contained the information that the English suppliers could not believe that we needed cannons. When the honourable Member says that he got the information from the United Kingdom, he is saying no more than he had access to the cable from the United Kingdom which queried the need for the cannons, and I admire him for the way that he avoids the truth without telling a lie. That is the only point I sought to clarify.

The cannons were all part of the deal for the Coast Guard in 1979 or whenever it was. I asked honourable Members that if they really think that the purveying of little tit-bits of information which they get, usually wrong or misunderstood, is in the best interest, dealing with the Defence Force, of Barbados. We have been told about the bandages and the stretchers, which happen to be true; not the number that the honourable Member spoke about, but obviously the army has to have bandages and stretchers. The honourable Member got details of goods waiting to be cleared for the Defence Force and he brought them in here to show he had them. The honourable Member is quite right in saying that a helicopter is a helicopter and it becomes a gunship when you put on a gun, but you must understand that the armament for a name vessel or helicopter can quite often cost more than the hull of the vessel or the body of the aircraft. I mentioned in here how the French gave us a quote for a patrol vessel in which they would have given us a gun and a fire control system that would have cost more than the vessel itself. Therefore, when you are dealing in helicopters and you are arming them, you may very well be paying as much for the armament and the fire control system as you are paying for the helicopter.

4.30 p.m.

An enquiry was being made about a helicopter for the Regional Defence Force, and all of that had to be discussed in the House. People made enquiries from Barclays Bank as to whether they would be prepared to finance the deal, because there are no list of prices for what we are talking about. The price of what we are talking about goes according to the customer, according to the feelings of the Government of the country in which the weapon is made. We had all that talk in here. It might conceivably have been confidential and the honourable Members might have thought that they may not be doing the best thing especially since it was not Barbados' secret, if it was a secret at all, and since it was related to the Regional Security Force.

We have on political platforms stories about Skyvans to be armed with guns for millions of dollars and to carry soldiers, and now in here I am put in a position that I have to state in order to quell alarmism that we are not buying any replacement for a 20 millimetre cannon but we are buying a manual and a few spare parts; something dealing in hundreds of dollars rather than thousands, a far less millions. I do not know what the sacred attraction of a military secret is for honourable Members that they must talk about it every time they get hold of something that is the pettiest of little tit-bits.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You have to be more open in Parliament and in Barbados on these matters).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member for St. Michael South is saying that I must be more open in Parliament and in Barbados. I am going to arrange to carry the honourable Member for St. Michael South into the Sergeants' Mess in the Garrison in his constituency and let him tell the sergeants and the various men who may write the telexes and arrange to send them off that it is a good idea to talk about the cannons, the decisions of the Board on whether or not we want manuals for them, or discuss generally whether it is a good thing to have gas masks or not. If we are not to have gas masks, let the honourable Member who is the Opposition spokesman for defence come and address the Defence Force in the lecture hall, secure in the knowledge that chemical warfare is a growing part of today's military thinking, and tell them that they must not have gas masks. Is there something unusual about buying gas masks for an army?

The honourable Member wants to know how many bullet proof vests they have? He wants to know how many armour plated bullets they buy from time to time? What are debates on defence now? Examples to show off Mr. Wilson's garrulousness under the influence of alcohol or whatever? Or somebody at Cable and Wireless feels that they have something on the Government so they will tell the Opposition: "I want you to tell the Skipper this for me. I hear the people in England asking why so and so." Is this really what defence debates are about?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): I should like to look at this matter in a very clear light against the priorities and problems facing this country and how this money and other related matters that we are being called upon to decide today will contribute towards the solution of these problems.

As I understand it, there are three areas in which Aero Services operate. One is in the area of tourism, in which they apparently provide a charter service to persons

who wish to go on charters to other islands of the Caribbean. The second area, is the area in which they carry freight, cargo and whatever else they carry, again to other islands in the eastern Caribbean. The third area is some shady area, some grey area, in which there is some arrangement, as I have heard today, with the Defence Force to help that Force carry out some of its defence responsibilities.

In this country it is accepted that tourism is in a very depressed state, and a number of reasons have been advanced why tourism is in that depressed state. Those reasons range from the charge that the Director of Tourism was causing more damage to tourism than any hurricane in Barbados, down to the suggestion that the Board of Tourism was not spending enough money on promotion. I believe we can go through a virtual A to Z analysis of the plight of tourism in this country, but nowhere have I heard it advanced so far that one of the problems in Barbados' Tourism is a lack of charter facilities and capabilities to move people by charter from Barbados to other territories of the eastern Caribbean. I have not heard any serious analysis of the tourism sector advance that kind of reason as one of the main factors operating to the detriment of tourism in this country. Therefore, I have to ask myself, and I ask Members of the Government, whether it is a contribution to the solution of the problems facing tourism for this Parliament to appropriate funds, or to give guarantees, or take any other measures in relation to Aero Services in order to give it a tourism facility which is not at the top or even the middle of the list of problems relating to tourism in this country. On tourism grounds, I have not been convinced of the arguments advanced so far that we need this kind of investment, or this kind of guarantee, or this kind of allocation as far as Aero Services is concerned.

I go to the second area of freight, mail, packages and breadfruit, and whatever else may be involved in this second area. As I understand it, the main thrust of the Government and its agencies in moving the products of Barbados out from Barbados to buyers and other persons is through, first of all, the scheduled airlines, and secondly through a specialised aircraft service known as CARICARGO, which is a joint project between Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago. Therefore, if there is a problem of moving the products of Barbados out of Barbados, should the capability and the facility not be directed towards CARICARGO and the established airlines, Caribbean Airways, Liat, BWIA and all of the other scheduled carriers? So I would think that if there is a problem in the movement of your cargo and mail, that the direction in which we would be moving to deal with those problems, when once the problems are identified — because up to now we have only heard about the movement abroad, and I do not know that was a major problem for this country or for any other country in the Eastern Caribbean — would be to look to the established

carriers, scheduled and specialised, for the movement. Therefore, on that second count we, of the Opposition, remain unconvinced that we should make this commitment by way of guarantee and other related matters for an investment into Aero Services.

4.40 p.m.

We come then to the third area, which relates to the shady grey area of the relationship between our Defence Force and Aero Services. This remains a very grey area. It is an area in which the Government does not disclose the relevant information to this Parliament or to the people of Barbados, and so we have got to go on the information that becomes available to us.

Right now in the United States there is a big debate still going on over the matter of defence policy. In Britain itself, there is a debate still going on about information coming out in relation to the Falkland Islands. These are issues, and they debate these matters and they come out in Parliament itself. The Prime Minister of England has to stand up in the House of Commons and deal with the issues and give the necessary information. But here in Barbados, so long as you mention the word "defence", it is supposed to be hush-hush, it is supposed to be secret. If we get information and we disclose it, there is something treasonable, somehow or another, about telling the people of Barbados what is going on in Barbados with the money that the taxpayers have to pay month after month. All kinds of accusations and imputations are levelled against the Members of the Opposition simply because factual information is given.

We need to know a lot more about the relationship between Aero Services and the Defence Force so that we will be able to come to a conclusion as to whether the services which the Defence Force claims that it needs, or the kind of mission that it has to carry out, can be carried out most effectively and efficiently through its Aero Services contract. All we are hearing about is that what the Defence Force requires is somehow or another spread over all of the financial activities of Aero Services itself. That is the statement that was made in this debate.

We have already heard that for the requirements of the Defence Force to be met in terms of search and rescue, that it is not a requirement that there should be this contract with Aero Services. We ask ourselves, therefore, why is it necessary at this time for the Government to come to Parliament to ask for money to be guaranteed which they may eventually have to pay back out of the taxpayers money, because nowhere has it been said that Aero Services is or will be a successful commercial venture? In fact, the contrary has been indicated, because it has started out, we are told, with inadequate equity put into the operation. We have heard that there was an attempt to clear off old debts but nothing really to set it

up on any sound financial basis. We have not been told what are the projections for this particular company that we are being asked to guarantee this money. So we have a great shady area as far as the defence requirements are concerned, and when we look at the commercial capabilities and viability of Aero Services Ltd., we find that there is nothing that anyone could go on to invest in that company: for because when you look down the road, medium-term and long term, there are no projections to say that in 1990, 1995 or the year 2000, it will be a paying concern or a going concern.

We have heard, again to the contrary, that each year hereafter, and including this year, that the taxpayers of Barbados would have to look for \$300 000 as subsidy to be paid to Aero Services. For what purpose? Why must we take up money to pay to a company \$300 000 a year as subsidy, when our manufacturers are crying out for assistance in order to get their business going, to provide employment and all the other services that they provide for this economy. The manufacturing sector is a very important and crucial sector in the economy of Barbados. If we have to look for that kind of money to subsidize a company, why are we not looking at the other areas of the private sector? — Those commercial companies which are now in receivership and facing bankruptcy and which are crying out for assistance and aid. We hear nothing about that, but we hear it said quite glibly that the \$300 000 as subsidy to Aero Services was left out in error.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We are going to put this money into Aero Services. Why must we do it? The argument that we are advancing is that on no ground at all — tourism, the military, the area of cargo and freight, nor on financial grounds — have we heard any substantial argument why this kind of commitment should be given, and why this kind of investment should be made, and when we contrast it with needs in the other sectors of the economy, we say that we are not convinced that we must make this kind of investment. It is for this reason that we are asking the Government to withdraw this Resolution that they have before us now, think again on these issues and come back with a better case which may be convincing to us and the public of Barbados. Unless that kind of step is taken, we will be forced to vote against these measures.

4.50 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Sir, I know, we all knew, we could all have predicted and expected that the kind of speeches that were made by the two previous Opposition speakers would have been made. They want the public to believe that they are opposed to the Defence Force, therefore anything at all that comes in here to deal with or that is remotely

connected to the Defence Force, they are going to oppose it. So it is not anything that we did not expect, but in the arguments that they use, I would hope that they do not manufacture figures in the future.

Everyone knew from the beginning when Aero Services was purchased that it was not a commercial operation, that it was primarily to facilitate the needs of the Defence Force. The Defence Force wanted to have an air wing and it was cheaper for it to have the services that it enjoyed to be provided by an air wing through the utilisation of one of the existing charter companies. There were two in existence. The honourable Leader of the Opposition and his associates know full well about the two charter companies that were in existence, Aero Services and Tropic Air. Both from their birth lost money. One was bought out by the Government and the other was bought out by the private sector — I do not believe that its financial position has improved greatly under their new ownership.

So what you have to evaluate, therefore, is whether it was cheaper for the Defence Force to have its own maintenance, its own subsidiary personnel and things of that kind, or to contract them from Aero Services and at the same time permit Aero Services to carry on a service which it had been carrying on for a long period of time. That is all we are talking about there, and our evaluation of it is very clear — that it is cheaper to do it this way than to do it the other way. We are uncertain of the financial existence of the other private sector company. They tell you that. It was always a dicey thing. If you have a very good tourist season, it would make a dollar; if you did not have a good tourist season, it would not make a dollar.

The re-equipment of aeroplanes is always a controversial matter. Nowadays when a country is buying aeroplanes, the manufacturers of aeroplanes have become so few in the various categories that it is not difficult for the proponents of a particular aeroplane to get information about the alleged defects and alleged shortcomings of their rivals' products; because the competition is so hot, there is a tremendous amount of bad talking going on. A classic example of this situation is LIAT's procurement of aeroplanes. There is a ding-down war going on between the advocates of the two types of aeroplane and each side is not saying that the aeroplane the other side has is no good, but they are saying that the aeroplane the other side has is an inferior performer to theirs. As a matter of fact, there is one side claiming and professing the attributes of their aeroplane, which has never even flown commercially; so you have to buy a pig in a poke. This is what goes on.

When the honourable Member comes in here with information, we know where he gets it from. The lobby for the other side who wants to sell another plane to the

Government will feed him with the information. They are in truth and in fact a very small number of manufacturers in each category. In the class of the Skyvan, the 20-seater class, you will see that there are a very small number. We know that the Skyvan is a good plane. The Americans have just bought a large number of Sherpas. The honourable Member will tell you that a Sherpa is a little bit bigger than a Skyvan, and the Americans bought them for ferrying men, materials and equipment to the European cities.

Do not let us fool ourselves, the countries in the Eastern Caribbean have learned by bitter experience that they have to have some kind of association to be able at least to fool themselves that they will be able to provide some sort of token defence for themselves. And once you are talking about that and you are dealing with island territories, you have to have a means of moving from one territory to the other territory. If you are not going to do it by helicopter because that is too expensive, and you are not going to do it by hydrofoil because it takes too long, you will have to get an airship or an aeroplane. These are the facts you have to take into account. The Barbados Labour Party is not ashamed of the fact that it believes in having a reasonable association for the promotion of mutual defence. We are regionalists; that is our philosophy. We know that the other side are not regionalists; that is the difference between them and us.

So it has boiled down to this: the Defence Force has a certain need in this area and it is cheaper to provide it this way. At the same time, you will continue the service to the tour operators in Barbados who carry out a useful service to the tourist industry, and furthering the concept of providing multi-destination holidays in the Caribbean. It can be argued that LIAT or Tropic Air could carry out that service, and it could be argued that the two of them could carry out that service. It can also be argued that since Aero Services was carrying it out before, and since the carrying out does not in any way interfere with the objectives of being able to carry out that service plus providing the service for defence, and that it is cheaper and better to keep it in existence, we think we should allow it to continue what it was doing before. Of course, the finances of the company would be better assured now, because it would start off with one contractor, the Government, with a certain amount of money. This is what we are coming to.

I heard the honourable Member talking about CARICARGO. I want to correct a few facts for him. I know the honourable Member does not mean to say anything bad about CARICARGO, because we share a common belief that without our own independent specialised freight company, our electronic industry would never have developed to the position it is today. The first plane was bought for \$3.3 million. The second plane was bought for \$850 000. Of the two planes, 707s, one

has a cabin door fitted to it already. I disagree with your assessment, of course, that the first one was overvalued. It is not \$1 million. Value is always a matter of opinion, as seen by \$3.3 million for the first one and US\$850 000 for the second.

5.00 p.m.

Both of the planes are now part of the fleet. It is generally accepted and by the Barbadian Directors of CARICARGO that concerning the prices for the planes, having regard to the market price, having regard to the air freight time, having regard to the condition of the plane, they got a reasonable deal. When you add the two together — you know that sometimes even if you pay a little bit more for the first that you pay less for the second — we got a good deal.

(Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Buy one and get one free.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: So you got two for one price. I do not see any difficulty with that.

The installation of the kits. Barbados — the Foreign Minister can give us chapter and verse on this — are regarded in Latin America and in New York and in Miami among the Port Authority — Governor Graham talked about it when he was here — as being the most articulate and efficient operators of an air freight service. We have demonstrated our capacity to be able to provide the finance to keep the 707 within the new noise abatement regulations. The argument was that the International Civil Aviation Authority had recommended to Government to postpone the introduction of new noise tenders for a certain period of time. But the Port Authorities and the authorities in the respective parts of the United States set a mandatory date of January 1985. A big lobby arose, not only among the Caribbean airline companies that use the 707 but the rest of Latin America, and what is more, and the Leader of the Opposition would know this, among a large number of domestic operators in the United States itself.

Three kit manufacturers — Bowen, Patchett, and Shannon — were seeking to provide the kits. Very elaborate discussions took place among all of the 707 operators, not only the Latin American ones but those that were domestically owned in the United States. Enquiries were held by the Department of Transportation. Big lobbying went on with this — how does the honourable Member think that we operate? We operate in accordance with the highest possible standards of efficiency — and the Foreign Affairs Ministry followed the Ambassador in the United States and Barbadian advisers followed the arguments of the lobbyists over the terms of contract. We were advised that Shannon kits were about \$2.5 million. If you put them on, you had to have a pay load penalty which you had to charge back into the costs. The other ones were \$2.6 million.

Because of the fact that a number of operators were holding out to the last moment on the signing of contracts, the proprietors even tried to counter lobby with the United States Department of Transport to try and get them to force the 707 operators to buy particular hush kits. Barbados was one of the last to sign, and we managed to get \$100 000 off each hush kit. So each main would be US \$2.5 million and you got \$100 000 off. That includes the \$100 000 for the installation fee, whereas with the other, you would still have to add on the installation fee and the penalty.

The honourable Member knows that among the technicians who is a primary adviser to CARICARGO is a Mr. Mayers — he is well known to the honourable Member — and I am sure that the honourable Member feels that he is a very competent gentleman in the engineering field. All of these things were gone through. The Foreign Affairs people had the best advice available to them. Do not come in here and say that we are wasting Government's money and CARICARGO is wasting the Government's money by buying the most expensive hush kits. They must speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

All of us can be proud of CARICARGO. The Government of Barbados has shown great faith in it. It is an example, as far as I am concerned, of what will happen in the future. There will be a lot more regional companies, both at the governmental level and the private sector level. CARICARGO is a very successful one. There are some which are not as successful, but in the aviation field, more will emerge. Aero Services, I have no doubt, will emerge in the future as being the same type of operation.

The last thing I want to say — and the honourable Member knows this — is that CARICARGO rents aeroplanes of about 11 000 lbs. capacity for the distribution of cargo within the Caribbean. The honourable Member misunderstood something. It is that CARICARGO has said that if the Skyvan can carry the amount of weight that the manufacturers say it can carry, there will be scope for hiring and subcontracting sometimes to CARICARGO itself, because obviously, they will prefer to hire Aero Services plane than to hire the C47 that they hired from Puerto Rico and the operators that are in the Caribbean.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The pre-load, as I understand it, is either 8 000 lbs. or 10 000 lbs. I am not sure, but it is not 13 000 lbs. We will check that out. I am sure that it would be in kilos now.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That may be a different model. You do not know which model we are having.

(Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Tell me the correct model you are getting.)

5.10 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: All I am telling you is that there is nothing inconsistent. Everybody knew from the beginning — I think I said it in here when the first Resolution came down — that the Government recognizes that its commitment to the principle of having a Defence Force involves some means of transport. Once you project that into a regional situation, it means that you have to have it, and we must get back some money for these services that we perform.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): I believe that it is about time that we call a spade a spade. The taking over of Aero Services from Barclays Bank had nothing to do with tourism or a cargo service. It was to provide infrastructural support for the Defence Force plane. More than \$3 million was involved in that exercise. From the projections of the subsidies of \$300 000 a year, it will mean that in a three-year period we will have spent another \$900 000, or they would have accumulated losses to that extent. That is about \$4.1 million dollars. You are putting in equity to the extent of \$800 000 in one form or another, so you are some \$4.9 million down. You are buying a Skyvan which, depending on the rate of exchange, because I believe that over the next five years it will probably even out at \$2.75 or thereabouts, will mean \$5 million up front. So consequential on the purchase of Aero Services, this Government would have sunk some \$10 million dollars for the purposes of defence and security.

You have to recognise that you are speaking to intelligent persons. There is no way that with a passenger plane carrying twenty passengers or one or two other small planes that you can ever amortize the cost of that kind of operation with this kind of expenditure. Let us forget the tourism sector, let us forget this business of carrying breadfruit and cargo, and let us start to talk about what it is all about. It is all about defence and security essentially, and it can be used for these other purposes. Let us call a spade a spade. The question is, are we prepared and are we satisfied that \$10 million of Barbados' money should be committed in a two or three year period in this way, in capital and recurrent expenditure, for the air wing of the Defence Force?

All this business about a Mr. Wilson and Cable and Wireless leaking information is nonsense. It is a simple matter. The Leader of the Opposition asked me to go to London some time around the end of August particularly

to look at the U.S. dollar and get some kind of projections in the city as to how long it would last at that level. I have made a statement subsequently in relation to that. When I happened to be in London, accidentally I came across this information, a dinner as a matter of fact, at which there were some aviation people. They were talking about the Skyvan, and Mr. Wilson's name was mentioned to me then — while I was in London. The information that we got came from London, and since then I have been able to get some more detailed information about the aircraft.

Quite clearly, Aero Services will be a continuous losing operation that will require a subsidy, and what you are in fact asking the House to do is to underwrite \$10 million dollars in capital expenditure. It will be \$10 million: \$3.2 for the original purchase, your accumulated losses, the \$800 000 you are putting in now and some \$5 million dollars for the aircraft. Let us not fool around with this, this is public's money that you are talking about. The point is that this is a purchase for defence and security and that it is on those grounds that you have to try and justify it in here.

We do not know what the hard currency exchange rate will be, and we want to get this clarified later in the debate, but on the question of guaranteeing a debt to Aero Services, which clearly cannot be a commercial venture, you cannot invest that kind of money in a small aircraft and ever hope for a large return. So all of this business about linking up with CARICARGO and carrying passengers and getting an economic return is foolishness. I think that putting in the anticipated subsidy of \$300 000 a year is probably the correct thing to do — if you can justify it on defence and security grounds.

From the specifications that I managed to get, the aircraft will be a multi-role aircraft. It could be a VIP aircraft when it is carrying 26 passengers; all seats can be taken out quickly and it can be so reconstructed as to carry twenty fully-equipped troops, it can carry the equivalent of a landrover; it can permit parachuting; it can drop rubber rafts at the site for a rescue operation; it is difficult to identify the object as distinct from a helicopter; and that it can be fitted with special inertia navigational equipment which is quite expensive, even to carry out the role of identifying objects when flying low at the speeds at which it has to fly. So when we are talking, we are not talking about any foolishness that you will see in a brochure, we are talking on the basis of sound information, and the fact is that the only person who is telling the truth in here as to what it is all about is the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister. Even he did not tell the whole truth, he only told one-fiftieth of the truth — that is the nearest that we got to it.

All this business about enhancing tourism and carrying breadfruit is nonsense. This is a defence and security expenditure, but you have problems here. There

has been a big tug-of-war going on between the Government and the American experts over the purchase of that aircraft. The Americans advised you to buy a small helicopter, well within your resources, that could carry out on land civil rescue operations and sea operations. The original cost of the helicopter would be somewhat lower, although the operational cost may be higher. Every single senior officer in the Defence Force advised against the purchase of this aircraft apart from one senior officer and the Minister responsible for Defence and Security. I know what I am talking about. There is a big division in the Defence Force over whether they should have gone along the line of getting a small helicopter to do the security work or whether they should have gone ahead with this aircraft and I know that the Prime Minister, Minister of Finance, and Minister responsible for Defence was the chief bully in pushing this particular operation through.

This is not the first time that this Sky-van business has come up. I have been investigating further, I have been in contact with my sources in London, and what they told me was that even at the time of the purchase of the Trident in Barbados, part of the package at that time was to buy at least one Sky-van, and if they had bought the same Sky-van at the time when they bought the Trident, they would have bought it at half the cost.

I have seen the information, and I have verified it, and the source that I got it from in London has proved to be accurate in every single detail. I can give you all the specifications of the aircraft. As a matter of fact, I came so close to being taken seriously that I was even offered a ride on the aircraft or similar aircraft, but I thought twice — I might have gone for my last ride on that particular aircraft. So when I came to Independence Square and announced that you were buying a Sky-van from Short Brothers of Belfast, it was with some information. I would not make a statement like that and damage my outstanding credibility unless it was based on solid information.

5.20 p.m.

There are other concerns in this country. There are other concerns, for example, that St. Vincent might well not be interested in any Regional Defence Force. There is yet another concern, because I heard a statement from the Prime Minister of St. Lucia only last Sunday on a radio programme that rather surprised me. When he was asked whether or not 20 defence personnel would be stationed here in Barbados, it would appear that he said that it was a rumour emanating out of the Defence Force in Barbados and that if he has any money to spend he is going to spend it on the police.

Of course, the police would be neglected in this area. You are going to spend a whole lot of money on special and urgent navigational equipment in order to make that particular aircraft even reasonable for the

purpose of identifying small objects at sea, whereas the police cannot get the sort of technological aids they would require to identify the arsonists in a whole lot of fires that are burning down this country. They need the expertise and the technological help, and it is simply not available in Barbados. I know what I am talking about. There are special chemical and other technological developments that have taken place in the last three years at a scientific level that go a long way to trace the origins of fire and to help determine them.

There are other areas such as the probable implementation of a special Police Reserve in Barbados where some money needs to be spent to help control crime, and the police are being neglected in many other areas in terms of available equipment. There are a lot of problems being developed between the Defence Force and the Police Force over the inordinate expenditure in one direction and the neglect in the other.

The public out there must clearly understand that this money is being spent for defence and security, that all the other things brought up in the debate about tourism and cargo were just to clog the issue. If we were to look at the kind of arguments that were put forward against the helicopter, which was supported by a majority of senior officers of the Defence Force, they said they would have to train pilots because pilots do not fly the small helicopters. I have investigated this and I have discovered that there is a fully qualified naval helicopter pilot here among the Loan Service officers from the Royal Navy who is quite capable of training pilots already working with Aero Services to fly the small helicopters. The Americans, in any event, had offered to provide that training service if they had gone along the route that they wanted.

This thing has foreign policy implications as well. There is a lot more I have to say, and if you want to hear it before the House you will hear it before the House, but I will be as guarded as I think I should be and very judicious in what I am saying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That word "cargo" has been stuck in there because it was announced in Independence Square that it could carry a tank. What cargo? How much cargo can that carry on an economic basis? Does it make sense to you? After all, you have been in aviation long enough. You know the kind of expenditures that have been committed in CARICARGO, and you know the volume of business that has to be developed even for that to break even, and you are going to come and tell me you will sink \$10 million in an aviation development of this kind over a three year period with 26 seats one way and one or two other aircraft, and you could base an investment on that? Let us forget that.

That is just helping to write off the losses. Any work you get in carrying a little bit of breadfruit here, as you say, or carrying a few passengers down the road, is just helping to write off the losses and the amount of the subsidy. It cannot be a serious argument to justify this kind of capital expenditure either past or present.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Chairman, I believe it is necessary for me to enter this debate in order to respond to a few of the statements by the Honourable Prime Minister. The Honourable Prime Minister said that the Leader of the Opposition must have got his information from one of the B.E.T. staff. From the time I left Combermere School, I have been a member of the Cable and Wireless staff, which is now B.E.T., and on joining Cable and Wireless we had to sign a declaration of secrecy, which means that anything we see or hear in there has to remain in there, and we have abided by that declaration.

I am speaking for the staff of B.E.T. We have our Bs and we have our Ds in B.E.T. as it is now, but those chaps at B.E.T. do not allow politics to get into their personal lives. They do not get involved in politics at this level. I believe that I have to set the record straight.

I sincerely hope that suddenly at B.E.T. it does not become as it has become in certain Government corporations where, because of the long hand of Government, you have certain people looking at other people and listening to other people and that sort of thing. That is causing a lot of confusion in other Government corporations in Barbados. Leave B.E.T. as it is and as it has been as Cable and Wireless. As I said, I have been there for years. It has always been a friendly place to work and it has boys of high integrity there. The honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) well knows that, and I hope that it remains that way.

If you remember, when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition brought out his statement on bandages, the Honourable Prime Minister blamed a member of the Defence Force. When the Honourable Leader of the Opposition brought out his statement about the helicopter gun ships, the Honourable Prime Minister blamed an officer at the Barclay's Bank for that. Now that this information about the requisitions for the Defence Force has gone out, he is now blaming a member of the staff of B.E.T. The honourable Prime Minister has to understand that there are channels of information opened to him and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that are not opened to you or me, ordinary people like us. They have and they get information that we will never get. The Prime Minister knows that this is so.

5.30 p.m.

Another disturbing and very alarming statement made by the Prime Minister is when he said that the Government has means of monitoring calls in and out of Cable and Wireless. This bothers me. I never knew about this before and I am wondering how it can be done, because calls out of Cable and Wireless go via satellite or microwave, and I would like to know how it is the Government can monitor these calls and what type of equipment they are using. What is more, a statement like this leads people to wonder if the privacy of their calls and telexes are not now being destroyed. It is a very serious thing.

There are person in America and Britain who call home around election time, and the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) knows this, too. These people try to use the little influence they have on their relatives here on how to vote. Some may say, vote for the Barbados Labour Party. Some may say, vote for the Democratic Labour Party. If people's calls are being monitored where is the secrecy? All secrecy has broken down. Can you not see what is happening if this is so?

I believe that the Prime Minister owes us an answer on this, and I eagerly await his answer.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Mr. A. TRUSS, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE and Mr. L. L. SISNETT — 11

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. P. M. GREAVES and Mr. L. A. WEEKES — 7

HEAD 73 — MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Subhead 3: PURCHASE OF EQUITY BY GOVERNMENT IN COMMERCIAL VENTURES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): I have already outlined most of the arguments in favour of this Resolution, so I do not wish to be long.

I cannot deal with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes). He says quite definitely and positively that he is absolutely sure that this airplane is being bought for military purposes and not for tourism or cargo. He did not get the flight on the airplane he was soliciting in England, but it did not fly as far per ratio.

The day that the first passengers are going to Martinique in the Skyvan, I will arrange for him to be present at the airport. I hope that he would have the good graces and decency to apologise to the public of Barbados for his ridiculous alarmism and the childish approach he takes in sensationalising every issue in politics. Evidently he does not like the fact that I have been congratulating him on moderation, and therefore feels it still necessary to show that he is the same Arthur Scargill type, militant, as he always was. He is really the Arthur Scargill of Opposition politics in this country at certain times.

What absolute nonsense! We are borrowing money to buy a Skyvan to replace two of Aero Services airplanes and somebody says it is not being bought for passengers and cargo. We have a contract to carry passengers to Martinique, to Grenada, to Tobago, and we buy an airplane to carry passengers. We are selling the two airplanes which now carry the passengers and buying another, and we are being told that the airplane is not to carry passengers. Why do we have to listen to this garbage?

I beg to move that this Head stand part.
5.40 p.m.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): I have to declare an interest because, as I said earlier, I was President of the Light Aeroplane Club for twenty years. I really do not know what my status is. I know I am a life member and a founder member of the Barbados Light Aeroplane Club. I have not been to a general meeting last year or year before, so I do not really know if I am still President of the Club. I doubt it, because I had indicated to them that they should get somebody who should be more active, but since I have been so closely associated with the Barbados Light Aeroplane Club, I have to say that I have an interest, because the Barbados Light Aeroplane Club was one of the original founding shareholders of Aero Services.

When the Government took over the debt owed to Barclays Bank, they paid complete disregard to the interest of the shareholders in Aero Services other than Barclays Bank and Mr. Lloyd Roberts, who was Chairman of the Board. I do not have any financial interest — it is the club and not me personally — but I do not think that people who founded the company, the people whose hanger the Government even now through Aero Services is occupying, who built up the facility to what it is, were being dealt with fairly.

I hear the Government is going to put new capital by buying new shares, but not paying the original shareholders anything or giving them any shares in the new

company. I just want to draw that to your attention. Any time that something is happening in this country, we find that the expatriates are being given preference over locals. The son of the Honourable Leader of the House was replaced by a foreign Major, replaced as manager of this same company by a bird of passage. Do you think that was fair to the son of the honourable Member who was trained in aviation management? He is probably embarrassed by my saying that, but I am quoting facts.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What happened to the Major now? I heard he has gone through the eddoes, too. We do not victimise people.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is the point that we are making all the time, that in their anxiety to victimise us they victimise some of their own people all the time.

Putting all sport aside, it is not right that we give preference to expatriates. Mr. Lloyd Roberts was able to go back to London smiling as a retired Director because he had wiped off a debt to Barclays Bank owed by Barclays Bank, incurred by Barclays Bank, to our disapproval. We had been protesting against the way Barclays Bank was running the company into trouble, and when they ran it down the hill they managed to off-load their shares on to the Barbados Government, and the Barbados Government never paid the Light Aeroplane Club of which I was President — and I said nothing in the debate because I did not want to get involved in it — or any other members, including the President of the Senate, one single penny for the investment which they had put in building up that company.

Today we hear that the Barbados Government is putting in more money which they probably will use as working capital, something which they themselves admit is not going to make any money. The aviation business is not making any money anywhere, and certainly by changing managers and substituting expatriates for Barbadian personnel is not going to help them to make any money as it has been proved in the result. I do not want to say any more. A word to the wise is enough.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, I just wish to respond to a few remarks by the Honourable Prime Minister. I do not think that he heard the speech of the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister. The point that I made was that with the capital investment involved in the purchase of Aero Services, the operating losses, the accumulated losses since that purchase and now this new capital expenditure, when you have sold off these planes and you have accumulated this expenditure, there is no way that on any business level you can think of being able to operate a 20-seater aircraft with

limited cargo capacity and have that operate at a profitable basis when the total investment you have made by that time is somewhere in the region of \$10 million. You cannot get a return on that kind of investment by carrying passengers. As I said when I was speaking, you can probably help to reduce your losses by hiring out the planes from time to time, but it would be madness to say that you can make that kind of capital expenditure and hope to make a profit or break even on it on that basis.

There is a fundamental principle, as I understand it, in aviation, that is, when you are dealing with small aircraft, small equity, small investment, you make money. When you are dealing with big aircraft, big investment, big fleet no in-betweens, it just does not work out, and I guess that has been the rule of thumb applied to the aviation industry down the years. I believe that the only exception to that rule that I have seen in the recent literature on commercial aviation was a reference to a small airline operating out of Georgia that offers an executive service, run by some black Americans. It may be Air Atlanta. I guess that is the only exception to that general rule that has obtained in relation to the aviation industry over the past ten to fifteen years. Small aircraft, small investment; big aircraft, big investment, big fleet or you are in trouble. That is the basic rule.

Getting up and saying you will invite me to go on the first flight does not in any way detract from my argument. Ferrying people cannot be the main purpose, and it does not make sense to tell this House or tell anybody that that is the main purpose. Get up and say that the main purpose is defence and security, define it on grounds of defence and security and defend your Government's position. I congratulate the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister for having the guts to get up and say that that is the main purpose for the purchase of Aero Services, for the subsidy and for the new purchase. That is a far more honest and straightforward approach to the matter. In those circumstances we could discuss the merits or demerits of the defence matter, but do not try to confuse the public by telling them that this has the potential of a successful commercial venture and leave that grey area, which the honourable Member for St. Michael South spoke about there. The grey area was largely clarified by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister and this House should be grateful to him, and it was further clarified by me, so if there is any problem, the problem has been created by the Minister of Defence and Security himself. Let us argue over the meat of the matter rather than the peripheral matters.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): We have been talking about what Aero Services would sell and what they are purchasing. I am wondering if we could get some concrete details from the Government side, from the Minister of Finance. If the Minister of

Finance does not know, I would suggest he ask the Minister for Defence; and if the Minister of Defence does not know, he can ask the Prime Minister.

What is the price which Aero Services expect to get for the planes that they are trading in? I think he said they are handing them in. I know there are three commercial planes which that company specialise in; one is a Short's 330, their standard plane, there is the stretch version of that, the Short 360, which is their most up-to-date one, and then there is the Skyvan. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the Skyvan is a kind of box, and therefore cannot carry the kind of cargo and kind of specialized cabin that we would get in other kinds of aircraft. We have not heard anything yet about the suitability of the aircraft for the kinds of things that it is supposed to be doing. I wonder if the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Defence can tell us what is the price for the Skyvan.

5.50 p.m.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Or the Chief of Staff.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You do not know anything about it. There are only three people on that front bench who know anything about it. I have been following this. The Prime Minister knows, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the Member who is the Member on the Defence Board, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. When I see the Member for the City sitting down, and the Member for St. Lucy, they are as enlightened by what we have been talking about here tonight as the general public, because all of this is news to them. They did not know anything about these matters.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: First of all, to respond to the response, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that I did not listen to the Deputy Prime Minister's speech. The honourable Member did not listen to mine. I introduced the amendment by saying that, arithmetically, the existence of Aero Services saved the Defence Force money. If the honourable Member chooses to interpret that to suggest that therefore you are buying a Skyvan for the Defence Force, he is welcome to chop the logic.

The point is that the existence of Aero Services enables the Defence Force to spread its overheads and maintain its aeroplane among a larger fleet, and that even if you have to subsidize Aero Services to the tune of \$300 000 a year, you are still getting maintenance of the Defence Force aircraft. It is cheaper than if you have to employ the staff yourself. Therefore, Aero Services and the Defence Force are intimately bound up in each other. There is a certain amount of money which it will cost to provide an air capacity for the Defence Force. Having a commercial airliner to share some of that cost reduces it, and it is an economic advantage to the Government. That is the connection between the two.

The honourable Member suggested that the way we should have handled it was that we should rent aeroplanes from Aero Services. That is exactly what we did all along. I think the Leader of the Opposition said that. Eventually, it proved economical to us and not to Aero Services.

I am nothing to do with the shareholders in Aero Services, because when Aero Services approached us, they were already in the hands of a receiver. What the transaction between the receiver and the shareholders was, I do not know. What I do know is that the company is still in existence and Barclays Bank is trying to sell it to the Barbados Shipping and Trading as a tax loss to pay Shipping and Trading Corporation Taxes; that Barclays Bank, in addition to having sold us the goodwill, are now trying to sell the bad will to the Barbados Shipping and Trading. The Government is engaged in taking legal advice as to whether Aero Services has anything left to sell to Barbados Shipping and Trading to cost the Government money. It may be that if we let that go through, the shareholders would get piece of change.

I studied the shareholders list. Six thousand shares were allotted to the Leader of the Opposition, but he never paid for them; and, therefore, the receiver has excluded him from getting any of the money.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, Sir. This is the first time that I knew that I had been allotted six thousand shares. I do not think that I would have taken them up if I knew.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You wrote a letter to them.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: They wrote a letter to me?

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You wrote a letter to them.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: And said what? That I would take them up? As a member of the club, but I never took out any shares in Aero Services.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Between the exchanges, I think the truth satisfactorily emerge.

There are other connections with the Light Aeroplane Club, because the situation is that at present the Government is the landlord of the Light Aeroplane Club and the Light Aeroplane Club is the landlord of Aero Services. The Government is now negotiating with the Light Aeroplane Club to buy out the lease from the Light Aeroplane Club which would put some cash in the Light Aeroplane Club's hands. We will then give the Light Aeroplane Club a smaller portion, but we believe that

with the cash in hand it would have a new lease on life if the House gives the funds.

The finances of Aero Services, undoubtedly, have been complicated. The honourable Member's figure of \$10 million is not correct, but it is not very far short. There is \$3.3 million in a loan, \$300 000 in losses, which I think the Government has met — I know we agreed to meet \$300 000 in losses; whether we have voted the money escapes me at the moment; perhaps honourable Members will recall — we are putting in \$800 000 and the Skyvan will cost some \$3.4 million.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Three point four million what?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Barbados dollars. You can make all your multiplications and additions, just take it from me that that is the cost. It comes to a little less than \$8 million, of which \$800 000 will be represented in equity, \$3.3 million will be represented by a loan from the Government to the company, and \$300 000 is a subsidy. You can regard that as a payment to the company — why conceal what it is for? — because Aero Services only began to have losses after tourism and the Grenada operation coincided. We were going down a bit in tourism and the Grenada operation halted Aero Services operation for some time because of requisitions and various difficulties.

There is \$800 000 in equity and loan funds of around \$7.7 million. I do not consider that that is a badly capitalized company, nor do I consider that Aero Services' normal receipts of \$150 000 to \$200 000 per month — I would not quote September, because Aero Services took in some half million dollars in September — and its normal cash flow is inappropriate for a capital structure of that kind.
6.00 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation, if the Prime Minister will give way. He has quoted a figure here of \$3.4 million for the purchase of the Skyvan. The February 1984 price list for the Short's Skyvan was some US \$1.2 million. Are there additional purchases that would bring the cost of this Skyvan to the amount indicated?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This perhaps will be more appropriately answered in the next Resolution, but the honourable Member is welcome to look at the quotations. The quotations to us are £1.2 million. If the honourable Member can produce a list to me showing US \$1.2 million, I would be very glad indeed to know, but I can only speak of what I have here in my hand. The price, as quoted to the Government, is £1,249,602.

I cannot believe that the Short Company is either so dishonest or that our people who deal with these matters are so inept that they are not capable of reading a price list for a new Skyvan. I believe that honourable Members must be looking at a secondhand Skyvan. We could have bought a Guyanese Skyvan — they bought some — very cheap at some particular point. If the honourable Members do have a new Skyvan quoted at that price, I would be glad if they tell me. I am serious. The Leader of the Opposition really is welcome to see all the files on Aero Services.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not sure that the price quoted by the honourable Member for St. Michael South is a new price. I base that on the fact that the time before overhaul on the engines is 3600 hours and engines of this kind would normally have 5000 hours on it. That engine probably has 1400 hours, so that the price is probably a good second-hand price. There is no point of being conspiratorial about this.

Is the \$650 000 which has been quoted for maintenance, which the right honourable Member for St. Thomas claims that they are saving by buying into Aero Services, for the aircraft, which is the Cessna 402, which Aero Services now owns, or for the Vista Skyvan, which they hope to own but which is already flying Barbados colours, and for the Cessna 402?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, that is for the Cessna alone, and I will tell you how it is arrived at.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before he does, it is within my knowledge that the Government was offered a contract for about \$240 000 for maintenance on the Cessna 402. That was just before they took over Aero Services, and I believe negotiations will go on between the Minister of Aviation, or his Permanent Secretary, and the company. I wonder why this was not taken up. Obviously, it would have been in the interest of the Government to put out a maintenance contract instead of spending \$3 million to acquire a whole company to look after one aircraft.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is indeed so. The reason why the maintenance contract with whoever it was — Mr. Chairman, you would know better than me perhaps — was not pursued — and I really do not say this in any way to denigrate any of the people concerned — is that over the period of negotiations, they really never got their act together. Aero Services was proposing to maintain the Cessna for somewhat less, and we had been paying them less than the \$240 000, but they could not continue doing it at the existing price and we gave BIMAIR, which was supposed to be formed out of the ashes of Aero Services — they were going to take over some of the engineers and so on — every possibility to make such a proposal. But BIMAIR's proposal, as I

recalled it, was postulated on their being able to buy Aero Services equipment or other equipment, and at one stage I believe it was even suggested that we would have to buy the equipment for the maintenance ourselves, and that what they would provide would be the staff and the servicing. The negotiations were pursued honestly on both sides and they simply failed. Those considerations belong to the original purchase of Aero Services rather than now.

I will tell Members the basis of calculating the \$600 000; I am sure that I do not have to tell the Leader of the Opposition; he could probably tell me. Even to have a single aircraft you must maintain a certain amount of engineers. This is required by the regulations at the airport. You have to have engineers dealing with such and such, and they have to have certain qualifications. You have to have certain specified lists of spare parts. We have an avionics man, but there is only one aircraft for him to maintain, and we are told that we would have to pay his salary just to keep him to do the work on the Cessna alone; and if you wound up with Aero Services, because of the demise I believe of Tropic Air and because Barclays must get their maintenance done somewhere else — they have a jet — there is simply not the work for him, except as provided by the Aero Services fleet. The same applies to a highly paid engineer, to the engineering staff and so on. When you add up the staff salaries, the salaries of maintaining the pilots and insurance, you get that figure and there will be some saving because the pilots of the Defence Force do not necessarily have civil licenses — they are very experienced and knowledgeable pilots, more knowledgeable than Aero Services with longer service, but they are military pilots — so they cannot fly the Aero Services planes. There will be some saving because they will fly the Defence Force plane without that difficulty. That is how the cost arises, and I am still satisfied that while the overheads of maintaining one aircraft or four are the same, the cost per plane of maintaining one is much higher than the cost of maintaining four. That is why we are buying the aeroplane, to keep Aero Services growing as a company with the tourism spin-off, but with the basic measure that the Defence Force's operation is still going to be cheaper through Aero Services than otherwise.

The honourable Member wanted to know how much each Trilander costs. I see the figure of £150 000 here. The figure of \$1.85 million is more than what is needed to pay for the aeroplane. Originally there were going to be packages, one of which involved a substantial cost in U.S. dollars on installing some equipment in the airplane. It is an American package, but Short Brothers are going to install it.
6.10 p.m.

The loan has been negotiated on the basis that Short Brothers are still going to install it, and we are

going through with the loan because it is the amount in the loan document, but we have not bothered with that. The cost has gone up in pounds anyway, obviously, since it was negotiated, but we are not bothering about it, so the amount the House will be asked to guarantee is more than the amount that will necessarily be borrowed. There is nothing unusual about that, you do not have to borrow the whole amount. I think honourable Members are aware of that. In any case, it is foreign exchange and it is not on onerous terms, so I do not think honourable Members need to be too much worried about that part. Sooner or later the Public Accounts Committee will be able to determine that the House guaranteed so much and so much but a rather smaller sum was borrowed. Certainly we are going to borrow the full foreign exchange cost of everything we have to pay even if we may pay some of it in cash, such as the spare parts package, that goes with the Aero Services planes.

I am glad the honourable Member for St. John showed his knowledge of the hours that these planes log up, because one of the advantages of the Skyvan is that it does not need to be serviced any more than every 3 000 hours. The Trilanders now have to be serviced every thousand hours, and for that reason their operation cost is much more than that of the Skyvan. The Skyvan uses a cheaper fuel, but perhaps uses more of it than the Trilander, so that balances out below the cost price of fuel and that should be an advantage in the future.

The question that Head 73 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Mr. L. L. SISNETT, the Resolutions were read a first, second and third time.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Mr. L. L. SISNETT, the Resolutions were agreed to, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Hon. V. L. JOHNSON; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Mr. A. A. TRUSS and Mr. J. G. ODLE — 12.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN; Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN; Dr. R. C. HAYNES; Mr. P. M. GREAVES and Mr. L. A. WEEKES - 7.

GUARANTEE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF A LOAN
OF THE EQUIVALENT OF £1.85 MILLION TO
AERO SERVICES BARBADOS (1982) LTD.
BY SHORT BROS. LTD. BELFAST

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): There is just one point I would like to raise. On the question of exchange rate, a little to my surprise recently I saw a Resolution that would fix the exchange rate up front at \$2.75 to the pound. This was among the Resolutions circulated last week. I am enquiring whether this would be an up front, fixed rate, or whether the exchange rate payable would be payable when the instalments become due.
6.20 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, there is one other question which arises out of the one raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. Our understanding is that some kind of commitment was entered into by Aero Services and/or the Government of Barbados some months ago in relation to the acquisition and/or purchase of this aircraft. The pound has been sliding steadily during the past three months and the rate today is Bds. \$2.40 to the pound sterling. We are being called upon to guarantee an amount of £1.85 million, which at today's rate of exchange would be equivalent to Bds. \$4.44 million. At the time when these negotiations were taking place, the pound was probably a little stronger, if we can use that expression in relation to that currency, than it was today. If the correct procedures had been followed, no contract should have been signed with Short Brothers for the purchase or acquisition of this aircraft until the Government of Barbados approved the acquisition, which could be any time after midnight tonight, Greenwich Mean Time. The point which I am making is this: that we first have to know at what point of time the contract is entered into and, secondly, the point raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, on what basis the future commitments of interest and so on will be.

The problem is that the very terms of the Resolution are in conflict with the laws of Barbados, with the Central Bank Act, the Exchange Control Act and the Interpretation Act, because all currency should be expressed in terms of Barbados currency. This is a big

problem. When you go and you express a contract, which is a long term contract like this, in terms of a foreign currency, and we do not know when the contract is signed or when the contract is to be resolved over a long period of time, what the commitment of the Treasury is going to be, we are putting ourselves in a rather invidious position where we are not able to state what our ultimate commitments are in this respect.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): The honourable Member raised some major questions, obviously not contentious as between parties, but it goes to the root of the nature of bargaining between a small country and other countries providing inter-services loans or whatever.

One or two contractors in sterling have recently shown a willingness to negotiate with us in Barbados dollars. Nearly everybody who lends money to Governments in this hemisphere lends in U.S. dollars. In Washington recently I held some talks with banks which were making offers to Barbados; one of them was prepared to gamble in sterling and the Governor of the Central Bank and I are considering the matter. He is offering us a loan in mixed currencies. Whether we want to get into that or not, I do not know. I have not made up my mind yet.

Whatever the rights and wrongs of borrowing in your own currency, I think that very, very few lenders would lend to the small Third World Countries in their own currencies. If that was so, the big Third World countries would have no problems. Brazil would be glad to borrow cruzeiros. I can see the Minister of Finance in Brazil smiling all the way to the foreign exchange dealers if he was able to borrow four trillion cruzeiros from somebody overseas who would have to buy the cruzeiros with another currency. I, and I think the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, will borrow almost any sum in Barbados dollars from overseas sources who will lend us. I would be glad to print them, sell them to people, and then borrow them back from them.

The Attorney General is very careful about these matters, and the contract has been drawn in sterling for specific payments. Aero Services will have to execute 10 promissory notes, the first for £151 000 and the last for £105 000, and these promissory notes, presumably - they are like postdated cheques - will be cashed on the day they are presented and at that day's exchange rate. They wish to be paid in sterling.

The original contract which Short Brothers asked for, in fact, did not depend upon parliamentary approval,

but I think that by signing time — the Leader of the Opposition by indication is quite correct — their counsel would have advised them to wait for the Government guarantee. But the Government of Barbados is not contracting. Short Brothers were quite ready to contract directly with Aero Services, sell them an airplane, give them supplier's credit for it, because it is just a supplier's credit agreement, and have a lien over the airplane. The promissory notes would be issued, and they would have in their hand all the promissory notes relevant for the particular operation.

There may be one or two side contracts for spare parts and other matters, but the main contract deals with all the essential points. The airplane is ex-Belfast, delivered in Barbados and made in England. The contract was made in England through the High Commission, acting as Aero Services agents. The contracts will be exchanged once the proceedings in the other place are completed. It is a fairly ordinary supplier's credit contract with no pressure at all upon the Government. I must say that.

6.30 p.m.

We have no complaint about the way that the Shorts have dealt with the matter. Everybody is gambling at sterling when you agree to buy something in sterling, but I do not think we have any option. We are fortunate in so far as sterling has fallen a lot since the negotiations began. Honourable Members say this is not the first time they heard about the Skyvan, but not one honourable Member has asked himself what did the Skyvan cost in Barbados dollars at the time when they brought one down here and gave a demonstration at the Garrison to sell to us. It flew up and down off the Garrison, it landed on the Garrison, did a floor run and landed again, and we had a little party in the Officers' Mess while we observed the Skyvan flying. Nobody asked what it cost then. Obviously it cost much more then that it costs now.

People like to talk about inflation. A file came to me today, Public Servants and Travelling Allowances and Car Loans, and the analysis revealed that motor cars are cheaper now than when the figure for car loans and travelling allowances was last fixed. I suppose the file was written before the Stamp Duty. I think even despite the Stamp Duty, it is like 6 per cent to 7 per cent cheaper than when travelling allowances were last fixed. Honourable Members can bear that in mind. It is very unlikely that they will get an increase in travelling allowance with the regraded salaries.

The honourable Members' questions is that the contract is in sterling. It is almost impossible in these circumstances to get a contract other than in the currency of the country from which you are doing the

buying or in US dollars, certainly not for a small country like Barbados.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. SISNETT, Mr. A. TRUSS and Mr. J. G. ODLE — 12

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. L. A. WEEKES and Mr. P. M. GREAVES — 7

THE STAMP DUTY (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT

Order No. 3 was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Stamp Duty Act, Cap. 91.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): This Bill simply says that it seeks to amend the First Schedule to the Stamp Duty Act, Cap. 91 to alter the rate of duty payable on the C.I.F. value of certain entries, and 5 per cent is changed to 10 per cent in the Stamp Duty Act. I believe that it is absolutely important that Members of this Honourable House should appreciate the full extent to which this Bill will impact on our lives. The rationale for bringing this Bill is the implementation of a budgetary proposal based, in my view, on highly defective reasoning. The reason given was that Government has suffered a shortfall in revenue as a consequence of the strength of the US dollar which had cheapened imports into Barbados, and consequently the yield from indirect taxes in Barbados has not been what was anticipated in the April Budget of this year.

I think that reason was defective for a particular reason. Firstly, I believe that this is about the first occasion that I have ever heard a Finance Minister complain that he was not getting enough taxes because prices has not risen sufficiently in the community. In essence that is what he was saying, because if in fact you look at the imports pattern into Barbados, you will find two things: there has been no significant reduction and indeed there has been an increase in items subject to Stamp Duty over the first six months of this year, a 15 per cent increase. (I will get back to that later on.)

But even more important is that there has not been any significant deflection of trade from the US dollar or to areas with a softer currency. In other words, that statement could only be fundamentally true if there was a shift in our trading pattern from US dollar areas to areas of softer currency, unless, of course, it is an invitation to the President of the United States to increase the inflation rate in the United States in order that the Barbados Government can derive further taxation.

A further argument for the imposition of the Stamp Duty was increasing the cash flow of private companies. I find this particular line of reasoning highly alarming, because if there is one thing the Stamp Duties would do, it would be to reduce the cash flow of private companies at two ends. At one end, it would remove a significant amount of money from circulation. Secondly, it would push prices up at the other end. Indeed, these companies that depend heavily on hire purchase sales will almost certainly find that they are restricted in that area, because some of the good might now require a much higher deposit, or in the alternate, in some instances, people will now have to pay cash for them.
6.40 p.m.

The third thing is that there was some plea for a reduction or moderation in wages. It would appear that the Stamp Duty was the answer to the recent wage increases inside and outside of Government. And on top of that, the Government has given in that particular statement, which is a document of the House, a firm assurance that the tight controls on credit and the high interest rate will remain.

I recently asked a question as to what were the projected exchange rates between the Barbados dollar and the US dollar. One reason why I asked that is that the Honourable Minister of Finance has just discovered what was well known at least one year ago and was certainly reconfirmed again this year, that the probability is that the US dollar would remain strong in relation to the European currency for probably two or three years. The most optimistic outlook would suggest that a rise in sterling to about Bds\$2.75 to £1 sterling is about the best that you can anticipate over a two-year period. Indeed, even more recent estimates of a month ago would suggest that the fundamental question relates to the strength of the US economy *vis a vis* the other economies: that it has very little to do with such matters as deficit, or high interest rates, and even less to do with the renewed confidence in the banking system. These points are important. But the two important points there are the strength of the US economy in relation to the economies of the other industrialized countries and the inducement for large capital flows into the United States, which have become relatively independent of trade patterns between the United States and the other industrialized countries.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for dinner until 7.30 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
6.45 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, to continue. I was establishing the point that the basic and fundamental argument of the Right honourable Prime Minister was fallacious to the extent that to blame the reduction on imports, which did not take place significantly, or a reduction in earnings from imports on the strength of the US dollar was quite wrong; that it could only be right if there were significant diversion of our imports in an area outside the dollar area and this did not take place. The failure of growth in imports has been largely due to Government's own declared monetary and fiscal policies, which have been designed through a credit squeeze and through high interest rates, to prevent significant increases through the impact of those two situations on price levels in Barbados. I find it difficult to believe that the honourable Prime Minister at any time sought proper advice in imposing these stamp duties, because the reasoning was fundamentally wrong.

I believe that honourable Members should be aware of the seriousness of the under-estimate by the honourable Minister of Finance, because while I would not like to accuse him on the floor of the House of deliberately misleading the public, I would refer to page 7 of the "STATEMENT AND PROPOSALS MADE TO THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE FOR THE PURPOSE OF RAISING REVENUE TO MEET PUBLIC EXPENDITURE" dated October 23, 1984, in which he said, referring to the stamp duties:

"On the basis of the collections to date, this increase in the rate of stamp duty ..."

That is 5 per cent:

"...is estimated to raise an additional \$10 million in the remaining months of this financial year and \$20 million in a full year."

If a 5 per cent increase in Stamp Duty yielded only \$20 million, then there would have to be an almost total

collapse of the Barbados economy in the year to come. I myself do not anticipate a collapse of the Barbados economy and, therefore, it would be quite unreasonable to assume that our imports could fall to the level where it only generates \$20 million in additional revenue.

I want to substantiate my arguments to this House by referring to some documents. First of all, I think that there should be a proper analysis of the probable yield from Stamp Duties. The Barbados Economic Report 1983, which is already a document of this House, shows that in 1983 imports into Barbados amounted to \$1.248 million, re-exports, \$135,800; Therefore, the net imports would be just about \$1.1 million. If you were to discount all items that could be exempted from the Stamp Duty, that is, the re-exports, even including the new exemptions and the exemptions announced in the 1984 Budget, which will be implemented, as I understand it, by November 15, your total exemptions would hardly be more than \$300 million, and I am being exceedingly generous. So you are really coming down from a figure of \$1.1 million, that is total imports minus re-exports, and I am discounting \$300 million, so you end up with a figure of \$800 million. Ten per cent of \$800 million is \$80 million, and 5 per cent is \$40 million dollars.

I have discounted it even further, by assuming that the impact of these Stamp Duties would lead to further unemployment and other problems within the community, and the minimum yield will have to be some \$37.5 million.

7.35 p.m.

This is working it back from the gross imports minus re-exports and then taking \$300 million from items which are not subject to Stamp Duty, and that is a gross over-estimate.

The question is, have Barbados' imports which are subject to Stamp Duty fallen significantly within the first six months of this year? If you were to look at the Economic Review, which should be a document of this House — if it is not I will make it a document — Volume 9, September 9, 1984, pages 5 and 6 dealing with Foreign Trade and Payments, you will see that the demand for imported cars has declined, but total consumer goods are estimated to have increased by 15 per cent, mainly on account of non-durable imports, food, personal care products, jewellery and similar items. In fact, those items are subject *in toto* to the full impact of Stamp Duty. So there can be no question, if you were to take \$750 million or \$800 million as the amount of imports that will be subject to Stamp Duty, that you are safely home. My judgment is that it will be significantly higher than that, but I am going to be careful. The amount of money that one would anticipate from a 5 per cent increase in Stamp Duty must be not less than \$37.5 million.

I believe that this has to be hammered home, because that amount of money is of critical importance in many areas when you assess the effects of these Stamp Duties. I would like to refer to the Estimates of 1984–85, Page VI, where you see that when the Stamp Duty was 2 per cent, the actual revenue of 1982–83 was \$17.247 million. When in 1983 it went up to 3 per cent, the estimated yield, the original estimates, was \$28.5 million, which was reduced to \$25 million. So the calculation was that the one per cent would yield another \$7.5 million.

In seeking to reinforce this argument, and this is absolutely important, I refer to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals made by the Right Honourable J. M. G. M. Adams, Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning, on Wednesday, 27 April, 1983 in this House. It is already a document of this House. At page 14, this is what he had to say:

“Mr. Speaker, I turn next to Stamp Duty. The Government is now considering certain improvements and extensions to the services performed by the Customs Department. It is therefore only reasonable for some additional revenue to be raised to assist with defraying the expenses involved. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I have decided that with effect from April 28, the Stamp Duty which is charged on documents processed by the Customs Department will be increased by 1 per cent. Also, in view of the new Exempt Insurance Bill, which has added to the offshore services provided in Barbados, I propose a new Stamp Duty of \$10.00 for all exempt insurance documents from April 28. It is expected that the additional revenue under this head will be \$7 million.”

Sir, we have \$7 million when our imports were significantly lower, confirmed in the Estimates, and now you have a situation where the Honourable Minister of Finance comes into this House and says that he is going to impose a 5 per cent increase in Stamp Duty and that will generate \$20 million dollars, suggesting that Stamp Duties on imports would drop to some \$400 million in Barbados. It just is not possible.

I wish to prosecute this case further by referring to his own words again, and I refer to the House of Assembly Debates, Official Report, Tuesday, April 27, 1984, page 962. When the Stamp Duty was increased from 3 per cent to 5 per cent, this is what the Honourable Minister of Finance said:

“Effective April 18, 1984, Stamp Duties on imported goods will be increased from 3 per cent to 5 per cent. Additional revenue of \$19 million is expected.”

Two per cent on April 17 of this year, \$19 million dollars; now 5 per cent — he is telling you is going to yield \$20 million in a full year! Either there has been a serious lapse of judgement on the part of the Honourable Minister of Finance or it has been a misprint which he did not correct and read to this House. I cannot believe that anyone who has the responsibility for fiscal and monetary policies in this country would not have some idea of what levels of imports come into this country. It is fundamental to the proper management of the country to know what foreign exchange you have to generate to pay your import bill, and you should also have a reasonable idea of the imposition of those imports.

If at today's prices a situation was to occur where a 5 per cent increase in Stamp Duty would yield only \$20 million, Barbados would be in a very sad state. The reason is that you are talking about \$400 million in imports that would be subject to Stamp Duty. If you were to look at food alone, in 1983 our food bill was \$148.7 million — and that is by 15 per cent, according to the Central Bank reports. Beverages and tobacco — \$19.432 million — and that is by 15 per cent. Between food and beverages alone, when you add on the 5 per cent, that is almost \$17 million alone, so what he is saying is that with all the other imports in Barbados, you are going to end up with \$3 million. That has got to be a joke and it is tantamount to saying, if it was correct, that Barbados' import bill would drop to over a half; and that would have serious implications to the economy of Barbados, and it could only happen in the event of a major collapse of the Barbados economy, which certainly we will not allow to take place.

7.45 p.m.

I invite honourable Members on that side to seriously examine whether they can associate themselves with a Bill that seeks to increase Stamp Duties in this country by 5 per cent and with a statement in this Honourable House that that 5 per cent would yield \$20 million in a full year, when all the facts and information, which I have made available to the House, statements from the mouth of the Honourable Minister of Finance in the past, from the Economic Reports of Barbados, from the Central Bank's statistics, must indicate that that statement is totally wrong.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. HAYNES) were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The question is, why is it that the Minister of Finance resorted to the stamp duty? It is because of the failure of his economic policies and the failure of the Budget, which he introduced into this

country earlier in this year, because, quite clearly, expenditures in Barbados, from the public point of view, were moving ahead in excess of revenue.

Long ago I said that you would reach the stage where the taxable capacity of this country would be exhausted, and the shrinking of the pace of revenue yield is a clear indication that this is happening, and indeed a clear indication that the monetary and fiscal policies being produced by the Government are completely wrong. So the Government, in the face of a widening deficit, to find counterpart funds for an ill-conceived capital programme, which I will deal with later, because it was stated that these Stamp Duties are for counterpart funds, and because of the contracting revenue base, has had to resort to these stamp duties.

What are going to be the effects of these Stamp Duties? The whole song and dance about the high value of the Barbados dollar has resulted through these Stamp Duties in a substantial reduction in the purchasing power of the Barbados dollar. Make no mistake about it. By the time you have added on 5 per cent on the C.I.F. value of goods, and that 5 per cent goes through the mark up process, that is, the wholesaler and then the retailer, you will realise the extent to which the purchasing power of the Barbados dollar has been reduced by those Stamp Duties. It is an iniquitous increase in the levels of indirect taxation, because the burden of that tax is going to fall very heavily on food, medicines and essentials that people have to buy. The lower income groups in this community are the people who will be bearing the full impact of that 5 per cent increase in Stamp Duty, because they spend all their money on those basic essentials and will therefore be exposed to its full impact.

Think of the impact of the increase, on pensioners. Is it realised that the increase in pensions granted to old age pensioners was largely wiped out by that 5 per cent increase? That 5 per cent will translate itself into some 9 per cent in a very short period of time, or maybe higher than that. That is why when I called for budgetary adjustments I included in that some provision to be made for an increase to old age pensions. I gather that that will be coming. That should be some relief.

Another effect of these Stamp Duties is that prices will go up throughout this community, and that is why I am sending a clear signal to the private sector of Barbados that they have an opportunity to help themselves and to help the poor people of this country by immediately taking steps to divert their trade from the United States to Europe and the United Kingdom. There is plenty of room. The constraints, I gather, are on things like bran meals and this kind of thing, but the Government itself should have been taking the initiative for diversion of

trade in that area, and if they had lost revenue as a consequence of that, then at least one could be somewhat sympathetic to them.

What is the point of moaning and groaning about the strength of the U.S. dollar when in fact you want it not only to get stronger, but you want prices to go up, as you clearly indicate in your statement as a justification for this 5 per cent increase in taxes? If you wish to see what I mean, I will refer again to the Economic Report on this question of the possibilities of trade deflection from hard currency in the U.S. dollar area to other areas. If you were to examine the base of our imports, you will see that in 1983 46.3 per cent of our imports came from the United States of America, 12.2 per cent from CARICOM, and 4.2 per cent from Japan. Now look at the areas where the currencies have fallen relative to the U.S. dollar: United Kingdom, a mere 9 per cent; Canada, 5.4 per cent; the EEC 6.4 per cent. There is plenty of room within here for significant trade deflection, and if the private sector would move on this one they would avoid a lot of the problems involved with the increase in Stamp Duty and frustrate the attempt of the Government to place these burdens and impositions on the people of Barbados in the pursuit of a policy which has demonstrably failed over the past three or four years.

That 5 per cent Stamp Duty, combined with the levies and Income Tax, has wiped out all wage increases given to the public sector in Barbados. You can start with 7 per cent, add to that the levies, add Income Tax on those that have gone into a different band, and you will see that those wage increases have been wiped out. You can say what you like. When you add a 5 per cent Stamp Duty and on top that a 15 per cent increase on the import duty of non-CARICOM goods which would impact on consumption taxes, I am telling you that you have wiped out the effect of any increases that people would have got. The 15 per cent would have gone.
7.55 p.m.

Stamp Duty is going to drastically increase the cost of business operations in Barbados, because it means they have to outlay more money. They have to pay more money for credit. They are going to have to pay more interest to the banks. There will be less money in circulation on the other hand, because Government would have pre-empted \$37.5 million at the minimum through this increase. So there is going to be a fall-off in business and a relative increase in the operational cost.

One of the serious problems that has led to serious contracts in this economy, is the absence of cash in the community. What is going to be happening is that you are going to be removing 5 per cent through the Stamp Duty in areas where you can generate triple goods for the earning of foreign exchange and divert it to the public

sector to sink in the ground in non-tradeable goods expenditure. What kind of policy position is that? I warn you that this mini Budget has been far more drastic than the combined effects of the 1983 and 1984 major Budgets introduced in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not discussing the Budgets.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir. I am talking about the effect of the increase in Stamp Duty.

Mr. SPEAKER: You did not say that. You said "this mini Budget." We are not discussing any mini budgets in here.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The 5 per cent increase in the Stamp Duty will have a negative impact not only on the commercial sector, but it is going to have a serious negative impact on the hotel industry because a significant part of the hotel overheads relate to the cost of imported food, the cost of beverages and the cost of services. The cost of services will go up once the cost of living goes up, and the cost of building and all these things will be increased by the increase in Stamp Duty. As I pointed out recently, there has been an estimate that the gross overheads of one major hotel will go up by \$138 million directly as a result of that 5 per cent Stamp Duty.

The cost of manufacturing would also be considerably increased by the Stamp Duty, because the exemptions that will be applicable to the manufacturing sector would only be applied to a part of their operating cost and not to the total operating cost, so the overall effect on the manufacturing sector will be a significant increase in the overhead cost.

Even the taxi drivers are going to feel the pinch. I particularly mention taxi drivers because the impression was given that the taxi drivers had some relief, but they will find that as a consequence of the Stamp Duty their overheads will go up. In addition to that, the people of Barbados will have less money, and there will be less people travelling in taxis in Barbados.

In the area of housing, there is going to be a substantial increase in the cost of housing as a result of the Stamp Duty. You are also going to find that by pre-empting an increasing slice of the wages of people, they are going to find it more and more difficult to get the money to pay the down payment either for your sites and services programme or for your housing programmes.

The net effect of all this is that, in my firm analysis, the Stamp Duty is going to lead to an increase in unemployment in Barbados which cannot be compensated even if the total yield from the Stamp Duty went into the counterpart funds for the public sector spending.

The manufacturers, the hotels, the commercial sector, and individuals will be under greater pressure.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is now repeating himself. I have counted at least four times that you made the same statement.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This is the first time that I have referred to unemployment in relation to the effects of the Stamp Duty. I have mentioned unemployment before when the Honourable Prime Minister said it would relieve unemployment. I am mentioning unemployment in a different context now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Obviously the honourable Member does not understand the term "to repeat oneself."

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Another effect of that Stamp Duty is that it is going to create problems with our CARICOM partners. In effect, when we get up and proclaim our commitment to regional trade and then come in here and increase a substantial barrier to regional trade in Barbados you can expect some kind of retaliatory action.

We must ask ourselves now, in the light of all these disadvantages, why it is that the Minister of Finance resorted to this method of generating increased revenue for public services? He has exhausted his borrowings under the National Insurance Scheme. He has literally pre-empted over 50 per cent of the earnings of the National Insurance Board. He is unable to pay back a single cent, and on top of that, it is creating a loss for the National Insurance Board because.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are we discussing the Stamp Duty or are we discussing other matters? The honourable Member must keep himself within the ambit of the Resolution.

The honourable Member must understand that you cannot discuss a ministerial statement unless there is a substantive Resolution before the House, and the honourable Member will not be allowed to go running all over the financial area of Government under the pretext of dealing with the Stamp Duty.
8 05 p.m.

The honourable Member must stick within the Rules of the debates. There are rules for containing debates, otherwise we would have no order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I believe that a reasonable approach to the Stamp Duty is to explain why the Minister of Finance resorted to Stamp Duty.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is your belief. It is my ruling that you have to keep within certain limits. If you want

to debate that, there are ways and means of doing it. Nobody has ever prevented you from doing what is right.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, you are ruling it is outside.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That you cannot go to the National Insurance Fund, you cannot roam all over the area of Government to debate the Stamp Duty Bill.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not doing that, Sir. What I am trying.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not arguing.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not arguing, Sir, I am trying to explain to you in the hope that you would accept my explanation. All I am trying to do is to establish why the Minister of Finance has had to resort to Stamp Duty. Is that relevant to a Stamp Duty debate or not?

Mr. SPEAKER: The National Insurance Fund is not relevant to the Stamp Duty Bill, and I will not discuss it any more. That is my ruling.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We have established so far that there was a wrong reasoning for the introduction of the Stamp Duty, we have further established a figure that the Stamp Duty would yield, we have dealt briefly with the effects of the Stamp Duty, and indeed, sooner or later they are going to lead to further increases in property value and property taxes in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not come into it. The honourable Member will have to keep to the Bill before the House, and I am not going to say that again. The honourable Member must understand that there are ways and means of debating a ministerial statement. It must be done by a substantive Resolution before the House, and then, and only then, would any Member be permitted to roam all over the entire financial position of the Government. Where there is a specific Bill before the House, honourable Members must keep within the rules.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have heard your ruling. Would it be proper to refer to the purposes for which the Honourable Minister said that he would be raising the 5 per cent Stamp Duty?

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you going to debate the ministerial statement? Are you going to refer to a ministerial statement? On what basis?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have made by main points on the Stamp Duty. I understand the name of the game. I understand it quite clearly, and having made the points, I will take my seat voluntarily at this time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): It is fairly obvious that the honourable Member has failed to appreciate that the Stamp Duty, as amended, has to be read in conjunction with the pre-existing law, and one of the reasons why he is at a loss as to the amount to be collected is that he ignores the fact that the existing law provides for a substantial amount of exemptions from Stamp Duty. If he understood the nature of the exemptions, he would realise that none of the imports to Barbados which are for fiscal incentive industries under the Fiscal Incentives Act, the Industrial Incentives Act or by an approved export producer within the definition of Industrial Development (Export Industries) Act — in short, the whole gamut of industries which we have in Barbados which came in here under one or the other of the incentive schemes from 1954 or 1953 — none of these are subject to Stamp Duty.

If one were not interested in scoring political points, but were interested in an objective examination of the impact of Stamp Duty, one would at least have done some fundamental homework and spoken about that proportion of the total imports to Barbados which are imported for these industries. Secondly, one also has to deduct another category, because the exemptions also relate to equipment and machinery whether for fiscal incentives or not, having a C.I.F. value, whether imported in one piece or not, of \$100 000 or more. It is not too difficult to understand that that proportion of your goods which are capital goods are also exempted. You only pay \$10 on that, a Bill of Interest. We also have to take into account the fact that by way of another amendment to the Stamp Duty, there is a remission of Stamp Duty on goods which are re-exported by eligible exporters other than these. So you have four categories that you have to deal with.

Almost 60 per cent of our industries in value goes to exports. One of the points we have to make is that if you deduct non-sugar exports from the total exports so far this year, you will find that we are likely to have some \$450 million in exports.

None of the oil that is imported into Barbados is subject to Stamp Duty. That is a reasonably substantial portion of our imports, so that is another category. The impression that is being given is that the stamp duty is paid on all imports, but all you need is a Bill of entry or set of entries relating to the following imported in bulk: crude oil, reconstituted crude oil, reformat, partially refined petroleum and refined fuel, important components of our imports. Also, since we are a centre of entre port trade, a large amount of our imports come in and go back out, so you would have a tremendous amount of deductions that take place.

8.15 p.m.

Stamp duty is not paid on locally grown vegetables. Stamp duty is not paid on black belly sheep converted into mutton, or Wiltshire or the Cross, nor on beef grown in St. Andrew. So to the extent that you increase the value of Stamp Duty, you give an incentive to local production. You do not pay Stamp Duty on cement produced in Barbados.

I am not going to follow the honourable Member down the line, but I know that it is a fact that all the countries in the Caribbean, and in the countries where the United States dollar has strengthened in relation to their currency, they have come up against the problem of how to deal with the impact. We still import from a lot of countries whose currencies have fallen in relation to the American dollar. I trust that the attention of the House will be drawn later on a more sophisticated analysis of the total imports in Barbados, segregating categories of imports which are exempted and those which are not.

As I understand it — I am not giving a definitive position — there are arguments going to and fro now as to whether it is possible to rebate Stamp Duty on exports to the CARICOM area. But Barbados is not the only country that has a Stamp Duty and while our rate of Stamp Duty is not the lowest, certainly there are at least three other countries in the Caribbean Economic Community that have higher rates of Stamp Duty than ours. All these are factors that I think we should take into account in debating Stamp Duty.

I am sorry that the honourable Member did not think it fit to bring a Resolution so that we could have a full budgetary debate, so I am not going to follow him down the line. But once again, the honourable Member finds himself in the impossible position, one in which he has advocated that you must have lesser taxes, more wages, more expenditure, but he is not saying where it should come from.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North:) The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central put forward the theory that the Stamp Duty imposed by the honourable Prime Minister, contrary to the figure put forward of \$20 million, would bring an estimated \$35 million over an entire period. The honourable Deputy Prime Minister in his contribution brought to the attention of this House a series of exemption from the Stamp Duty. But the point still remains that all of those exemptions were in existence in 1982–1983, when a 2 per cent increase in Stamp Duty was estimated to bring in \$20 million. So if there has been no change in the base, it is only reasonable to suggest, and I support the argument, that if a 2 per cent Stamp Duty is going to bring in \$20 million with the same exemption categories

as outlined by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister, it is fair to assume that a 5 per cent increase in Stamp Duty, unless there is a terrific reduction in imports into Barbados, will certainly bring in more than \$20 million as put forward in this document.

It is my considered opinion that one of the aims of this Stamp Duty, among other things, is to increase the possibility of employment in Barbados. I would say that there is a distinct possibility that it has the reverse effect. If you look at the construction industry, the employment generated by the construction industry is 8.1 per cent of the total labour force.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to let you get into that either. Honourable Members must, I repeat, move the proper resolution in here if they want to debate that statement. They will not be allowed to debate it in a circuitous way.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be guided by your ruling.

The proposition put forward by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, in which he deducted \$5 million from the imports of Barbados, covered all the categories suggested by the honourable Deputy Prime Minister, and it is our considered opinion that that Stamp Duty will generate a lot more income and subsequently remove a lot more spending power from the people's pockets in Barbados than is suggested by the honourable Prime Minister in this documentation.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): I recall that just before the honourable Prime Minister's Budgetary Proposals, the owners of stores in the city were asking for the removal of the Stamp Duty as a means of helping them to keep employment in their respective firms. In the Budgetary Proposals of the honourable Prime Minister the Stamp Duty was carried from 3 per cent to 5 per cent. The Prime Minister said that he was somewhat disappointed.....

Mr. SPEAKER: When was this statement made?

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: It is a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: When was this statement made?

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: It was made in the Budgetary Proposals of the honourable Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: When?

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: On April 17, 1984. He said that he was somewhat disappointed at the irresponsible suggestion by the Chamber of Commerce that the

3 per cent Stamp Duty should be removed altogether. I find it strange in March the Chamber of Commerce was asking for the 3 per cent to be removed altogether in order for them to keep their employment levels up and the Prime Minister carried it up from 3 per cent to 5 per cent, between which time and now employment has fallen even more, it is now going from 5 per cent to 10 per cent — he is doubling it. I am wondering what is the rationale, because this seems to be conflicting with the wishes of the Chamber of Commerce. I hold no brief for the merchants or anything like that, but I believe that these persons who pay.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member at this stage debating the Budgetary Proposals?

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: No. I am dealing with the Stamp Duty.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you quoting the Budget of 1984 which has already been passed in this session?

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are doing it and you are not entitled so to do.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am not querying that. I am querying the doubling of the Stamp Duty in the last mini-Budget.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are referring to a debate in this Chamber in this session. You are not entitled to query that debate. It has to be done in a particular manner.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am referring to a debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are referring to a debate which was dealt with in this session and you are not entitled to do that.
8.25 p.m.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to accept what you say, but I always thought it was if you are 'reflecting' on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are reflecting on a debate which has taken place in this Chamber already.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Am I to believe that 'reflecting' and 'referring' are the same thing? How could that be?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, it is a difficult debate to reply to, because in one case the voice is the voice of Esau and the hand that of Jacob or the other way around. I was hearing exactly the same argument coming from the honourable Member for St. Michael

South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) as I heard on the radio two nights ago coming from Frank Alleyne, and as I read, in identical phrases in both the *Nation* and

Advocate newspapers, in a style which the honourable Member does not normally adopt on political platforms. I do not know who is writing this thing. The very phrase about "tradable goods", I heard Frank Alleyne with it and then I read, allegedly, the honourable Member with it in both newspapers.

Mr. SPEAKER: But I will warn the Honourable Prime Minister that he must only reply to what has been said in here today and within the confines of the Stamp Duty Bill.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Thank you, Sir.

I heard somebody debating the Chamber of Commerce. I have not heard the Chamber of Commerce say that Stamp Duty caused unemployment. I never heard them say that. They said that it caused cash flow difficulties, and I refuted that. They have obviously accepted my refutation.

I am sorry that I do not have the paper on the basis of which the estimations of the collections were made. You can argue as much as you like that we have a billion dollars in imports, that a third of them are consumer goods on which Stamp Duty will apply virtually uniformly, and that although a third of them are capital goods — heavy machinery, vehicles and so on — that Stamp Duty applies still to a large number of them — it certainly applies to commercial vehicles, although not the transport buses. You can also argue that a lot of our raw materials, which are another one third of our imports, go into enclave industries but a substantial number are going to local industries, which have to pay the duty. You can argue all of this, but the fact is that the collection of Stamp Duty for the first six months of the year, after the tax was raised to 5 per cent, was no more than the collection when the tax was 3 per cent. That is the fact. They are the figures which were produced to me. The Director of Finance and Planning and the Senior Revenue Officer and I discussed this matter. I am fairly sure that the slip was circulated at Cabinet, not just the day that the proposals were coming to the House but on earlier occasions. Unless I am very mistaken, this year's collections for September were only \$12 million — at 5 per cent.

Even if you assume that those figures were correct, you were finding that contrary to the often repeated accusations by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that there has been no shift in trade, the only explanation is that dutiable goods are being obtained from cheaper sources. Bear in mind that in 1982 the cash

amount of imports into Barbados fell. In 1983, although imports rose, it is doubtful whether consumer imports rose during 1983, and it is doubtful whether this was entirely due to recessionary conditions. I daily collect pieces of evidence that a lot of imported goods in this country are coming in cheaper.

I do not know how often any of the honourable Members in here buy electronic equipment or how often they buy motor cars, but I have already made reference today to the fact that the Establishments Division has discovered that motor cars are cheaper — this is in connection with Public Officers Loans — than they were in 1981, despite the increases in Stamp Duty since that time. There has been some reduction of taxation also on some motor cars, and they are cheaper than they were, 6.8 per cent cheaper in some size of cars and nearly 8 per cent cheaper in the case of others, so the 5 per cent Stamp Duty is going to restore the cost of cars to what they were in 1981, and also the tax bite. The reason why more taxation on motor cars is being collected is that more motor cars are being sold, not that the amount of taxes per car is increased.

All of these factors are pointing in this direction, the estimate was given, perhaps a little on the conservative side, of \$20 million in additional taxation. Forty million dollars will mean taxable imports of \$400 million. This year's estimate would have met taxable imports of \$560 million if the honourable Members think about it, but we were not running at anything like that figure. Maybe imports will go up sharply as Christmas draws nearer, maybe there has been some deferral of imports, but foreign reserves do not give evidence of that — they give evidence that there has been a fairly steady importing in the middle of the year. The foreign reserves have been stable for some time; in fact, they have risen over the last three or four weeks apart from adventitious appreciations, but if the picture changes in the rest of the financial year, the Minister of Finance will be happy that it has changed.

The honourable Member who spoke of withdrawing purchasing power from the economy — I cannot remember which of the honourable Members for St. Philip it was — if the Stamp Duty withdraws \$50 million instead of \$28 million — should consider that the Stamp Duty is not being raised in order to be wasted. It is being raised for productive spending and job creation. The Stamp Duty is being raised to support the Government programmes, and if you take away small sums of money from a very large number of people in order to concentrate that money in the hands of the Government to make a big investment to employ people, you are carrying out one of the classic economic roles of the entrepreneur — it is Government entrepreneurship. Governments do not have to raise money by joint stock companies, for, fortunately,

they can raise money by Stamp Duty. We are raising the Stamp Duty to carry out capital works, and those capital works will create jobs, and you may very well, therefore, be stopping the dissipation of money that might be wasted on imports, on frivolities that have no employment component.

8.35 p.m.

Very little else has been said in the debate. Honourable Members are only saying that we are going to collect more money. Suppose we collect more money! Honourable Members may have a chance at their own initiative, or next year in April, to debate the Budget when we see how much we have collected, how we have spent it, if employment has increased, and all the other matters to which the Stamp Duty is going to be devoted. My proposals were designed to raise money for public purposes, namely public expenditure, and the Stamp Duty is part of those proposals. If the money is more than I have estimated, I am not going to spend it, it is not going into my pocket. Cabinet does not even want the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister to get a salary increase this year. They tell us we have got all we are to get already, so we can stand free from the fray — we can stand back and watch the jobs being created.

I recommend this Bill to the House. There are one or two points that have not been raised by honourable Members, but to which I could perhaps advert. The Deputy Prime Minister spoke about the CARICOM aspect of it and covered the areas very well. I would point out that there is nothing in the CARICOM Treaty that forbids Stamp Duties, and it is open to everybody to impost Stamp Duties if they are imposing them for revenue reasons and not in any way for protection. It cannot form any barrier on trade because it applies to everybody. Everybody has to pay for it.

Consumption taxes sometimes can have just as protective an effect on CARICOM imports, if they are placed on imports that are not produced locally, as the Stamp Duty makes them more difficult to buy, but these are all monetary and fiscal mechanisms which are permitted by the CARICOM Treaty.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. G. ODLE; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Mr. A. TRUSS; Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE and Hon. V. L. JOHNSON — 11.

Noes: Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN; Dr. R. C. HAYNES; Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN and Mr. L. A. WEEKES — 5.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 2 stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, now that the House is in Committee I would like just to examine one or two things in Clause 2.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has done his history to make a second reading speech.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir. It is really a serious matter. I exempted something like over \$500 million in imports from the Stamp Duty, and I am very worried about Barbados' economy if what the Honourable Prime Minister said is true, because you are really talking about a reduction of \$800 million.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member cannot take that line in Committee. Clause 2 reads:

"The First Schedule to the Stamp Duty Act is amended by deleting the words "5%" appearing in the first paragraph under the heading "Customs" and substituting the words "10%."

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In that case, Sir, the point I am trying to make is that if what he says is true, then we would have to be looking at that 10 per cent. On a percentage basis you are really talking about \$400 million in taxable incomes that are subject to Stamp Duties, including CARICOM imports. This has serious implications. Either the collection system is wrong, or the monitoring system is wrong, but it certainly seems to me to be something that should require a full investigation of the Minister of Finance, because I cannot see this possible. Or in the alternate, that there are serious leakages of imports coming into Barbados avoiding detection. That would be the 10 per cent.

I would suggest that this be examined. All the exemptions cannot come to more than \$500 million however you look at it, and you are left with \$700 million. So there is something wrong. I am taking the Minister of Finance at his word. This is the spirit in which I am approaching this particular thing at the

moment. If what he said is correct, and these are the figures connected to it, I would suggest to him that he should really see if there is not something wrong with his collection system, or some problem inside there, or it looks as if we are heading for even greater trouble than I assume there is.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

8.45 p.m.

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN the Bill was read a third time.

The question that the Bill do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW, Mr. L. L. SISNETT, Mr. J. ODLE, Mr. A. TRUSS, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE and Hon. V. L. JOHNSON — 11

Noes: Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN and Mr. L. A. WEEKES — 5

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, earlier in the day I indicated that I would do two Resolutions. One is a 10 per cent increase in pensions and one relates to professional services. I propose to do these two items with the leave of the House, if there is no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has indicated that it is all right.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. 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.

HEAD 19 — MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING SUBHEAD 8 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): This is to pay the services of Lobbyists to help promote the

national interests in the United States of America and to contribute to a monthly magazine which will be featuring Barbados during December.

Aside

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Explain what? You have it in the Resolution. Am I to look at a Cabinet Paper and tell you a lot of nonsense at five minutes to nine o'clock?

I beg to move that Head 19 stand part.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a significant amount of money here. I am sure the House is entitled to some better explanation of the purposes of the expenditure. A lot of money can be spent and can have little effect in promoting the interest of Barbados.

I knock around Washington quite a lot and what I have discovered is that a lot of our representation in Washington never really reaches out on the Hill, it never really reaches where the action is. You get the common complaint that they are never seen by anybody, that our representatives are never on the Hill. The official representatives of Barbados do not seem to appreciate that on the Hill is where they should be directing a lot of their attention, that is in the Washington area.
8.55 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, this Government, like the last Administration, has the fullest confidence in Mr. Oliver Jackman.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): On any grounds this matter is being dealt with in a totally unsatisfactory manner, and we would be lacking in a sense of responsibility if we did not point out that the business of this House and the business of this country cannot be conducted in this particular manner. Here we have a Resolution talking about the national interest of Barbados, and that that national interest is required to be promoted abroad, and we are seeking supplementary provision of some \$287 555, and all we are getting from the Government side, in a totally unsatisfactory and unparliamentary manner, is a Minister of Government getting up and merely saying this is for lobbyists and in addition we will be featured in some *Institutional Investors Magazine*. No explanation is given! We can read what is written here!

We have got to be serious in this country. I am certain that some of the others on the front bench and some on the back bench are totally dissatisfied with the way in which the Government is presenting this particular matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not here discussing Government. If the honourable Member wants to talk about this, he is entitled to. The Chair is still waiting to hear from him concerning this Head of expenditure. Instead we are being treated to what one Minister thinks of the other. That is very much unlike the honourable Member.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I thought you would be quarrelling with the Government for not explaining the matter. They are the ones who should be talking about it.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD) and the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. CRAIG) were ordered struck from the Record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the interest of Barbados should be promoted abroad, and if we are talking about lobbyists, this House should be treated with the courtesy of being told exactly what is the nature of this lobbying that will take place. What are these national interests that are to be promoted? What will the cost be, and how will it be paid for? Is it like an air services agreement, to get somebody to speak on your behalf? Is it in relation to trade matters? What is it in relation to? We as a House must be treated to the information.

Lobbying is a very wide term. Lobbying takes place at the level of the White House, at the level of the civil servants in the United States of America, at the level of the different governmental agencies, and in respect of Congress on the Hill, as the honourable Member said. Wherever influence may be wielded and decisions may be taken, lobbying takes place. In what particular respect are we talking about here?

Nothing at all has been given to this House on which you can ask honourable Members to vote. If we are talking about democracy, exactly what is going on? You are asking us to vote money. Not only do you come in and push it in here today, but when we come to debate it; you do not even explain it. This is shocking, it is shabby, and I will be raising my voice against this type of cavalier treatment of the public affairs of this country. It must go on record.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): What righteous indignation? I am sure the honourable Member only gave us that exhibition to demonstrate that he knew who the institutional investor was, because he is a learned man, a very read man, and I would expect that he would be familiar not as a subscriber, but as a reader with the content of the Institutional Investment, a well known magazine which deals with monetary matters and

banking in particular, and is read by the investment bankers, the Eurodollar bankers and others in these fields.

They feature countries in their magazine regularly; special supplements on countries are published, and they are published in such a way that you have pull outs and you can get 20 000 or 30 000 pull-outs, and they have a list of interested people that they circulate with the pull-outs on the profile of the country similar to what the *Financial Times* does. It is a highly specialised magazine. Barbados has been invited to have a supplement to advertise Barbados, its economy, its people, its stable Government and things of that kind, and the cost of that is \$35 000.

In respect of the lobbyists, the honourable Member gave an excellent description of what a lobbyist does, and the honourable Member knows that Barbados has three or four areas which are now being negotiated with the United States in which the United States policies are at variance with the expectations not only of Barbados, but also of a number of countries, both under the CBI and under the general system of preferences. Therefore, we must lobby.

I will give the honourable Member a very classic illustration. Some time ago there was a threat to the export capabilities of Barbados in respect of brassieres. It took a lot of lobbying to be able to cut through the bureaucratic red tape in Washington to get across the point of view that the statistics were being compiled the wrong way. That is one thing that you use your lobbyists on. Secondly, when it comes to the other areas, like the implementation of the CBI, you continually have to have a lobbyist until all the forms and regulations are completed, until that area of the CBI which is uncertain is fully clarified, you have to have lobbyists running right through the various levels of Government in the United States. Thirdly, there is the Double Taxation Treaty. 9.05 p.m.

There is so much the Ambassador can do. The independent agencies of Government expect you to approach them in a certain way, and lobbyists are specialists in the American system.

As to the points raised by honourable Members about up on the Hill, I have been on the Hill, carried by Barbados' Ambassador. I must say that during the CBI, I probably went on the Hill at least twenty or thirty times. The Barbados Embassy, like the Jamaica Embassy, the Trinidad Embassy and others, were very familiar with all of the various groups on the Hill, and they knew the particular attitudes at Committee level which particular Senators were going to take.

We saw the Black Caucus, the Florida group, led by Sam Gibbons, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee — all of these people. The honourable Member thinks that when we go away, we do not go away to do work. You must not say that because we were not able to get the whole of the Congress Ways and Means group and other people interested in CBI down here, when the CBI was going along without lobbying and a concerted attack. These are the things that you do.

There is so much that the Foreign Affairs people can do, and they recommend that you have lobbyists. Other countries have them. It is usual when the Republicans are in to have lobbyists who are close to the Republicans. When they go out, you get lobbyists close to whoever comes in. The honourable Member is familiar with the American system. He is only gallivanting tonight.

Barbados had permanent lobbyists for a long period of time called Quinn and Quinn, who were lawyers and were interested only in a very narrow area — sugar. Sugar is also an area. There are at least five areas which we have outlined already, in which we need to have constant monitoring.

The question that Head 19 do now stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984–85 No. 14
HEAD 24 — PENSIONS

Subhead 1 — Pensions Gratuity and other Retiring Benefits.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that Head 24 do now stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, I have stamina, stamina and stamina when it comes to public affairs.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Only?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This says:

“From April 1, 1984, all Government Pensioners should be paid an increase at the rate of 10 per cent of the aggregate of their pensions and allowances. The annual additional cost of this proposal is estimated to be \$3.2 million.”

When I called publicly for budgetary adjustments, as published in the Barbados *Advocate*, on front page, three days before the mini Budget, one of the things that I included in that was that I thought that Government pensioners should have an increase. I think that in view

of the imposition of the Stamp Duty and other taxes, that 10 per cent should probably be moved up to 17.5 per cent to accommodate the loss in purchasing power through the Stamp Duty and other recent impositions.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): The amount voted in the approved Estimates of 1984–85 is \$10 million. The increase being sought is 10 per cent. How do you get that worked out to \$3.2 million? If the approved Estimates is \$10 million and the amount being sought is 10 per cent for a whole year, something is wrong. Is the \$3.2 million to include the new pensioners as well as the 10 per cent?

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This is to make up.)

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You have new pensioners coming on this year, too.)

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you very much.

The question that Head 24 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that you do now report the passing

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was on my feet.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The question was put.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The question was put, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You asked me what I rise on. I can tell you what I rose on, if you would give me the opportunity.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, you put the question already.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot entertain the honourable Member. You are a little too late.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There has to be a mistake somewhere here.)

(Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: It cannot be \$3.2 million.)

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85 No. 15
HEAD 73 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING
Subhead 5 - Energy Conservation

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that Head 73 do now stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, I must join with my colleague, the distinguished Deputy Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and protest against this most cavalier fashion in which the Government is trying to deal with matters relating to public expenditure. Surely, there is an obligation on the part of the Government, particularly when these matters are handed to us when we come inside here, at least to get up and say what they want the money for, why there are shortfalls, and why they are coming for this tonight.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no objection to the honourable Member asking questions.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But they are not going to answer, so I am going to talk.

This says:

"The amount allocated in the 1984-85 Estimates have proved inadequate because of the payment of certain commitments from the 1983-84 financial year. In addition, unforeseen expenses were realised for the holding of the National Energy Awareness Week. Some private firms had to be engaged to provide certain services during that week. It has therefore become necessary to provide supplementary funds under this Subhead to meet expenditure to the end of the current financial year."

9.15 p.m.

We want to know some things: What were the unforeseen expenses and why were they unforeseen? Who were the private firms that were engaged and what services did they provide during that particular week? What was the estimated success of the National Energy Awareness Week? What was the programme like? What impact has it had on public consciousness? What was it targeted to? Was it targeted, for example, to better architectural designs in order to accommodate better cross-flow of the breeze and better utilization of fans, a reduction in the use of air-conditioning? Was it geared primarily to architecture directing its use towards the need to use double glazing for example in windows in air-conditioned buildings, or buildings without air-conditioning so, that you will have less heat loss and, therefore, less energy use? Was it targeted toward the better use of domestic appliances? Was it directed in order to help people that you can

buy automatic defrost fridges rather than one you can defrost yourself but energy consumption will be greater? Was it directed towards making people understand the proper use of a deep freeze and how to save energy in that context through proper packing so that you would go into the deep freeze less frequently? Was it directed towards the proper use of gasoline, teaching people the frequency with which they should use their carburetors, directing their attention to the type of cars they should buy, and how they should always keep foremost in their mind the consumption of the amount of gasoline in relation to their capital expenditure? Was it directed towards diverting purchases from gasoline fuel vehicles towards diesel fuel vehicles? Was it directed towards a public campaign to get the Barbados Light and Power to bring down their bills by the three cents that I have recommended? Was it directed to make the public aware of how notional expenses in relation to public utilities can impact on their particular bills while generating cash flows far in excess of what is necessary for the operations of the public utility, and indeed even after contributing the accepted 20 per cent to the capital development, and without rate suppression, allowing for a rate of return to the investors way above that obtaining within the society for comparable companies which are subject to greater risk? Was it directed to teach people the safety relating to equipment that use energy like electricity; for example, that if you go into a bathtub and probably use an electric comb, you can get electrocuted?

If those concepts were the reasons for the expenditure of this money, there can be some justification for it. But the Government has given no explanation or justification.

Did they get into a true analysis of the proper use of the gas that is cleared off? I see that the Chairman of the National Oil Company is very interested in this exercise of energy conservation and proper energy usage. Was it drawn to the attention of the public that that excess energy and gas should find itself along Martindales Road, right across Bank Hall and as feeding into Carrington's Village, Brittons Hill and elsewhere where for the capital investment you will have a high rate of return? Did it address itself to the environmental problems that could be consequential on offshore drilling? Did it address itself to the improbabilities in Barbados of deep-sea drilling successfully, with a high capital cost, in water deeper than 600 feet? Did it address to the need to protect our environment from oil spills which have been creating serious problems for certain tourist resorts? Did it address itself to the problems relating to hoteliers who have taken out the air-conditioners in their rooms and have put in fans, and who have found that, because of the original construction, the guests no longer find the rooms satisfactory and attractive, and therefore they have to find some alternative? Did it address itself to the problems of the auto-

matic turnoff of air-conditioners in hotel rooms in Barbados once you open the door the air-conditioning turns off and when you close the door it comes back on?

Unfortunately, we have got our act wrong in Barbados and have created a lot of problems. If you had the opportunity to go to certain parts of California and, I gather, Singapore — I have never been to Singapore — and Tahiti, you will see that the system works smoothly. Each time you open a window or go through a door, off goes your air-conditioning; when you close up, on it comes. I have gone to hotels in Barbados when I have had to meet with people privately, and I was surprised to find that the thing was a bit of a nuisance, a lot of problems. The system is just not working in Barbados.

I should like to know if the Honourable Minister seriously got across to the public the importance of energy as a cost factor in all operations throughout Barbados. Did you try to explain to them the relationship between energy and job creation? Did you explain to them the relationship of energy the cost of living and to the balance of payments?

What was the whole thrust all about? Was it in macro-economic terms or was it in micro-economic terms? Did it stretch from the household? Did you explain to the farmers in Barbados how in a mixed farm unit they can so organize the possibilities of energy generation so that they may not have to incur the kind of expenditures if they go into mixed farming? The Honourable Minister of Transport may well recall that there was an occasion when we spoke in this House of the possibility of generating energy from manure and other sources on the farm unit. I have heard recently that there are possibilities of using solar energy and converting it into electricity in the context of protecting the fences on a particular farm. Have they been able to get across to the farmers that by buying a relatively cheap solar conversion unit, that could be converted into electricity which will reduce the cost of the kind of fencing that they have to buy? In other words, they can use the chainlink fencing and just feed about two volts of energy through the chain-link fencing, which is much cheaper than the BRC, so that each time the animals touch the fence they will get a shock.

9.25 p.m.

This is what the Energy Awareness Week should have been directing itself to. If I am going to agree to this expenditure, one should know these things. Some Minister on that side, should have been able to get up and say what took place. I do not have to refer to any document to get up and tell you what an Energy Awareness Week should be in the context of Barbados. The only contribution that I have ever heard the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) make to the energy

debate in Barbados was when he was Minister of Housing. He said that he put in solar drying units in houses at \$10 000 a unit. Do you know what is a solar drying unit, Sir? That is for drying clothes in the sun.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, do you know that there should be some way that when the honourable Member walks downstairs, the police should arrest him and carry him straight to the Mental Hospital and give him some shock treatment?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And do you know, Sir, that at the Mental Hospital they have now devised some system that when the Member for St. Michael South Central gets there the door will be opened and he will have to sleep in there for the balance of the week? Have you realised the amount of time he has wasted in here?

I beg to move that Head 73

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, I will not cover the ground so admirably dealt with by my colleague, the Member for St. Michael South Central.

Aside

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am speaking on the matter that is before us.

Aside.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, tell him to sit down.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have not completed my speech.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sit down. I have caught the eye of the Chairman.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You are on a point of order!

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Chairman says I can speak.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, do you know that I have not completed my speech and that I have more energy than any of them on the other side? Even more than you, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to look at this matter in a slightly different light. We are

dealing with Capital Works programme here, and it is undoubtedly one of the functions of the House of Assembly to ensure that money that has been appropriated is used for the purposes for which it has been appropriated.

The Subhead we are supposed to be supplementing is Subhead 5, and this speaks about provision for expenses relating to Phase Two of a technical assistance project in energy conservation. It is partly funded by the World Bank. I wish to know how it is that on top of the commitments coming over from the 1983-84 financial year, which have made the amount provided in the 1984-85 Estimates inadequate, the Ministry of Finance could go and make a commitment to something called National Energy Awareness Week, when the amount of money provided was inadequate because of commitments brought over from the previous year.

I am wondering if we are not breaching the very rules under which we should be operating, because it is a very serious offence for a Ministry to go and spend funds that are not there. It appears to me from this particular note that funds were committed to be spent, when the vote was inadequate to meet the commitments which this House agreed to. This is a very serious charge in terms of the management of the public finances of this country. It appears that there has been an over-commitment to a vote.

In addition to that I am asking how does a National Energy Awareness Week become a Capital project? What is the Capital nature of it? Is it construction? Is it equipment and furniture being put into a building? Is it pipes being laid? I am at a loss to see how something called a Week and the celebration of activities during a Week can be something called Capital. Is this an appropriate Head from which such an expenditure should be made? On the surface of it, from the information supplied, I can see no justification for this money to be spent from this particular Head.

I have heard about a Transport Week, and I am certain it was not a Capital expenditure. I heard the Minister too, I listened to him. He made a good speech too, but this cannot qualify as a Capital project. I would like to hear some explanation of this on financial grounds coming from the Ministry of Finance itself.

I would find it very surprising if the Ministry, which is supposed to be the guardian for the propriety of expenditures, should be the one that is breaching the rules which they are supposed to be the guardians of.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Put the question, Sir. I beg to move that Head 73 stand part.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, there must be some answer from the Government. I have raised a

very serious question here. Is the Government incapable of answering the question? What is happening in this country, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. You asked the Chairman what is happening. The Chairman will put the question. I do not see a quorum. Let the bell be rung. 9.35 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak again and to draw to the attention of the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister, who is present in this Chamber now, if he is still totally in command of his faculties, to explain what appears to us to be an infringement of the Financial Administration and Audit Rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me inform the honourable Member that nothing he is saying now has anything to do with Head 73, which we are now debating. I am prepared to hear the honourable Member on Head 73. He has already made his contribution and the rules allow him to speak again, but he cannot return with the same argument nor the same line of approach of argument.

I should also inform honourable members on both sides of the House that there is no question of a Minister of Government having to answer questions under these circumstances. It is irrelevant.

Asides

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chairman is speaking and the honourable Member should be sitting in his seat.

I am prepared to hear from the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central any further contribution he wishes to make in respect of this debate.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I can assure you that I can talk on energy and the different aspects of energy under the area of the National Energy Awareness Week. I want to know whether this sum of money that we are voting today in any way went to alerting the public of Barbados to Government's policy on oil production.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not dealt with this in my last contribution. I dealt with energy conservation when I spoke last. I am talking now about pure oil production and national awareness of the importance or unimportance of national oil production. I have not addressed this matter and I am going to address it now separately in this 15 minutes period.

What is the capital basis and the capital outlay in relation to our oil production in Barbados? Twenty-four million dollars to purchase the assets of Mobil

Exploration Ltd. and our oil under the ground, another \$35 million in terms of loans to the Barbados National Oil Co; and taxation of \$6 million in the 1983 Budget, so there has been a heavy out-lay on the part of the people of Barbados for oil production.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I draw to Your Honour's attention that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is now dealing with something completely out of the ambit of the Resolution before the House

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. The honourable Member, your point is well taken. The Member must confine himself to the Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What I am saying is that in the light of our heavy outlay in the area of oil production and the future of oil production in Barbados, I would like to know what proportion of the \$35 322, which represents the additional expenditure here, was allocated towards generating national awareness during that week of the importance and the significance of oil production in Barbados? It is to that particular aspect that I am addressing myself.

Were the people of Barbados made aware during that week that one of the reasons why they are asked to pay high gasoline, high electricity, high water, ...

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I must draw to Your Honour's attention that this has nothing to do with the Resolution before the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

(Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. HAYNES) were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. CHAIRMAN).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it is my contention that in the area of national energy awareness, apart from national conservation that I spoke of when I first addressed you, the second most important part is oil production in Barbados, and I am trying to find out whether or not during that week the following points were raised

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must let the honourable Member know at this time that I am forced to have honourable Members confine themselves to Subhead 5 which deals with Energy Conservation. I will not entertain arguments that are outside the ambit of that. The honourable Member knows exactly the parameters within which he should go.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: All right, Sir. In the area of energy conservation, have the people of Barbados been made aware of the fact that one way in which they can conserve energy is to make greater use of windmills, as they have done in the past?

During that week was it stressed that the bagasse, which is available from the sugar factories through the process of pelletisation, a highly specialized procedure, is very cost efficient? This has been developed in the United States, and one major plantation in Hawaii, through bagasse, produces about 10 – 15 per cent of its total electricity needs through the process of pelletisation. So if we can get into a pelletisation programme, we could probably effectively link our sugar industry towards an energy structure in Barbados and thereby conserve energy. In other words, instead of a dissipation of energy from bagasse, we are talking about conserving energy from bagasse and feeding it into the national grid through the process of pelletisation. Pelletisation is a method of reducing the molecular structure of bagasse and compressing it in such a way so that for a given volume, because of the law of mass action that takes place within the context of that energy, a considerable amount of energy is saved.

This particular technology was stolen apparently from the United States by Vesco, who had the protection of the Bahamian Government, and it was sold to the Cuban Government. This has been a major problem in the United States in its major thrust for energy production. 9.45 p.m.

Another major role is solar heating. Has it been explained to the people of Barbados that just as you get solar heating, the technology of solar heating can be so developed as to replace air-conditioners? Has it been explained to them that at least in two buildings, I think one in Graeme Hall and one in Culloden Road, this technique has been used and the technology has not caught on in Barbados, but in certain countries solar cooling can be an exercise? Has it been brought home to Barbados that the Post Office could have been cooled in this way, conserve energy, and therefore conserve on the recurrent cost of the General Post Office and probably reduce the capital cost of the General Post Office?

Has it been explained to the people of Barbados that that foolishness that the Government started to develop some years ago when they talked about generating energy through saline transfer from the energy of the waves, which would cost a fortune even in the most developed countries, had to be abandoned? When it comes to energy conservation, I am a scientist and I am an expert on all these things. Have you explained to the people of Barbados how a biological system can be used

in order to generate a recycling effect in terms of energy conservation? You have not done it. Have you wasted the \$35 222? Have you spent it on just feting or did you get into anything about it? Was the money stolen or was the money used? Tell me where the money is? If \$35 322 has been spent and no Member on that side can tell you how it has been spent, then we must become a bit suspicious in relation to the \$35 322, which will become a major issue in the St. Peter By-election.

I think I have taken long enough, and I thank you for your patience, Mr. Chairman, but I think at the same time the House has benefited from a wide range of approaches to the question of energy.

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the

passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, October 23, 1984 1486

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER 1486

Re two items inadvertently left off the Order
Paper.

MESSAGE

Mr. SPEAKER 1486

Re issuance of writ for by-election in St.
Peter.

PAPERS

Hon. L. S. Craig 1487

The Annual Report and Statement of Ac-
counts of the Barbados National Bank for
the year 1983.

Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw 1487

Recommendation No. 169 concerning Em-
ployment Policy adopted at the 70th Session
of the International Labour Conference held
in Geneva on 26th June 1984.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. Craig 1501

Resolution to grant the sum of \$3 487 555
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at
the disposal of the Government to supple-
ment the Estimates 1984-85, Part I -
Current, as shown in the Supplementary
Estimates 1984-85, No. 14, which form the
Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$35 322 from
the Consolidated Fund and to place it at
the disposal of the Government to supple-
ment the Estimates 1984-85, Part II -
Capital, as shown in the Supplementary
Estimates 1984-85, No. 15, which form
the Schedule to the Resolution.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Questions by Mr. A. TRUSS (St. Michael Central) . . 1487

Of the Minister of Transport and Works
(Hon. V. L. Johnson)

Re construction on four acres at Waterford
Bottom, St. Michael.

Re road repairs in various areas of St. Michael
Central.

Re street lights in various areas of St. Michael
Central.

Re road improvement in various areas of St.
Michael Central.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Suspension of Standing Orders 1488

Compulsory acquisition of land at Six Men's
St. Peter for the Speightstown By-pass Road,
(Phase 3). 1488

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 1488; Dr. Haynes,
1488; Mr. Craig, 1488, 1489; Mr. Greaves,
1489, 1490; Mr. Franklin, 1490; Mr. R. E.
Brathwaite, 1490; Mr. Sandiford, 1491; Mr.
Johnson, 1491, 1492, 1493 1497; Mr.
St. John, 1493, 1494, 1495; Mr. Taitt, 1495,
1496, 1497, 1498, 1499; Mr. Adams, 1499,
1500.

Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to
Subhead 3 - Head 73, Ministry of Finance
re Aero Services Barbados (1982) Limited . . 1501

Mr. Adams, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1505, 1510,
1511; Mr. Barrow, 1504, 1505, 1506, 1507,
1508, 1509, 1510; Mr. Sandiford, 1506, 1511,
1512, 1513; Mr. St. John, 1513, 1514, 1515;
Dr. Haynes, 1515, 1516, 1517; Mr. Blackman,
1517, 1518.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85

No. 13 \$800 000 1518

Mr. Adams, 1518, 1520, 1521, 1522; Mr.
Barrow, 1518, 1519, 1520, 1521; Dr. Haynes,
1519; Mr. Sandiford, 1519, 1520, 1521.

Resolution re guarantee of £1.85 million by Short
Brothers to Aero Services Barbados (1982)
Limited 1523

Mr. Adams, 1523, 1524; Dr. Haynes, 1523;
Mr. Barrow, 1523.

Stamp Duty (Amendment) Act, 1984 1524

Mr. Adams, 1524, 1531, 1532, 1533; Dr.
Haynes, 1524, 1525, 1526, 1527, 1528,
1529, 1533; Mr. St. John, 1530; Mr. Franklin,
1530, 1531; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 1531.

Head 19 – Ministry of Finance and Planning Sub-
head 8 Technical Assistance 1534

Mr. Craig, 1534; Dr. Haynes, 1534; Mr.
Sandiford, 1534, 1535; Mr. St. John, 1535,
1536.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984–85 No. 14
\$3 487 555 1536

Mr. Craig, 1536; Dr. Haynes, 1536; Mr.
Franklin, 1536.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984–85 No. 15
\$35 322 1537

Head 73 – Ministry of Finance and Planning.

Dr. Haynes, 1537, 1538, 1539, 1540, 1541;
Mr. Craig, 1538; Mr. Sandiford, 1538, 1539.

SUSPENSIONS 1501, 1525

ADJOURNMENT 1541

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

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

BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)

BLACKMAN H. A. (St. Philip South)

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

BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)

BRATHWAITE, His Honour R. E. (Deputy Speaker) (St.
Lucy)

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

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

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

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

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

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

SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)

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