
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 12, 1985.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.25 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (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, Industry and International Transport)
Mr. L. E. Sandiford, 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)
Mr. B. M. Taitt, B.A., (Hons.), M.A., LL.B., (Hons.)
Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour, Social Security, Sport and Community Services)
Mr. L. L. Sisnett, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Trade)
Mr. W. O. Franklin, A.I.A.S., J.P.
Hon. A. Truss, (Minister of Tourism and The Environment)
Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc., (Econ.), (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

Prayers were read by Fr. D. Stapleton.

His Honour R. E. BRATHWAITE (Deputy Speaker) entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, February 5, 1985.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes for Tuesday, February 5, 1985 be taken as read.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of: Accounts and Statements for the month of December, 1984 prepared by the Accountant General.

I am also to announce that I am in receipt of a letter from the honourable Member for St. Michael West complaining about a breach of privilege of this Honourable House. The honourable Member may now proceed.

BREACH OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of this month I wrote Your Honour a letter in which I indicated that, under Rule 76 of the Standing Orders, I proposed to raise a matter at the previous sitting concerning a breach of the privileges of this House. In that connection, I drew to Your Honour's attention an article appearing in the Barbados *Advocate* newspaper of Saturday, January 26, 1985 captioned "Dear: Charge Irresponsible".

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to draw the honourable Member's attention to the procedure which

must be used, as is set out in the 19th Edition of May's Parliamentary Procedure, when seeking to introduce a motion for a breach of privilege.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Since I only have at my disposal the 18th Edition, I wonder if Your Honour could indicate the correct procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: Reading from May's Parliamentary Procedure, the 19th Edition, on page 163, it says

"When complaint is made of something published in a newspaper or book, a copy of the newspaper or book, and when complaint is made of a letter sent to a Member, the original of the letter said to have been written, must be delivered in at the table by the Member who makes the complaint and, if they have not been read to the House by the Member, the passages complained of read aloud by the Clerk for the information of the House before any further proceedings are had in relation to the complaint."

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I have the original complaint here, which I will hand to the Clerk of Parliament.

I was saying the article was captioned "Dear: Charges Irresponsible," and it was on page one of that newspaper. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, after careful study of the article and the relevant authorities, including May's Parliamentary Procedure, that the remarks attributed to the person therein named and their publication

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is reminded that he must either read the article complained of to the House, or he must request the Clerk so to do.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that I could put the information before the House and then ask the Clerk, but if Your Honour wishes

Mr. SPEAKER: The House would not be aware of what the honourable Member is complaining of.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Very well, Sir. The article reads as follows: "Dear: Charges Irresponsible" is the headline.

"The chairman of the Barbados Board of Tourism, Mr. Jack Dear, yesterday described as 'scurrilous and the height of irresponsibility' remarks made by certain politicians in the recent debate in the House of Assembly on crime.

"Mr. Dear made the criticism at a luncheon hosted by the outgoing Minister of Tourism, Mr. Bernard St. John, at the Ocean View Hotel for

members of the Board of Tourism; the Board's overseas managers and its top staff.

"Mr. Dear said that charges made by one of the politicians about a west coast hotel 'have not been supported by any particulars', nor had the politician indicated that he had gone to the Police on the matter and had produced no evidence to support the charges being made.

"Mr. Dear said that if the remarks had been made outside of the House of Assembly they would have led to a serious charge and felt that such politicians should be seriously censured by the Press.

"He said that the charges made were damaging not only to the hotel in question but to the tourism industry as a whole, and he saw it as another example of cases where Members of the House of Assembly shroud themselves in the privileges of the House to abuse the said privileges."

Mr. Speaker, May's Parliamentary Practice, 18th Edition, at pages 140 and 141, especially the paragraph at page 141 - I am quoting from the first indentation on page 141 - says

"Reflections upon Members, the particular individuals not being named or otherwise indicated, are equivalent to reflections on the House."

12.25 p.m.

Without going into long details, I draw Your Honour's attention also to pages 146 - 148.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you leave page 141, will you continue with the fine print under that page?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, with respect, in light of the fact that I only have fifteen minutes, I would rather not read the whole part.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like you to continue.

Mr. B. M. TAITT:

"For instances of breach of privilege or contempts by publishing false or scandalous libels on either House or its proceedings, see the cases of Hall, 1 Hatsell 93 D'Ewes 291, C.J....."

Mr. SPEAKER: Good. Follow the other fine print further down:

"For instances of breach of privilege or contempts by speaking words defamatory of either House or its proceedings....."

Are you saying that the article is defamatory of the House or proceedings, or are they scandalous?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, under the Rules of this House, I am unable to say that. The Rules of this House at Rule 76(3) indicate that all I can do is to draw the matter to Your Honour's attention if permission is given, and that I could move that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges. I am unable to speak on the merits of the complaints. I have indicated to Your Honour what my contention is. It is for the Committee of Privileges to determine, after Your Honour has ruled, whether a *prima facie* case has been made out, whether the breach, in fact, occurred.

My understanding of my responsibility in this matter is that I am only to draw the offending article, as I perceive it, to Your Honour, to draw any relevant information to Your Honour in the likely event that Your Honour would not be aware of it, and to move a Resolution accordingly.

I would crave your indulgence, therefore, merely to invite you to proceed in the event that pages 140 – 141 do not cover the particular breach. I draw your attention to pages 146 – 148, and I move that this matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges for its consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: What part of 146 – 148 you would like me to look at?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, in order to grasp the essence of the article complained of and the sentiments expressed therein, one would have to read from the caption "Attempted Intimidation of Members" all through "Acts Tending Indirectly To Obstruct Members In The Discharge Of Their Duty" right through to 148 up to "Reflection Upon Members".

For ease of reference, the matters and the cases, which are voluminous, are outlined, and while a particular case may not be on point, I draw your attention to page 146 where it says:—

"Examples of this kind of misconduct are:

Publishing statements impugning the conduct of Members and threatening them with further exposure if they took part in the debates of the House".

I submit that, by analogy, the indication that the Press ought to censure a Member for a statement made in this House is relevant. I go further, Mr. Speaker, and I indicate for the Record that it is my view that this House is not a court of law, as has been indicated by no less a person than the Prime Minister himself. The information

which an honourable Member brings to this House does not require, as I understand it, any proof or any information as would be required in a court of law, for example, but it requires only that the conduct which the honourable Member engages in is satisfactory to the presiding officer. I, therefore, submit that any person or persons who, in the light of a debate which was approved by no less than His Honour the Speaker himself, seeks to cast aspersions and make suggestions about censuring by the Press, the punishment visited would fall within the ambit of the matters covered by these relevant paragraphs and pages which I have cited.

I think that, within the Rules of this House, I am unable to be more specific without engaging in a debate which is strictly prohibited under the same Rule 76, by which I bring this matter to Your Honour's attention and to the attention of this House. I therefore move that this matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges

Mr. SPEAKER: You can only so move if the Speaker finds that a *prima facie* case has been made out.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But I could only move and then Your Honour would rule! As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given careful thought and attention to your complaints, but I cannot find anywhere in the Rules of our House, or in May's Parliamentary Procedure, where such a statement could constitute a breach of privileges of this Honourable Chamber.

All the matters referred to in May's Parliamentary Procedure deal with libel and slander. I would hate to see the day when Members of this Chamber are allowed to say what they feel like, when they feel like and how they feel like, and that members of the general public are not allowed to comment upon those statements. This is democracy, and we must not shroud ourselves in a privilege and expect no one to comment on what we say.

This is my ruling. I do not find that the statements constitute a breach of the privileges of this Honourable House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With the greatest respect, Sir. I heard your ruling, but I draw your attention that, under the said Rules, Mr. Speaker is not required to rule on the merits of the particular complaint but merely to determine whether, in his opinion, a *prima facie* case has been made out.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said that I do not find that a *prima facie* case has been made out.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I well understand why Your Honour might so rule, and I have to abide by your ruling. I have no alternative on the matter but to accept the ruling by His Honour the Speaker.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1985.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1985.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 8 months ended 30th November 1984.

The Caribbean Common Market (Origin of Goods) (Amendment) Regulations, 1985
12.35 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Legal Profession (Qualification for Admission to Practice Law) Rules, 1985.

The Council of Legal Education Order, 1985.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1985.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1985.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Spooners Hill, St. Michael.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 15, asked by the honourable Member for St. George North, is ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984–85 No. 36

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the sum of \$46 480 which this Committee seeks is to supplement the Estimates for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to see it through until the end of the financial year. This has come about due to an increase in the cost of freight in respect of diplomatic mail, from £20 to £23 per kilo. In addition a number of officers were transferred during the year, more than were anticipated, and there was the promotion of an officer and the promotion and creation of a temporary post of Accountant. None of this expenditure was estimated or put in the 1984–85 Estimates.

I do not know if there is any matter which Members on the other side would care to raise. If they raise anything, I will do whatever is within my power to give whatever reply is possibly necessary.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, I have taken note of the explanations given by the Leader of the House in introducing this particular matter, and as far as those explanations go, I certainly have no quarrel with them. But I would like to look at this matter in a little broader perspective, because the provision of funds for travel and for operating expenses goes to the heart of the purpose of our Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and it is not very often that in this

House we get an opportunity to debate at length our foreign policy and the implications of that foreign policy.

Let me at the start pay tribute to a former Foreign Minister of this country, the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde). The two of us were certainly in agreement on one matter.

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You are very touchy! Are you a touched mango?

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am rearing to go.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You know you said that wherever Keith Simmons ran, you were going to run, and when Keith Simmons said he was going to run in the south, you ran to the north. You are always running away from things!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am running in St. Michael South, not St. James South.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak.

Mr. Chairman, I think any serious examination of the foreign relations of this country would certainly indicate that it is absolutely necessary in our democratic society for there to be a body in this Parliament to give consideration, on an ongoing basis, to the developments of our foreign policy and the implications of that foreign policy. We have been defective over the years in not establishing a Committee of this Honourable Chamber to examine the foreign affairs of this country and to scrutinise the developments in that area. I know that the honourable Member for Christ Church West has his heart in the right place, or had it until he was no longer the Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs. He held the view, and this was certainly supported by us over here, that there should be a sub-committee established in this Chamber in order to keep the foreign affairs of this country under review. It is a pity that, up to this day, such a committee has not been established, even though the foreign affairs have become increasingly complex, and indeed certain trends which may not all be for the good development of this country have been indicated.
12.45 p.m.

I wish to make a call again that there should be established a committee of this Chamber to keep under review and to scrutinize the foreign policy of this country. I believe that one of the main ways by which a

democratic society, and a democratic Parliament, can keep track of such developments is by way of the establishment of a body which has an ongoing mission to give continuing consideration to the various aspects and ramifications of our foreign policy. This is, of course, nothing new. Other Parliaments which have to consider these matters have set them up. I have spoken with the members of the Sub-committee on Foreign Affairs and Hemispheric Affairs of the House of Commons. I do not recall at the moment the exact title for that particular sub-committee. The United States Congress, House of Representatives and the Senate, have committees to look into this matter, and I think it would be in the best interest of our own public policies, as to how they impinge on other countries and how they impinge upon our own domestic policies, that we should have that kind of consideration.

Barbados became independent in 1966, and I can put it no other way than to say that since that time our foreign affairs and the general security of this country have been certainly put into a state in which we have been sometimes fearful of exactly what direction we are going in, and what are the implications of the situations into which we have become involved. We started off with the enunciation of a policy after Independence that we were friends of all and satellites of none, in clear and eloquent testimony to the fact that we intended to pursue a policy that was independent, that was non-aligned in the truest sense of the word, and also a policy that was in the best interest of this country. Since that time, we find that in the short intervening years this country has gone to war. We went to war in Grenada.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You supported it too.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I said that we went to war. Are you denying that we went to war? What are you saying?

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No. You go on. I just wanted to jog your brain.)

Asides.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And won.)

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We have gone to war. We have intervened in the policies of independent countries. We have gone into St. Vincent and the Grenadines, intervened in the affairs of sovereign, independent countries. We have found ourselves with our policies torn and tattered, and I should like to take a brief review of the different theatres in which our foreign policy has run into difficulties.

If I may start right here at home in the Caribbean, I think it is true to say that at no time since we became an independent country, with responsibility for our foreign affairs, has the foreign policy of Barbados been in such low repute, and the status of Barbados in our own Caribbean region more subject to attacks and criticisms. If we take Guyana, we find that, as a result of the policies pursued by that Government over there, as a result of certain infelicities pursued by the Government, our finances are in jeopardy. So we are at loggerheads with Guyana over certain matters relating to the Multilateral Clearing Facility and other matters. There is no doubt that our relations with Guyana over the recent past certainly leaves a lot to be desired, and the Government has no one to blame but itself for the situation in which we find ourselves.

In respect of our major trading partner in the Caribbean, Trinidad and Tobago, our foreign relations are very strained, to say the least. What is at the root of this? What has caused it? Perhaps, the Government can explain. But the fact is that our relations with Trinidad and Tobago are so bad that, as I read it in the Press, olive branches are being waved around the place in order to get the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago to pay a visit to Barbados so that, hopefully, relations between Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago would be mended again. This is a situation for which the Government of Barbados has full responsibility. They got us into this particular problem and it is for the Government to get us out of that problem.

I understand that our Foreign Minister is now in Trinidad and Tobago, or should be, trying to mend the fences which were broken by the very Government which he represents. That is the nature of the problem. No one can deny that our relations with Trinidad and Tobago are at a very low ebb, at a time when we can ill afford to have those relations so disrupted. In Barbados, our economy, our manufacturers, our industrialists and our workers and the families who depend upon these workers feel the result, the pinch, of the failed policies of the Government in respect of our foreign policy with Trinidad and Tobago.

Over the years, we have sedulously cultivated our relations with the countries of Belize and the Bahamas. But when this country was in a major crisis over Grenada and the matter came up in the United Nations, those countries with which we cultivated those relations, as I said, so sedulously, and in which we have tried in all cases to foster in their own best interest, somehow or other our foreign policy makers and our foreign policy shapers could not influence those countries to come out and support the position taken by Barbados. Again, an indication of the weakness of the initiatives taken by the Government, and a failure of the Government to use a strategy that would have been successful in trying to win

support for the positions being taken. So in that particular area we find that the foreign policy objectives of the Government have not been achieved.
12.55 p.m.

To leave the Caribbean and go to the wider world outside, we find that one of the foreign policy objectives of Barbados as enunciated by the policy makers, by the Government, was to win a seat on the Security Council of the United Nations. That particular objective was not achieved, and that is another failure in the area of foreign policy of the Government. The reasons for that, why there was a failure, the Government itself is in a better position to explain. What I do know is that when we look at the objective and ask ourselves whether that objective has been achieved, regrettably we have to say that it has not been achieved. Whatever the ramifications of the policies of the Government, whatever different objectives the Government were pursuing in other areas, the fact is what they were doing in one area was in conflict with what was happening in another area, which indicates a certain obfuscation, a certain lack of clarity, of the policy objectives of the Government, and a failure to choose the correct strategies in order to achieve those particular objectives.

As far as the United Nations is concerned.....

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The talk shop)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, it is the talk shop, but democracy is about talking, Parliament is about talking. It is good that we can talk about that, and we need a body that can talk. I am going to talk about the United Nations and the family of nations specifically a little later. I will start with one of the specialised agencies, UNESCO.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two more minutes.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Within UNESCO, I think it was a shock to most progressive-thinking persons in this country when the Government came out and said that it supported the United States in withdrawing from UNESCO.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point-of order, Sir. The honourable Member must really not make statements that cannot be substantiated. I challenge the honourable Member to say when he ever heard the Government come out and say it supported that.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Government indicated that it was in support of the policy of the United States in withdrawing from UNESCO. Britain was in support of the United States, and Barbados was behind Britain and the United States in that particular position. I think it was shocking for a Third World country such as Barbados,

in relation to an agency whose mission is to develop education, science, culture, information and the other facets which tend to bring about social development in a country, and from which Barbados itself has benefited, should come out and support the positions taken by countries which, for their own reasons, and for cold war purposes, were interested in attacking UNESCO.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I will wind up on this point. In the United States itself the National Commission for UNESCO was against that particular position. I do not know whether this matter was referred to the National Commission for UNESCO in Barbados, and I do not know what position the Ministry of Education took on that matter, but I would be surprised if the Ministry of Education here in Barbados would have been in support of a stand that would be hostile to the best interests of UNESCO.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Normally, I would not have intervened in this debate, but I think that the manner of expression of the honourable Member who just spoke, indeed the very words that he used, and the intent that he tried to convey in relation to aspects of the foreign policy of Barbados in relation to the Caribbean, are of such a mischievous nature that I felt compelled to intervene. This capacity for mischief is a characteristic of the Democratic Labour Party, and one of the chief exponents of this mischief is the honourable Member who just sat down. The other thing is that it is also characteristic of the honourable Member to be sanctimonious.

1.05 p.m.

We well know that the stand taken by the Government of Barbados in respect of Grenada only received support from the other side in this House of Assembly because they thought it was politically expedient. There was no genuineness to it. At first, they wanted to seek to exploit any potential political capital that could have been made out of our stand, but when they saw that there was almost universal, one hundred per cent, solidarity of the people of Barbados behind it, they fell into line. We all know that, but I am going to put the records straight on a few other matters.

I want to deal with the relationship within the Caribbean. We have never said it, but in view of the fact that today the honourable Member mentioned the specific countries and suggested in here that the relationship between Barbados and those countries are bad because of the Grenada situation, I think the records should be put straight. There is absolutely no doubt that throughout the Caribbean Economic Community difficulties have arisen in the trading relationships between the Member States, not only between Trinidad

and Tobago and Barbados, but between Trinidad and Tobago and other countries like St. Lucia, St. Kitts, Antigua and others. There have also been difficulties since 1975 in the trading relationship between Guyana and the rest of the Caribbean, and since 1976 between Jamaica and the rest of the Caribbean. The situation has been greatly exacerbated by the fact that the international economic recession has weighed down heavily on Jamaica and Guyana, to the extent that they devalued their currencies by well over two hundred per cent or three hundred per cent in that period of time, which has meant that the whole fundamental basis upon which the Common Market was founded, namely, that there was relative equality of opportunity to sell to one another, was being removed. That is the cause of the strain, and those strains, for the benefit of the honourable Member, if he is interested in the truth, were in existence before Grenada.

Check the minutes of the meetings of the Common Market Council and see how repeatedly the Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce in Trinidad and Tobago was saying that he was under pressure from his manufacturers because of the fact that devaluations were taking place in two of the large countries and they did not see that they would be able to sell to those countries. When Jamaica established the two-tier system for its currency....

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: What is that?)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am not surprised that the honourable Member does not know what it is. The honourable Member is not interested in these things. He is interested in making mischief. He is not interested in an objective analysis of the relationship between any particular country. He is, pure and simple, a mischief-maker.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order. If you permit the Member there to call another honourable Member a mischief-maker, I think it is contrary to the Rules, but I would like the honourable Member to tell me what is a two-tier system. I am interested in the truth. Tell me what is a two-tier system!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Let the honourable Member go ahead. He knows very well that from October 1983, and even prior to that, there were a number of problems, and there were a number of conferences dealing with Jamaica's currency problem here in Barbados. But he does not want to deal with it. The honourable Member has come in here today exhibiting one of his greatest defects of character, his capacity to be sly-speaking, and I would not use any other parliamentary language.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I submit that the language used by the honourable

Member in relation to another honourable Member is contrary to the Rules of this House. To say of a person that he came in and.....

(Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: What Rules?)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You do not know about any Rules.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Come outside and talk about Sandy Lane and Jack Dear!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Is Jack Dear somebody? Jack Dear can frighten you, but he cannot frighten me. Jack Dear can frighten you and all the rest of them in here that are frightened for Jack Dear.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, order! I cannot entertain this sort of conduct in here.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am going outside and I am going to talk about it, and I am going to talk about the other.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Members please contain yourselves and let us not be provocative. Order, please!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I submit that the language used by the honourable Member in relation to the honourable Member for St. Michael South is unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member, please continue.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We must continue! We must put an end to all of these Members who come in here and think that they are past masters in the art of insinuation and that kind of thing. I say it is deplorable conduct bordering on treason, on the part of the honourable Member. You are a traitor to your country when you come in here today, when you know

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: It is against the Rules for anyone to call another honourable Member a traitor, I submit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I said "bordering." I was very specific — bordering. I know the honourable Member, and he is not to get away with it. He knows that since August 1983, well before Grenada, the Government of Barbados, in company with other Governments, has tried on a bilateral level to work out a regime whereby the impact of the changes in the fundamental assumptions under which CARICOM took place would be taken into

account. I am not going to say anything more on those matters.

The honourable Member said that Belize and others did not support Barbados in respect of Grenada. Belize had a democratic right not to support Barbados, and the electorate in Belize had a democratic right to take that into consideration in the election of its Government. And the honourable Member is in as good position as I am to judge whether that was one of the factors contributing or not contributing to the recent events in Belize. Do not think that you are going to come in here and say that Belize did not support us and therefore relations are bad.

We pursue democracy. The Government is not ashamed in any way of the stand it took in respect of Grenada.

1.15 p.m.

The Government is not ashamed, either, in respect of the stand it took in St. Vincent, because it was invited there by the legitimate Government of St. Vincent that was just being elected. If the honourable Member thinks that in these small territories it may not be necessary in the future for the same type of action to take place, the honourable Member is living in a fool's paradise. This Government knows fully well of the impact a few small people who are bent on overthrowing a Government can make, the devastating impact. That is why we will continue to support all efforts at creating a regional agreement with respect to making sure that democratically-elected Governments are not overthrown.

We have no apology to make. The Barbados public knows that when they elected the Barbados Labour Party, they elected a political party that is committed to closer association economically, politically, socially and culturally in the Eastern Caribbean in particular, so do not bring any foolishness in here. Do not think that you can get in here and try and fool the unsophisticated people who have not followed what was going along. You are not going to be allowed to get away with it. And do not plea the Rules of the House either, because there are some ways of expressing yourself bluntly and clearly. One other way of expressing yourself is sneakily. You have cultivated one aspect of expression, I have cultivated the other. I am a Joe Blunt. I call a spade a spade, always within the Rules of the House. I do not need to hide it. If I need to say it, I will say it.

I reject any contention that the relationship between Barbados and the other countries in the Eastern Caribbean is bad, caused by the action of the Government. We are the leaders in the Caribbean in trying to point out that the solution to the economic crisis that we have now does not lie in giving away to the forces of protectionism. The Barbados Government will forever

advance the viewpoint that to concede to protectionism, and any element within your community who wants to blackmail you into adopting a protectionist viewpoint, is wrong. So if because we pursued a policy of advocating a regional common protective policy as opposed to an insular one, if because we pursue the policy of advocating that there must be consultation prior to devaluations, if because we pursue the policy that it is unreasonable to expect that you can conduct yourselves in a way which is in violation to solemn agreements entered into, if because we pursue the policy of advocating all these things the honourable Member is under the mistaken belief that that is the cause of difficulties between Barbados and other Governments, let him continue to be under that mistaken belief. It is not going to change the Government of Barbados, because we are convinced that it is the right policy.

This Government does not pursue a policy purely because it may bring popularity. That is the kind of thing I would expect the honourable Member to do. That is characteristic of him. He desires to be popular so much that principle means nothing. I expect him to do that, and do it in a manner in which he would convey the impression that that is not really what he wants.

The Government of Barbados' policy in relation to all of these things is well known. We believe that that policy can stand examination. It may be unpopular with some, but this Government is not motivated in its actions only by its ability to court popularity.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member who just sat down, the Deputy Prime Minister, very often in this Chamber believes that by shouting his points they will be more properly appreciated by those who hear them. But I do not believe that this in itself would be sufficient to change the very clear perception which almost every single person in this country has, that whatever was the state of the relations in the Caribbean before the invasion of Grenada, the surreptitious and sneakily-planned invasion of Grenada, and the utterances of the Prime Minister of this country in relation to a foreign state, the specific utterances of the Prime Minister with regard to an ambassador who represents the Head of State to Barbados, created worse relations, the worst relations that Barbados has ever had, not only with Caribbean countries but with countries throughout the world.

He seeks to indicate that they do not pursue policies for popularity, and suspects that that in itself would be sufficient to justify what appears to be a profound paranoia which pervades that entire Government, and which is manifested by its public utterances and its public behaviour in the arena of foreign policy. So when he says that my honourable friend holds a mistaken belief, he is really manifesting what we have come to understand and accept from his Government. Why does

he not tell us, about the relationship with Trinidad and Tobago on the question of BWIA the very silly policies and sometimes vindictive policies, pursued by the Government of Barbados in relation to BWIA, while trumpeting, as he just did, that they are the repository for all feelings towards a Caribbean nation? They have this capacity to say that the Barbados Labour Party has always been interested in a Federation, in bringing the peoples of the Caribbean together, and they believe that merely by trumpeting that, that that is sufficient to inculcate into the minds of especially the young people in this country that they are for it and the rest of us are not for it.

The truth is that it is by their deeds you will know them, and from the time the Barbados Labour Party came to power, the position of Barbados *vis-a-vis* the rest of the Caribbean has seen a steady decline. I challenge any honourable Member on that side to examine the evidence of a systematic decline in our relations. Our relations with Guyana declined, in spite of the fact that the Guyanese had excited them to the point where they were going to get the blueprint for the implementation of Guyanese policy in Barbados. Their relationship with Jamaica, even in the face of what can be described as a philosophical coincidence between the Prime Minister of Barbados and the Prime Minister of Jamaica in respect to the right of the rest of the people of the Caribbean, is at its lowest ebb, partly because of a transparent desire on the part of the respective leaders to fight for a place in the hip pocket of the President of the United States.

1.25 p.m.

There are some people who believe that you cannot utter a single word that might suggest that you differ with the policy of the United States without, in the words of the honourable Member who just sat down, suffering at the hand of democracy. When democracy is being used to perpetrate causes that are not beneficial to the broad masses of mankind in this region, those causes are said to be democratic. So I would not be surprised if the honourable Member got up and said that there is democracy in places like Chile, because that is what they say about Barbados. You do not have to go too far to hear the word, 'democracy' trotted out by persons who are alien to the concept.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Like Haynes!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Democracy is the easiest word to trot out. But it is the manifestation, by way of their acts, that it is determined whether you have democratic principles at the core of your public life, whether you believe in democracy and truth or whether you are a hypocrite who will use any kinds of words to parlay yourselves into an acceptable product to the vast majority of the people in a community.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: In a democratic country, you do not need a Democratic Labour Party passport.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Democracy has been brutalized in this country by some of the most careless acts in Christendom, and especially in the last five years our attitude, both domestically and in the foreign affairs policy of our country, has demonstrated a decided move away from democracy.

When examining the foreign policy of this country, I believe that the most categoric and catastrophic failure of our foreign policy would have to be in the area of economic achievement arising out of our foreign policy. You need only to examine the fruits of our foreign policy initiatives, in the last five years especially, and compare them with the achievements of, let us say, the first twelve years after Independence to see that, far from our having an effective foreign policy, we have been drifting on the waves of what may be termed, because I am in this Honourable House, the dictates of our masters from time to time.

When you examine the foreign policy of the United States, you will see that it is motivated by enlightened self-interest. If you examine the foreign policy of the United Kingdom, you will find that it, too, is motivated by enlightened self-interest. If you examine the foreign policy of the USSR you will find that it is motivated by enlightened self-interest. Every country in the world that practises foreign policy has, at the back of its initiatives, its own self interest.

The self interest of this country must necessarily find its root in the well-being of the people of this country. If you wish to discover whether a foreign policy is being effective and successful, you must look at the result. You must examine the people in the particular country, and in this country, if you look at the achievements or lack of achievements for our people arising out of our foreign policy, you can then determine how successful it has been.

We have been independent since 1966. The Democratic Labour Party held office from 1966 to 1976 in our independent time. The other Government has been in power since 1976, and it is nearly a decade they have been in power. If you visit, as I have from time to time, the capitals where we have diplomatic representation, where we have consular representation, you will find that we have not yet, nearly two decades after Independence, rootenized our systems and brought our policies to bear in the manifestation of the way in which people perform their duties. What we have is a lot of corruption still in the offices, brought about by the policies of that Government over there.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: That is unparliamentary.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I know you are going to tell me to bring evidence. I hope you do not tell me to bring evidence.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You would know about dishonesty better than I would. If you say I am dishonest, I would take it from you, because you are the master of dishonesty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, no cross talk.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If you say I am dishonest, you would know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I said that there is corruption in some of the offices. When the Honourable Leader of the House was proposing this Resolution, he said it had to do with promotions and posts. I really regret that the Attorney General and Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs is not here, because he, perhaps, would be in a better position to answer, but I wonder if the honourable Member would be prepared to indicate whether he, or the Government, is aware of how the posts are filled in New York. I wonder whether the honourable Members on that side would like me to discuss some of the posts that have been created in New York and the whims and fancy of individual Ministers. I wonder if they would like to discuss the fact that monies have been lost in the offices in New York, and that there has never been a report, either in this Parliament or outside, coming from that Government about the nature of the loss of those monies. I wonder if they are prepared to indicate that the partisanship and the victimization which is current in Barbados itself has found itself into some of the offices in the overseas departments; that certain persons are deemed to be of certain political persuasion and that those persons, as a result, are unable to execute their responsibilities in freedom and in comfort.

(Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Where is that? Tell me the embassy!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The time will come when the details will be put before the people of Barbados outside of this House.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: As usual!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The facts will be put, and the arrogance which is demonstrated by the Government constantly in its domestic and its foreign policies will be brought to bear when they have to come face to face with the people themselves.

The fact is that when we examine the fruits of those offices, we find that you cannot pinpoint a single, solitary economic benefit. In 1976, this Government said that it was going to concentrate on the economic aspects of its foreign policy, and some nine years later there has been little change, if there has been any change at all.

Aside.

1.35 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, at another time we will examine whether our economic policy and our foreign policy as they relate to each other constitute merely the borrowing of money from one capital or another, or whether we ought not by now to have worked out a regime which would be known to all and sundry, and which would be recognised and practised by those who join the Foreign Service, those who join any area of our overseas representation, and indeed that they can look forward to having a career that would be committed to a certain pattern as opposed to the cut and gerrymandering which appears to be the standard. Time will come again to expand a little further in this matter.

The question that Head 35 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 2 was called — To move the second Reading of a Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to permit the Minister of Health to delegate by Instrument in writing to the Chief Medical Officer any function conferred on the Minister by regulations made under the Act.

Honourable Members will recall that the scheme of health legislation in Barbados is such that there is an omnibus Act which permits the making of regulations to cover a variety of health matters. Pursuant to those regulations very often permissions are necessary, and the regulations were drafted in such a way that the Minister himself had to give each and every permission, and there was no power, according to legal advice, for the Minister to delegate, pursuant to the Interpretation Act or otherwise, this power to the people who really make the decisions on these matters, the administrative people. For

a large percentage of routine matters the Minister had to affix his signature, and this has no doubt caused a tremendous burden on the time of the Minister. In order to tidy up this position, the Minister is being empowered to delegate in writing these functions to the Chief Medical Officer.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, since this would be delegating authority, I do not think anyone can quarrel with that *per se*. I think it is very necessary that, in the interest of a speedy resolution of certain problems, the Chief Medical Officer may be able to act for the Minister. Indeed, many times it may be desirable.

In that context, recently it has come to my knowledge, in a very painful way, that there appears to be an epidemic in Barbados of which we have not heard anything, and on which we have not had any official pronouncement, and there seems to be all kinds of different bits of information being circulated. I would like to ask the Government Ministers — and I am not here trying to take the Ministers unawares, it is a serious matter — if they can indicate now or have the Minister of Health make a statement with regard to the incidence of gastroenteritis in the country.

Gastroenteritis seems to have reached epidemic proportions in Barbados. Last Monday, for example, I am told that some 29 children were admitted to the ward at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I said I discovered it quite painfully, because in my own family one family member has contracted the disease. On Sunday afternoon at my branch meeting, a large number of members of the branch asked that when I come to the House of Assembly I should find out what the real position is. I have tried to find out by contacting one or two public health authorities, but they, in keeping with the rules which have been outlined by a Minister of Health, have indicated that they were in no position to pronounce on the matter one way or the other "because they did not wish to get into any trouble." I feel, therefore, that a clear-the-air statement outlining the truth, outlining the facts, and letting the public know what the situation is, would be the best bet for the Government.

1.45 p.m.

Obviously, health is not an area in which one seeks to gain particular political kudos, but at the same time, where the community is concerned.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the honourable Member would just give way on a point of order, Sir: Do I under-

stand you to say that the disease which you have complained about has reach epidemic heights?

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am getting the information from Dr. Harney. You said that it is at the point of an epidemic. Is that correct?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am only seeking clarification so that I can get the information to pass on to my colleague. Kindly repeat what you said.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will repeat that I was asking the Government whether gastroenteritis has reached epidemic proportions.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: G-A-S-T-R-O(Go ahead? Do not give them anymore? Do not educate them? The Minister would have to know what he is going to ask about)..... E-N-T-E-R-I-T-I-S. You say "enter" and then add "itis".

Mr. Chairman, quite seriously though.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It is Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I beg your pardon. I got accustomed to seeing the Chairman, and in your resplendent robes sometimes I do not pick you out in the background.

What I wish to find out from the Government is to what extent this sickness has reached. Anytime 29 children are admitted to a ward at one time in Barbados, that, to me, is an epidemic; and when I know 16 people who have been told by doctors that they have gastroenteritis, all within a radius of two miles, that, to me is an epidemic.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member from the City, the former Minister of Health (Hon. B. A. Miller), wishes from her seat to question the use of the word "epidemic", it is a matter for her to get up and explain to us what constitutes an epidemic and when is an illness an epidemic. But if, as I understand it, gastroenteritis is running rampant, as far as I am concerned that is an epidemic. It may not be technically correct according to the rules of medicine, and that is why I am asking the Government to tell the population what is the incidence, how high it has reached, what steps they are taking, whether they have discovered the cause of it, whether

it has anything to do with the recent flooding in Barbados, whether, in fact, it may have

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller rises.

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point of order.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am not prepared to define epidemic. I am just suggesting that we do not want to terrorize people

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has no right to define anything because she has not yet spoken.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Exactly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, please take your seat. Continue.

(Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: You are a one-man epidemic. You have talked nonsense for the last 40 minutes.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member said from her seat that I am a one-man epidemic, which means she must have caught something from me.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is an aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You must have caught something from me. If you say that I am a one-man epidemic, you have to defend yourself. I do not know, it might be a cold.

I think that I have made the point, and I think the Government has a responsibility, if for no other reason than to stop the terrorizing of the public by wanton and wrong information, to say what the situation is. I think that the Deputy Prime Minister would take the point, unlike his colleagues, because I can see from his demeanour that he understands what I am trying to do. I am trying to get the Government to do its job. I am trying to get the Government to make a statement. Let the Minister or the Chief Medical Officer make a statement saying there is no epidemic, we have had a high incidence, we have traced the cause, we know what it is, we are taking steps or some such thing. That is what a responsible Administration will do, and a responsible Opposition has a duty to come in

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not heard one word yet about the matter which is before the House, and it is about time that we look at the relevancy of matters before the House. What I have before me is a Bill

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It deals with delegation to the Chief Medical Officer, and the Chief Medical Officer is the person responsible for reporting on epidemics in the country, and I am dealing with the Chief Medical Officer.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I am saying that you are not dealing with the matter before the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am at your disposal. You are the Speaker, and whatever you rule, I have to agree with. I have to sit down if you tell me to sit down, but I do not have to agree with you intellectually.

Mr. SPEAKER: You do not have to agree with me intellectually, but you have to agree with me on what is before the Chamber.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: And that is all I have to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as I am concerned, the Rules of this Honourable House say that debates must be relevant.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: And if you tell me that health is not relevant to the Chief Medical Officer, you are putting me in a position where I do not know where next to turn. I am discussing gastroenteritis and you are telling me that is not relevant. What is relevant then?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not argue with you.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not arguing with you either.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the matter before the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am dealing with a matter before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please do not shout at me.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I can speak at any level, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please do not shout at me.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not shouting at you. I am speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER stands.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member please take your seat.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, you can tell me that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

(Mr. TAITT sits down and rises)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As I was saying, if you say

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member will please take his seat.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will take it.

(Mr. TAITT sits and rises again)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As I said, Sir

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not hear the honourable member anymore.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is your privilege. You are the Speaker.

(Certain remarks made at this stage by Mr. B. M. TAITT were ordered expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER).
1.55 p.m.

Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN (St. Michael East): Mr. Speaker, this measure before the House of Assembly purports to deal with a minute modification of the way in which the bureaucracy within the Ministry of Health functions, and while I have no difficulty with the legislative proposal before the House, it simply represents an infinitesimal scratch on the surface, since while, as it is, the quality of health in Barbados is perhaps the best in the Caribbean, the delivery of health and improvement of the quality of health in Barbados have been seriously retarded by the presence of a cumbersome bureaucracy that wallows in what I call professionalism.

In the first place, the health institutions in this society appear to be run and operated primarily for the convenience of professionals, doctors, nurses and otherwise, and this is not surprising in view of the fact that, over the years, we have slavishly followed a model which in many countries is deemed to be obsolete, namely the medical model. In large areas within the bureaucracy within the Ministry of Health, there is a mistaken view that health is equivalent to medicine, and it is not surprising that when debates in this House occur in relation to health, we find ourselves in a straight jacket arguing about diseases. But health, I submit, goes way beyond medicine and moves into the social arena.

When I was Minister of Health, I struggled to replace this archaic and inefficient model, based upon the equation of health with medicine, with a socio-medical model, which is more relevant to the needs of Barbados. A socio-medical model, therefore, would completely transform the bureaucracy; it would give rise to a complete overhaul of the administration of the Ministry of

Health, and it would end the absurd practice where hospitals are operated like other Government departments.

In a situation where institutions are forced to deal with emergencies of all kinds arising out of health matters, it is nothing short of nonsense to have them hamstrung by rules that are not even appropriate for running a post office. The colonial shackles of health institutions that are required to be flexible and to deal with emergencies should be abolished without further delay. Once one abolishes the colonial rules that trammel the bureaucracy of the Ministry of Health, the way becomes open to replace the sterile medical model by a more relevant and modern socio-medical model of health.

Hospitals should be operated in a way that the people whom the hospitals are set up to serve interface with the professionals, and have a considerable input into decision-making and into how hospitals are run. I will give you an example as to why I believe this is an urgent necessity. Some time ago, I saw a woman, a 77 year-old woman, who was lying speechless in the Casualty for eight hours after having suffered a stroke, and when I enquired as to why this woman was lying in the Casualty for eight hours, the doctor, who could barely speak English, informed me that he was waiting for a report from a social welfare officer. I was astonished at the response of this doctor, and asked why was he waiting on a report from a social welfare officer in order to deal with a woman who had a stroke and was in a manifestly crisis-ridden condition. He then informed me that the social welfare officer had to conduct investigations as to the circumstances within the lady's home to determine whether she should be sent back home or to the geriatric hospital, the almshouse.

This woman was going to be confined to the almshouse in Beckles Road, and probing beneath the problem, I discovered that the doctors had made a decision that since this woman was 77 years-old and she had suffered from a massive stroke, and she had no money to go into a Pay Ward, then her chances of survival would be bad; and since she could swallow, as I was informed, she could either be fed at home, until her Maker saw fit to take her, or languish in the almshouse in Beckles Road. When I then ordered that this woman be admitted to a ward immediately and be taken care of, one of the doctors is reported to have said that if he were present, he would not have admitted the woman to his ward. The ward that the taxpayers of Barbados are paying for was described as "his ward". He had a proprietary interest in this ward, and he could determine who should be admitted and who should be rejected.

2.05 p.m.

What this particular episode illustrates is the need for a decision as to who should be admitted to wards. Decisions about those who should be up there for services of insti-

tutional care ought not to be left exclusively to the decision-making of professionals, some of whom are bogus in the extreme. The question of admission, who should be admitted and who should be deemed eligible to receive the medical services for which the taxpayers of this country pay, ought not to be left to solitary professionals, because professionals, in pursuit of their own convenience, very often tend to subordinate the interest of the sick people.

Nobody who has a mother seventy-seven years old would be happy if she were ripped off and denied the opportunity to get acute care simply because of her age and her past history. That is not for a doctor to decide. That is for the society to decide. That is for the representatives of the society to decide. The representatives of the society must establish the machinery in order to ensure that the debilitating effects of professionalism in the narrow sense are extirpated.

What we need, therefore, when we liberate these institutions from archaic colonial rules, would be to establish a system whereby these institutions are governed by committees of management, where ordinary men and women who become ill will have some say about the kind of service that they ought to be expected to receive when they enter these institutions. The doctors are not the Lord Almighty, nor are the nurses there their archangels. Hospitals exist for the service of the sick, and it is incumbent upon all those with responsibility to ensure that those who are sick and are cared for have a voice in determining how they are cared for and in determining the quality of care that is delivered to them. The elitism that now suffuses the bureaucracy within institutions that come under the umbrella of the Ministry of Health must be smashed, and the whole bureaucratic enterprise democratized — and it can only be democratized if the people who go into those institutions are free from the tyranny of professionalism. And not only the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but all the health institutions need to be democratized in this way.

There are some policy-makers who believe that the best way to operate a ministry such as the Ministry of Health is to be pally with professionals. If you are not pally with the professionals, if your relationship is what some people call 'an abrasive one', then the professionals might be exposed to malpractices within the institutions and embarrass you. The sphere in which political administrators walk and tiptoe around ministries is a disservice to the people for whom these institutions are administered, and it is absolutely necessary to come to grips with this particular problem.

I do not believe that the transformation and the recasting of the bureaucracy within the Ministry of Health is a job of such great magnitude that it requires constant application and it cannot be accomplished in a very short order. The people who use those institutions will be

eternally grateful to all policy-makers who have contributed to the liberation of those institutions from the deadly effect of professionalism. This matter that is before the House just represents a scratch, it just represents tinkers. The Government should seize the bull by the horns, grasped the nettle, to deal with the problems of restructuring the bureaucracy, giving ordinary men and women some input alongside the professionals. And I mean ordinary men and women. I do not mean people drawn from a particular social layer, who come from the middle class in a particular social layer, end up in a particular ward and, sad to say, are given preferential treatment. People who are short-changed by professionalism in the pejorative sense are poor people, the dispossessed and the disinherited whose articulate voices cannot be heard once they come under the influence of dominion of these professionals within these institutions, these are the people that democratization of democracy must involve in the process and ensure an improvement in the quality of health in this country.

Administrators have a responsibility in the health institutions to ensure that the facilities are not abused. Professionalism again, in its worst sense, has created a situation in this country where beds are used, in institutions that are misdescribed as hospitals, by people who are not sick, because it is something which contributes to the convenience of professionalism. This question, therefore, of how to deal with bureaucratic problems, how to ensure that those who control the bureaucracy do not operate it in their own interest rather in the interest of the people they serve, is one that has to be met.
2.15 p.m.

The problem of a bureaucracy acting in its interest and against all other interests, of course, can be found to a lesser or greater extent in other areas of Government, but within the Ministry of Health and in health institutions one finds that it is particularly resistant to almost any change at all. That is why I would like to urge on the Government to speed up the process without delay, a process initiated by your humble servant, to ensure that a programme of modernisation of the bureaucracy of the Ministry of Health and all health institutions can be implemented without delay.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.15 p.m.

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

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

2.22 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, the Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee without amendments, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

During the debate we did give the assurance that we would check a certain amount of information. We are checking the information, but the information we have to hand so far is that there is nothing unusual in the number of reports, bearing in mind that at a certain time of the year there are usually, on a regular pattern, more reports of a particular type relating to the matter mentioned by the honourable Member.

We will check it further, but, to date, the examination does not reveal that there is an unusual number, but there are a number.

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

On motion of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was passed.

BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BANK (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 4 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Development Bank Act, Cap. 323.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, the principal reason for bringing this Bill to the House is to vest certain land situated in Hincks Street,

Bridgetown, into the Barbados Development Bank for the purpose of building a new headquarters. In connection with this matter, it is being exempted from the payment of Land Tax on the principal property.

The bank is also being exempted from paying Income Tax on its income in future. This may well be a necessary precaution, since in these days the Barbados Development Bank is moving nearer and nearer to making not only a profit on its operations, but, perhaps, a taxable profit. It is not intended by the Government that we should so handle the bank as to make it pay Income Tax as if it were a straightforward commercial bank.

As I said the principal purpose of the Bill is to vest the land in Hincks Street, on which stands a building known as *Marshall Hall*, in the Barbados Development Bank for the purpose of the bank building a headquarters. It is intended that the bank will so reconstruct *Marshall Hall* as to give it four floors within the existing facade, at a cost which was estimated in 1981 of approximately \$5 million. A basement garage is also intended to be excavated. The bank already owns property next to *Marshall Hall*

I have it wrong. The Leader of the Opposition has corrected me on this before, so I would not give him a chance to correct me again. *Marshall Hall* has been bought. It is the property next to *Marshall Hall* which is being vested in the bank on this occasion, because there is a cloud in the title. But the purpose of the whole transaction is to build a new headquarters.

Marshall Hall is an ancient monument. It was completed in 1861, with walls of 24 inch coral stone blocks, and, for a very long time, it was virtually the conference centre of Barbados. I have an engraving in my office of a dinner being held in the last century, in the late 1860s, for the visiting Trade Commissioners from Canada, who were on a trade mission to the Caribbean at that time, and for whom a function was held in *Marshall Hall*. In the fulness of time, I intend to present this to the Barbados Development Bank at the function which no doubt, will mark the completion of its new headquarters.

That the bank needs a new headquarters is beyond question. The bank has been relocated four times since it was founded in 1969, and from 1979 it has been trying to find a place to have a headquarters and to build the headquarters. The firm of Kenneth Gardner Associates has been selected as architect of the project, and it has produced a plan, a sketch of which I will be glad to pass to all honourable Members.

(Perhaps if the Leader of the Opposition would care to look at the elevation of the ground plans first, he could send it back over for the benefit of any Members

on this side who have not seen it.) Preliminary work by way of test boring has also been done.

3.25 p.m.

As a result of the Government's plans for the whole Hincks Street area, and for the Spring Garden Road and other areas, it is anticipated that that part of the city of Bridgetown will change for the better in character. The fishing harbour is to be built just to the north along the shore in the back of *Marshall Hall*, and it is anticipated that there will be a waterside walk. It will be a beautified area, and it would form part of the general improvement of that area of the city of Bridgetown. A certain amount of the new building will be reserved for renting to outside clients.

The first thing I would say about the plans is that there may have to be some modification as to the arcades on the ground floor, which we were intending to provide for small businessmen. This purpose still remains, the Government is not reneging from it, but it does not seem to us that there is the same demand as there may have been for arcade and shopping mall space as there was when the matter was conceptualised. Nonetheless, that is the plan which we intend to use, and any changes which would be made in the plan would be made in the light of economic circumstances and the time of construction.

There is very little more that I can say about the building, except that it will have this novel feature for buildings in Barbados of having its own space for parking for 24 cars. If other persons putting up buildings could perhaps incorporate the idea of completely off-street parking, we would have far fewer problems of parking in Bridgetown. Certainly when I look and see the number of cars parked on the road in Hincks Street and Princess Alice Drive, I wonder why we bother to provide car parks at all, but that is really a matter for the police and the traffic wardens, who the Ministry of Transport and Works proposes shortly to appoint to assist the police in their work in Bridgetown.

I gave a figure for construction, of just over \$5 million. The bank plans to raise this money partly by a loan and partly by an increased equity capital. The Central Bank has made a tentative agreement to take up some entity in the bank, and as soon as we can get the equations together, I expect that construction on this work will start. The fact that we will not be changing the facade of *Marshall Hall* should give pleasure to the National Trust and to other persons interested in the historical preservation of buildings in Bridgetown.

In addition to the Canadian Trade Commissioner, I could mention that the Exhibition was first held in *Marshall Hall*, not in Queens Park, which was then occupied

by the Major General in charge of the British garrison. In 1861, the Bridgetown merchants gave a dinner at *Marshall Hall* for His Royal Highness, Prince Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh of that day. In 1880, the building was sold and became first a rum refinery and then a warehouse. It has sufficient history for us to want to preserve it in the general townscape of Hincks Street and the Careenage.

I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition will not have the same strictures to offer on the development of this site that he has had to offer on the Central Bank site. We are not spending that kind of money, although we do expect the returns from rent will perhaps play a greater part in the repayment of the loan than the rental proceeds that can be expected from the Central Bank. It will all be part of the improvement of Bridgetown in the long run. It will lead to the reduction of the cost of the Barbados Development Bank, which will no longer be paying rent in other people's buildings, but will be occupying its own distinguished premises in a new development in Bridgetown.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say to distinguish the acquisition and construction of the Barbados Development building, which we are now discussing, from the Central Bank building is that at least we did not go outside to borrow money to do it — we are relying on our own resources — quite apart from the magnitude of the expenditure in respect of the Central Bank.

I think a gentleman called Mr. Miles Rothwell, writing a column called *Miles Ahead*, has already drawn attention to some of the, — I wish to find a neutral word, unusual features of the project. *Marshall Hall* is historic in a way. It is not a very elegant piece of architecture from the outside, but with the site which is now occupied by the Barbados National Bank at the corner of James Street, which used to be called Albert Hall, and the building which is immediately to the west of here, now known as the Olympic Theatre, which was the *Wilhemina Hall*, the *Marshall Hall* was one of the trio of buildings in which the general public sought entertainment from time to time.

The redeeming feature, I think, of *Marshall Hall* was the rather splendid staircase or staircases built out of mahogany, which even in the days when it was relegated to the status of a warehouse continued to be in operation. I remember on one occasion going with the late Mr. Oliver Messel and the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) and carrying out a fairly thorough investigation of *Marshall Hall* to see if

we could somehow convert it into a theatre for the performing arts. I think the main objection which the Town and Country Planning Officer had, and which we shared at that time, was that it was already a congested portion of the town in itself, and to think of having, say, 800 or 1 000 people congregate there for a performance, even although the neighbouring streets are fairly wide, would create some difficulty in parking.

I am not an engineer, but I do not personally think that the parking which was being projected for 24 motor cars will be justified, for the simple reason that my experience in Barbados now is that you need at least one car park for every individual member of staff.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not saying there is anything wrong with it. With the allowances and things that they get in the Public Service nowadays, unless you are a very junior officer, just out of school, you normally need a car space for one member of staff, and if you have people coming in on business, you need another eight or ten spaces for your customers.
3.35 p.m.

Excavation can be a very expensive matter. I have no doubt that the walls of the *Marshall Hall* are solid enough to carry another storey. So I am not objecting to it on structural grounds.

The Development Bank elected to buy this building after Jason Jones had had it on the market for a considerable amount of time. I was not satisfied that enough bargaining had taken place between the Development Bank and Jason Jones to get them to reduce the price of acquisition from what they had been asking for over ten years and had not succeeded in getting. I expressed my reservations about that at that time. Then, it appears to me that although the Development Bank felt that they needed a new building, they took another five or six years, for the Central Bank even to build, to produce plans to convert the *Marshall Hall* into an office building.

It is a well-known fact that the Central Bank is not likely to have all of their office space taken up within a reasonable space of time. And since the Central Bank of Barbados was expecting that some of the foreign service corporations, foreign companies, offshore banks and such operations would have responded in taking up some space in their building, and that has not come to fulfilment, I was wondering, since we are saddled, if that is the correct term, or burdened with the millstone of the Central Bank around our necks already, whether in these days of stringent finances the Development Bank could not bide their time and rent space from the Central Bank. That is the point I should like to make. I am not satisfied, no matter what is happening on the other side of the

Careenage in a very limited way, no matter what plans there may be for the expansion of Bridgetown as a fishing port or whatever facilities they are going to place there, that the office accommodation, which would be additional to the surplus office accommodation which is already available in Bridgetown, would be taken up within the foreseeable future; I mean, within two or three years. And it appears to me that people have very expensive expectations when it comes to office accommodation.

Some students used to go and work at the post office in their vacation, as you know, Sir. Some would go and work at Lions Corner House. I am very fortunate, because from early on I picked the location of the St. George's branch of the Inland Revenue Income Tax Office, which was in a building that had originally been a dwelling house; the Ministry of Works had not even put a coat of paint on it and the offices were small. But what was important was that we had about forty or fifty people working in the St. George's branch of the Income Tax Department, and we collected more tax than almost the whole of the rest of the United Kingdom put together, and we did not have any big, elaborate building. It had nothing to do with my efficiency. I went and found it there.

We collected tax for the whole of Oxford Street, Regent Street, the whole of Westminster, that was owned by the Dukes of Westminster, and we collected more Property Tax than most. We were collecting from Selfridges, Marks and Spencer, Cumberland Hotel, Grosvenor House, Browne's — very few of the other honourable Members would know about Browne's — but Browne's is the Grosvenor House with a college education on a smaller scale — and all those big hotels. We had one little building, and nobody complained. The amount of tax that we collected in there far exceeded the Government revenues of Barbados today.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will tell the Right Honourable Member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if that could be discussed privately.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, perhaps later on. I did not quite understand. I thought the Right Honourable Member was enquiring about the remark that I made and asking for an explanation. That is a very special little hotel, as you know, that very few people know about.

The point is that we collected taxes for the whole of this area. It was most remarkable. Very few people knew that this was a tax office. It far transcends any Government business that the Barbados Development Bank can do. I worked in there for three years, only during the long vacation. I would not like to tell you, Sir,

publicly how my time was spent. It was spent in good tradition of those English civil servants. I did some work, but not all our working hours were spent in looking at tax forms or anything like that. We had a gentleman who used to go around the corner and invest in what was going on at White City, and he would pass around from office to office and that kind of thing. It was very pleasant. That is traditional in the British Civil Service. But we collected a lot of money.

Comfortable accommodation is all right, but giving them big, air-conditioned offices does not necessarily create efficiency. When we live in small societies such as ours, institutions like the Barbados Development Bank must put their emphasis on service to the community, rather than — I would not like to use the term investing, because that would be too polite a word — seeking accommodation in luxurious surroundings, let me put it that way. It is conspicuous consumption.

I am not saying that one of these days, Barbados having come out of the woods, we should not look around for projects which may uplift the general building standards and set standards, particularly in the metropolitan area. That time, however, has not arrived, in my opinion, and the Government itself should set an example, instead of discouraging young, married people and people who want to acquire their own homes from building because of high interest rates and restrictions on the banks lending and so on, while the Government itself, through its financial institutions, goes in for expenditure like \$8 million, as we hear in this case — I was going to ask for the exact figure — and over \$70 million in the case of the Central Bank.

I am not saying that a Government corporation should not own the site. We own part of the land already, as I pointed out to the Right Honourable Prime Minister — the open spot which we leased to one of the Bridgetown companies. Tropigas was there at one time. It is a little less than one third of an acre.

It is good that when Bridgetown was burnt down, I think that was one of the re-developments that took place there, and historic sites should be acquired, but not without a certain amount of bargaining. I do not think that institutions like the Development Bank are setting a good example when they just march in and pay the asking price for buildings that have been on the market for a long time. We made the same mistake with the Telephone Company building, which was Yarborough Hall before it was a telephone complex. Next thing we are going to hear is that we are going to complete the triad by acquiring the Wilhemina Hall, probably as an adjunct, which is the one over there, better known as the Olympic Theatre. As I said earlier, there is Wilhemina Hall, the Albert Hall and the Marshall Hall, and we would

be complete, and probably pay for them some fantastic amount of money when they have no parking at all.
2.45 p.m.

The Government has provided a car park outside Furniture Limited which accommodates much more than 24 cars, and I am sure it did not cost what excavating inside the *Marshall Hall* is going to cost just to provide parking for 24 cars. We have to take what the honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) a couple of weeks ago described as "a holistic view of the whole financial situation," or we should be investing in things which are going to be productive and create continuing employment for the young people who are leaving school.

I am not an architect, and I am not sure that I like the idea of a fourth storey, but I would leave this to *Miles Ahead*. The writer of that may be ahead of me in some respects, although he was miles behind me when I pointed out to him that he should not be building that building that now is collapsing near the playing field by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Everybody on the Central Planning Committee knew that when I saw them rolling the foundation, I asked them if they knew that that was where the Deanery was and that I used to catch crabs there. I assured him that the building was going to sink, and he said "Oh no, you would not understand these things." But go and look at the slope on the roof now! He was miles behind me on that occasion.

I am not joining issue with him or with the bank on whether they should have four stories or not. I am saying that the question of priorities arises. I should like them to look very carefully into this idea of the 24 cars, whether that kind of cost in excavation is really going to be justified in the last analysis.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): I would like to make a few points in conjunction with the points made by the Government. I was a bit concerned when I heard about the excavation, and I asked one of the Directors of the Bank about it. I was informed that, in fact, there was an excavation which was done previously on part of this land, which prompted the thought that since that was done, more could be done. There used to be a molasses tank in part of this area.

Secondly, one must look at *Marshall Hall* now and the adjoining land in relation to another scheme which, for the relatively small sum, I understand — and this is the budget figure — of \$2½ million, the Government is going to pay to do, the reclamation on the sea side from the point of the Texaco bond or the edge of the wharf to the fish market. That area is going to be reclaimed. When that area is reclaimed, the land that we are vesting in the Crown now, although it is owned by the Crown — we are formally vesting it — will be made wider. So one must look at the whole of the development here in relation to this bit of reclamation.

We must also bear in mind that in respect of this area of land, because of the width of the road, there is great scope for the use of some of these buildings as potential sites for retail business. There is no doubt about it, Broad Street is a very, very congested street, and the retail sector of Bridgetown has to be extended. I believe that that extension will take place in two areas. One is in the area by Manning and Company going up towards Bay Street partially, and the other area is this area between the Cloister Book Store and the fish market. Already the Shipping and Trading Company has started to do a redevelopment of what was the area known as the Union Club area. The development at *Marshall Hall*, in my view, is consistent with this.

With respect to the cost of the development, this is a very difficult area. I am seriously concerned about the institutional framework we have in Barbados, both at the disposal of Government and at the disposal of the private sector, for providing a second opinion on one's own professional advisers. As I understand it, in other countries of the world very often there are specialists whose job it is to advise employers or owners as to the value of the advice that they receive from their various professionals in the building trade. It is called value engineering. I would certainly like to see such a unit developed.

The second point I am seriously concerned about is the question of the general structure of building contracts in Barbados. It is most remarkable that in the last six years, both in the private sector and in the public sector — and I stress, both in the private sector and in the public sector — an examination of the contracts that were let, with all of the professional services — and they were let to contractors both local and foreign show that a large percentage of them ended up in arbitration. There must be something basically wrong when the experience of both private and public sectors is such that some 60 per cent to 80 per cent of the contracts end up in arbitration.

Are we following the right forms of contract? Are we getting the details of the specifications and drawings done in such a manner that they are capable of precise costing and are capable of precise quantification? I know that an analysis of some of the allegations in some of the arbitrations that have been concluded will show that the unavailability of materials, particularly of cement in the past, was one of the major causes of the allegations. I think that all of us in Government and in the private sector, and I really think that Miles should make a real contribution in this respect, because he obviously seems to be interested in the general conditions of the building industry and the role of the professionals therein, should do some kind of evaluation as to the reasons for this lack of precision.

Subject to that, I hope that this building will be completed and that it will add a worthwhile amount of

space for the retail trade in Barbados. It is necessary to have a relief from some of the acute congestion that is taking place, and this is a logical area for part of the movement which is obviously going to take place.

At one time, many people thought that the Fontabelle area, that is, between Kensington Oval and where Motor Services is, or even opposite starting from the St. Mary's wall, would have developed as the area for the expansion of the retail trade. People thought that with the building of the Deep Water Harbour, that would have been the area where Bridgetown would have expanded. Apparently, that is going to go more in relation to office buildings than in relation to commercial buildings. I understand that a couple of insurance companies are going to build there. So we are dealing here with a question of the slotting in of one owner of a building which is in consonance with the plans for that area.

3.55 p.m.

I am a very strong believer in having the most precise governor of any class of profession dealing with building. I have come up in the industry, and I know that you have to have very clear concepts, clear instructions and give a budget figure, and you have to fight and fight, even though you are the owner, to remind them all the time that it is your money that they are spending and not their own. I know that this is equally a matter of concern for us, and at the Planning and Priorities Committee, we are trying our best to ensure that this kind of supervision of professionals, whether they be from inside Government or outside the Government, takes place, because, after all, all of us have to remember that we have a limited amount of money and that this money has to be spread in many directions.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): So far as the Bill itself is concerned, I was under the impression that this property next door to Marshall Hall was supposed to be vested in the Development Bank, and I am under the impression that it was over a year ago that this matter was supposed to have been dealt with. I therefore, take note of the methodology that we are using to correct what I think is a deficiency concerning the collection of taxes from the statutory corporations. But I will not dwell on that, because I do not think that, in the end, it makes a great deal of difference which method is used. I am interested in the tidy arrangement used in these matters, but one understands that from time to time different methods would apply.

In the light of the debate which has taken place, however, I wish to caution the Government concerning a pattern which I notice emerging in recent times. It seems to me that when one considers the Development Bank's acquisition of these properties and the proposed buildings that will go under, when one looks at the

Central Bank and the announcements that have been made about the use to which the space created for the Central Bank would be put, and when one remembers that it is only recently that there was an announcement of the acquisition of property at Roebuck Street, the old Modern High School, for the construction of yet other related facilities, in each of the cases it has been announced that it is the Government's intention to enter the real estate market, that the Government would be renting some of its space to the private sector, or in any case making the space available for rent. I should like to caution the Government on this pattern which is emerging, where the Government, in expending scarce resources, look towards rentals as a method of either justifying the size of the space which is enclosed or seeking to indicate that they will somehow recoup some of the monies expended.

I submit that the Government really ought not to become involved in the real estate business. I think that the Government is much better off if it restricts itself to doing those duties which, traditionally, have been associated with the Government. But even if not traditionally, I think we in Barbados have to chart a course as to the areas that Government would become involved in and not become involved in.

I am not here speaking in ideological terms because I do not have any brief for those who feel that the Government must not go into the market place if Government believes that it is in the interest of the community so to do. I am dealing specifically with this area of real estate speculation. It can only be described as real estate speculation, because even with the best place, and bearing in mind what the Deputy Prime Minister has said about the tendency for estimates never to fall below the projected figures but rather to go towards the upward figures, it is necessary, and, I think, very desirable, that when we are spending scarce resources we pay attention, yes, to the aesthetics of the environment, yes, to providing proper and spacious accommodation for governmental activities, notwithstanding what my colleague has said about the need to avoid ostentatious exhibitions, but we review this concept that whenever we are planning a building, the architects seem to be including this private space, this space which the Government hopes to rent.

My experience and my training tells me that in a certain context, so far as Government is concerned, never a good deed goes unpunished. What I am saying is that every time the Government creates space, the bureaucracy will fill it. Parkinson explained that law very carefully. So far as it applies to Government, so long as Government creates the space, you can be certain that it will only be a matter of time before that space is filled in one form or another by non-productivity, in its very rigid sense. Of course, Government is productive in the broad sense of the term, but in terms of the kinds of money which we

are called upon in modern times to spend on the acquisition and modernisation of public offices, that is, public spaces, then it becomes very important for the policy-makers, for the Minister of Finance more particularly, to recognize that not every aesthetically desirable recommendation that is made from each and every sector of the Government and their quasi-governmental agencies, because of the mere aesthetics, should precede the need for recognizing that we are in stringent times.

I would not like what I am saying to be misunderstood to suggest that we must not plan forward. Clearly, if the opportunity for urban development or, indeed, urban redevelopment presents itself, it would be a short-sighted policy to allow a view toward the pecuniary circumstances in the community to interfere with a vision of twenty-five or fifty years to come. Clearly, for example, the persons who were constructing this building in which we meet on a weekly basis had the vision to erect a structure that even hundreds of years later we can use it more or less with a certain degree of comfort, and we in this generation have a duty to generations to come to see that we include planning for those generations as part of our decision making. But all of that notwithstanding, it is still important for us not to be taken by the fact that when we travel outside of Barbados and we go to certain exotic capitals, we look at Government buildings and we see huge structures and very magnificent structures, and become enthused with the idea that what we need in Barbados is to copy these cities as nearly as possible.

4.05 p.m.

I think that many persons do not recognise that even in those countries, for example, in Washington, in the United States that although the outside of these buildings would suggest a great magnificence, when one enters these buildings, one soon discovers that there is a deficiency of the use of space which reduces any concepts of grandiose office filling to realistic terms. I think that anyone who is familiar with the general administration office in the United States would know that there is a very rigid code of how many chairs each officer is to have, how many desks, how many pencils, who gets a water jug, who gets a refrigerator, and there is a very rigid code which is carried on from about the fifth floor all the way up to whatever level of floor there is. The point I am making, in the final analysis, is that we must be extremely careful not to allow exotic tastes on the part of, say, an architect, or even an individual in a particular department, or even a Minister, to interfere with the need for us rigidly to pay attention to our ability to pay, our ability to afford a certain kind of building in certain circumstances.

I do not think anyone is going to vote against this Bill *per se*, but I have to join with those who express reservations about the idea of excavation. When we realise that this area is in fact part of the coastal area of

Barbados — albeit reinforced by concrete, it still constitutes part of the coastal area — and look at the whole question of the preservation and conservation of the sea as it relates to the harbour in Bridgetown, and bearing in mind that just to the south of this building there has been for some considerable time an outlet for sewage, I think we have to be extremely careful that in our excavation activity we do not by that kind of activity actually interfere with the ecological balance which may subsist just under the concrete structures around that very delicate area of our land.

I do not think that it is fully recognised, understood and appreciated that that entire area running from where the Hilton Hotel is constructed, taking in what has been known as the Bridgetown Harbour and stretching out to the — promontory might be too large a word — very delicate area that embraces Paradise Beach and those areas is a very relatively young part of Barbados and needs a substantial amount of nurturing. I think that we have taken it for granted for so long that not many people realise that we may be in danger, and we could be in danger, of creating further ecological imbalances that will have a fundamental effect on what happens in Barbados and the west coast of Barbados over the next 100 years. I hope that the most careful and meticulous standards will be maintained when we come to looking at excavation in this very delicate area of our land.

The plans, as one has seen them, deal with a 24 car park, and I still think it is not too late for there to be review of the idea of having a 24 car park. I take the Prime Minister's point that if all the new buildings that go up in Barbados made provision for inhouse parking, perhaps the parking situation would change, but I wonder to what extent it really can be beneficial and useful to increase the car parking facilities by 24 at the risk and at the price we are about to pay. I really think it is not too late for the Government to invite a reappraisal or a re-examination of that particular part of the proposal.

I think, for example, of car parking facilities in really large buildings that house 500 cars. I think of places in Bridgetown that could realistically perhaps over time house 100 to 150 cars. I think that would make an impact, but I am not sure that 24 cars occupying the basement floor next door to what in essence is the shoreline of Barbados is going to be worth either the trouble or the money.

I hope that the remarks which I made will be taken in the spirit in which they are offered.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, since no other honourable Members appear ready to speak, I would like to thank the honourable Members on both sides who have contributed to the debate. I have taken

the point about the basement parking into account and I will convey this to the bank and to the architect.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned a figure of \$8 million as being the overall cost of the development. I mentioned the figure of \$5 million. In fact, the figure of \$8 million is correct, in so far as that includes the acquisition prices and various other prices. Some of that has already been paid, because the land has been bought from Jason Jones, and it was \$200 000 included in that for the cost of this property.

In respect of the Jason Jones property, it was for sale for a very long time. The Government valuer valued it at \$780 000. The land tax valuation was \$797 000, and they were paying taxes for that. The Development Bank eventually bought it for \$775 000. In all the circumstances, since the Government's policy is, in general, to offer people the tax valuation for their property as a fair market price, I consider that it would have been very unreasonable of the Government to collect taxes for a number of years on almost \$800 000 and then offer somebody, say, \$700 000 for the property. It would have been compromising the Government's own valuation system, especially as we did get it for less than any of our valuers places its likely cost at. I do not think in the circumstances that \$40 a square foot is a lot to pay for land in that area, with a usable building.
4.15 p.m.

The Government has found that it can reclaim land next to the sea cheaper than it can buy it. It costs the Government less to drive piles, build a wall, drop marl and reclaim a piece of land than to buy the land on the shore. Therefore, with the fishing harbour, we will be reclaiming land rather than trying to buy land from other people. But I do not think that, in all circumstances, it can be said that we pay Jason Jones an excessive price for *Marshall Hall*.

For what it is worth, the Development Bank bargained quite hard with the Government itself for this land, and agreed to pay the Government \$200 000 for it. The valuer then went subsequently and valued it to \$300 000. So the Development Bank may very well have got off \$100 000 from the Government in respect of what we are doing now. But information which recently has come to hand suggests they may be less fortunate in another aspect, because it seems that it would be an error to exempt it from the payment of Land Tax or as property, and in Committee I will be deleting that section, which, apparently, was put in by the draftsman by mistake, because he thought he was modifying an earlier section that had existed in the old Government Act. It seems that the Development Bank is already paying taxes on *Marshall Hall*, and it is really not intended that it should pay Land Tax at *Marshall Hall* and pay no Land Tax on the rest. So in Committee, I will be dealing with that part of it.

I listened carefully to what the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition said. I think there is a lot of good sense in his pointing out that there may well be an excess of office accommodation in Bridgetown at the present time. I was especially impressed by the fact that when he said "foreseeable future" he defined "foreseeable future" to mean the next two or three years. It may very well be that foreseeable future in respect of this building is the next two or three years. I think that a little further down the line, if the fate to which the honourable Member for St. Michael West pointed has not overtaken us and the bureaucracy occupied the property, we will obtain some rents in a place like a rebuilt *Marshall Hall* from people anxious to get a good waterfront site.

It would not have escaped the attention of honourable Members or of the general public that there has been a sudden surge in the use of the waterfront properties along the Careenage. I refer to the Waterfront Cafe and another place. I am glad to see it doing well, and am glad to hear that there are other places planning to move next door to it. I think the Government now has a duty to negotiate with Da Costa and Company for the improvement of the actual roadway, and for the improvement of the docking facilities that the Port has introduced for yachts in the Careenage.

When we build the fishing harbour, which will be built with an *Arthur Stone* breakwater, using very heavy stones out into the sea, some reformation and enclosure, and when the Ministry of Transport and Works, as part of the Government's own project, extends a wharf-type front from the present Carlisle Square, right up past this building up to the yachting club building and the Cheapside market leading directly into the new fishing harbour, I think we will create another very desirable area. I have no doubt that people will try to get the ground floor accommodation that this project will produce in order to let them have a look out to the new careenage, because, effectively, that is what we will be building, a new careenage to the north of the present careenage. If the Careenage is picturesque now, I think it will be doubly picturesque when it has a little more protection to the north and a much larger number of vessels using it. I am only hoping that the design of the on-shore facilities of the new careenage will match the design of this particular structure.

I agree with the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition that there is no exceptional architectural merit in *Marshall Hall* the way it looks now. I believe, however, that the coral stone facade being embellished, as it is intended, will reveal the proportions of the building in a superior way. I would also point to the fact that those buildings have been used as warehouses, and look like warehouses. When they are painted, decorative windows are perhaps put into them or the decoration restored around the original windows, when the Union Club is fully converted by Barbados Shipping and Trading, and the street has pavements, I think that Hincks Street will become one of the

most handsome streets in Bridgetown. When we have the removal of the warehouses and the parking to the large car park that the honourable Member described as Furniture Limited's car park, when the cars are persuaded by the action of the traffic wardens to go and pay them the fare and go into facilities provided by Government, that we really will have a very splendid new shopping boulevard in Bridgetown.

In respect of *Miles Ahead*, I do consider that the engineer concerned has shown a lot of wisdom in a great number of his comments. I think he would have been straining his sense of conflict through too narrow a mesh to believe that he would give unlimited praise to a building designed by Gardiner Associates. Nonetheless, I think that he has actually praised the *Marshall Hall* construction with faint damns in all the circumstances. I think that we will get on very well with this, subject to the sensible comments made by the honourable Member.

I am glad that the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition, after several years of contemplation of earlier opinions, has come to the conclusion that the Delamere land swamp is a bad place on which to build. I think he will now agree with me that we did well to move the Polytechnic to Wildey and not attempt to put it where the St. Michael School has a playing field, an open space in the centre of Bridgetown. All that now remains in that area is for the National Conservation Commission, as in so many places, to try to landscape it properly and create a Bridgetown of which we can all be proud.

There is one further matter, relating to the legal finagling. The Government lawyers are very good in their ways, but their ways do not include, as a rule, a full grasp of the realities of real estate in this country, or the nuances of real estate laws. They do not know how to buy and sell land. They really do not know it. They do not understand title suits. They do not understand what constitutes good title. Their concept of title begins and ends with the Land Acquisition Act. All along, the Government's lawyers have been resisting all other means that experienced lawyers in Cabinet — we were lawyers once, and we still have a little memory of that — have been recommending as other ways of getting title.

The title deeds to this land were lost in the early part of this century, and the Barbados Development Bank had refused to accept the Government's title without a personal affidavit from the Minister of Housing, as to the lost of the title deeds. The Minister of Housing is no spring chicken, but I think the title deeds were lost before he was born; certainly, they were lost before I was born. I think he is a year or two older than I am. The reason why it has taken so long and comes in this form is because of that.

This is not the only area where the sort of comments made by the honourable Member for St. Michael

West are likely to be presented. For example, there is a house in Bay Street which belonged to the estate of a deceased person, and he had not been able to pay the taxes for many years, nor pay certain National Insurance debts on some of his business. He entered into an agreement for sale to the Government to sell the property to the Government and in the agreement for sale, it was specifically said the proceeds of sale would be paid as to: \$400 000 to the Commissioner of Land Tax, \$148 000 to the Director of National Insurance and so on. We did not make the Director of National Insurance and the Commissioner of Land Tax parties to the agreement, as might tend to be technically perfect, but it did not really matter. If the estate were willing to accept the Government's cheque as a discharge of its responsibilities, that is all that the Government should have worried about. Believe it or not, although that was entered into by one lawyer in the Crown Counsel Office, the lawyers who actually have to convey the property were doubtful about the quality of the title that would be received under such an agreement for sale. This has gone on now since 1983. When last I asked them to complete it by January 31st of this year, they wrote back to tell me that it had not yet proved possible to put a Section 4 Land Acquisition Notice into the *Gazette*.
4.25 p.m.

We do have difficulties. Persons responsible for the Government are willing to accept a title. The cloud in the title perhaps might be the Government's own mortgage, which it can discharge by payment, the Government's own claims, but certainly those in the Government are willing to accept the title. But you meet lawyers who will never have any responsibility for dealing with the title in the fullness of time, who feel no hesitation in giving the Government bad advice that causes the Government to lose not \$20 000 or \$50 000, but hundreds of thousands of dollars sometimes questioning the title, not understanding the nature of real property in Barbados, basically because many of them never practised for any length of time in legal offices dealing extensively with real property claims.

I fully expect that if we were to try to acquire a piece of land from the estate of Samuel Hall Lord, deceased, anywhere near Sam Lord's Castle, some Government lawyer would point out by a will drawn in the 1770s that land was conveyed to grantees to uses for a portion of 999 years and that it is not freehold land, there is still an unexpired portion of 700 years on it, and that in 700 years' time perhaps somebody will arise to claim it. I do not think the owners of Sam Lord's Castle are greatly worried about that, but I have fair confidence that the possibility of the Government's lawyers making difficulties could arise.

I have dwelt on this for a little bit, because it is something that will come before the House again, the

contentions between the Government and its own lawyers, and the unwillingness sometimes of the lawyers to find ways and means of effectuating the Government's wishes. You tell the lawyers what you want and ask them to advise you on how you can do it, and they completely ignore the request of the Government. It is not even as if they are getting money for it. If there was money involved in going about things the long way, I would understand it, but there is not a penny. They seem to prefer to have something on their desks for a very long time rather than expedite things. As far as I am concerned, they can plead political interference, if they want to in the future, if somebody questions it.

The reason why this has come before the House is that the BDB refused the title. They not only refused the title, they refused to do it through a title suit, they refused to do it through the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act, which we used to vest some lands in the National Housing Corporation, and which they questioned even after it had been done. We decided in the end that we should vest this land in the way that I believe the Right Honourable Member for St. John would be familiar with, a device that was used to vest parts of Graeme Hall in the Agricultural Development Corporation when perhaps there were similar difficulties, although I am not so familiar with the details of that matter. That is why it comes as an amendment to the BDB Act. We feel it is really the only safe way to do it in the end.

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

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am moving that Clause 3(b) be amended. It should read "repealing section 24 and substituting the following:" and delete the number one in brackets, and delete the number two in the brackets and all the words which follow it. In other words, the new Section 24 will simply read: "The income of the Bank shall be exempt from income tax."

Before that, in subsection (a) of Clause 3, under the proposed section 23A, the words "Law of" in the short title of the Law of Property Act, 1979-11 should be

deleted, and it should just read "Property Act". So delete "Law of" in clause 2(a) and delete the whole of subsection (2) of proposed section 24, subsection (b), deleting also the one and the bracket.

I beg to move that Clause 3, as amended, stand part.

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

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

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill, as amended, in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.
4.35 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, there is a reply to Parliamentary Question No. 15, and I would like the House to revert to that particular Order of the Day so that we can give the answer to this question.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, Question No. 15, which was asked by the honourable Member for St. George North.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. George North.

Mr. J. G. ODLE: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 15:-

To ask the Minister of Housing and Lands: Will the Minister state: (1) the total sum allocated to Barbados under the U.S.A.I.D. housing programme for onlending to house owners or prospective house owners in Barbados, and the amount of such funds presently available for lending to low income earners, identifying in particular, whether any such funds are held by the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company, (2) the names of the Banks or other lending institutions participating in the U.S.A.I.D. scheme and the amounts allocated to, taken up by, and disbursed in unit loans by each of them for house repairs or house construction, (3) the criteria mandated under the U.S.A.I.D. scheme for unit loans, any specific

instructions by Government to any lending institutions under the scheme and any discretion beyond such criteria or instructions available to the lending institutions in processing applications for unit loans, (4) whether such criteria, instructions or discretion allow (a) the lending institutions to require a guarantor of any loan to deposit with the lender, for the duration of the loan, a sum equal to the amount of the loan, (b) in particular, the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company to require from applicants, before applications are considered, detailed plans for loans as low as \$1,500 to help to purchase or complete wooden houses, (5) whether Government will carry out immediate investigations into the administration of the U.S.A.I.D. housing programme to ensure the fullest benefit for those for whom the scheme exists, and (6) whether Government will consider placing a sum of money with the National Housing Corporation for onlending to low income earners for house repairs and house construction?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The answer to Parliamentary Question No. 15 asked by the honourable member for St. George North is as follows:—

"The attention of the honourable member is drawn to the statement on this matter which was made in this Honourable House on the 5th February, 1985."

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any Supplementaries? If there are no Supplementaries, that brings us to the end of Question Time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this brings us to the end of Government Business for today and I beg to move that this Sitting be now adjourned until Tuesday the 26th day of February, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. J. G. ODLE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the Sitting accordingly.
4.40 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, February 5, 1985. 1961

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER 1961

Accounts and Statements for the month of
December 1984 as prepared by the Account-
tant General.

Letter of complaint from Member for St.
Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) re breach of
privilege of the House.

BREACH OF PRIVILEGE

Complaint by Mr. B. M. Taitt (St. Michael West) re
report in *Advocate-News* 1961

Mr. Taitt, 1961, 1962, 1963; Mr. Speaker,
1961, 1962, 1963.

(*Prima Facie* case not made out).

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS. 1964

The Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers)
(Amendment) Order, 1985.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amend-
ment) Order, 1985.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise
Receipts for 8 months ended November 30,
1984.

The Caribbean Common Market (Origin of
Goods) (Amendment) Regulations, 1985.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 1964

The Legal Profession (Qualification for Ad-
mission to Practise Law) Rules, 1985.

The Council of Legal Education Order, 1985.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon L. S. CRAIG 1964

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment
(Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order,
1985.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment
(General) (Amendment) Order, 1985.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acqui-
sition of land at Spooners Hill, St. Michael.

ORAL REPLIES

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 15 asked by
the Member for St. George North (Mr. J. G.
Odle) 1964

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 1964

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85 No. 36
\$46 480. 1964

Mr. Craig, 1964; Mr. Sandiford, 1964; Mr.
Adams, 1966; Mr. St. John, 1967; Mr. Taitt,
1969.

HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) ACT,
1985. 1971

Mr. St. John, 1971, 1975; Mr. Taitt, 1971;
Dr. Blackman, 1973.

BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BANK (AMEND-
MENT) ACT, 1985 1975

Mr. Adams, 1975, 1981; Mr. Barrow, 1977;
Mr. St. John, 1979; Mr. Taitt, 1980.

QUESTION TIME

REPLY TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION
No. 15 1984

SUSPENSION. 1975

ADJOURNMENT 1985

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)
BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)
BLACKMAN, Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)
TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)