

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1981-86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 5, 1985.

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

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Speaker)
His Honour R. E. Brathwaite, (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House)
Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams, Q.C., M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning)
Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education)
Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)
Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)
Mr. B. M. Taitt, B.A., (Hons.) M.A., LL.B., (Hons.)
Mr. P. M. Greaves, B.A.
Mr. W. O. Franklin, A.I.A.S., J.P.
Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc., (Econ.), (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office).

Prayers were read by Father D. Stapleton.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

Before we commence the proceedings, I am in receipt of a letter from the honourable Member for St. Michael West complaining about a breach of privileges of this Honourable House.

Unfortunately, the research on the speeches had not been completed until late yesterday evening, and I am therefore not in a position to entertain the application this morning. If the honourable Member would care to raise it at the next sitting of the House, I shall be in a position to deal with it at that time.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, January 29, 1985.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting of January 29, 1985 be taken as read.

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

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

Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD and Hon. H. deB. FORDE entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PAPERS

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

The Passports and Travel Documents (Fees) Order, 1985.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on behalf of the Minister of Housing, I wish to lay a Statement. Copies of the Statement will be circulated later. The Statement relates to the USAID Housing Programme.

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

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the Reply to Question No. 15, asked by the honourable Member for St. George North (Mr. J. G. Odle) is now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Mr. L. A. WEEKES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

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

Hon. A. TRUSS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. M. A. KING entered the Chamber and took his seat.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984–85, No. 30
– \$321 305 HEAD 38 – MINISTRY OF
INFORMATION AND CULTURE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Speaker, this being International Year of the Youth, part of this money is sought to give assistance to the Ministry of Culture. Part of the funds is also for the purpose of Government advertising, for example, land acquisition. There are some outstanding bills for advertising which have to be paid. This also relates to maintenance on property and supplies and materials for the Public Library.
12.25 p.m.

There are a few bills relating to the post office to be taken care of and a bill for the Water Authority. A sum of some \$17 000 is for furniture, fixtures, and shelves and things of that nature for the new post office. If there are any questions which Members on the other

side have to ask, I will endeavour to give whatever answers there are at my disposal.

I beg to move that Head 38 stand part.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, under Subhead 2, it says that the provision of \$150,000 "has proved to be inadequate to meet unusually large unanticipated expenditure". I wonder if the Minister could be a little bit more explicit in giving this Honourable House information as to the nature of this "unusually large unanticipated expenditure." It seems to me that, in the normal course of budgeting, there might be some unanticipated expenditure, but if it is unusually large, I imagine it would have been anticipated. I wonder if the honourable member could shed some light on that.

I should like to take this opportunity to express some reservations about the methodology of the Minister responsible for Culture in regard to some of his public pronouncements. I speak particularly on the question concerning the recent decision, or non-decision, to run a series of programmes over a period of four years in the NIFCA series. It is my clear recollection that, when the information was first put to the public by the Director of Culture, it was stated, or at least implied clearly, that this had the blessing of the Minister and of the Government. I formed the impression that the Minister himself had pronounced on the theme for the four years, and I recalled an explanation being given that because of some uncertainty as to the exact date of emancipation, as it affected the Caribbean, a four-year period had been agreed upon so that both Antigua and the other Caribbean countries could have effectively celebrated the centenary or whatever the occasion was.

There was an outcry in the country as to the desirability or otherwise of having slavery as a theme over four years. I really do not propose to deal with that issue *per se* in this intervention, because I do not know that it would serve any useful purpose, but what I object to is the facility with which the Minister, in what can only be described as a complete about turn, suddenly announced that the Cultural Foundation, or the authorities responsible....

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not quite sure how it was phrased, I do not quite recall, but, in fact, he said that the Cultural Foundation had proceeded on this exercise, this decision, without the approval of the Minister, and that subsequently the Minister had determined that there would now no longer be a four year thematic revelation concerning slavery.

I feel that, especially in the area of culture and information, there is a pristine necessity for truth and accuracy.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member does not understand the phraseology, but if he could reflect on the nature of his administration, he would recognize that the word is properly used.

I think that, especially in the Ministry of Information and Culture, there is need for truth and accuracy, if for no other reason than that these matters are relatively new in their manifestations, or in their more recent manifestations, to the population, and especially the young population of the country. I think that the debate which was going concerning the issue of slavery was one which, by its very nature, was enlightening. But as I said, whichever position one takes on that is not necessarily important. What is important is the position which the Minister has been seen to have taken on the one hand, and then, in a very short time, adopt a complete reversal. That is not the first and only occasion on which the Minister responsible for Information appeared to be engaging in what may more properly be described as 'disinformation'. It is not the first and only time that the Minister responsible for Information and Culture and the Cultural Foundation appear to be at cross-purposes in their representation of what constitutes the cultural heritage of Barbados, and what would be a good policy in the context of promoting cultural activity and the intensification of culture itself in this society.

I am not going to do what is coming naturally to me and castigate the Minister. On this occasion, I think that I am simply going to invite the Minister responsible for Culture, and the Cultural Foundation, to see if in the future they can get together and ensure that when information is put out into the market place, that that information is reliable, is worthy to the country as a whole, and that the question of culture be removed from the partisan areas of the political arena.

It seems to me a contradiction in terms to have culture portrayed as a Barbados Labour Party product. I am not accusing the Cultural Foundation of having done that yet. I am accusing the Minister of giving the impression, from time to time, that culture in Barbados is something that was discovered on September 2, 1976, and that culture in Barbados somehow is retained in the breasts of a selected few persons who happen either to be in the Ministry of Culture or related to the Cultural Foundation. I think that we in this country would be better served if all of the resources that are available could be put to use in this search for our cultural heritage and a culture direction for a community such as ours.

Mr. Chairman, there are some other thoughts which are in my head, but in the interest of what I am proposing, I will leave them for another day, unless, of course, it

becomes necessary in the course of debate, if one should develop.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, Subhead 10 of this item deals with subvention to cultural organizations, and it particularly mentions the National Cultural Foundation. It is under this Subhead that I would like to signal a warning to the authorities, particularly the National Cultural Foundation, that there are likely to be problems this year in one of the art forms that have developed over the last two years to the stage where it is now acknowledged to be on par with this art form in other countries, namely the art form of calypso. 12.35 p.m.

The National Cultural Foundation, over the last year, has assisted the calypso tents in various ways. I am not in a position to itemise them, but I know they have assisted them in things like taping some of the shows, in making recordings available for sale, and in one or two other areas, but it is within my certain knowledge that most of the tents which operated last year are in serious financial problems. I have come across this information as a result of my friendship and relationship with some of the people who operate these tents. They have drawn to my attention that there are tents in particular, which I will not name here, that are now in serious doubt as to whether they will be operational in this coming 1985 Crop Over season.

It is well known that the success of the Crop Over season is due in no small way to the part the calypsonians have played over the last year. This is due to the fact that the calypso season has been able to develop the feeling and the tempo leading right up into the finale of Kadooment Day. Without the calypsonians and their art, I would venture to say that the other parts of the Crop Over festivities would fall very flat on their backs.

There have been continuing arguments among the calypsonians as to whether their share of the takings, particularly during the semi-finals, which are entirely a calypso thing, has been adequate to compensate them for their effort and the part they have played. I know they have even reached the stage where serious thought was being given by some of the calypsonians to form counter semi-finals and finals, but this is not to be encouraged, because the necessary work and the organisation to carry out a function of this scale, which is now a national function, is not there.

It is my contention that the National Cultural Foundation should very early in this year start to have meaningful discussion and negotiation with the organisers of the tents. The organisers of the tents in the past year have voiced their dissatisfaction with the way the authorities went about actually dictating to them what form they should play, and when on numerous occasions

they sought to meet with the relevant authorities, the Director of the Cultural Foundation, it is within my knowledge that all of those meetings were not as satisfactory as they would have liked them to be, since they figured that they were not being given an opportunity to put the case very forcefully.

The calypsonians are suffering from one of the things that many people in Barbados suffer from, in that they are not in a position to offer a united front. There is a lot of cut-throat going-ons in the calypso industry. There are a lot of newcomers coming in and commercialising the whole thing, and we are in danger that if it is not properly structured, if the National Cultural Foundation will not open their hands and give the necessary assistance, be it financial or otherwise, that is needed, we might see the demise of this art form within the next couple of years. I would really regret this, because we must acknowledge that our calypsoes have now reached the stage where they are now ranked on par with the leading calypsoes in the Caribbean, and they have in no small way contributed and developed the Crop Over Festival, which is now our number one national festival for the year.

I think the time is right, and it is not too early, for the National Cultural Foundation to extend a hand to the people who are involved in this area, see what their difficulties are, see how they can assist, and get them well structured, because as I have said, large sums of money are owed by these organisations that sought to operate tents last year, and it is a fact that at least three of them have question marks surrounding them as to whether or not they will be able to survive and function as such in the 1985 Crop Over season. I sincerely hope that we can take the ball right now, open all the necessary channels that need to be opened to make sure that the practitioners of this art form are kept happy and satisfied, and that a reasonable and satisfactory arrangement is worked out by the National Cultural Foundation and the calypsonians about the share they should have in any proceeds from the shows, particularly those like the semi-finals, which is entirely a calypso situation.

What is going through my mind is that the National Cultural Foundation should have some idea of the reasonable operational cost of these organisations, and at the end of the season, if they can produce proper accounting figures to show that operating within those constraints they are still out of pocket, the National Cultural Foundation should seek in whatever way possible to make sure that the individuals that seek to promote this art form are not being penalised in a monetary way in having offered to all the thousands of Barbadians and visitors the enjoyment of the many nights of relaxation at the calypso tents. I am making a plea at this time for the early involvement of the National Cultural Foundation to the satisfaction of everybody, the Founda-

tion and the calypsonians, for a successful 1985 calypso season.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) invariably tries to cast the Government in the position as if it were determining that Barbados started in 1976. We do not accept that. What I do know is that a serious cultural policy in Barbados started in 1976. I think that is indisputable. Obviously — and I agree with him — it would be a denial of culture to put it in partisan terms. That is an antithesis to culture, so we accept that. But it certainly is a different thing when you are talking about denial of cultural policy. There has been no cultural policy at the official level in this country prior to 1976. The record is there, and I do not think that we need every time we get into discussions on culture for the honourable Member to keep making that point.

I remember going into the Ministry of Education in 1976. There were a dancer, a clerk and a junior administrative officer working in one room with three desks, and with a budget of under \$50,000. That was the contribution of the then Government to formal cultural policy in this country.

The situation today is very different. This Government has seen the need for a dynamic cultural policy to compliment all the other areas of development in Barbados. I am from time to time accused by the right honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) of being a culture vulture. That is all right with me. At least it is a recognition of my interest and enthusiasm for one particular aspect of life in this community.

The honourable Member mentioned the question of the theme of slavery in NIFCA for the next four years. I am not part of that decision. I am not really sure how the decision was taken, whether it was taken by the National Cultural Foundation, which is a statutory board with powers to make these kinds of decisions, or whether the Director of Culture spoke out of turn and had to be corrected by his Minister, as one interpretation of what I read would suggest that — I really am not sure. But what amazes me is the reluctance of people in Barbados to talk about slavery, and what amazes me about the debate is the stringency with which the descendants of slaves were putting a case against the concentration of slavery. That is what surprises me.

12.45 p.m.

The honourable Member gave his usual wishy-washy contribution and at the end of it did not have the courage to come out clearly and categorically on one side or the other.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: It is unparliamentary to accuse any honourable Member of being a coward. Secondly, the honourable Member is trying to suggest that it is necessary for me to state my position. He is there stating. State a position on what? You do not state your position on slavery. That is not something to state a position on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not know why the honourable Member always likes to interrupt me. I do not want the honourable Member to state his position on slavery — that is a matter for him — but he is the one who brought into the debate the whole question of the statement by the National Cultural Foundation or its Director as to whether slavery should be a theme for four successive NIFCA's. He went on to say that he thought that the position had been harmonized in the Caribbean, and he mentioned Antigua. I do not know why but he singled out Antigua. He said he thought the position had been harmonized as to how we go about dealing with the 150th anniversary of emancipation in these parts. But, in the end, he only raised questions. He never really gave any answers. Why are people who are descendants of slaves allowing themselves to be railroaded into a position where they feel that they are saying something rude, unacceptable, demeaning or embarrassing to deal with slavery?

Let me state my position on NIFCA. I myself do not believe that slavery should be the theme for four successive NIFCA's. My reason is that I do not believe that cultural expression should be straight-jacketed. You cannot have a National Independence Festival of Creative Arts involving 65 000 school children and another 20 000 or 30 000 young people and tell them that they can only give vent to their cultural creativity in one particular area. When some eight year-old child wakes up a morning and sees a beautiful sunrise, and is moved either to write poetry about it or paint it, you say: "We are not listening to you this year, because we are not looking at that kind of creativity this year or for the next four years. We are dealing with slavery this time around." I do not accept that, but I certainly do accept that slavery should be part of the theme or one of the topics for NIFCA for this year, the next four years and perhaps the next 40 years. I feel strongly about that, and those who would prefer to see the discussion of slavery as something that is taboo, who push that aside and do not touch that, are people who do not find favour with me, and I do not care who are these people who support that point of view.

I remember that, recently, there was a development called Theatre in Education. It was not a new concept, but it was introduced in Barbados for the first time in recent years. It was a concept that promoted the use of

drama and theatre in the teaching of a number of subjects, particularly the Social Sciences, and I was very pleased to observe in a number of primary schools in Barbados the way in which the history of Barbados, the history of Barbadians and the history of the Caribbean became a dynamic thing by the use of theatre. I saw the history of slavery depicted in at least two primary schools, in which the dry bones of history, the things you read in the books they put out, took on a living meaning. The children were put as house slaves, field slaves, masters and the rest of them, and they dramatized an aspect of slavery that brought home to those kids in the space of an hour or a day much more dramatically what it was all about, as written in all the written pages you could read in one book after the other. This is the kind of concept that is the whole business of theatre in education, but it is a concept that removes a lot of the drudgery out of learning and makes the classroom a more interesting place for even dull students.

I remember also that some years ago, I think it was 1978 — and I will let the honourable Member for St. Michael West know that 1978 came after 1976, in case he is not too sure about these reckonings — we introduced summer workshops in all aspects of the arts for children. We started initially with children around Bridgetown, and these were children who were of low income groups, who in the summer months found very little to do. We started these summer workshops at Queen's College with very little money because of the meagre resources of people, and again we saw what was up to that point the dormant creativity in these children, and how they were able to give vent to the creativity in the circumstances that were presented. One morning at Queen's Park pasture, I went out to see them and I saw a dramatization of about two hours of important aspects of Barbadian life, past and current, and what amazed me was that after, when I was talking with the children at the end of this dramatization, nearly all of them were able to discuss in an intelligent way, with a great deal of feeling, many of the things that they would not have been able to discuss about Barbadian life were it not for this kind of vehicle for expression.

I would like to make one parting shot in relation to the question raised by the honourable Member. A few days ago, I was reading an excerpt from one of the most recent publications of that Barbadian scholar, poet and historian, Edward Kamau Brathwaite. He was dealing in an autobiographical part of his publication with his own life in Barbados, his upbringing, the influences of his life, what happened to him when he went to the United Kingdom as a student of Cambridge at the beginning of the Fifties, the way in which his eyes were opened in a new environment and what he did after he left. He went and lived in a small village in Ghana where he taught and worked for eight years. I remember one of the things that

he spent some time on, and which may or may not impress some people, is the rootlessness that he said he experienced when he got to England because, on reflection, since he had not realized it before he left, he had lived a rather unreal life in Barbados because he was several things at the same time.

12.55 p.m.

We pinned it down to the fact that there was rampant in the Barbados that he left a spirit of what he called — these are his words not mine — “middle class materialism and rampant Philistinism.” He was writing of over thirty years ago, but a lot of that still remains in the Barbadian community. And it is only through the kind of cultural policies which this Government has been pursuing over the last few years, with whatever weaknesses there may be in it, that we can gradually change — because there is not going to be any apocalyptic change — and bring about a new consciousness and awareness in this community of the importance of our people, history, habits, customs and our values.

Every time something unusual happens in Barbados, for instance, a crime wave, if there is ever one, if you read what is written in the newspapers and listen to what people say, it amounts to, “That is not Barbadian.” In other words, it does not accord with Barbadian morals, values or culture. I make this point only to say that people feel instinctively what is Barbadian and what our culture is all about. If the Government is to pursue a policy that is to encourage, assist and co-ordinate this kind of feeling and translate it into a burst of activity for the improvement of individual life and community life, I think that the Opposition would do well to jump on the bandwagon and say how useful it is before they get left behind.

One of the more important things about our policy has been the fact that we have given a sense of community to many districts all across Barbados. Talk what you like, the Crop Over Festival has moved away from a flirtation by the other side with values and practices that were alien to our society into a full-fledged community festival. All across this country, at Crop Over time, communities large and small come out, with little encouragement from the centre,.....

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Only for three weeks.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: It shows the ignorance of the honourable Member for St. Michael North. He says it lasts three weeks. If the honourable Member would take a little time to talk to his friend who runs the school at Eden Lodge, the Eden Lodge Primary School, she will tell him that in all her years in teaching, she has never seen the type of self confidence among young school children that she is seeing today. You see, there are some things that are not quantifiable.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES. That is self confidence in community spirit.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Imagine my being heckled by the honourable Member for St. Michael North. Self confidence has nothing to do with anything. Suddenly, they woke up one morning and they had sour-sop for breakfast and that gave them self confidence, that is how the honourable Member sees it! It has nothing to do with anything relating to our policies either in culture or in education! It is a new birth control pill or something they are taking that gives them that! That is how the honourable Member sees it, but we see it differently on this side, and what I would like the honourable Member to understand is that the people see it the same way that we do.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: What you all need are some retroactive birth control pills.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I want very briefly to talk about International Youth Year. International Youth Year is an idea born in the United Nations and supported by all the member countries to focus in 1985 on youth in the world community. We in Barbados again have taken up very seriously the whole question of the problems and concerns of the youth, and we have established, in the Ministry of Information and Culture, an International Youth Year Committee that, so far, has been doing some very useful and constructive work in focussing on the problems of young people and seeking their greater involvement in national activity and, indeed, in inciting them to move towards seeking solutions to many of the problems of the community and not only those that relate to youth.

International Youth Year has as its theme, “Participation, Development and Peace.” I want to deal with the last one, “Peace,” because in all the things I have been hearing, there has been a lot of emphasis on participation and development but very little on peace. That is understandable in the context in which we live. Barbados is a small island state and has been happily blessed over the centuries with being removed from the maelstrom of war, conflict and internecine warfare. Therefore, our people have the feeling, somehow, that what happens out there does not concern them. I have other views on that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Since you tell me my time is up, Mr. Chairman, and I cannot put into a few sentences what I wanted to say in respect of peace, I will yield at this time and speak at a later point in the debate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Sir, I wish to advert to a few of the specific Heads under this Resolution. The first I wish to speak about very briefly

is the Archives. I do not think that we get much opportunity in this House to look at the operations of this department and to see in what way it has been performing its function to the country.

The Archives Department is unfortunately too little used by the public of Barbados. It is one of the best run departments of Government, perhaps second to none in Barbados. I have noticed recently that the Government has made funds available to enable it to save much of the valuable records in our country, but I remain concerned about the consciousness of the people of our own country about the value of some of the records which we have.

If you take, for instance, the private sector, there is an abundance of records which have been destroyed through lack of knowledge, maybe thrown away in some instances because of carelessness and in many instances because of the lack of appreciation of their importance to the social, political and economic development of Barbados. I think it will be difficult for us to find anywhere in Barbados an assortment of the contracts that are negotiated in respect of workers. Yet, the importance of those documents to manpower planning, if one looks at one instance, in giving us some idea about labour conditions existing at any time in our community, cannot be underestimated. If we look at the sugar records of our island, once again it is true to say that perhaps the most valuable of those records still remains outside of Barbados rather than within Barbados.

1.05 p.m.

I am not satisfied that the current records are being preserved in the way they ought to be. I have used perhaps two areas that are much more esoteric or arcane, if you like to use that word. My friend, the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford), the Barbados Scholar that he is, prefers to take the term 'arcane' in this context, because we are discussing about a local situation, but I use the term 'esoteric' because of the fact that although it is about a local situation, it is foreign in the minds of many of the persons dealing with the material. There are several other areas that I am sure that are of equal significance to us, and I sometimes regret that there is not a programme, probably run by the Ministry itself, to raise the consciousness of people about the worth and value of the documents passing through our country.

I am not aware of any rule which the Government has for itself for the preservation of Government documents and for the revelation of the contents of those documents. For instance, I am sure that the whole history of the operation of Cabinet Government, from the Council, to the Executive Committee right through to the full Cabinet, would be extremely revealing, and would at the same time gives people in our country a greater

appreciation of the value of democracy and of the development of the representative system. It takes some time before these documents are released, and I am not so sure that they have all been preserved. I understand that at the time of Independence, despite the best efforts of the Government of the day, certain documents, particularly those at Government House, were destroyed rather than preserved. I do not know whether those would be the secret documents pertaining to exchanges between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Governor, but the importance of them to our historical development could not be undermined, and their destruction is much to be regretted.

I hope to see a policy in which we make the vital records of the Cabinet fully available after a respectable period of years. While I am conscious of the fact that Cabinet Minutes are written still in a very terse language, reflecting unanimity rather than, as happened in some other countries, reflecting the full discretion in the Cabinet, I think that the revelation of the documents, despite the limitation of the manner in which Cabinet Minutes are kept, would be of inestimable benefit from a historical perspective. I wonder if the Minister in his reply could tell me what is the policy of the Government in relation to the publication of these documents and their preservation, and what is the rule, if any, which has been developed for this purpose.

I think that the Archives is more and more perhaps supplementing or giving a lead to the Museum, but I am pleased to see that the Government has given a greater subvention to this body. I hope that there would be an even larger subvention to the Barbados Museum and Historical Society. Anyone who wishes knowledge, even a passing knowledge far less an indepth knowledge, of the history of our country, should take time out to scan through the past Museum Journals and read the very learned articles that appeared in them from time to time on all aspects of the development of Barbados. One would then get a true appreciation of the value of that journal and of the Museum to us.

I also know that there is a greater subvention being given for capital works at the museum as well as for the collection of Barbadian paintings and sculpture. I hope that this aspect of culture gets much more assistance. We go to foreign countries, particularly those in the developed world, whether in Europe or in North America, and we will spend hours on end going through their galleries and looking at all of the various collections from their artists, and walk away in wonder and in admiration of this representation of the lifetime of these people. But it is very difficult in our own country to find many places where you can look back over the history of our country and reconstitute the historical development from paintings, sculpture, or other memorabilia. For instance, other than the effort of a private person, and

for a limited service being provided in the Museum, there is really no collection of the various implements and other things that have gone into the development of the sugar industry in this country. If, however, you go to the French territory of Martinique, you will find a museum dedicated to the sugar industry. It is possible to spend an hour in that museum and become conscious of all aspects of the implication of sugar and its impact on the development of that country.

There is no way, for instance, that you can in Barbados go around and look, whether it be even in the public library, Museum, Archives, or Queens Park, what is now becoming a national gallery, and find a collection, either pictorial or by any other form of representation, of the architectural development of our island. That is why when you get a publication such as that put out by Dr. Henry Fraser, or some other non-national, people rush to buy it up, because we are short on our history — too short on our history! I make bold to say that one of the functions of the Ministry of Culture must be directed towards the publication of historical documents about Barbados and the collection of historical and other material on Barbados, and the promotion of museums, if you like to call them that, for the display of these various aspects of our culture. I think that we tend to think that everything should be new and modern, and the archival aspect of our development is too often forgotten.

1.15 p.m.

A country's culture does not develop overnight. I am one of those who believe that there are several strands of this development, some of it predating even the very modern foundation of the island of Barbados. Many of us assume that Barbados' existence only dates from 1627. That is a great heresy. There was life and civilisation here on this island prior to 1627, but I am not sure that any recognition is given to that at any time.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: To a limited extent, there is, as my friend, the honourable Member for the City, reminds me that there is a book on the pre-history of Barbados. There is one, for instance, on the geography of Barbados prior to 1627. I believe that perhaps the only honourable Member in this House who has a copy would be the Prime Minister. I have been trying to buy some of these publications at sales overseas, at least for my own private collection. Maybe one of these days I will make them available to the Government, but I think it is important that we should stress the necessity, if private enterprise will not give the lead in this regard, for the Government itself to step in and fill the breach.

I also wish to place some emphasis on the role which this Ministry can play in genuine community development. I know that a lot of the accent has been put on NIFCA, which has probably become the central

focus on cultural development in the last few years since the festival commenced. I think, however, that we have to go beyond NIFCA and beyond the celebration of that festival, although I would be the first to concede that with the development of NIFCA, there has been a greater cultural consciousness in our island.

I believe that the Government has to spend more money on genuine community development, with the infrastructure being put in as well, if it is to promote seriously cultural development. I made the point in here before, and I am repeating it, that if you take the area between the Garrison and Chancery Lane, and between the sea, and extend to St. Philip at the Ebenezer-Six Cross Roads junction, you will find one community centre available.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: All right, Sir.

In this regard, I must congratulate the right honourable Member for St. John on his foresight in establishing an auditorium which has been made available on a non-partisan basis for cultural development. I believe that we need more auditoriums and community centres. In my own constituency, one of the most densely populated areas of Barbados, there is not one community centre available.

It is easy to say that we may use the church hall when that is available, but as far as I know, there is really only one church hall that is of significance, which is at St. Matthias. There is nothing else. I know that the Government is at present establishing a similar centre at Parish Land, but it seems to me that we have not focussed our attention adequately on the infrastructural developments within the community. I would like to think that the Development Plan for future years, for the balance of this century, would highlight this aspect of cultural and community development.

Sir, you said I had one minute, so I will sit down in case any other honourable Member wishes to make a contribution.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS (St. James South): Mr. Chairman, in making his presentation I believe the Honourable Attorney General said that serious cultural policy started in 1976 and that they have a dynamic cultural policy. As he spoke, my mind went back to what was happening before 1976, and it came forward as the last Member spoke and reminded me of NIFCA. Those of us who were involved with NIFCA before 1976 and up to 1977 can attest to the fact that it was a very exciting affair for youngsters. It brought out the best in our young people and all the talent or dormant talent came to the fore. Unfortunately, with this dynamism, as he calls it, NIFCA

has faded into nothingness. I say so because since 1978 or 1979, I believe, NIFCA has been decentralised and it is suffering tremendously from the effects of decentralisation. For one, there are not enough officials to properly judge and officiate at the activities. Very often there is not enough equipment to go around, and the general enthusiasm which once was aroused is no longer there.

Those of us who were with NIFCA in 1974, 1975 and 1976 when it was centralised, and when there were three phases — I believe the preliminaries, the finals and the gala performances — could say how excited and how interested people were. I remember the choirs had to meet at St. Michael Girls School, as it was then called. We met on nearly every day of two or three weeks before the finals, people from all over the country came from all the schools and all the youth groups, and it was really a contest. Today that no longer exist. In some centres if you can get one choir meeting, or one drama group, or one dance group, you have enough, and that in itself does not lend for the competition which is necessary in an activity such as this.

Of course, NIFCA has suffered too from the fact that Crop Over, which is intended to come immediately after the crop is over, comes somewhere during July and August, and that takes away from the time which people have to prepare for NIFCA. A lot of people who are involved in the Crop Over activities are also involved in NIFCA, and after the August holiday, when children have to go back into school, there is not enough time to prepare for the NIFCA activities in November. What is happening now is that NIFCA has run into the Christmas season and youth groups are finding it impossible to perform at NIFCA and also perform in the Christmas season.
1.25 p.m.

I do not know how many Members realize this, but a number of youth organizations in this country make money around the Christmas season by performing in hotels. They cannot do that when they are also performing in NIFCA, and, of course, NIFCA is dropped in order to make some money, because you do not make money at NIFCA. I know that the group to which I am affiliated had to spend as much as \$1 200 in costumes for NIFCA, and I am sure that that group, when it can make \$1 500 or \$1 600 on the hotel circuit, would not expend \$1 200 in NIFCA without making anything at all. So I think the organizers should look at Crop Over and draw it up, as I notice they want to do, and, secondly, look at NIFCA and have it centralized again, because the decentralization has caused a number of problems.

There is one other area in culture to which, I believe, I should draw your attention. One or two of our artists have had scholarships overseas, I believe mainly

to England, and they have come back here and somehow, from my own investigations, they have not been able to obtain jobs with the Government. I believe that it would have been a wonderful opportunity for these persons, I believe there are about two or three of them, who have had expensive training to be employed so that they can impart some of their knowledge to most of the groups and, indeed, the schools. But this is not to be so.

The Honourable Attorney General made reference to Crop Over and said that it was a growing thing, but Crop Over today, to my mind, is only three activities, that is, the calypso competition, the bands, and they have reduced their numbers considerably, and now Kadooment, for the first time last year. So I do not think that the Government should pat itself on the back and say that Crop Over is this great achiever. I believe that there is a need to look at Crop Over carefully, and in order to do that, it is better if you talk to the people who are involved.

Too often we look at a spectacle and it looks good to us and we believe that it is good, but sometimes it is better if we go out there and talk to the people. Last night, for example, I picked up a youngster in my car who was very much involved in NIFCA, and he was lamenting the fact that NIFCA has gone to nothing, and that however those who are involved try to impress upon the minds of the so-called authorities, they cannot get through — the authorities set up a programme and you either follow the programme or you drop out of the programme. I believe that it would be a good thing if the authorities were to at least listen to them and try as far as is humanly possible to implement some of their proposals, so that it is a community effort. Most of these community efforts are voluntary efforts, and we should try and get people to volunteer, but we cannot get people to volunteer if we ignore what they have to say.

I come now to International Youth Year. Enough is not being done. There is not that fever which one would expect among the young people for this year. Groups wanting to become involved in the activities for the International Youth Year are finding it very difficult to finance their activities. I know that there are limited funds around but, at the same time, when young people approach the Committee for International Youth Year, they are told that they are not sure what funds there are available to put on the activities, and this is the actual year. I am working with a group for the Whitsun weekend, and this is February — it is about three months away — and up to now we are not quite sure as to what financing we can get from Government; things like hiring of hi-fi equipment, bands, even putting up posters, because advertising is a very expensive affair, and it is pointless having any activity unless we can put our best foot forward.

I am asking the authorities to look carefully at what is happening over the year and see if they can call a meeting of youth groups again, so that the youth groups can put before them their problems and see how best they can sort them out, because, whether you believe it or not, young people are most frustrated at this time. I do not think that there has been a more frustrated period in the history of Barbados for young people than there is at this time. At every turn and twist they seem to be neglected. Last week a friend of mine said that when they became frustrated a few years ago, they became Rastas. That has failed them too, and now they are like sheep in the wilderness — loose and not knowing what to do — and probably we are seeing the results of that frustration.

I am also asking that wherever young people are making proposals for activities in the International Youth Year, resource personnel be given to them on loan so that they can plan properly. A lot of youth groups in this country have not got professional or experienced people working with them, and a lot of their shortcomings surface because of the fact that they do not have senior or experienced people to work with them. If this year is to be meaningful, I believe that the Government and the Committee of the IYY must look again at what is happening. This is the second month in the year and, as far as I can recall, only one national activity has been put on, and there has been a lot of criticism about that. In this regard, I also hope that they should have an urgent postmortem on what happened at the youth rally. I want to say no more about that.

It has been my contention for a number of years that the community centres, as the last speaker said, are not properly used. It still baffles me in this year, as we approach the 21st century, that those who work at the community centres, calling themselves, I believe, Community Development Aids, are only people able to open the doors and close them back. They cannot help plan a programme with any youth group whatsoever. If we are serious about community development, not only must we have more community centres throughout the country, but each community centre must be staffed with people who can assist young people when they come there on a daily basis, not once a month, and if they think that your youth group is doing well do not come around for six months. That is not good enough.

It is my opinion that every housing estate should have a community centre. Those of us who have lower income houses in our constituencies, if we pass through them often enough, will see that the youngsters have nothing to do on evenings. Youngsters between the ages of 16 and 25 more fall foul of the law than any other age group, and if we are to direct them properly, we must put the personnel there. I cannot even think of a housing estate in which there is a scout group, a guide

group, a first aid group, a St. John Ambulance Brigade group or a Red Cross group to assist the youngsters in going in the correct direction. As a matter of fact, sometimes reports even refer to housing areas as the bad areas, not realizing that there are sociological problems attached to what is going on.

1.35 p.m.

When we are talking about community development, I think we should not only talk about it, but we should look at it seriously to see what can be done to assist the problem. Nowadays, when our communities, as we knew them some ten, twenty or thirty years ago, have disintegrated, the need is even more urgent for more attention to be paid to community development, and for more officers. I believe that the Community Development Officer for our area in St. James has about ten community centres to look after. That is an impossible situation. The poor lady sometimes works from 8.30 in the morning until 10.00 o'clock at night because she is conscientious. But how long can she do that? Or, how much service can she give to ten community centres? It is nearly impossible for anybody in this day and age, when she is not only looking at community development in terms of the cultural aspect of it, but she also has to look at social problems, domestic problems. Children get themselves into all kinds of problems.

Mr. Chairman, I gather my time is up. I would ask again that we look again at the planning of NIFCA, the planning of Crop Over and what can be done now to assist IYY.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, human culture is human existence. The fact that people exist in this country is a fact which, when spelt out, means that there is a Barbadian culture. We have to be very careful when we speak of culture purely in terms of the organisation of the cultural and artistic expressions of that culture.

It would seem to me not to make sense to say that culture did not exist in Barbados before 1976, or that there was no public policy towards culture prior to 1976. Certainly that public policy has always existed and will always exist, and is determined by what the public has always felt to be the appropriate method of development of itself and in what way and within what constraints the public would like to see that development culturally expressed. So I believe that the statement probably was intended not to mean that there was no public policy towards culture, but, I presume, as a political point that Government spent less money on culture.

I am committed to the view that culture flourishes with freedom. I believe that an appropriate public policy towards culture would be a commitment by the political

director to make resources, financial and physical, available to the community, and to participate less and less in the political direction of such activities. When I speak of culture, I speak in a broader sense. It ranges from the area of information and the style of presentation of information, and I, for one, would hope that the day would come when politicians would generally realize that it is in the interest of the community as a whole that organs of information should be free from the day-to-day interference of the political directorate.

I refer to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation in particular. Whatever might be the shortsighted benefits in maintaining such control, it is my view that in the long run, with the power of modern electronic media to mould people's thinking, and to help promote various forms of cultural expression, it would be stymied if it is totally under the control of public policy makers. In other words, I feel that the expression of culture and the direction in which it should develop should emanate from a much wider base than the constraints naturally imposed on a political directorate or even on Parliament itself.

Great nations have become great for many reasons, and among the reasons is that they understood how they came about — they understood their history. They taught their children their history, the good and the bad, and out of that melting pot many a great nation has been born. I therefore found the debate on whether the emancipation of slavery, or celebrations or otherwise of the emancipation of slavery, should be considered as an issue to be avoided, by any sector of the community, to be largely a non-issue. In my view, the trauma of slavery has been far less economic and has been far less social. The trauma has been mainly psychological, and indeed, it is an indication of that permanent psychological trauma on the total community which has probably given birth to the debate as to whether or not a people seeking to celebrate part of its history would necessarily have ill-effects on the total community.

1.45 p.m.

I believe, that we have to look at where you come from, and this is one of the big problems facing us. Many of the social and political attitudes that we have in Barbados can be related to the fact that we do not wish to face up and come to terms with how this community has been molded and affected by its past. I do not believe that the celebration of emancipation would be of less interest to the white people than the black people in Barbados, or any group of people in Barbados, because we all share the same common heritage, and, indeed, many of the attitudes of all Barbadians are reflected in part of that history.

It is very interesting to note that if you go, for example, to certain parts of the southern States of

America, you can still identify families of white Barbadians even by their accents, although they have not been in Barbados for a hundred years. Those families have not lost that accent and you can pick it up from time to time. If you were to listen carefully to the Barbados dialect, you will find that probably a higher percentage of white people in Barbados speak the Barbadian dialect in its pure form than the blacks. I think the reason for this is that a lot of blacks in Barbados have somehow altered their accents over the years, and have lost it — with one or two generations in various households, you will see that the true accent has been modified substantially, particularly in the middle and upper-middle income groups of black Barbadians.

I think it would be of tremendous value to the entire society if we recognize that we can of course go forward if we are aware of our present and our past, and that it is nothing to be ashamed of. Our progress over the years has been such that we can only be proud of the fact that we have moved from one level of development to another as time has passed. What is absolutely sure is that if we continue as a nation to seek to deny our origins and we know not where from we came, this will always create all sorts of conflicts in the minds of people, leading to the emergence of alien cults. I do not necessarily refer to the Rastafarian movement. I believe that the Rastafarian movement was an importation into Barbados, and I believe it was because there were a large number of people out there in limbo with no clear understanding of what their cultural heritage has been, and, therefore, they sought an identity that was not rooted in anything. That is why the Rastafarian movement has been unable, as far as I can see, to develop in the same way as it has developed in Jamaica, and in many instances, when you talk to many Rastafarians, they have no clear understanding what in fact is the cult that they claim membership of.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is a fact. There are many people who call themselves Rastafarians without knowing what it is all about. There are certainly many that I know in the St. Michael area. When you sit down and you talk to them and you ask them about their religious commitments or otherwise, they have not the clearest idea.

There may be some Rastafarians who have a clear understanding of what the movement is all about. I am not saying that is not the case. What I am saying is that there are many others, and perhaps the majority, who do not clearly understand what it is all about. I doubt very much whether the Rastafarian movement constitutes a natural outgrowth of the cultural heritage of Barbados. I have my doubts about that. Of course, when you are dealing with these social phenomena, it is impossible to speak with absolute certainty, but I do not think

myself that the Rastafarian movement is one that has sprung out of our indigenous cultural heritage.

I would like to see the Cultural Foundation moved entirely out of the sphere of management of Government, probably effectively funded by Government but supported by individual citizens and by various corporate citizens. In this way, I think that many of the problems which have arisen between the Ministry and the Cultural Foundation would probably go away. I hope that one recognizes the influence that information has on cultural development, and that steps will be taken as early as possible to ensure that all organs such as CBC become truly independent organs, free from dictatorship of Ministers of Government.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member who has just sat down has given us all food for thought. Perhaps, more importantly, too, is that if you do not know what to talk about, shut up. Those of us who studied the Classics remember Alexander Pope who said, "A little learning is a dangerous thing; drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring." The honourable Member obviously knows nothing about concepts of culture, but he wants to get into every debate that comes before this Honourable Chamber. He is a dilettante, he touches everything, but nothing very serious!
1.55 p.m.

He starts off with a very simplistic form of the existentialist philosophy — I exist, therefore I am. I think that Jean Paul Sartre, the French philosopher, was the man who put that particular twist on the existentialist philosophy of his time. This theme was developed at a later stage by the German philosopher Heidegger and by the philosopher Descartes. The new concept, the one that really means something to people who have a passing knowledge of philosophy, is "I think, therefore I am," not "I exist, therefore I am." So this philosophy that because people exist there is a culture is something that makes very little sense in the context of new dawns in development in those particular areas. I will not spend time on the philosophical aspects that the honourable Member will seek to throw into the debate without quite understanding them. I prefer to challenge a number of the practical things he mentioned.

He challenges my statement that there was no public policy for the development of culture in the period before 1976. I do not know why he needs to do these things, because as I say, *res ipsa loquitur*, the thing speaks for itself. I would challenge the Right Honourable Member for St. John, who was Minister of Finance prior to 1976, to say how much money in the ten years prior to 1976 he spent on culture. I would say that the figure would be a tiny percentage of what is being spent in the year 1984–85. Money is not everything, and therefore I am not using the criterion of expenditure as the sole

criterion for public policy on culture, but where was the plan? Which Department of Government articulated or implemented a plan? I would like to hear the answers.

I will answer one or two points made by the honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons). He was brought in about two or three months before the 1976 election to occupy a desk next to the Prime Minister to deal with these matters, youth affairs and culture. That is the extent of their planning, and I do not understand why there is need to throw out challenges in this area.

The honourable Member for St. James South should be very careful about some of the things he says. I remember in 1977 hearing the honourable Member for St. James South addressing a Parent-Teachers' meeting at Hindsbury Primary School and criticising me, who was then Minister of Education, for putting the 14 year-old children who had been thrown out of school back to school.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will not lie on the honourable Member. Why should I? The honourable Member for St. James South criticised me as Minister of Education for taking a decision and telling the people in the Ministry of Education that they had three weeks in which to get those children back into school.

(Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: I still do. It has served no useful purpose).

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not understand how the honourable Members can see information; just because they want to put some criticism on the Minister of Information, as an integral part of culture and do not understand that education is also an integral part of culture. I do not understand it.

The honourable Member for St. James South criticised NIFCA and said that there are not enough activities. I wish that the vision of the Opposition was a little broader than that. When one talks about the development of culture and its importance to national development, we want to hear something more than you had three dances but there should have been four; or that you had seven plays, but why were there not ten. That is first form debating. We have a wider scope of the importance of culture in this community than to reduce the debate to whether you have 15 community centres rather than 12.

The honourable Member said you should put a community centre in every housing area. I would have thought the message would have got through to Barbadians that it is not the mere provision of physical

facilities and material resources that determine the impact on the life of a community. There were times when the Modern High School had over one thousand children in an area no bigger than in here, and it produced results. They did not have any big fancy buildings like they have at the Garrison Secondary School or St. James Secondary School. What they had was motivation. I would like to hear the honourable Members, if they are serious about these things, talk about these concepts that seem to elude them every time.

The Government of Barbados, if it were so disposed, could go around and build a number of community centres. There is a community centre in Ellerton, St. George, in the heart of my constituency, and do you know what I discovered? That 95 per cent of the time the centre is empty, but the boys would hang out down by the Love Rock corner on the shop step, drink rum, and talk about every social issue in the community. To ask them to walk 75 yards up the road to the social centre, they would say you are making sport. So do not come and tell me that what you want is a social centre. A social centre in itself means nothing. I pass by public lavatories – not now, but many years, up to a few years ago – and I would see people stand up right next to public lavatories and relieve themselves outside, so it is not a question of whether you provide facilities in those terms.

If you want to talk about facilities, let us talk about the facilities we have provided at Queen's Park House, Queen's Park Steel Shed and at Combermere School, the provision for the first time in this country of three authentic theatre spaces. By 'authentic' I mean meeting the rigid requirements for the proper presentation of drama in any civilised society. But we are not interested in that. That is why I did not mention it when I made my first intervention, because I do not believe that the provision of those facilities in itself is something.....

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The verb is wrong. The facilities *are*.....).

Hon. L. R. TULL: No, the provision in itself. The provision of the facilities in itself. The provision in itself of the facilities. If you do not understand the language, do not tackle me over English.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: That is when he is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, we get a lot of pop psychology and pop sociology in these debates from people who do not understand what they are talking about. The Right Honourable Member for St. John used to advise them in the words of the Psalmist: "Lord I am not high minded. I have no

problems. I do not exercise myself in matters that are too high for me." I think the Right Honourable Member had better pass down the words again, because the fellows are forgetting.

2.05 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: We hear all this. Pop psychology, all this business about rambling, inanities about white people and black people, and how people in the South talk and so on. I am challenging the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to get up and tell me of one town, village, or city in the United States where people speak the Barbadian accent who have been there for a hundred years.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I never said a town in the Southern United States. I said that there are families that you can still come across in the southern United States, in Southern Carolina, who still speak with a Barbadian accent. I have certainly been entertained by families in South Carolina one in South Georgia, and one in Florida, and I was surprised to note they still speak with a Barbadian accent. I was surprised that none of the successors, none of the members of the families who are still alive, had ever come to Barbados or had been in contact with anyone who lived in Barbados.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, there is one part of the southern United States where Barbadians settled in numbers, and this was in South Carolina, about seventy miles from Charlestown, Goose Street, and that is the only district where there has been a Barbadian community in settled numbers for a hundred years.

I heard the honourable Member. He went down in Georgia, he went down in Alabama and he went down in Timbuctoo, but those are not the areas, where Barbadians were settled.

Asides

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Two minutes more.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member said that he would like to see the time come when the Cultural Foundation moves out of the management of Government. Welcome to the club. That is the position that I have articulated in here on a number of occasions. Since I had the author's pen in putting up recommendations to Government for the creation of a National Cultural Foundation, you are speaking the language that I have been speaking for a long time. I do

not believe that central Government is the proper department for the management of cultural activity, and therefore I believe that there should be an autonomous Cultural Foundation, financed not only by Government — I said that in here, so if you are now saying what I am saying, thank you! — but financed by private benefactors, business people, who should put money into the development of culture in Barbados.

The honourable Member for St. James South had the nerve to talk about youth groups finding it hard to finance activities as part of the International Year of the Youth? Why not tell the youth groups to go out and make the money themselves? In everything they come to Government, and Government doles out money. I do not believe that that is the way it should be done. It would be an important thing if the honourable Member for St. James South could impress upon the young people in his communities that they have to get up off the shop steps and do things for themselves. A little bit of self-reliance never hurt anybody.

There is a group in St. George, in the Melverton/St. Luke's area, called the George Trotters the finest youth group in Barbados. They do not ask anybody for money. They do not come to Government, cap in hand and say, "Give me money." They get up and do things in the community, and they make a powerful impact on the life of that whole community. You want to put up bus shelters, they put them up. If they want to repair old people's homes, they hold dances, collect money and repair the old people's homes. If you have old people who are shut in, who live by themselves and find no comfort anywhere, they go in and sit down every day and read the Bible to them, feed them and care for them. We want more of that in this community, not everybody walking about, putting out their hands to Government and asking for money for this thing, that thing and the other. But as long as the leaders in this country continue with that kind of mentality, that disease will continue to permeate the whole community. I am inviting the honourable Member for St. James South, whom I believe means well in this sense, to hearken unto that.

I wanted to say something about peace, Mr. Chairman. Did you tell me my time is up?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Your time is up. You can wind up.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I also agree that culture flourishes with freedom. I am glad that the honourable Member is now coming on to my point of view. I stood up in this Chamber a year or a year and a half ago and made the exact statement, and I gave an example. I had the good fortune of studying two civilisations, the ancient

Greek civilisation and the ancient Roman civilisation, and in making the point that culture flourishes with freedom, I gave the situation in the nation state of Athens and the way in which the arts and everything flourished and the other nation state, next door to it, the state of Sparta, where everything dried up. So I am glad that the honourable Member is beginning to see a little light.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Who is the classical scholar?)

Hon. L. R. TULL: You are the classical scholar that does not even know to say, "many are". You still say "many is". You are a discredit to people who studied Classics, so do not tell me that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Your Honour report the passing of one Resolution in Committee to His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that I report to His Honour, the Speaker, the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The question is that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that I report progress and ask for leave to sit again. That has been settled.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock for lunch.

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

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

2.15 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

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

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.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two points which I should like to make on this debate on culture. Listening to the honourable Member for St. George South, one would think that

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have already dealt with Head 38. That Head was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We have not passed the Head. We have not passed this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But the Head was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, no. There was a big mix up there. The Head was not called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me check it with Mr. Clerk.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Head was not called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I called the Head.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You were actually going to report the passing of a Resolution and that was not done either.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I asked to put the question, Sir. The question was that Head 38 stand part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Head 38 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would ask you to check the Record. There was a mix up on Head 38, Sir, when we passed a Resolution which was not passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That Head has been called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair asks for one minute, please. Head 38 has been called and passed. After that, we reported progress and asked for leave to sit again. We cannot now deal with Head 38, unless.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I want to draw to his attention, Sir, that there are other matters under Information and Culture that the Right Honourable Member can still speak on. I am quite sure my colleague is waiting to reply to anything he may have to say.

Aside.

Mr. Clerk started to call the next Resolution.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We are now going to get into a lot of difficulty, because the Clerk of the House is calling another Resolution.

There was a mix up at the end of the morning sitting in which Your Honour was actually going to report the passing of a Head in Committee. That Head was never passed in Committee. There was a mix up in what the Leader of the House asked you to report and what was actually put.

The motion that was put was that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again. It was not the report of the passing of a Resolution. If that were so, then the Clerk of the House would be right in putting another Resolution. None of that took place. I intended to speak and I was listening very carefully to what took place.

The only way in which Your Honour could resolve this is to call for the report of what took place this morning. There was a mix up. In any case, we have not dealt with Subhead 10.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, there was no mix up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Right Honourable Member has spoken. I have listened carefully to what the Right Honourable Member had to say.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I asked that you put the question that Head 38 stand part. That was passed. I then asked that you report to His Honour the Speaker the passing of one Resolution in Committee and ask for leave to sit again, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me say that Head 38 was called and it was passed.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is as simple as that!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The Right Honourable Member knows the procedures better probably than any other Member in here, but he is certainly mistaken this time. Head 38 has been called and I will not return to Head 38. There will be no discussion further on this matter. We now go to the next item.

The Right Honourable Member knows that he will get a chance before very long to get his points across.

We are not going back into that. We have done the Head and I now invite....

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, there is no subhead to be called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am speaking, Sir. I am not out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But I am speaking. Let me finish.

Head 38 has been put and I am finished with that. We go on to the next item, which deals with the Resolution for the sum of \$90 000. Please proceed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85,
No. 31 - \$90 000

Head 50 - Post Office - was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 50 do now stand part, Sir.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I keep hearing from the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition. If there were ten Resolutions, I would call ten Resolutions at the end, and at that stage I would report the passing of the ten Resolutions.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. Order, please.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, in Subhead 9, Maintenance of Property, I see there is a sum of \$62 000 in which money for a closed circuit T.V. is included. I wonder if one of the Government Ministers would inform us of the need and necessity for a closed circuit T.V. This is Head 50, Item 9:

"The occupation of the new premises will represent an increased cost in the maintenance of equipment such as lifts, air-conditioners and closed circuit T.V."

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Maintenance.)

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Is there in existence a closed circuit T.V.?

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Yes.)

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: As a matter of interest, would you just update us on this, since it is a new building and we are not all familiar with what is included in the new building?
3.10 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, last Tuesday when we passed some money for the Post Office, I raised some questions, but it was late in the evening and the Prime Minister at that time felt bound not to respond to the questions. We have the Post Office again. I wish to find out from the honourable Members from the other side whether the move of the post office from this building to Cheapside has been completed; if it has not been completed, what are the hold-ups or which area of the post office is still not operating at Cheapside; and whether the sorting room has been straightened out.

We had discussed in this Honourable Chamber the architectural innovations where the sorting room of the Post Office now is a room without windows and entirely independent on a new air-conditioning system, which itself is dependent on a well to be drilled or completed within the vicinity of the Post Office itself. It was my understanding that this particular system had not been perfected. I am asking the Government whether they can confirm that the Post Office is functioning, that the building is functional and that the persons working in the sorting room are now operating in relative comfort. I should like to know.

I am not asking these questions merely for the sake of asking them, I should like to have answers to them. On the last occasion these questions were asked, it was indicated that, if one wanted to get information, one should bring a Question. I have never heard in my life that if you have a substantive measure before the House, the Government will say to you that if you want to get an answer to a question concerning the item before the House, you are to bring a Question at Question Time. It is the most asinine statement that I have ever heard, and the honourable Members on that side have persisted in doing what can only be described as a travesty on parliamentary process and procedure.

I wish the honourable Member would give me, and thereby the public of Barbados, information concerning the Post Office. I want to know whether the building is functionable, and if all the departments have been moved to Cheapside. Depending on the answers which I receive, I will have some more to say.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): In response to the Member for St. Michael West, I invite him to put down all the specific questions which he has asked so that I can give him the specific information. I also invite him, since he is so interested in the Post Office, and since he should be proud, like all of us, of the Post Office now

after it has been almost twenty years in the making, to take a tour. Call Mr. Weekes; I am quite sure that Mr. Weekes will be happy to give any member of the Opposition a tour of the new complex.

As far as the specific questions you have asked, I will give them when I get the questions on a Parliamentary Question. That is the answer.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say for the Record that I resent absolutely and completely this travesty on Parliament.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you now debating Parliament?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me remind the honourable Member that there is no Rule in this House which requires that a Minister must answer a question under these circumstances. It is nowhere in May's Parliamentary Procedure.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you. And I submit, with respect, that nowhere is it the business of the Chairman to do anything other than conduct this debate and to see that it is conducted in a manner commensurate with the Rules.

I want to deal with the honourable Members who draw the people's money as Ministers. It is their duty when they come into Parliament to answer questions. They come and tell me to bring a Parliamentary Question!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Members can bring Questions, as they do all the time. You know that. But at this stage of the debate, in this Committee, and in Committees of the House, it is not mandatory, although I must concede that it is desirable. But no matter how desirable it is, it is not mandatory that a Minister must respond to the questions asked, and the honourable Member knows that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not saying that it is mandatory. But it is mandatory on me, as the representative of the 15 000 people in St. Michael West, to point out the inefficiency of the Ministers if they refuse to answer the questions. They do not have to do a single thing. They can sit in here and they do not have to answer, but it is my duty and responsibility to draw to the attention of this Honourable House that, on more than one occasion, I have asked questions about the Post Office. What have they got to hide about the Post Office?

I am saying that it is reprehensible for the Government to hide behind a call for a Parliamentary Question when a substantive issue is before the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with that issue.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do you mean that I can only discuss the behaviour of a Minister when we are dealing with Parliament?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are discussing the behaviour of a Minister, definitely not in this Committee.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not going to discuss their behaviour I am going to discuss their failure to answer a question on Head 50 — Post Office.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Stick to that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am saying that the vast majority of people in Barbados wish to know about the Post Office. I am saying that the post office has been built in Barbados at a substantial cost of money. I am saying that the building of the post office has been steep in all kinds of controversies. It had a problem from its inception. We have heard in this Honourable Chamber that there have been difficulties with the building of the Post Office. The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has said that the Post Office was unlikely be completed in his lifetime. I heard that with my own ears. Therefore, now that we are being called to vote money for utilities — utilities relate to air conditioning system — I am asking in this Honourable Chamber that those who are responsible and who are expending the monies of the people who pay their monies in Income Tax, Sales Tax, levies, and in all manner of ways — they are responsible for spending that money — to account for the spending of that money by indicating to me, and thereby for the rest of the population, whether the Post Office has been completed, whether the air conditioning system is functional, and whether the well which was to be dug to produce the water that would allow the Post Office air conditioning system to work has been successful, especially in view of the fact that we have been told by one of the Ministers that there was some problem relating to the air conditioning, and especially in view of the fact that the Minister responsible for Information and Culture, under whom this particular Head falls, himself had indicated that there were difficulties with the construction of the Post Office. I am seeking information.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Maybe there is difficulty in answering the questions now. When the difficulties are removed, maybe then you will get your answers.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If you are suggesting that the Government is unable to answer, I understand that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that the honourable Member put his questions down on the Order Paper.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, with respect, I submit that you ought not allow yourself to get involved.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not getting involved. I want to have a debate on the Post Office.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am submitting to you that you should not allow yourself to be foxed into this non-parliamentary process of telling persons during a debate that if they ask a Parliamentary Question, they will get an answer.
3.20 p.m.

As a matter of fact, since that has been put, let me say that asking Parliamentary Questions in this Honourable Chamber during this Session is a hazardous exercise. The failure of the Ministers to answer Parliamentary Questions is legion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are really being totally irrelevant.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG rose.

Certain remarks made at this stage by Hon. L. S. CRAIG and Mr. B. M. TAITT were ordered to be expunged from the Record by the Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When two honourable Members are on their feet and there is cross talk, that is not to be part of the Record of this House. It is unfair to the Reporters.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I confess that I really do not understand whether we have moved into a new era. I have great difficulty sometimes understanding what is the procedure which we are following. Here we are being asked for \$28 000 to supplement utilities, and \$62 000 for the maintenance of property, air conditioners and closed circuit televisions.

I would like to know, to go on to another point, what we need closed circuit televisions for. Is it to see if anybody is stealing stamps? Is it to capture the "physiogue" of persons who come through the door? I really do not understand why we need closed circuit television in the Post Office. I have no doubt that there is some esoteric and advanced methodology which is being used which requires the closed circuit television, but it would be useful if the Ministers could give some indication as to why we need closed circuit television in the Post Office. Furthermore, since they have not vouchsafed any information to us in the past, could they tell us what is the cost per annum of maintaining the closed circuit television? I hope that is not a question that is too far beyond their competence to answer. There must be some good reason for closed circuit television in the Post Office.

Sir, do you think we can get an indication as to whether the whole Ministry of Information and Culture has moved into the Post Office building? Do you think it would be all right if I asked the Ministers if they could tell the House whether the entire Ministry has moved to the Post Office building, bearing in mind that they had told us originally when they came for money to build the Post Office that we needed all of the space which had been planned for the Post Office? Is it letters they are going to be scanning in the Ministry as well? Can they tell us whether the entire Ministry has moved, and how much space the Ministry occupies? Because either they were wrong when they indicated that the Post Office needed all the space that it has, or they are wrong now when they say it does not need all the space it has. I would like to know what plans they have so that we will know when we will expect the Post Office to be expanded, or if it is not being used at its full capacity, when they anticipate it will be used to its full capacity.

I would also like to ask the Honourable Leader of the House, who is piloting this Resolution, whether the situation with regard to the Eagle Hall Post Office has been settled, whether the Eagle Hall Post Office will continue to be in existence and whether it is part of the planning to use that post office fully in the provision of up-to-date postal services in the country; or whether, as was planned not so long ago, it is still the intention of the Government to eliminate the postal aspects of the services provided by the building at Eagle Hall. I think it is important that the people who live in that vicinity get a definitive statement from the Government rather than the uncertainty which exists, because a number of persons believe that the post office at Eagle Hall will soon be brought to an end in its present form. If that is so, we should like to know, and this would assist me in terms of the earlier question I asked about the capacity of the Post Office building, and whether the whole Ministry of Information and Culture is now housed at that building, and how long it will be before the Post Office itself utilises the space for which the Post Office building was constructed. If I have to bring all those in a Parliamentary Question, I think you will appreciate that it would be very difficult to do so and get the required information, which would be more easily given if Ministers would do their duty and respond at this point.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have one point to make before I ask you to put the question. It is really regrettable to hear the Member for St. Michael West making reference to the scanning of letters at the new Post Office. No doubt within a few hours and days from now you will hear the people in the street saying they cannot post letters because the Government would be scanning them and looking into them. This is the type of ridiculous utterance you get from the Member for St. Michael West.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not trust the Minister).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You do not even trust God! You are really a ridiculous young man! I had some admiration for you, I wished you well. I have said good things about you. Even at this very hour I am giving away about 1 100 votes to take on one of your colleagues to help make way for you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Deal with the Post Office.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am dealing with the Post Office, Sir. Even in this hour you can still find things to say that would convey to John Public that they are not to have any confidence in the new Post Office. Look at you! The closed circuit television will be scanning the letters now, so if you write a letter to anybody they will be able to scan it and know what is in it! And to compound the injury, you say you do not trust the Government at all! The people trust us, you have not got to trust us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get ahead.

Certain remarks made at this stage by Hon. L. S. CRAIG were ordered to be expunged from the Record by the Chairman.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I have been in here for 18 years and I know about in here. I know how to debate in here. I also know this is a Resolution and I can talk about anything in it. I can teach a lot of people about things in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable Member please deal with the Post Office?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am dealing with the Post Office, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member does not have to shout.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is my style. I used to shout on your platforms. I cannot change my style overnight.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please leave that out. It has nothing to do with it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If you get yourself into the debate I will reply to you. Do not tell me not to shout, that is my style.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is becoming very unparliamentary, and I must warn him.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order: The honourable Member is being very discourteous to the Chair. If you ask for a Resolution to suspend him, from this side we are going to move a Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The gin bottle is not yet empty, it is still out there for you.

What confidence will people have in the Post Office to mail their letters if you can get on the floor of the House and convey to the public that because of closed circuit television in there, they would now be scanning people's letters? Then, to compound the injury, you say you have no confidence in the Minister or in the Government. If you go outside I will tell you why you should!

3.30 p.m.

Asides

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is a personal thing between you and the Minister. I cannot get in that.

As far as the Eagle Hall Post Office is concerned, I have no intention of replying to that. I gave the answer to that during the Estimates. You wanted to find out if the post office was going to be removed from there. I gave you the answer on the floor of the House and I have no intention of replying to you. If you want to know, the Minister of Information and Culture is there, get on the telephone and ask for the number.

I beg to move that Head 50 stand part, Sir.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the Minister, for whatever reason, feels constrained to display behaviour not in keeping with the high levels that one would expect.

The question I have asked is a question which I have asked before. That is true. But the fact is that the constituents whom I represent have persisted, adamant in their belief, that the response which I got on the occasions which I asked was merely to let the matter pass. What I am asking the Minister for is a definitive statement, because people in Eagle Hall still believe that the postal services are going to be removed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The point is that they do not believe the message you carry to them. That is what they do not believe!

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I would bow to his superior wisdom of the people of Eagle Hall, if he thinks he knows them better than I do. But I represent them — he does not. As a matter of fact, it is questionable now where he represents, because he has abandoned the people in St. James North.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. We are not dealing with representation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. We are dealing with the post office. The original representation of the people can be found in the post office. Almost one of the first instances of public activity is to establish a post office, so when I talk about representation, I am in keeping with the post office here.

The honourable Member for St. James North is cantankerous, unnecessarily. All he has to do is to get up and give the answers. That is his duty. It may very well be that he does not have the answers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is where we were before.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, I am moving on beyond that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, do that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I did not know that the Government was scanning letters. It never occurred to me that the Government would scan letters at the Post Office. I never said that the closed circuit television was for scanning letters. I asked him to tell us what it was for. It is significant that he has not told us what the closed circuit television is for and he chooses to bring the closed circuit television and the scanning of letters in the same vein. I had absolutely no intention of suggesting any such thing. But he still has not answered what the closed circuit television is for.

Those of us who have lived in large countries outside of Barbados and have seen post offices that function at high speeds and efficiency, and move millions of letters per day, none of us can recall seeing these closed circuit televisions in those post offices. I think the people of Barbados have a genuine interest in finding out what the closed circuit television is for. Is it a security measure?

Can the Minister tell us what is the final cost of the Post Office?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG rose.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not finished yet. You just cannot jump up like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two honourable Members are on their feet.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: We must have some decorum in this Chamber. You cannot let him bully you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

On what does the honourable Member rise?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is going to have a smoke, Sir. He is going to cool his head.

I really would like to know, and I think the people in Barbados would like to know, what is the final cost, because the reason I have been asking these questions is that you cannot determine the final cost of the Post Office until it is settled. I heard there was arbitration. I heard there were problems. One set of people were put in court. There was a contest between the first contractors and the Government. A new set of contractors came in. No information was given in regard to these different happenings as emanating from the Government, so far as I know.

Why is the Government so afraid to answer questions about the Post Office? Why does not the Attorney General bring some sanity to this problem and answer some of the questions? I would like to know for the people of Barbados what is the cost of the Post Office. Why are you afraid to answer questions about the Post Office? That is all I am asking, for the people of Barbados. Tell us!

Hon. L. R. TULL: Since the honourable Member seeks to bring me into debate, let me tell him. I thought he would know this. Under the Post Office Act, the Postmaster General has powers to search mail under certain circumstances.

In relation to this business about scanning by Government, Government does not scan people's mail in Barbados. The answer to that is 'No. We do not scan mail'. If the honourable Member had asked his leader, he would have been able to tell him that the powers of the Postmaster General, under the Laws of Barbados, are not laws that were just passed. These are laws that were around a long time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Will you give way for a minute?

The powers of the Postmaster to open mail under the Post Office Act is in the presence of the addressee, so that does not answer the question. He cannot open the mail in the absence of the person to whom it is addressed.

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I was not questioning that. Do you think that you are more Attorney General than him? He is my Attorney General at the moment. Do not worry to come out front playing you are coming to answer the questions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, let us get ahead.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He has come in front taking up the law books trying to show you up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will not allow the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) to come to show up the honourable member for St. George South. That is the Attorney General of Barbados there. I am addressing you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Post Office, please!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The question really is, what is the closed circuit television for? That is all I ask.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The closed circuit television is for security purposes, and that is a simple answer.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am here until tomorrow morning. There are one or two things which have been raised and which I would like to lend my support to.

The first matter of concern is that under Head 50, Subsection 1, Post Office, Item 6 — Utilities, it reads as follows:

"The expenditure under this item will increase significantly with the move to the New General Post Office. The sum of \$28 000 is required to supplement this item."

It would seem to me that in this day and age when the Government is talking day after day about energy conservation, about the adaptation of our architectural effort in order to reduce expenditures on energy, one must be surprised to find that, now a new Post Office has been built, it is anticipated that the cost of utilities will increase significantly.

3.40 p.m.

I think that this is evidence.....

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I suspect, Sir, that this is evidence of bad planning.....

(Hon. H. deB. FORDE: No, no!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:.....evidence of mismanagement and a further indication of the general principle which I have talked about in this House, where we get ourselves involved in all sorts of capital expenditures which generate increasing charges on current revenue and lead to further and further taxation. I think it should be explained to this Honourable House why it is that in this day and age, a new building like the Post Office has been so designed that it is clearly anticipated that more and more money will be spent on electricity, gas and water. It seems to me to be bad planning, and that the Government itself is not addressing the problem of energy conservation with efficiency in Barbados.

The second problem I should like to raise relates to the use of closed circuit television in the Post Office. The public and the workers in the Post Office building are entitled to know the purpose of the closed circuit television. Is it for the purpose of security?

(Hon. L. R. TULL: Repetition, Sir.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am going to make a further point. If it is for the purpose of security, the laws of the United States provide that if you have closed circuit television for the purposes of security, then a notice must be posted so that the public can see it. And when you enter a bank, for example...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. We are dealing with the Laws of Barbados, not the Laws of the United States.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I know. But I am talking about closed circuit television. The public wants to know, and we want to know, the purpose of the closed circuit television. I am not saying that it is a good or bad thing. We are asking here for a vote of \$62 000 for matters including closed circuit television within the new Post Office. We want to know what it is for.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of Order, Mr. Chairman, the Resolution does not say that. It does not say that the money is required for the purchase of a closed circuit television.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Including!)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Nor including a closed circuit television. The money is for maintenance of certain equipment, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: May I read the Resolution, Sir?

"Maintenance of Property

The occupation of the new premises will represent an increased cost in the maintenance of equipment such as lifts, air-conditioners and closed circuit T.V."

My colleague asked a simple question, "What is the purpose of the closed circuit T.V.? Is it for security purposes?" That was not answered.

There may well be a legitimate and good reason.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:.....to have closed circuit T.V. Just get up and answer the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: They are going to have to answer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An honourable Member is on a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: They are going to have to answer or we will talk until tomorrow morning on this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member must sit.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member knows that if he wants to talk until tomorrow morning, he has a friend. I am with you. But the fact is that I have already answered the question about the closed circuit T.V. I have told the honourable Member for St. Michael West that the closed circuit television has been installed for security. Yet, the talkative one goes on and on and on.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If it is for security, one would like to have an assurance that if it involves transactions between the public and employees in the Post Office, adequate notices would be placed in the Post Office, as done elsewhere, stating clearly that transactions are being recorded on a television circuit. If we are moving into the area of closed circuit television to enhance security at the Post Office, I am all for that. There is no difficulty on my part. All I would wish to make sure is that the public and the workers in the Post Office know exactly the reasons why the closed circuit television has been installed, that the workers would not feel any sense of insecurity because of a suspicion that they may be under constant surveillance, and that proper rules would be established between management and workers in relation to the closed circuit television system.

We are trying to make a contribution from this side of the House in order to make the system work more efficiently and generate greater public confidence in the system. But instead of listening to the main elements of the contribution that we are trying to make on this side, we hear a whole lot of rantings from the Leader of the House, who does not know anything about any Resolution that ever comes before this Parliament.

What I am trying to do is to try to bring to bear on this debate the experiences in other countries, where closed circuit television has been introduced for security reasons and the kind of problems they have had. These problems have been twofold: with the public who should know that they are being photographed and with the workers in the institution who should work comfortably with the system. In other words, put it this way. If workers in an organization where there is a closed circuit television feel that that television is a spy network on their activities.....

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member, please.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I am on a point of order. Sit down!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not see anyone, Sir. The light is reflecting on his bald head, so I cannot see him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable Member please be seated!

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: The honourable Member has for the last fifteen minutes been repeating himself over and over and over again. That is offending against the Standing Orders. You are not allowed to repeat the same thing constantly in here.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have not dealt with the impact of closed circuit television on the morale of workers within an institution. All I am advising the Government is that, before industrial or other problems develop, up front, there should be clear rules established as to how the workers in the Post Office would relate to the existing system.

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Richie, sit down!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Would you please tell the honourable Minister of Transport to behave himself? He is supposed to be a Christian. I saw him in church only recently and he looked like a stranger in the church.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. That is nothing to do with the debate.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Imagine that, Mr. Chairman! He is challenging your authority by saying that I have been speaking for more than fifteen minutes,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:.....which is against the Rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: the honourable Member has been repeating himself over and over again.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have concluded my speech, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member's point is quite in order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have concluded my speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I draw your attention to the inaccuracy of the statement made by the honourable Minister of Transport when he said that I was speaking for more than fifteen minutes, challenging your authority. I am defending you as a St. George North man.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down!
3.50 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I rise to make a statement in response to a query by the Member for the St. Michael West. The Government was accused of being scandalous by the Member for St. Michael West in the light of not answering Questions. I rise to make a statement to support the statement. Between 1971 and 1976, the then Opposition asked 152 Questions according to the Order Paper. When the House was prorogued in 1976, 79 questions remained unanswered on the Order Paper. To date, in four years the present Opposition has asked us 26 Questions; 16 of them have been answered. Of those that remain on the Order Paper, ten of them came in between the 8th January and today, and five of them concern the Member for St. Michael South Central. I just want to have it quite clear. Out of 152 questions asked in five years, 79 of them remained unanswered during their regime. Twenty-six questions have been answered in this session of which 16 of them have been answered. Of those remaining on the Order Paper, five of them have come from the Member of St. Michael South Central. The public can now judge the efficiency of the Opposition and the work of the Government.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): I welcome the presence of closed circuit television in a very sensitive place like the General Post Office, where large amounts of money are held and dealt with on an almost daily basis. I do not know whether honourable Members have been following developments in the commercial sectors in Barbados, but more and more commercial institutions which deal with large sums of money are moving to install on their premises all of the modern security gadgets, including closed circuit television. At least one of the commercial banks, if not more, has had such a system in operation for several years, several of the supermarkets have installed the

system, and I have not heard any allegations made against them that the purpose of the closed circuit television is either to harass workers, as implied in the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, or indeed.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order: The honourable Member for Christ Church West is always more honourable than that. He knows perfectly well that what I said is that it is important, up front, to get rules established so that the workers will not think that they are being spied on or anything like that. You know that I did not say what you are trying to say. What is wrong with you today?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am glad for the honourable Member's clarification. My conclusion from his statement is that there was an implication that the workers were being harassed, or there was something against the interest of the workers in installing closed circuit television on the premises of the Post Office. In my view, it is for the protection of the workers, and if in the process it will help to increase productivity and remove fear from their minds, all the more reason why it should be installed there. I do not expect that the House would not want to belabour a point such as this, but that the House should be welcoming the modern steps being taken by the Government to improve security in relation to people who misuse the customers of the Post Office and also to improve the security of those persons who work on the premises of the Post Office. I would like to see the same thing done in each commercial bank in this Island and in the supermarkets.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I wonder if the honourable Member will give way. Will the honourable Member see that we get that in the Barbados Marketing Corporation as well?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will agree that if there is any danger with the Barbados Marketing Corporation, they should have such a system as well. As a matter of fact, there are some Government offices that could do with increased security. I have noticed that there are some Government offices where the security happens to be quite slack, and I would like to think that we would install such a system if it contributes to the security of the place.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We also hope that we will see such a service at Cottle Catford.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member raised a point about the increased cost of utilities. I would have thought that that would be obvious. The Post Office is occupying much more space than it formerly occupied. Obviously, you have a wider area both to light consistently during the night and to keep air-conditioned,

so, obviously, there will be a consequential increase in utilities.

I do not see why we are belabouring these points in Committee, except that Members feel that today's workload is not heavy enough and that we must talk. This Resolution is a very simple Resolution, there is nothing unusual about it, and I would hope that the Committee can pass the Resolution speedily.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take the opportunity on this Resolution to draw to the appropriate Ministry the situation at the St. Philip Post Office. It is now completely inadequate for the work that is expected to be carried on there. In the mornings the postmen can hardly get into the building in conjunction with the other workers, and I would invite the appropriate Ministry to look at the St. Philip Post Office as a matter of urgency, and expand the physical facilities up there.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): I am glad to see that the honourable Member for St. Philip North is putting a plea on behalf of his district for improved postal facilities up there. Listening to the debate for the last several minutes, I formed the impression that honourable Members on that side begrudge not only the public, but the workers of the Post Office, the new and improved facilities which they have.

I would not have thought it necessary to stand and spend a long time debating the necessity to increase the allocation for utilities at the Post Office. It is a brand new spanking facility, with all of the modern facilities that would make working in that place infinitely more comfortable for the hundreds of people who have to work in it. When they were occupying premises under here, a number of the postal employees had to work in sweltering conditions without air conditioning, so clearly the utility bill would not then be as high as it will be in a building of the sort that we now have built for them. The same thing goes for the public. Conducting business in the sweltering conditions that we saw people enduring below us here was not a pleasant experience.

I am surprised to hear the Opposition get up and quarrel with the Government, for the last hour since lunch, for putting in a security system in circumstances in which we have all sorts of marauders running about today threatening people with shotguns. It is clearly more advantageous to be able to spot the beginnings of trouble rather than wait for it to occur, until somebody is dead or wounded, at an unprotected new Post Office, in which case they would be getting up afterwards and saying that the Government of Barbados was short in its planning for building such a multi-million dollar place without putting in the common everyday protection facilities that other finance institutions carry all around the world.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would be saying we could have spent another \$50 000 — it did not cost that much — another \$10 000, and that would have saved the life of some poor girl from Carrington Village.
4.00 p.m.

But now, because it is in, that same man, who has the facility to twist his mouth all around, 180 degrees, can come in here and quarrel with the Government for anticipating that kind of trouble, and in accordance with modern contemporary planning anticipate all those problems and provide for them. We have him coming in here trying to create the impression that we need to be pilloried for looking after the interest not only of the workers, but of the public that we serve. The honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin), on the other hand, said that we have such a beautiful building down there he wants one up in St. Philip.

The Barbados Labour Party is prepared to continue on the path it is going, unmindful of the distractions that come from that side, and I think that honourable Members in here who understand their duty will have no difficulty at all in passing this Resolution.

The question that Head 50 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85,
No. 32 — \$85,698

HEAD 80 — MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 80 stand part.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): The honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) suggested in the course of the debate that I said he was a culture vulture. I do not know whether the honourable Member, in an attempt to quote me, felt that I was paying him a compliment, because the definition of a vulture is a bird of prey that swoops upon things after they have been dead. It does not capture the living.

The approach which the honourable Member adumbrated, which I suppose, is the general opinion of his colleagues, is that we only spent at one time \$50 000 on culture, and culture is something that is dispensed in direct proportion with the amount of money which is passed by the Legislature, or squandered by a host of formerly unemployable persons. I do not necessarily refer to all the persons who are employed by the Ministry of Culture who, like those discontented persons, have found

in the Ministry of Culture a veritable cave of Abdullah, which, as Your Honour is aware, was the resort to which all the discontented and malcontents of the country used to flock.

There was an amount of \$50 000 voted for Cultural Affairs in whatever year it was, and I take it he has quoted it correctly. The point is that many public officers pitched in and contributed towards the development of such cultural activities as were promoted and postured by the Government without necessarily being attached to a specific Department or a specific Ministry.

As I think the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) pointed out previously, culture is something which springs from above. You cannot vote money in here and give somebody \$3 000 worth of culture, or another person \$5 000 worth of culture, and by getting some junkanoo people, or the expression they use in Barbados on Bank Holidays – the donkey men, and so on, and say that that is culture. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was pointing out that culture is something which springs from within the people themselves, their way of life, their outlook; when they take the dimensions of time and space and put them either in time, in music, or space dimensionally in painting and other art.

There is more culture in places like Haiti where the Government takes absolutely no part, except tax wise, in the proportion of the indigenous culture of the people which is sprung from the people themselves. If one goes into the market place in Port-au-Prince in Haiti, one sees thousands and thousands of people packed closely together painting, making things and exchanging them, not using money as a medium of exchange at all. That is what you call culture. Haitian art is something indigenous to that country, and their expression of their culture is autochthonous, or sprung from the land itself.

These latter-day saints come in here saying you only spent \$50 000 on culture. But in spending \$50 000 to buy the essential things that some spirited public officers would need, we were able to produce the National Independence Festival of Creative Arts without the expenditure of thousands and thousands of dollars and having this vast military array of administration of fifty or sixty people who say they are walking around the country dispensing culture. So if I said that the honourable Member was a culture vulture, in the United States of America that is used in the sense that some persons go assiduously after promoting concerts and buying tickets for this, that and the other, but I mean it in the true sense of being a bird of prey, preying upon the susceptibilities and the innocence of a lot of people, giving them five and ten dollar prizes and thinking that we are promoting culture.

The lowest form of culture we have in Barbados is Parliament, because if what goes on in here is a reflection of our culture, all I can say is may the Divine Providence save this country from a fate which would be much worse than death, because we do not set any example in this adversary atmosphere that we know anything about culture at all. If you do not absorb culture in your home, or you cannot get it in the schools – and all we seem to be getting in the schools today is drugs – then no matter how much money we spend, this society could never be viewed as a cultural society. I can only repeat the words of a famous French philosopher in saying that Barbados is a country that has moved rapidly from a state of barbarism to a state of decadence without any of the intermediate advantages of civilisation.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the honourable Member thinks that I am so naive and innocent as to believe that when he made that comment about me he was paying me a compliment. I do not get compliments from the other side, and I certainly did not single it out in that vein.

The Right Honourable Member goes on with the same kind of uninformed nonsense about culture that we have heard from people on his side already today. What can be more alarming than to hear the Right Honourable Member saying that there is more culture in Haiti than there is in Barbados. That is an insult to the people in Barbados and it is a misunderstanding of what is the meaning of culture. What kind of foolish statement is that? The honourable Member does not even know how to separate the arts from culture. There is more painting in Haiti – yes, there are a lot of things in Haiti, but culture? But I knew that the honourable Member was going to get into trouble when he prayed in aid of the statements of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. The moment he relied on what that Member said to support his arguments, I knew he was in deep trouble.
4.10 p.m.

What I said today had absolutely nothing to do with the Government promoting culture in the way in which it was defined by the Right Honourable Member for St. John. In the days of the Democratic Labour Party, they had no cultural policy, no official Government policy. I said earlier today that there is a difference between partisanship in culture. When the honourable Member for St. Michael West talked about the DLP and culture, I said I would be the first one, as I have said already, to agree with him that you cannot have partisanship in culture. It is a denial of culture, as I put it, to have any partisanship involved. Where the partisanship came in in my presentation was in the elaboration and implementation of an official cultural policy. I am not moving from that. I am saying that the Democratic

Labour Party, when it was the Government of this country, never elaborated a cultural policy. They never spelt out one. They never conceptualised one, and they never implemented one. So do not get up now playing that you are driving these back-of-the-arms at me.

First of all, the Right Honourable Member misrepresented what I said. Secondly, he thinks that I am so foolish as to think that I would ever get a compliment from any of you over there. I would feel uncomfortable if I got any compliment from anybody over on that side. Then, he got up, five minutes after making a rather useless – I almost said malicious intervention about BMC, and talked about the level of behaviour in Parliament. What is more improper than the insinuation in here in his statement about BMC?

(I go on. Since one honourable Member says he wants to talk until morning, we might as well keep it going.)

When I am talking about culture, I keep saying that I am not going along with the Jean Paul Sartre theory "I exist, therefore I am", something that I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central say. I am interested in "I think; therefore, I am." I am in that school of philosophy, and what we have done on this side, as the honourable Member for St. James South said today, is that we pick out people and give them scholarships in dance, music, drama and the theatrical arts, generally, for the first time in the history of this country. We said that this was an important area for national involvement and we gave a lot of scholarships, starting with National Development Scholarships. If you push me, I will start rattling off all the names of people who were given scholarships, certainly in the time I was in the Ministry. These people were brought back to Barbados and put in the mainstream, and I consider it beneath the depth for any honourable Member to get up in here and describe people who work in the Public Service in the terms in which the Right Honourable Member for St. John has just done.

For him, the people who work in Culture are the scum of the earth. I do not share that view. Why do you not go out on the platform and tell them so? The people who are unemployed, unemployable and the ne'r-do-wells and all of that that you said who work in Culture? Is that how you understand the young people who make a contribution to Barbados. When you used to hold some donkey cart parades with some people dressed up in English finery, with fans, with bonnets and put flowers on them and drive them through Broad Street with you behind them that was culture? In those days you did not have anybody to abuse. You did not have anybody to call the scum, but now you have people today who have a different perspective about human development and better understanding of what is the nature of the society in

which they live in – they understand where they came from and where they are going, and they are making an emphatic statement in this country – you write them off with a lot of pejorative comments. I will tell the honourable Member this. I will be their champion, and if the Right Honourable Member wants to kick them about, he will have to face me on it.

I hear the idiot chupsing his mouth. The Philistine, the man who knows absolutely nothing about these things got up in here and made a perfect fool of himself, and that is his reaction.

I have often told the Prime Minister that I would like to be Minister of Culture for all time, because that, to me, is far more important than a number of things that we involve ourselves in in governmental activity. It goes to the soul of the personality of the people in this country. There is an old Chinese proverb that says, "If you give a man a fish, you cure his hunger for a moment, but if you teach him how to fish, you cure his hunger forever." I believe that we have to cure the inner hunger of the people in Barbados by giving them the type of intellectual fare that would help them to enhance their own lives, their own personalities and the lives and personalities of the total community, and the instrument for this is a good and proper cultural policy in this country. I am not talking of culture as the privilege of the elite, the Green Room Theatre and those others. That is part of it, but it is not everything. It is involvement of every single community in this country in a single search of the whole. It is involving every person in this country, whatever his roots and background, in the development of this country in the way in which he can contribute, and it involves what Professor Nettleford calls "an enhancement of the creative intellect to bring out in every man the best that is in him". The Democratic Labour Party Opposition do not know anything about these things. They get up in here and talk a lot of foolishness.

The honourable Member for St. James South got up and talked about building community centres, as if you could build a community centre and transform Barbados. I remember that when I used to go to school the British Council used to be resident here in Barbados opposite the Barbados Home Centre, and they used to have the school children out there – outdoor theatre – in the British Council's yard, just outside White Park Road. I have not seen as high a level of drama in this country in the schools since what I saw then. But we fool ourselves that we have to have big massive theatres, fancy props, modern lighting and all that to give the type of drama that I saw in those days, and that was a long time ago.

I move to more recent time. I stood up on the playing field at Queen's Park.

Asides

Hon. L. R. TULL: I shall repeat it because of the wisdom in it — not the foolishness I just had to listen to, that there is more culture in Haiti than there is in Barbados. You deserve not to have a Government for that statement. That statement alone constitutes the biggest insult I have heard the Democratic Labour Party inflict on the people of this country.

I stood up on the playing field in Queen's Park and I saw young, underprivileged children from the City dramatize slavery in a way that was moving, emphatic and dramatic, and it brought home to those children a greater awareness and a consciousness of what their ancestors went through and what was really their heritage. You cannot make sport at these things. And you cannot get up glibly and accuse me of being a culture vulture just because I dare to articulate a lot of things that other people do not want to articulate, like those descendants of slaves who would bury their heads in the sand and say that they do not want "Slavery" to be a theme in NIFCA. I support it. I do not care who does not support it.

4.20 p.m.

I remember that when I was Minister of Education and Culture, every time there was a Crop Over Festival, I would get a lot of telephone calls at a certain time of the year telling me, "Do not burn Mr. Harding this year." They did not want Mr. Harding burned because of a lot of the hangovers from days that people would like to forget. I decided that whether they wanted Mr. Harding burned or not, I was going to burn Mr. Harding. I believe they must have stopped burning him since I left. Certainly I felt that it should be burned, and whoever did not like it, just too bad. I refuse to cow down to any small group of people in this country. Not this fellow, let the others do it. I believe that it was an essential part of the celebrations of the Crop Over Festival. I am glad that the honourable Member got up and talked on this, because it gives me a further bite in his cherry.

I know that most of those people who went off on scholarships in dance, music, painting, drama — the whole works — are back in the schools in Barbados, the primary schools, working with those children. And there is a birth of creative activity such as this country has ever known; they are there doing the work. Those children are, as a result, developing a self confidence that was absent in every generation of Barbados before their time. I say that. That is my proud boast. So I do not want repeatedly to hear people putting down the efforts of people in culture. And I am not talking about culture in the rather facile and superficial way in which the Right Honourable Member has just mentioned it, I am talking of the sum total of every Barbadian's experience, about three centuries ago, the things that made us great.

Only two Saturdays ago, I had an in-house seminar with the Foreign Officers in my Ministry, Foreign Affairs. One of the things that they discussed was whether our foreign policy should not tilt more now in these days towards practical things, technical assistance, trade, more tourism. I told them that I have absolutely no intention of presiding over any Ministry that was only concerned with materialism and material things. Of course, that is needed, and we will pursue that with all the power of our command, but at the same time, I was concerned with image building, the projection of Barbados' image internationally, the way we feel about others, the impact we can make on others, and I had to bring them back to things that have happened in this country in a generation or two before us, when Barbados supplied the teachers of the Caribbean, when Barbados provided the priests of the Caribbean, when Barbados provided the administrators of the Caribbean, when Barbados provided the policemen of the Caribbean. Do you know why, Sir? Because this country was able to build up and maintain an image of balance, respectability, good sense and good judgment that was revered and respected throughout the Caribbean.

I do not only want that to happen in the Caribbean and beyond in respect of Barbados, I want in our own country that our people, our children and our children's children, would come along with a feeling of pride, satisfaction and a sense of worth in this community. It cannot be done only by coming in here week after week and talking about balance of payments and aid from this place and borrowing money from the other place, unemployment and all those things. You cannot only deal with those things. This is another dimension of human living. If the honourable Members on that side do not understand it, too bad for them. All I can say is that there is a new dawn in this country, a new awakening. Young people and old people are beginning to feel the pulse of a new and dynamic society that has been edged along by a Government that understands what development is. If the Democratic Labour Party had any sense, they would try and get on the bandwagon before it is too late.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable Member has just made a most remarkable speech, which he ended by suggesting that the Democratic Labour Party should get on the bandwagon. I believe that, in all honesty, the honourable Member does in between the statements which he makes, feel some of the things he indicated he feels. But I think that his utterances suggest a total misunderstanding when in a speech in this Honourable House, he talks about a new pulse, a new dawn, and at the same time, he seems to be claiming for himself, as I have charged before, and his party, that they and him are the repository of cultural development in the country.

Mr. Chairman, I should like you to come with me on a small journey. Walk through any street in this country today and tell me what is the manifestation of this new dawn that he is talking about? Tell me what is the manifestation of this new pulse which he says can be felt by young and old? Is it the fact that every youngster in Barbados now has a large box on which he can listen to punk music as he moves from place to place? Is that the new pulse of which he speaks?

I should like to ask the honourable Member where he was on Christmas morning 1984? I want him to tell me if he heard a single village choir in this country. Let him tell me which church in Barbados had 5.00 o'clock service on Christmas morning. Let the honourable Member, who speaks of the new pulse and the new dawn, go out into the highways and the by-ways and ask the Barbadians who had gone away to new cultures, and who have been hungering for their own culture and came back to Barbados, who say constantly, morning after morning, "This Barbados is not the one I used to know." I agree with him when he said that the bricks and the mortar are not all. I put it to this Honourable Chamber that if he is going to be discussing the development of Barbados in cultural terms, there are vast numbers of people in this country who would agree, who would be unanimous in their view, that the Barbados which is our cultural heritage is disappearing fast.

That Government with its so-called policy, eliminated all of the trained Community Development Officers that we had in this country. There are about twelve to twenty people in Barbados, who, by virtue of their training and their experience, can be identified as having special skills in community development. There is not a single one of them working at community development in Barbados today. They have all been eliminated by this so-called, new, enlightened policy of the Barbados Labour Party.

This Barbados Labour Party believes that a cultural invasion of North America into Barbados is an indication of a thrust forward in culture. Are we to understand that, some twenty years after we had television and radio in Barbados, we are still subject to the third rate garbage which emanates from producers in the United States, whose only interest is to make as fast a dollar as possible, which now comes on television by way of so-called serials, which now comes on television by way of action. Are we to understand that that is the manifestation of this new thrust in culture?
4.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, do you believe that a country that would boast of its cultural development would be at the stage where the only time we can see a locally-produced drama that has been written by Barbadians, acted by

Barbadians and directed by Barbadians would be from time to time at Independence time? If the honourable Member wants to talk about developing culture and a policy, why will the Government not agree to spend some money and create a Barbadian production unit? Why do we — B and D alike — not agree that in the area of producing television programmes, to leave as part of the heritage for those who are coming that we do not have to judge the station by whether it makes a profit or not? What nonsense do we have to listen to when persons are trying to convince the rest of the community that there has been this magnificent thrust in culture?

I submit that, foremost in the preservation of the culture of Barbados, if we are going to define it in those terms, would be to find out what precisely constitutes the culture of Barbados. For us to determine as a body or as a group which parts of that culture we wish to preserve, we cannot have the odd guitar festival and the odd shows in Queens Park and then announce to the world that we are making a thrust. We have to recognize that culture is an ongoing, everyday activity. In every school in Barbados, everyday there should be cultural expressions. It cannot be something manufactured, put together and thrown out by a foundation or by a Ministry, if the foundation and the Ministry, or each of them, will be claiming that that constitutes a thrust in culture. Any thrust in culture in Barbados must occur in the educational system in Barbados. Do not let the Minister, or any Minister, or anybody in Barbados, come and tell this honourable Member that what he or she proposes is the sum total of cultural development in this country.

There are young boys who do not know how to pitch. There are thousands of boys in Barbados who never played marble cricket. There are boys in Barbados who cannot make a roller out of a nugget tin and three pieces of clammy cherry wood. I am not sure if the Right Honourable Member for St. Thomas can follow that particular manifestation, but that would not in itself mean much, because there are things which he would have been able to do which perhaps we could not do. There are numbers of people in Barbados who cannot distinguish between a gulley root bush and cerasee bush.

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member who is the Minister of Education walks in and asks, 'What does that have to do with culture?' That is precisely the point. It is heritage, mam!

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: She says she wants the tone of the debate lifted up. It is precisely because she does not

understand that it is in these specifics that the debate should be directed that we have the quarrel — the difference is between us.

The honourable Member thinks that if he attacks the Green Room Theatre, that signifies that he is with the masters. The honourable Member believes that the Green Room Theatre and the easter bonnets represents the antithesis of culture. What the honourable Member should be working towards is having the expertise of the Green Room Theatre made available to the same people who he said he saw on the pasture in Queen's Park.

There are people in this country today that singing hymns from Ancient and Modern has nothing to do with Barbados culture. Yet, there is not a single person 40 years and under, who can turn a tune, who on hearing any of those hymns will not recognize that there was some time in his life time in Barbados where that constituted the major aspect of his cultural life. I find it remarkable that in this country today we can be discussing culture in the terms that we discuss them. I find that there are too many people who arrogate unto themselves the capacity to speak *ex cathedra* about matters of this kind. There are people in this community who seem to feel that only the Government has the capacity to pronounce on anything. You could be the biggest idiot in the world, but once you become a Minister, God suddenly imparts upon you all the wisdom in the world! There are people like that. I have no doubt that that will go on forever, because we in this country have been bludgeoned in recent times into believing that only the Government, or Ministers, or the select few, can pronounce on matters.

I think that the honourable Member who sat down before me wants to see pride and satisfaction in the ordinary people in this country, he and the Government would redirect their efforts towards instilling some basic concepts into people. There was a time when honesty was part of the Barbadian culture. There was a time when good manners was part of the Barbadian culture. There was a time when respect for your elders was a part of the Barbadian culture. Whatever may have been the origins of those particular aspects of life, they came to be part of the Barbadian culture. I submit that whether we are discussing the tourist industry, whether we are discussing manufacturing, or whether we are trying to discuss culture in a vacuum, until we recognise the basic human decencies as part of the culture of this country, we are going to make no progress.

I am amazed that the honourable Member for St. George South, in his flight of fancy, can suggest the sending of four or five persons on scholarship in cultural pursuit itself constitutes such a magnificent policy that he can.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: If the honourable Member will give way. There were not four or five people sent on scholarships. There were more like twenty-five or thirty.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am grateful to the honourable Member for the correction. If he thinks that sending twenty or twenty-five persons out on scholarship will itself be the magnificence of cultural development in Barbados, if that constitutes for him the quintessence of cultural policy, then he is doing the best he can. But where did he send the twenty-five or thirty people? He sent the twenty-five or thirty people into other cultures, he sent them on scholarship. I wonder if the honourable Member sent any of those persons to Cuba. Did he send any to Haiti or West Africa? I wonder if the honourable Member will tell us exactly where he sent these people on scholarship.

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He sent some of them to West Africa. I applaud the honourable Member that he sent some of them to West Africa, and they came back, and now our culture is in good hands. All is well because we sent out the persons.

I submit that we would do equally as well if he and the Government would go out and pick up those persons whose talents are lying abegging, those persons who have been discarded by the Government, for political reasons — if he agrees with me that culture is non-partisan, let the Barbados Labour Party Government go out and pick up those persons who have talent and bring them and put them as part of a task force or an employed group that will assist in developing culture in this country. If he wants me to give him a list of persons, I could give him that list, if he insists. If he wants me to tell him in great detail of what I speak — because I do not think it is necessary to embarrass people — take some of them who have been moved from the Community Development Division, those who have been moved from the Cultural Division, and bring them back together, because collectively they have a wealth of experience which is now not being drawn on.

4.40 p.m.

Perhaps we will also cease to have this foolish debate — I say foolish in its best sense — which continues to go on back and forth where whenever the honourable Member gets up, he says as evidence of his great cultural ability that he is a Classics scholar.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: I never said that!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am going to stop here, because the honourable Member says he never said that, and I am beginning to realise that his problem is that he does not even remember what he said. That is really the difficulty.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): Mr. Chairman, the discussion has gone on for a long time about culture, what it is and what it represents, and I have heard a number of definitions. I heard the honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) say that there is more culture in Haiti than in the whole of Barbados, and that would lead me to believe that he

suggests that culture is wood carvings, because in that respect Haiti has a larger heritage than Barbados. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) suggested that Barbadians are losing their capacity to speak dialect, the true Barbadian accent is disappearing, and so on and so forth.

I find this amusing, because certainly the classical definition of culture would seem to suggest that when we are talking about culture, we are looking at the sum total of one's sociological experiences. I do not think that we can discuss the subject meaningfully without taking that sum total of the Barbadian experience into consideration. To identify isolated aspects of that sum total is, in my view, a distortion of what culture really is.

I have some difficulty sometimes with the various programmes that are put on, and all are put on in the name of culture. I seem to get the impression that a number of persons are suggesting that when we speak of culture, we are speaking of the dramatic presentation of a certain aspect of our culture, the donkey man, the glorification or the deification of dialect as a communicative system, and perhaps even the norm in our society. All of these, in my view, are artificial attempts to deal with something which should be very spontaneous and which should arise out of the Barbadian psyche. As a matter of fact, the total Barbadian is part and parcel of all of that.

There are clearly some aspects of our culture which, as the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) wisely pointed out, we could best leave off, because it is foolish to suggest that gangsterism, the rise of the Mafia in the United States, which is essentially a part of the Italian culture there, deviant though it is, should be promoted. It is a part of the Italian experience and therefore would form part of their total culture pattern, but it is a deviant form of culture, and at best any self-respecting Italian Sicilian or otherwise in origin, would rather forget it. I would suggest that there are certain aspects of the Barbadian experience that we could easily forget. One of those, in my submission, is the unbalanced and unnatural emphasis that is being put on dialect as a form of communication. Dialect, at best, is a secondary form of expression. It is the form that a number of us lapse into from time to time when we are not in polished circumstances, and it is acceptable, in my view, in some cases when informality is the norm. I would suggest that in schools there is no place for sessions calculated to teach people how to speak dialect.

Dialect, like every other form of communication, is there for the purpose of helping us to pass messages back and forth among ourselves, and dialect is one form that we learn informally. As a matter of fact, all language is acquired long before any of us masters the syntax of the language. A child of three years old is able to speak fairly fluently, but he does not know anything about syntax, verb structures, or what a noun is, nor does he care. The

point is, he is able to communicate effectively using language. The dialect form of expression, in my view, has always been communicated informally and should continue to be communicated informally. I think it is a waste of good resources when we seek to structure it in the classroom programme or spend time teaching people how to do it. What happens when you do that is that you pervert the whole system of communication and you structure dialect as a far more important mechanism for communication than standard English as we know it here in Barbados. I am out of pace with those persons who propound the thesis that dialect and the structured communication and the teaching of dialect has a place in the Barbados culture. It has a place as far as it is an informal aspect of communication, and no more.

I think that there is a serious counter culture going on in Barbados at this given time, and I believe that Barbados is not unique in this sense. Whereas in the past cultural norms were passed on within a settled and fairly protected cultural enclave, that is no longer the case. We have a lot of discordant cultural norms seeping in from other societies through the mechanism of television and radio, and we are seeing the transformation of Barbadian culture by those external influences.

Once upon a time it was part and parcel of the Barbadian culture, as the honourable Member for St. Michael West said — and I hate to give him any credit for anything that is sensible, but he did make a few sensible contributions during those last few minutes when he spoke — for Barbadians to expect their neighbours to take notice when they were gone, and they could leave their houses open. It was possible to trade sugar across the half door, or pass rice. The bartering of foodstuffs was part and parcel of the Barbadian experience, but the whole process of social evolution has given way to a new set of norms. Whereas in the past we looked upon that as a reasonably normal process, present day civilisation in Barbados would suggest that that has little or no place under the present structure of things. So that has gone.

4.50 p.m.

Our emphasis upon sophisticated contemporary technology has suggested, that the little trucks that the boys used to make, and which used to proliferate the country-side when children picked up cane peelings and pulled them home on their trucks, has out-dated that.

But I do not think that anybody would want to suggest that the children of the honourable Member for St. Michael West, in order to show themselves as true Barbadians, must be seen on Highway 1 with a self-made truck, made out of corned beef and sardine tins, picking up cane peelings. There are hardly any cane peelings to pick up anymore.

(Mr. B. M. TAITT: I saw one when I went down Boscobel.)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: That only goes to show you that the people from the country district will hang on to certain aspects of culture.

Asides

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Sardine tins used to make the bonnets.

As I was pointing out, when you have CNN News in the morning and a lot of extraneous foolishness on television, all day long and all night long, one should not wonder that we have to spend so much time trying to tell Barbadians what they really are and where they really came from.

I can remember that when I was still Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, we, together with the Barbados National Bank and the Pine Hill Dairy, sponsored the Roots programme. I was bombarded night and day with telephone calls from persons who felt that to let Barbadians see a part of their heritage was terrible.

While we do not seek to go back to West Africa, it does not hurt us to know that that is where we came from, and it does not mean that because we had those kinds of origins that we are West Africans.

I am a Barbadian and know little of the West African experience, but the point of the matter is that I know from whence I came, and it does not help me to project my course if I am always conscious of my origin. It does not challenge or threaten my self-concept to know that somewhere along the line I was spirited out of one physical environment and brought into a new environment, and that is why I am saying that the sub total of our sociological experiences form our culture. But I am no more West African. I am a Barbadian. Certain aspects of West African culture still live in the Barbadian experience, and, to that extent, we have learnt them. But that does not make us anything but Barbadians.

There are certain aspects of primitive culture which we seek to celebrate, and this is part of the problem that we are having here in trying to find a course along which our cultural development should proceed, and we do need to sometimes reflect upon the primitive aspects of our culture. If we are going to be cultural anthropologists, we need to know our origins in every respect, we need to know those norms and values which form part of our heritage.

For instance, whereas voodoo formed part of the primitive aspects of our culture, voodooism has given way to more sophisticated expressions of belief in God. Since people have been able to read the Bible and communicate for themselves, they have been able to evolve a greater sense of identity with a superior being who is responsible,

and we understand in more concrete terms what that superior being is, so that aspect of our past is not, in my view, a permanent aspect. We reflect upon it, and we can marvel from whence we have come, because I would like to emphasize that the development of a cultural heritage is an evolutionary process.

We start off as primitives, meaning that we did not have the sophisticated implements that we now have. We had not yet developed sophisticated patterns of reasoning and the manipulation of our senses in order to exploit our environment more fully. So culture is an evolutionary process, and those of us who have difficulty understanding the role of voodoo and the need for us to be constantly harping back at primitive land structures, these are things on which we can reflect from time to time, but they need not be seen as more important than our present-day experiences.

I am saying that mankind, through the process of social revolution, hopefully, should become a better being, and we should go and pay attention and celebrate those aspects of our past that are going to help us better to exploit our present and our future. Those who come after us would be able to come into the system, and take up from where we have left off without feeling any disorientation when they look back at the past through which they have come. In short, I would like to invite Members to recognize that we are contemporary beings largely, and that to the extent that we want to celebrate, identify and call forward aspects of our past, those things to which we look to be the values that have made us what we are, we should discard, without apology, those things which do not celebrate the civilisation of mankind and try somehow to recognize that the whole process of social revolution is a dynamic process. It is a process through which we learn to live in our environment to exploit it, and I am not only speaking of its physical ecology, I am speaking of the whole process of accommodation with ourselves in the social and physical environment. When we do these things, I suspect that we will begin to pay meaningful attention to those things that we need to pay attention to, so that our children will not develop a split personality trying to figure out what it is indeed that they are.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Normally I would charge the statement of an honourable Member who made a statement of that kind which the honourable Member who just sat down made a distortion. I will not do so, because I think distortion implies a capacity to understand what was said and I do not think that capacity is there. At no time during any debate in this House did I seek to promote the idea that the promotion of dialect in Barbados should be a form of enhancement of our cultural expression. What I did say was that it is interesting that Barbadians, irrespective of colour, class or otherwise, share a common accent — I was not talking about dialect

— which is one indication that we all had a common heritage as Barbadians, that there is a common heritage which we all share, and, therefore, that we can all benefit from a total understanding of our history. It is accent as distinct from dialect.

5.00 p.m.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: At least he recognized the point that culture really is an expression of the total experiences of a community, past and present. And art forms represent an expression of that culture. When the Rt. Honourable Member for St. John says that Haiti is richer in artistic expressions than Barbados.....

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: He did not say that!)

(Hon. L. R. TULL: He did not say that!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:.....I should like to say that he is correct.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: The honourable Member is deliberately distorting what the Right Honourable Member for St. John said. The Rt. Honourable Member for St. John is in his place and he will tell you that he said that Haiti has more culture than Barbados.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Right Honourable Member for St. John was quite explicit in talking about artistic expressions. If you go to Port-au-Prince or any part of Haiti, you will see exactly what he is talking about. As a matter of fact, I believe that the two countries in the Western Hemisphere where artistic expression.....

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: On a point of order, Sir: Why do you not learn to be like him? He said what he said and he is standing by it. He does not want to apologize. He said so. He does not want you to apologize for him either.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is this a point of explanation?

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Point of explanation, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The two countries in the Western Hemisphere that have always impressed me by the wealth of their artistic cultural expressions are Haiti and Mexico. I say this because, whereas in many countries, an appreciation of culture or the right to an appreciation of culture seems to reside in a particular sector of the community, usually those who are better off, in Haiti and Mexico, from the bottom to the top, there is an appreciation and a feeling among the entire community that artistic expression is more or less the possession of the entire nation. I have never felt it in such an intense form in any European country, or any

other country anywhere in the Western Hemisphere, as I have felt it in Haiti and in Mexico. I talked about cultural expression in the form of the arts.

It is very interesting that if you were to look at colours.....

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: At what?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Colours. I do not think that anywhere in the Americas, except perhaps in various tribes in the region of the Andes and such areas would you find such a sharp perception of colours in the artistic representations of people as you find in Haiti and in Mexico. The interesting thing about it is that there are civilizations that have a completely different historical background. I always find it very fascinating to see how the art of these two countries is so dominated by the sharp relief of colour.

Another very interesting thing that you find is the role of food in cultural expression. Obviously, every country has its own tradition in terms of food, but Haiti, I think, stands out among Caribbean countries in cooking as an expression of culture. I believe that this probably stems from the historical French connection, of course. Mexico also has the same type of background. So that when you talk of artistic expressions of the cultural heritage of people, I would say that you would see its best fulfilment within this region in Haiti and in Mexico, and I have visited a lot of countries in the region. I was last in Mexico probably about 1970, and it was very interesting to go to a place like Cuernavaca to really see what goes on and how the peasant in Mexico has an appreciation of a painting or.....

(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Sit down, let me tell you!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Do you want to explain to me how it happened? I am just telling you what I have seen.

There is another crucial point which I want to make. One Member on the other side says that he agrees with me and that he has previously stated, although I never heard him state it, that the main thrust for our Cultural Foundation and the development of culture should be outside the orbit of the public sector. Government's promotion of culture can be a two-edged sword. It can be a vehicle for fruitful development of the community, but it can also be a vehicle for the manipulation of the minds of people. This is one of the reasons why I should like to see more private sector involvement in the management of the Cultural Foundation rather than Government supervision. One only has to look at the Soviet Union and communist countries and see the emphasis that they put on "culture", and how culture is used as a vehicle, not necessarily to promote national development, but as a vehicle to reinforce communist

indoctrination of the nation and of the young people in those countries. So I must say that we must be a bit cautious and recognize that public sector intervention in this area in a country such as ours has an important role. It has a role in giving a start to this sort of funding of artistic developments in the country, and I think we should always bear in mind that, in the long term, it is better to move more and more away from the public sector and try to involve the private sector more and more.

5.10 p.m.

There is at least one Caribbean state where we have seen for years the state promotion of culture largely to promote the interest of the ruling party. We have seen that at least in one South American country. We have to watch these developments, because you end up with a so-called cultural direction of development which really suits the purpose of the political directorate rather than a true reflection of the cultural expressions of the people as a whole.

I doubt very much, whether the people of Poland, for example, or the people of Hungary, as I made my assessment of them when I was last there in the 1950s, would have gone along the path of cultural development which we see projected as Hungarian development or Polish cultural development. I think that is largely superimposed on those people. That is certainly the impression that I have got. I am not accusing the Government of doing this. What I am trying to do is to draw to the Government's attention, and to the attention of all politicians, that there are dangers when you get the political directorate being the main force behind cultural development. It should regard itself as performing the role of a catalyst in terms of cultural development rather than in terms of totally funding and controlling the cultural development in the country.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the longer I listen, the more mystified I become. I heard the honourable Member of St. Michael South Central again trying to explain what I thought was quite well said by the honourable Member for St. John, that in Haiti, the Haitians have more culture than Barbadians. I alluded to the fact that in Haiti, artistic expression, in the form of wood carvings, is a more developed aspect of their culture than a similar expression in Barbados. We do not have as a central part of our cultural heritage a large stock of artistic carvings. Only in recent times, since the emphasis has gone into the direction of cultural expression, have the artistic carvings become a small part of the Barbadian expression. I can remember as a boy going to the exhibitions in Queens Park; at that time — and I am speaking now of paintings — the only local artist of note at that time was Ivan Payne — Ivan Payne dominated the canvas in those days when I was a young school

boy. An Ivan Payne painting, I believe, in the Barbadian context, is something rare and something to be treasured.

Asides

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) is indicating that he has one. I know that, being a man of culture, he would certainly have one of those.

I would like to direct Members to some works that would help them to understand better the context in which a debate of this sort should take place, and the various elements that go into making a culture, as we have been trying to define it. A standard text in cultural anthropology is Ruth Benedict's work "Patterns of Culture", a book which sets out in meticulous detail to try to give us an understanding of how certain cultural aspects stand out, and how they are learned and transmitted from one generation to the next. Clearly, they become a part and parcel of our total experience if, first of all, they are learnt and passed on from one generation to the next, to the point where it becomes a continuing part of our experience.

There are some aspects of our experience in Barbados that have been transitory, and we have to search long in our memories, and the memories of the old folk, to see if we can recall them. The reason is that, in our society, the mechanisms for the transfer of that heritage were not in place. The primitive form of transfer used to be from one generation to the next. A mother or grandmother told the next generation what used to happen, or, through the process of learning, you assimilated those aspects of the sociological environment that were worthy of attention. That is why in Barbados dialect has persisted. It has persisted until now because it was transmitted all along from one generation to the next. It, perhaps, has gone through some refinements, as indeed language has gone through refinements. If you read Chaucer, you will find that the old Saxon and Norman blend has gone through an evolutionary process until we have the refined version that we all speak today, even in Barbados with our own peculiar accents.

I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central speaking of accent, as if it were something big. Obviously, if you are a Barbadian, you are going to sound like a Barbadian. There is a certain mellifluousness of consonants and vowels in a way that only Barbadians can do it, and we know a Barbadian when we hear one, regardless of where he might be. The reason why the honourable Member may be under the illusion why people up north sound more Barbadian is because they are so out of phase with what is going on around them. They are speaking a completely different language as far as the sounds are concerned, and it is easy to identify them, whereas here in Barbados we take it for granted. It is

part and parcel of us, and we take no note of it, but it will hit us on our ear strangely if we hear it in a different cultural environment like in North America. So it is not that people are more Barbadian in North America or sound more Barbadian. It is just that they are speaking Barbadian in an American environment, and consequently the strangeness will suggest itself to your ear and you will know that somebody behind you is from the same place where you are from. In addition to that, part of our cultural identity suggest that when we are in a strange environment, we like to look out and reach out for similarities so that we do not feel isolated and alone.

I would also like to draw Members' attention to another good work on this subject written by Monigham and Glasser, "Beyond The Melting Pot". In seeking to deal with the Negro experience in North America, they were putting forward the thesis that in spite of the commonality of colour, and the commonality of the North American central experience, it was still possible to identify diverse cultures; it was still possible to identify the southern Negro, the northern Negro, the American Italian, the Italian from Sicily, the Jew and the Jew from Brooklyn. These little enclaves or cultural niches are quite evident if you go around in Barbados, in this closed environment — it used to be closed at one stage. If you go to St. Philip, you can hear the Philippines. If you go to St. Lucy, you can hear the "St. Lucyian". I guess that is what you would call him, I do not know. I am a St. Lucyian now too, but I am a transplant. If you go to St. John, there are certain commonalities of expressions that are peculiar or indigenous to St. John. As soon as you hear a man from St. John, if you know him, you can say he is from Todds Corner. This is to suggest that, depending upon the degree of closeness of a particular environment, it is possible for certain character traits to perpetuate themselves in a way that might be startling to us living in a small society such as we have here in Barbados.

5.20 p.m.

The same goes for our cultural transmissions along religious lines. I would also draw Members' attention to another work put forward by a distinguished sociologist, E. Franklin Fraser, who, writing for the Negro church in America, demonstrated the different trends, the different cultural developmental paths along which black religion flowed. The Negro church is a distinct entity from any other sectarian group. You can hear the Fundamental Baptist Church that has given birth to people like Aretha Franklin, who started off in a church environment, singing gospel music in church, and then gradually that expression moved away from the church setting and became part and parcel of the general entertainment milieu. It is possible then to identify people like Aretha Franklin, the soul singer, Ray Charles and those people, and the last great singer, who sings "All Night Long", Lionel Richie, who started off to be a preacher and

evolved into the contemporary folk singer that he is today. These are examples of how tradition establishes itself, and how certain identification patterns emerge within a particular minority group and stamps that group as part and parcel of a larger group, and the evolutionary divergent paths of development can be clearly identified.

In Barbados, our society is infinitely small. I have just been pointing to a few which are clearly identifiable, and there are others which I need not belabour. The point which I am making, and which I hope to leave with Members, is that it is not every part of our experience that we need to celebrate. There are some that need to be discarded because they are not ennobling, they are not uplifting, they are not adding to the heritage and the stock to which we can refer. I think sometimes in talking about cultural expression in Barbados we think in terms of certain things that only a small minority of our society themselves want to commemorate, and it does not really hold a great deal of significance for a lot of us.

The Cultural Foundation, as I understand it, which will be one mechanism through which we can look forward to a gradual and meaningful development of the Barbadian experience in a way that will allow us to put down roots that are clearly identifiable, so that we will not have to search far back in our memories for those things that are.....

Asides.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, your watch seems to get very fast when I am on my feet. Do I have five more minutes?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: My time is up. I think that I will speak again in due course.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, there have been many discourses on the question of culture. We have gone into the area of definitions and distinctions. I do not intend to add to those, but I want to correct a few misimpressions which may have been given during this debate.

First of all, I tend to follow the broad definition of culture as the customs, mores, practices, the arts — industrial and fine — which are characteristic of a people. By that definition all countries have their peculiar culture, and Barbados is no exception. Barbados has a culture. When we start to identify the various aspects of that culture, we will see how Barbadian culture, in its various manifestations, may be distinguished from other cultures.

I do not intend to trace the pre-history and the history of cultural development in Barbados. It used to be said that when sugar was king there was a dearth of cultural expression and cultural manifestation in Barbados. Culture has flourished in many kinds of societies, in different kinds of societies. It has flourished in repressive times and in times when corruption was very rife. I believe that when Michael Angelo was carrying out his paintings on the Sistine chapel in Rome, the Popes at that time were very corrupt, but yet you had one of the greatest efflorescents of culture that the world has ever known.

What we have got to ask ourselves is, how are we going to develop and shape our cultural expression in a way that will result in the total development of this country? We have chosen the road of establishing the National Cultural Foundation and to give a decided impetus from the Government towards cultural expression and cultural development in this country. I believe that in the absence of rich patrons to encourage the arts, it is right that this country should give the kind of stimulation to the arts which may not be forthcoming from other sources, and which in fact might not be desirable to be forthcoming from those sources in the kinds of ways that happen in other societies. Where you have the rich patrons patronising the arts, culture becomes something limited to only a few persons who are wealthy enough to get the artists to work for them and, largely, to reflect their own elitist positions in society. I think it is right and proper that in a developing country such as Barbados the impetus and stimulus for the development of culture must take some kind of State intervention and State direction.

Secondly, when we come to look at the whole question of the National Cultural Foundation, we have got to recognise that already that particular foundation has run into trouble, even though it is in a very early stage. I think it is very unfortunate that already we have had the National Cultural Foundation being subject to ministerial direction which has demonstrated that the Foundation has been, let me put it this way, on the wrong track. I refer to two specific examples. One relates to the question of the themes for NIFCA, as well as the statement coming from the National Cultural Foundation that this was to extend from four years, 1834 through 1838, I believe. The National Cultural Foundation was reversed in public on this particular matter. Attention has been drawn to this already in here. I think it is unfortunate that you can get developments going to that particular stage where the National Cultural Foundation can elaborate its decided policies and programmes and then, as it were, mid-stream, those policies are reversed by ministerial direction.

5.30 p.m.

It so happens that, in this case, I believe that what the Minister was getting at might have been more

appropriate and to the point than the method that the National Cultural Foundation was using. But, to me, it is indicative of the fact that the Government seems not to have been able so far to work out any proper relationship between the Minister and the statutory boards or statutory corporations, including the quango. The National Cultural Foundation was reversed both on the question of its theme as well as in the area of the award of monetary prizes for the NIFCA and that reversal in public and I really have to ask the question, is it that the National Cultural Foundation is going ahead without getting adequate policy directions or is it that the policy directions which the former Minister of Culture, the present Attorney General, would have us believe, have been so carefully elaborated by the Government are being ignored? Something has to be wrong. It is one thing to say that you have an elaborate policy but then find that the policies being pursued by the Cultural Foundation are being overruled in public by the Minister.

I think there is something wrong with the relationship that the Government has with its statutory corporations, and that was evident from the very start when the Government started out by making backbenchers chairmen of statutory corporations. That policy has been discarded quietly without any fanfare.

I wish to refer to another point, and it relates to the charge made by the honourable Member for St. George South that the Democratic Labour Party never related any policy relating to culture. I think we have to put this whole question in perspective. I would say that up to the 1960s, and indeed the 1970s, it was generally felt that culture was not a fit and proper subject on which a Government should be intervening massively in this country and in a lot of other countries as well. There was a time, for instance, if we go back into the history and development of Government, when the main function of Government was largely law and order, keeping the ring around the business people, employers and employees, and when it was thought that Government should keep out of areas such as stimulating industrial development, or agricultural development or whatever it was. The Democratic Labour Party, in its very far-sighted approach for the further development of this country, made a distinct input into this area and changed that whole concept, and gave positive indications that Government had a role to play in the cultural development of the country. That is why NIFCA was established.

I do not know what is this big, elaborate policy that you have to devise in order to get a National Festival of Creative Arts off the ground. I do not know what the Minister wishes to see in this particular regard. We instituted the National Festival of Creative Arts and there was a policy behind it, which was to encourage and stimulate the artistic talent and expression in the

country, so that the customs, the practices, the movements, the dance, the walk, the talk, whatever it may be that really touch the minds, the hearts, and the imagination of people, could be given some kind of expression.

That is policy in action and the National Independence Festival of Creative Arts, from small beginnings developed until we handed over that particular area of public policy to the new Government in 1976.

There was a distinct policy. The very National Development Scholarships to which the Member for St. George South referred, the policy to award them was initiated by the Democratic Labour Party and we started to award scholarships. I recall very well that at least one young Barbadian was sent to a university in Nigeria under a National Development Scholarship, and it was awarded during the time of the Democratic Labour Party. So it is absolutely wrong to give the impression, first of all, that there was no policy in relation to culture, and, secondly that no kinds of awards were made in this particular area, because the facts will not bear that out. That is what I can remember straight out of the top of my head, and I am certain that if the Government would allow me to search the files of the Ministry of Education, which was responsible for Culture at that time, I might be able to find other instances in which persons were given scholarships in order to pursue scholarships in the arts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two minutes more.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I will just refer to our manifesto for 1976. One section is headed "Youth, Sport and Culture."
5.40 p.m.

Asides

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: How can you really say that we paid no attention to culture.

(Hon. L. R. TULL: In Government. What did you do in Government?)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: So when do you think this was devised, when we were out of Government?

(Hon. L. R. TULL: In 1976.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You still have to be in Government to devise it. You only lay down government at the time of change in Governments. That is a precise point there, changing of the guard.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Read what is in it. It has two lines.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We left you on the files a proposal for the construction of a national auditorium as a home for the arts in Barbados. That is what we said. I think they actually submitted a report. It must be somewhere around. I think we said we wanted something like five acres of land, or something like that, for it. It says:

"Assist artists in developing their talents through local and overseas training programmes and through the provision of opportunities for sharing experiences" – (that refers to cultural exchanges and things like that) – "and provide in educational institutions more trained personnel in the arts."

What I would say in my final two minutes, Mr. Chairman, is this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your final one minute. Go ahead.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: It is my belief that at this stage of our development the subject of culture should be in the Ministry responsible for Education, because if we are going to try to develop the culture of this country in a meaningful way, we have to make the greatest impact right down there with those who are in their formative years. It is my feeling that that particular subject should be associated and included in the Ministry responsible for Education. When we have a separate Ministry of Culture, especially with a broad-based definition of culture, you are going to find that the Ministry responsible for Culture is going to get into all kinds of tangles, not only within the Ministry itself but with other ministries which have responsibility for some of the areas. This is one belief that I have. When the Government changes, as a result of the next election, this is one matter that we will be giving specific attention to.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, Item 6 – Supplies and Materials. I should like to enquire from the appropriate Minister what is the policy of the Ministry of Information and Culture on supplies and materials. The reason I query this is because Item 6 seeks a sum of \$10 588 to meet the expenditure for rental of a computer. Earlier on, we saw in an earlier item that they have already paid \$5 104 for the rental of a photocopier, and they were seeking a further \$3 000 for the rental of a photocopier. Therefore, that is \$8 104 being paid for the rental of a photocopier. I wonder what type of photocopier this is that you can pay \$8 000 for its rental. You could have bought about three photocopiers with the \$8 000. It is the same kind of problem you are getting with the computer. There is a rental fee of \$10 588 for a computer, and they go on to say that further sums are expected to be required for this rental policy.

What is the policy of the Ministry towards supplies and materials? Certainly, it does not make sense to me to be paying \$8 000 for the rental of a photocopier. The sum of \$5 104 is provided for the rental of a photocopier. Could someone please inform me about the policy?

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85,
No. 33 - \$2 430 757

HEAD 41 - CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM DIVISION

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

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: (St. Michael West): Subhead 6 of Head 41, Tourism Investment Corporation, I see that a supplementary provision is required for these payments, "the cost of the revision of salaries for employees of the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation and a proportional part of management for Caledonian Hotel Management in respect of Heywoods for the financial year." I have some very serious trepidation about the fact that we are going to be passing public monies to meet the cost of the management fee for Heywoods. I recall very vividly trying to seek some information from the Government, first from the Minister responsible for Finance, but more particularly from the Minister responsible for Tourism, at the time concerning the management contract between Caledonian Hotel Management and the Barbados Government.

The story of the Heywoods Development Project is perhaps sufficiently well known as not to warrant repetition here, but if certain aspects of that project are not reiterated from time to time, it will pass from the consciousness of Barbadians as a result of the effluxion of time and the disinterest which it is customary to see paid to matters of these kinds. I do not believe that the details of the contract between the Caledonian Hotel Management, as it is called in this Resolution, and the Government of Barbados have ever been vouchsafed to this Honourable House.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Never!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I believe that it would be, at the least, prudent for the Government to allow the contract terms to be openly displayed to the people of Barbados. Heywoods is now a fact, and the contractual terms, as I understand them, give the Caledonian people a ten year hegemony over the property. So, in law, this

Government, and succeeding Governments, will have contractual obligations to this management company. 5.50 p.m.

We have made the point before, and we will continue to make the point, that the Caledonian people are better known for their management of airlines than they are for their management of hotels. We cannot state with any certainty that the Caledonian structure, as it is known in Europe, is replete with an over-abundance of management skills in the hotel area. But of course, the Deputy Prime Minister has said that they are in the hospitality industry, and to the extent that Sir Freddie Laker can be said to be in the hospitality industry, so it is with the Caledonian people.

I am not even sure that it would be accurate to describe what has happened in Barbados since Heywoods has opened in any detail, because information regarding the management of Heywoods has not come from any of the officials of the Government of Barbados, neither from the Tourism Investment Corporation, nor from the Minister responsible for Tourism, nor from the Minister responsible for Finance. What information we have gathered from Heywoods is information which we have had to glean from internal sources, newspaper reports and occasional utterances by the management people at Heywoods. But one of the things on which there can now be no dispute is that the entire nature of the project, as conceived by the Democratic Labour Party, was changed, and has been changed so considerably that the objectives which were identified at that time are now way beyond possible achievement by Barbadians and Barbados.

The point has already been made, in debate and outside of this Honourable House, by all of us, that it will be some considerable time before the hotel project itself will be able to offset the tremendous cost at which it was constructed. But being of a socialist mentality myself, I will not hold that against the Government as a principle, although, in terms of the details, we will take the Government to task from time to time. We will acknowledge that the Government, in its own inept way, was trying to pursue a policy of providing employment in an industry which no longer is the subject of discussion as to whether it is an important industry in Barbados. So let us agree that the Government has eschewed the possibility of Barbadians becoming involved at the management level in the properties which collectively make up the Heywoods Project. Let us agree that, whereas we conceived and anticipated that Barbadians would become owners, in a private capacity, of some of the properties, if not all, at Heywoods; and whereas we conceived that therein would have been provided an avenue for investment of a large number of Barbadians, who at the time when we were in office we

understood to be capable of investment because they had surplus funds — a thought which would now not surface given the economic situation in Barbados, because except for a very splendid few, there are not many Barbadians who have surplus funds to the extent that they could invest in properties such as those which have been constructed in the Heywoods compound — let us agree that even if the Government in its wisdom, as the Deputy Prime Minister has boasted from time to time, changed the concept of the hotel, it is still desirable that we do a comparative analysis between the process which occurred in the construction and the development of the Hilton property and the process which is occurring in the construction and development of the Heywoods Project.

If one talked in terms of comparative costs, one would discover that the Heywoods Project is really a quantum leap away from the Hilton Project. The Hilton Project, even though we were never satisfied with the profits which accrued from the Hilton, can still boast, from its inception to the present, a successful arrangement between Government and the management people.

Perhaps I may be accused of being premature if I attempted to seek specific information on the profitability of the project and the success of the management today. So I am going to suspend the judgment, especially on the management aspect, in so far as it applies to profit-taking, or potential for profit-taking. I am going to eschew that in the interest of our national development, because they have only been open for a relatively short time and the management has been afflicted by continuing series of interferences from the political directorate, interferences which may have been motivated by the most noble Barbados Labour Party pursuits but which may not have been in the national interest, as viewed by a patriot.

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I hear an honourable Member making references to certain freenesses which may have been imposed on that property by the political directorate. But I am not going in that direction for the time being. I am going to say that there has been interference — there is no question that there has been interference with the management — and what I am saying has come not from idle gossip so much as it has come from North American sources which are in contact, at the highest levels, with the parent organization responsible for providing the service.

I asked before, and I did not have the benefit of a response, but my understanding is that the Caledonian contract at Heywoods calls for the Government to pay \$500 000 as a management fee plus 22 per cent of the

gross operating profit. It is my understanding that the Government also put out a pre-opening promotional expenses package of \$1 million, and that the contract is for ten years. As I said, I sought to get that information in the past and it has not come, so if I gave the figures that I have, perhaps the Minister of Finance will correct me if I am wrong, and in so doing bring to the country the information surrounding the management contract with Caledonian. I will say that it must have been a strange kind of pressure which would have allowed the Government to agree to \$500 000 as a management fee per annum plus 22 per cent of gross operating profit. Because if that is true, and I have every reason to believe it to be so, it means that there is no incentive on the part of the managers to insist on a net profit.
6.00 p.m.

No one expects Heywoods to make a net profit in the first year or the second year, but some time during a ten year period it would not be unreasonable for the citizens of Barbados to expect some kind of net profit out of a property which has cost us \$60 million on the face of it, plus God knows how many millions arising since the opening. I am not even going to try to castigate the Government, or put the Government to the test, for negotiating this contract in this way, because you will recall that at the time when the contract was given out there was a strong requirement for the Government to have a definitive statement as to the opening of Heywoods. What I find difficult to understand is that at the same time there was a local company which, in the bid for the same contract, had offered to carry out the management services for a fee of \$250 000 per annum, plus a percentage of the gross operating profit after the initial three years — and the bid was refused. In other words, they would have settled for a quarter of a million dollars for the first three years of the operation, and they would then have asked for a percentage of the gross operating profit after the first three years. In a hotel of that size, three years would be a reasonable period for the start up difficulties which all businesses have to be solved. So it is difficult to understand how that particular bid was refused, although I remember that, inferentially, it may have been the Minister of Finance who, in a speech indicated that the Barbadian interests who had made a bid for the management of the Heywoods Hotel had been deficient in the alacrity with which they paid their taxes or their dues to the Government. If I have misrepresented the Minister of Finance I would stand corrected, but I know it was a Minister of the Government. If it was not him, it was the Deputy Prime Minister but one of the two.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member has invited my elucidation. I am straining my memory. I think this is the first I have heard that a Barbadian company made a bid for a management con-

tract, far from ever having pronounced on it one way or the other.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not know if perhaps the new Companies Act had not come in and Roger Seymour was not incorporated, but my information is that he was a prime mover in the company that was bidding, and that Silver Sands, having been behind in the payment of an 8% Sales Tax, that knocked him out of the bidding. But if the Prime Minister understands that my use of the term "Barbadian" here applies only to a native-born Barbadian, then I would say that the company of which he is a prime mover would still qualify as a Barbadian company if it is incorporated here.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am now being corrected, and I am being told that he is at least as Barbadian as the Minister of Tourism who sat on our side and the Minister of Tourism who now sits on their side, so I do not know what the Prime Minister would be talking about.

(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I was his lawyer and I had to fight for him).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I am being given perhaps another reason why he did not get the contract. I am being told that the Prime Minister was once his lawyer. It may very well be that the Government has come around to understanding why the Democratic Labour Party Administration thought that the gentleman ought to have left. Anyhow, the point I am making is that, be that as it may, having been accorded the status of Barbadian, he would be accorded all the rights and privileges of that status.

I am not saying that he or his company should have been given the contract. I would be interested to know why a Barbadian concern would have failed to win a contract for the management of hotels where that Barbadian concern had demonstrated expertise in the management of hotels, and Caledonian, which had not demonstrated that particular perspicacity in the area of hotel management, was able not only to win the contract, but was able to win it at something like twice the price of the management fee.

We also believe that one of the problems with Caledonian and Heywoods is that while Caledonian is managing Heywoods, given their method of operating, with their filling of their other properties by way of their charter business, they are likely to draw on precisely the tourist market in Europe which formerly filled the much smaller Barbadian-owned hotels with European travellers. To the extent that Europeans come to Barbados in the face of the very difficult times they are having with European currencies, and especially the British pound,

they are likely to stay at the Heywoods Project in preference to, and in detriment of, a number of smaller properties in Barbados that before now enjoyed their particular patronage.

That in itself may not be a totally accurate statement, in that Caledonian has done some North American promotion, and I have noticed that packages from North America have been coming in to Heywoods. I do not wish to be unfair in my criticism, even though criticism it is, but I invite the Prime Minister in his capacity as Prime Minister to take an active interest in the kind of promotion which the Heywoods Project, through Caledonian, is perpetrating in North America. There is the very strong possibility that one of the ills which we battled with in the Sixties, and which to a large extent we have managed to eliminate, has been creeping back into Barbados' tourism economics, perhaps because the management — here meaning Caledonian — of Heywoods may not be sufficiently aware that this was an area that we had to fight and win. I am speaking here of the very strong possibility that substantial sums of money which ought to accrue as a result of packages from North America to Heywoods will remain in North America while the people themselves would come into Barbados. I say that quite seriously.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I regret that, Sir, but I understand.
6.10 p.m.

I say, quite seriously, that we must be extremely careful to ensure that whatever kind of promotion we do, this very high-priced project redounds to the benefit of Barbados by way of making sure that every single cent that should be retained in Barbados is retained. When package tours come into Barbados and the packages are paid for outside of Barbados, and certain ancillary services which are provided in Barbados are deemed to have been paid for outside of Barbados, the beneficiaries of that particular tourism cannot be Barbadian but must necessarily be persons in North America.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few more comments to make on Heywoods, but my time first time around is up, so I will give way to someone else and come back again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wishes to make a contribution on this one?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): I have to watch the tactics. The fellows are sitting down and not talking. We cannot let this slip through like that, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that, having spoken about the nature of the investment at Heywoods on so many occasions on the floor of this House, the most appropriate speech that I can make would probably be summed up in four words, "I told you so!" We shall be hearing in a very short period of time what a wonderful performance during this particular season the Heywoods Project is enjoying, what high levels of occupancy there are, but, at the same time, we will not be told that already in the first year of its operation the taxpayers of this country are being asked for contributions to the extent of \$6 254 355, mainly because of Heywoods.

Looking at the matter in the broadest perspective, I have always said that you cannot build a hotel in Barbados for over \$60 million and ever expect that investment to make a profitable return. I believe that the World Bank recognized the problems that we were heading for, and that accounted for the difficulties which the Government had with the World Bank in the later stages of that particular project. So I am not surprised that we are being called upon this year to pump over \$6 million into it, because, make no mistake, this whole business of grants and subventions to the Tourism Investment Corporation has not been caused by the Hilton Hotel, and the only other substantial investment in that area is the Heywoods Development.

We should be seeing more and more of these Resolutions coming before this Honourable Chamber from year to year, and we will gradually be paying for it in one form or another. We will find that when you have that kind of investment where no reasonable person can expect a reasonable rate of return, when you have buried that amount of capital in that kind of investment, then somebody has to pay for it in the long run. It is as simple as that.

We are being told that the Government is coming to this House to ask for money to make payments for the insurance of buildings and the Property Tax for Heywoods. I believe that these things should normally come out of the operating expenses of any hotel. Hotels have to pay their insurance and their Property Tax out of their earnings, but the taxpayers will pay these in the case of Heywoods. Hotels have to pay their full promotional costs, but, of course, Heywoods gets the substantial benefit of the substantial sums that we spend on tourist promotion from the public purse.

We have now created yet another public corporation and we are pouring more money down another public corporation, so we now have to find additional money to meet the costs of employees of the Barbados Investment Corporation and, what I think is most outrageous of all, a proportionate part of the management fees for Caledonian Hotel Management. I am going to make sure that I stay here and vote against this Resolu-

tion. I am going to vote against it as a matter of principle. The only thing that would stop me from voting against it is if the Minister of Finance can give to this Honourable House the details of that management contract. We have asked for it again and again. We have had all sorts of information about it; the honourable Member for St. Michael West has just given the best information available to him, and I think that if the public is being called upon to make a contribution to the management fees of Caledonian Hotel Management in respect of Heywoods, then this House should know what are the terms of that contract. This can be no secret. It can only be in the public interest, since we are all, in a sense, responsible for the management of the public purse. The Government is there to allocate the resources and we, on this side, are charged with the responsibility, as a democratic Opposition or an Opposition in a democratic country, to ensure that those resources are allocated in the best interest of the country.

We also want to know what is the present overall level of indebtedness of the Heywoods Project. Or, if that indebtedness is buried in the Tourism Investment Corporation, what is the total level of indebtedness that is attributable to the Heywoods Project. We would want to know what operational losses have been sustained over the first year. We would want to know not only of the indebtedness in relation to the long term liabilities, but we would want to know what level of overdrafts they are currently operating with before we can come to a decision that we should support a Resolution to throw this amount of the public money into Heywoods Project again.

We know that there were times when the Heywoods Project had problems in paying their Light and Power bill. As a matter of fact, in two different fora I have heard it said that, were it not a Government organization and were it not a by-election coming up, the Light and Power would have shut off the lights. I would imagine that if they have that kind of problem, they must be operating on a very tight string.

6.20 p.m.

I would also like to have some indication of what impact the opening of Heywoods has had on the many small hotels in Barbados, many hotels which have been financed by the Barbados Development Bank. It is my certain knowledge that, for most of 1984, rates were charged at Heywoods that were competing with small hotels on the south coast of Barbados. I have known people to move out of small properties and go down to Heywoods and pay less than they were paying to small properties on the south coast. This means that those hoteliers are suffering. They are suffering because you have built a luxury hotel and in order to create an artificial occupancy, you are charging rates which are unprofitable.

When the taxpayers have to come and vote this kind of money, \$6 million approximately, in the first year, next year it will be more and the following year it will be more. It will be more for evermore, from the nature of that investment, while at the same time, I will bet you that, within three months, the same taxpayers are going to be called upon, through their Government, to guarantee further loans to the Barbados Development Bank in order to stabilize the same small hotels which have been undermined by the particular development in the north. I confidently expect to hear that the Barbados Development Bank will be seeking more money in order to reschedule the loans made to the small hoteliers, which have been weakened by the competition supplied by Heywoods offering rates at a luxury hotel that are about the same, and sometimes less, than rates charged by other properties on the south coast.

It is for this kind of reason that I believe that we have to look very carefully at what steps we take in public investment. What is happening here is that we have not only created problems within the tourist industry, we have not only created other debts in terms of the long term liabilities for Heywoods, but as I have said again and again, this thing has become a charge on the taxpayers already in the first year of operation — and God knows what other short term liabilities they have in terms of overdrafts! This is a serious matter.

That Government strayed away from the original project as conceived by the Democratic Labour Party. They decided that they must borrow big and build big. Of course, they borrowed big, they decided to build big, and now they are losing big — and they are coming to Parliament for big money in order to keep that afloat. How long can we go on expanding the public sector in this way, creating further debts on the people of Barbados, calling on them to pay more and more taxes and to be throwing that money down the drain year after year?

There is no private company that I know about in Barbados or anywhere in the world that would come to Barbados or anywhere in the world and build a \$60 million hotel as a resort hotel. You might find that sort of investment in a hotel in the centre of London or in the centre of New York, or in the centre of a major city like Texas or in California. But I know of no resort, which often depends on seasonal inflow of visitors, where you could build that kind of hotel at that kind of money and hope to come up with a profit.

With a 13 per cent return on gross sales, you would be doing well in the hotel industry. Do you realize when you build a \$60 million hotel, what kind of sales you have to generate in order to service that loan, far less make a profit? Just think about it. It boggles the mind. Any hotel that can make 13 per cent return on gross

sales, that hotel is doing well. And I am talking about over time, because the nature of the hotel industry is such that nearly every three years or so, you need substantial capital investment for refurbishing and that kind of thing. That benchmark or that indicator of 13 per cent, I understand, is pretty average for the industry throughout the world, and with a resort centre you probably have to look to have some 14 per cent or 15 per cent on your gross sales. Just work out what kind of sales you would have to generate at Heywoods! I would say you probably have to sell in the region of \$70 million to \$100 million per year in order for Heywoods to be ever profitable. In other words, you have to sell \$70 million or thereabouts in terms of food, beverages, room sales and sales of other services at Heywoods in order to end up with a profit in order to amortize that loan, and make a profit. It is impossible.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We have to ask ourselves, what cost of infrastructure is justifiable if you remove the notion of profitability? Employment Generation? If \$10 million had been put in the Barbados Development Bank to try to stabilize the small hotels in Barbados two years ago, and therefore allow them to reduce rates, more jobs would have been saved in Barbados than those created by Heywoods Development up north. If this \$6 million were being put in the Barbados Development Bank now to help stabilize the situation then more jobs would be saved, if those loans are rescheduled and the pressure is taken off the small hoteliers in Barbados.

We say we have spent the money for infrastructural development, one of these vague notions. I say, yes, let us have some infrastructural development, but let it be realistic. I agree with the World Bank, and I agree with the more reasonable people in the Barbados Labour Party who must concede today that those costs got out of hand. I believe that the Honourable Minister of Finance, who from time to time looks objectively at these matters, must share some of the concerns which I have expressed before this House. We have to be careful of these kinds of public investments, because in the long run, the cost to the country is not worth the benefits.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, very briefly. I listened to the Member for St. Michael West when he made his first reference about the Heywoods Hotel and proudly boasted that the hotel was conceived by the Democratic Labour Party. At the time the figures projected that the hotel would have cost some \$40 million.

(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Twenty-eight million dollars!)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the speech by the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes)

condemns the building of Heywoods Hotel. On the other hand, the Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) lauded the idea of the Heywoods Project: they were the people who gave birth to it, it was their vision that a hotel should be built in the north of the country! Now we do not know where to go. It is out of these arguments that I have never really taken the Opposition Members' arguments very seriously.

6.30 p.m.

They come on the floor of the House and make some very wild accusations. For example, the Member for St. Michael West told me this evening that the postmen had even received their letters — if I may digress for one moment — to dismiss them from the post office at Eagle Hall. I promptly called the Postmaster General and asked him if this was true. He said to me, to quote him: "It is impossible. There is no truth in that. Furthermore, we are taking on some."

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: I never told the honourable Member that any postmen were being dismissed. I said that letters had been received to the extent that the post office at Eagle Hall will be closed and they will be transferred to town. To say that I said they would be dismissed is totally inaccurate.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He said that they had received letters that they were going to be dismissed from the post office at Eagle Hall and it was going to be closed. I called the Postmaster General and he said it was not true. I called my colleague to speak to the Postmaster General and he said that whatever the Postmaster General said was all right with him. Now where do we go from here?

I believe that all Barbadians can be justly proud of having a stake in a project of the magnitude of Heywoods. I see Barbadians flock down there. The project is owned by Barbadians. I think the Government owns some 51 per cent, if I am not mistaken.

My information is that there is no truth in the statement that there are any cut-rates at Heywoods that would in any way affect the small hotels in Barbados. There is a winter rate, as I understand it, by all hotels — the period which people refer to as the season — and out of season there is a summer rate. There is no rate lower than the other hotels for the purpose of putting the other hotels out of business. I am very, very happy to have read in the papers where Heywoods themselves, Caledonian management, had to rent another hotel to put up guests. It is a clear-cut demonstration of the management skills of the Caledonian group.

I would hate for the idea to go down in the minds of Barbadians that Heywoods is the white elephant which the prophets of gloom and doom have always

been predicting it would be. There is absolutely nothing that we have done in a project that is right. I want to laud the Government, the management and the Minister, for taking that bold step, in very trying times in the tourist season within the last two years, of opening Heywoods and to see it on its feet. I have no doubt in my mind that any money put into an investment would take some years before you see some real profit on it, and I really cannot support my colleagues on the other side when they get up and say that they are going to vote against the Resolution.

The \$500 000 which you are talking about is a management fee, and it is simply that it was not put in the Estimates at the time that the agreement was made between Caledonian and the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation. There are uniforms and other pieces of equipment which they had to bring in, and this is why we are seeking the additional \$500 000.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): This is not my Ministry, but I do have access to some information about Heywoods. And since we are virtually in an interregnum if the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Hon. A. Truss) does not mind my saying so, I should perhaps give the Cabinet's answer to the assaults that have been made upon the Heywoods arrangement.

First of all, the plan for Heywoods that was formalized between the World Bank and the Democratic Labour Party Government proved to be a bad plan. I am not blaming the Government but it was a bad plan. I have said on numerous occasions that the concept of having seven different hotels with Barbadians leasing each would prove to be unsatisfactory, and so it proved, and they did not get an adequate number of applications to run the hotels.

Secondly, the cost was much under-estimated by the World Bank and the Government of that day, and the World Bank declined to increase its investment. The total cost perhaps as was envisaged in 1976 may have been \$40 million; the ultimate cost was \$60 million. Nonetheless, it was not an arrangement that the Government felt it should renege from, and it is significant that at no time did the Opposition vote against the sums of money being provided to carry on Heywoods Project. If they are now criticizing it, they are criticizing for criticizing sake, because they did not put their money where the mouth of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central now is.

Thirdly, on the question of the management contract fees, the arrangement is that from June 1, 1983 Caledonian Hotel Management would be paid US\$200 000 for each of the two years and then paid 22½ per cent of the gross operating profit. This contrasts very favourably with the contract negotiated by the

Democratic Labour Party with the Hilton Hotel, in which they agreed to pay Hilton 33 1/3 per cent of the gross operating profit. Our contract is for 22½ per cent.

Fourthly, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is asserting, with some force, that the hotel will never make money, and he wanted to know what kind of money it would have to make to help pay off a debt of \$60 million. There is such a thing as equity and such a thing as loans. I would not have to explain those to the House. The Government has provided a part of the cost by way of equity of the Tourism Investment Corporation in Heywoods, just as at the Hilton. All of the cost of the Hilton was in fact absorbed by the Government, and the operations at the Hilton, as such, have never been called on to face interest charges.

The budget of Caledonian Hotel Management has run very close to actual realization. Thus, in November, the budget was that the total sales would be \$920 000; they were just over \$1 million. It was budgeted then that there would be a gross operating loss in November; there was a gross operating loss, but less than anticipated. In December, the budget was that Heywoods would take in \$1.843 million; it has taken in nearly \$1.846 million. During December Heywoods made not only a gross operating profit, but a net operating profit of \$200 000 also. It is projected that during January, Heywoods will make a net operating profit of half million dollars, and that this month, February, Heywoods will make a net operating profit of \$750 000. So much for the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central!

6.40 p.m.

The Hilton, in fact, is making a profit at the moment, but for the period under review the Government has not been able to collect anything from the Hilton and we have been in the habit of paying the insurance premiums on the Hilton — that is a responsibility of the Government, not the people who lease it — the Hilton and Heywoods are on the same basis — we have been in the habit of paying insurance premiums out of our collections from the Hilton. They have not been sufficient, and we need \$120 000 approximately to pay the insurance on the Hilton.

Most of the other sums required in this admittedly large supplementary have specific explanations, and this would be also true of the Capital supplementary. Heywoods was not envisaged originally as the top class, four star hotel that it has become. Heywoods has restaurant facilities which, in my opinion, by far exceed those in any other hotel in Barbados. It is the largest hotel and it has the largest area. It offers a very high level of service. If they wish my opinion, and I am not a hotelier, it is that they are charging too little for the rooms. That quality hotel requires a higher average room rate, in my opinion. But that is for the new Minister, and

the new Minister can hear my opinion, accept it, reject it, or whatever. I am just giving a view that the standard of Heywoods is too high for its average room rate at present.

There are a number of things that are needed at Heywoods — better staff, uniforms, office equipment, — because they are doing so much more business, and they are doing business in a centralised way that, for example, they have to replace the whole laundry. The laundries in Barbados are at the moment making an absolute fortune out of Heywoods, and they need to expand their laundry facilities so they can do their own laundry, and all this involves money.

I must tell you that, far from the jeremiads of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I think we should be expressing our astonishment that Heywoods can be making operating profits at all at this time, when we bear in mind the fact that it is a new hotel, it is still going through its promotional stages, and it is a hotel with expensive facilities. From Caledonian Hotel Management's point of view, they are making a contribution to the interest charges. They are paying their own management fees, of course. The net operating profit is net of the management fee; although we have to vote it in here, it is still ultimately in the accounts and it will still accrue to Government.

I think that although we are some years from being out of the wood with Heywoods, we really should not be complaining and assuming that Heywoods is in a terrible condition and will be a permanent drain upon the Government. It is a valuable addition to the tourist plant of Barbados, and a valuable addition to development of the north of the island. When the road from Mile and a Quarter to the airport via Warrens is completed, I believe it will become even more attractive. Work will very shortly start, I am told, on the first section of that road from Mile and a Quarter going south, and then access to Heywoods will be better. I think that instead of criticising Heywoods and threatening to vote against it and vote against its budget, we should be congratulating the Tourism Investment Corporation particularly, even more than the management. The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, the Deputy Prime Minister, has been making sure that the management's eyes are drawn to the ball on which they should be fixed, and that the management does not run away with the idea that it has to do nothing except collect the management fee, albeit only for the first two years.

The honourable Member, of course, is free to vote against the employment of several hundred people and the development of the north. There would be nothing extraordinary in that for either the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central or the Democratic Labour Party, which in its time as Opposition has managed to vote

against the Electoral and Boundaries Commission and against the Plantation Tenancies Act to give the plantation tenants the right to buy their spots. Vote against Heywoods! Do it by all means! I challenge you to vote against Heywoods and then go in St. Peter in the fullness of time and defend that!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir: I have made it clear on behalf of the Opposition that we will vote against this measure unless we are given details of the management contract, the Caledonian management, so you are not going to get away with that kind of distortion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. A. TRUSS (St. Michael Central): Mr. Chairman, Subhead 6 deals with Grants to Public Institutions. The Prime Minister dealt at length and in detail with many of the things that were raised by speakers on the other side, namely, the honourable Members for St. Michael West and St. Michael South Central, but there are one or two things which I would like to draw to the attention of this House.

In relation to the speech made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, the Prime Minister has correctly dealt with the management contract. CHM controls basically two positions at Heywoods. They control the position of General Manager and that of Financial Controller. But those positions were advertised in Barbados and in the Caribbean to see if there were persons capable of handling jobs of that magnitude in the largest hotel in Barbados. Since there were not filled, we turned to CHM and they offered their expertise.

In relation to the point made that CHM has no expertise at all in this hotel management, it is only fair to point out that that is not really true. CHM owns and runs hotels in the Far East, in Africa and in Europe — Barbados is not the only place. So we approached CHM against the background of a certain amount of expertise which they had on the international scene.

The Prime Minister already dealt with the change in the original concept from the time the Democratic Labour Party thought of the idea until it developed to the point where we decided to go the full route and have one management company to deal with it. One Barbadian company — I think the name was Hotel and Tourism Consultants Limited — put in a bid, but several things were wrong with that bid. Firstly, the hotel they were running was in financial difficulty, they were in arrears with their PAYE contributions, National Insurance, and the bank overdraft was so high that they certainly could not meet interest payments. The big question was, if you were a management consultant and the hotel to which you are assigned is in such a terrible state, how

is it then that you feel yourself competent enough to apply to be a management consultant for the largest hotel in Barbados? Secondly, their proposal was incomplete. Thirdly, there was a definite failure to demonstrate to the Board how they could effectively market the Heywood's Project overseas. Fourthly, their projections were totally unrealistic. They were over ambitious in their projections because they wanted to get the management contract, and the Government and the Board of Tourism recognized that this was so. It is for all those reasons that the contract was awarded to CHM.
6.50 p.m.

I must say, though, that all jobs other than the ones which I mentioned and three others, are held by Barbadians. The additional three posts, Food and Beverage Manager, Chief Engineer and the Chef were also advertised in Barbados. So, in effect, of the hundreds of people that work at Heywoods, five people are ex-patriots — the General Manager, the Financial Controller, the Food and Beverage Manager, the Chief Engineer and the Chef. Every other person is Barbadian, and Barbadians had the opportunity to apply for the post of Food and Beverage Manager, Chief Engineer and the Chef but could not meet the criteria that was recommended for one of the largest hotels in the island.

The principle of a management contract, as has been pointed out by the Prime Minister, was established by the Democratic Labour Party, when they were in power, with the Hilton Hotel. And in relation to some of the matters raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, let me say that all funds must be deposited in the local Heywoods operating account, which is at the Barbados National Bank. The CHM cannot, under the agreement, have an account operating outside of Barbados. The Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation has copies of all two operating contracts so they can monitor and control the movement of the General Manager of CHM.

It is not unusual for the Government to be paying the insurance for Heywoods. When the Democratic Labour Party was in power and they built the Hilton, they also established that principle, they paid the insurance for the Hilton under a similar management contract. We have followed the wisdom of the Democratic Labour Party, based on the expertise which they had demonstrated over the 15 years that they were in Government, and figured that this was possibly one of the best ways of handling this. So when the Opposition says that this is not a good thing, surely one would have to examine their own record when they were in power against what they are now saying. When they were in power they paid the insurance for the Hilton and allowed the management of the Hilton to run the hotel. In our Administration, we pay the insurance for

Heywoods and allow CHM to operate and run the management of Heywoods.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talked about the loss in the first year. I understand, both as a politician and a businessman, that it is always difficult when one has to face the people and say that we have lost money. As a private businessman, if you lose money it is not a good thing. If you cannot make your ends meet as a professional, it is not a good thing. And when you are dealing with the public funds and you have to operate in the Government and you lose money in any particular area for any period of time, it is not a good thing. But let us be realistic. To be critical, surely, is not the answer. To give alternative solutions to the possible problems which we have to face is the answer.

When the Hilton started, for the first three years it lost money. The quantity of money is relative only to what took place in 1965 when the Hilton was built. The point is that Heywoods, being a new hotel, took some time to be established and gain international recognition. These are facts.

Secondly, as a result of some delays, Heywoods had advertised itself for specific opening dates stating that they had certain things in the hotel, which were not there. I am dealing now with the point made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in relation to the cutting of prices. It is true to say that Heywoods cut prices, but they cut prices only at the beginning when they started operation, because the hotel was not completed, in the first place, neither were the grounds completed. So in order to avoid having the tourists sue the hotel, which they could, for false advertising, and to keep the tourists happy, a decision was made to give a reduction on the rate as advertised in the form of compensation for the hotel not being completed and the grounds not being completely finished. Basically, business principles applied here.

You must also weigh this against the background of the international recession, in which, as the Prime Minister pointed out, a hotel, well-run, and well established like the Hilton could lose money in 1982/83. In the summer of 1984, Heywoods did not measure up to the projections, they lost money, but as a result of the winter trade which we are presently seeing, with an occupancy of 85 per cent which they are presently enjoying, it is an indication that the hotel is becoming well known internationally and that CHM is doing a good job in terms of marketing the facility.

Another point is that if you use last year and this year to comment on any aspect of business, it is not fair. You can always take a period of five years when

one talks of a hotel or a business. In fact, even in medicine or in law graphically you have your ups and you have your downs. You cannot use a year like 1981, which was a bumper year in this country, as a base year. By the same token, you cannot use a year like 1984, which was not a good year, as a base year. I do believe that Members on the other side are honest enough, intelligent enough and realistic enough to understand the problems that we face in Barbados, and that the tourist industry face internationally.

In relation to the hotels and why they lose money over the first two years, this relates to the principle involved in signing a contract for \$500 000 for the first two years and 22½ per cent for the remaining eight years, from year 3 to year 10.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation I am still not quite clear. Is it \$500 000 for year 1, \$500 000 for year 2, and after that no more \$500 000 but only 22 per cent? When the Prime Minister spoke on the matter, he was not clear, and you are not clear now.

Hon. A. TRUSS: Let me be perfectly clear. First of all, it is not 22 per cent it is 22½ per cent. It is Bds. \$500 000 for the first year, and it is Bds. \$500 000 for the second year. There is no further payment after that. The 22½ per cent becomes operational from year 3 through year 10 on the gross operating profit. That is all you will get. If it is more than \$500 000, that is because it is reflected in the accounts. If it is less than \$500 000, that is also because it is reflected in the accounts. I dare say that the idea of establishing the \$500 000 mark was because it was expected that in the first few years the hotel would lose money, and that by year 3 the hotel would begin to make money. I hope that you are now clear on this whole question.
7.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 7.00 o'clock.

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 7.45 p.m. this evening for dinner.

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

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

7.02 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. J. G. ODLE took the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, Head 41, among other things deals with Heywoods, which is a *fait accompli*. Heywoods is now in existence in St. Peter, and we, as the people's representatives, are entitled to have certain facts about Heywoods and its projections for our own peace of mind, and so that we can pass on information to the taxpayers of Barbados at any time that they need it.

I do not think that the Right Honourable Prime Minister and Minister of Finance was quite as full with his information as he could have been. In fact, it could be very misleading to the people of Barbados when he, citing the projections of Heywoods, let us know that Heywoods is projecting for the month of December, a net profit of some \$200 000; in January, a net profit of some \$500 000; and in February about \$750 000, because all of us are well aware that these are the months of what we call the high season in the tourist industry. It would be a lot more complete and satisfying to us on this side if, at the same time he was vouchsafing this information, he had given us the projection right through the summer season for Heywoods.

The figures for Heywoods during the summer season, although for the first year, would still be able to be used as some base that we can look forward to in the next couple of years. Certainly, big organizations like these would have made projections for at least a three year period. It would be a lot more meaningful if the projections for Heywoods over the next three years could have been given to us on this side so that we would really be at ease with the facts and the expectations of Heywoods. These snips of information given to us, I am certain is intended to paint a picture of success for Heywoods. But we should not paint this

picture, and turn this picture over to the people of Barbados, if this picture is only partially a very small part of the whole.

It would also be of interest if we could have got some idea of the length of time over which you propose to amortize the initial capital outlay on Heywoods, so that we could really be a little bit more conversant and be at ease. It is creating jobs. It is adding to the tourist stock. At what cost? It is almost certain that the taxpayers of this country will have to subsidize Heywoods for some time. What we are asking ourselves is, what length of time are we thinking of, and what are the realistic projections for Heywoods coming out of that period?

The honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) said that we should always be happy and proud to be part and part-owners of the beautiful structure at Heywoods. We are. But if it is going to mean that the taxpayer will have to be continually digging into his pocket year after year, there is going to come a time when that pride which he had in Heywoods is going to disappear, and the harsh realities of having to pull out of your pocket hard dollar bills to support pride come to bear.

I would really like, on this occasion, so that in future when we are dealing with Heywoods we can let it slide, if the appropriate Minister, be it the new Minister or the Minister of Finance, would give full information to the House so that we would be more at ease and conversant with the overall projection of financing policies of Heywoods.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the moment I see you look that way, I have to let you hear my voice. I would like to respond to a few remarks made by both the Right Honourable Prime Minister and the new Minister of Tourism.

I think the picture is generally coming across. I think the Minister of Tourism did a lot more to enlighten the House in terms of the realities of the situation. He pointed out that substantial operational losses have been incurred to date, and he certainly did a lot to erase the disservice done both to this House and to the country when the Prime Minister, who is capable of fluctuating between blows and extreme blows, got up and gave us the earnings of Heywoods for the three months, November, December and January, and sought to make us believe that this is the general pattern to be expected in any given year or what obtained before those three months. That was quite naughty, and quite wrong indeed to do.

We have now got some information on the contract between Caledonian Hotel Management Company and Heywoods. But this is on the surface, because what is meant by "operating profits." Is it the gross sales minus the cost of sales? Does the cost of sales include the interest payments on current overdraft? Does the cost of sales include any part of the long term debt of the company? It all depends on the accounting principles which would be followed in relation to that contract. In other words, let us assume that the gross sales happen to be \$12 million; and the cost of sales happen to be in any given year \$8 million, then you can have an operating profit of \$4 million. But if to service the long term loan then you have an interest payment of \$3 million or \$4 million, and that is included in your cost of sales, then that profit is down to \$1 million. So it is important for us to know exactly what accounting principles will be used in dealing with the operating expenses.

7.55 p.m.

When it comes to, public finances, you have to be very careful. If I bought a hotel for \$1 million, I would know that, in any given year, I have to look at my gross sales, the cost of those sales, what I paid to the commercial banks, and what I paid the Barbados Development Bank in terms of the interest payments and capital repayments on my long term loan to look at my true profit at the end of the year. How the accounting would be handled to arrive at an operating profit of which 22 per cent would be paid is of interest to me, because that is of critical importance when you are dealing with an investment of this size.

Much has been said about the Hilton Hotel. There can be no doubt that the Hilton Hotel, over time, has been of substantial benefit to this country, and certainly no drain whatsoever on the taxpayers of Barbados.

There comes the time when you have to face the harsh reality, and the harsh reality is that I am more fortified tonight than at any other time that there is no way that out of earnings from that project you will be able to pay off that loan and get a return on your \$60 million investment. I will strongly advise the Government to face that reality up front, recognise that you have pumped \$60 million into it, and for the sake of the project convert whatever Government loans there might be there into equity at an early stage and try to inject further equity into the project in order to reduce that debt equity ratio. There is nothing worse for the people who have to work in a project of that kind to find themselves working year after year, and because of unsatisfactory debt equity ratio they can never generate any retained earnings and year after year you have to be coming back to Parliament for more and more money. In the long run, the whole morale of the project will come to an all time low. I say this in the light of the experiences of several other Government projects in Barbados which have

been plagued over the years with relatively low equity input and high loans. You see the way in which the managers of those projects have floundered over the years under poor morale as a result of their inability to make a profit, no matter how hard they try.

I am satisfied that my assessment is absolutely correct in that the taxpayers will not only be putting out \$6 million this year, but they will be paying that money for many a year to come. I cannot see any circumstances in which Heywoods will be generating the kind of income to meet the cycle of new capital investment which is an integral part of the entire hotel industry. As I said, there are cycles of three years where major capital outlays have to be made, and that first three-year cycle is almost already upon Heywoods. So in that \$6 million you are going to find elements of capital expenditure and other elements of expenditure, and it is going to come up again.

I believe that it would be much better for the Government to say it over-spent by \$20 million, it has an uneconomic project, it has to sink X amount of taxpayers' funds into the project up front, it has to regard it as infrastructural development, and that hopefully, the next 40 or 50 years it might be of some benefit to Barbados. Deal with those problems up front. You have to face the criticisms, because the mistakes have already been made. It has nothing to do with the Democratic Labour Party, nothing whatsoever. The present project at Heywoods is a completely different project from the one conceived by the Democratic Labour Party. The final cost was such that no Barbadian could lease the property. They would be better off buying a hotel, because they would have to lease the properties at somewhere in the region of \$360 000 a year.

Government certainly has to consider whether there is not a better kind of arrangement that might well be made with one of the major hotel chains, where that chain will also have some obligation of generating levels of profitability which will go, to some extent, to service the long term loan and also address itself to the whole question of return on equity investment. Because what we have heard here presented to us is a situation where \$60 million in loan capital and equity capital is left in mid-air. That is not addressed at all — you are talking purely about the operating expenses on an annual basis. That is all that is presented here so far to this Honourable House as far as I know.

That kind of thinking underlies almost all the projects financed in the public sector in Barbados. Nobody seems to care so long as they can come up here with accounts or suggestions of profitability, concealed largely by the contributions of the taxpayers from time to time, and face the occasional embarrassment by having to come to Parliament late in the evening. No one seems

to care to look and see whether or not these projects are fundamentally viable projects in themselves. That is why I have raised the very fundamental question as to whether or not, for a much smaller outlay, even the \$6 million outlay we are talking about today, we could have not secured 700 jobs or prevent 700 job losses in Barbados. We spent \$60 million creating 700 jobs and probably 2 000 or 3 000 have gone elsewhere. That kind of thinking is fundamentally wrong, and it is going to land this country into more and more trouble as we look further down the road.

One final point, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member's time has expired.
8.05 p.m.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE (St. Lucy): Mr. Chairman, Heywoods has created jobs, it has helped the small farmers in agriculture to the north of this island in getting their produce sold, and things like that. I remember that early last year, the same honourable Member who just sat down, the only thing he did not call Heywoods was a hotel. He called it a white elephant and all kinds of things. This afternoon I was very happy when he said that he could go to Heywoods and get things there at a cheaper rate. We should commend the management at Heywoods, because that was the cry throughout this whole island, that things were too high. To have the last hotel that was built in this country break down the prices, I am wondering what the small hotels will do, if you can go to Heywoods and get food so cheaply. I think that we should commend the management of Heywoods for doing such a wonderful job.

In the north right now we can see the overflow from the Heywoods Project in the parish of St. Lucy, and I would like to commend this Government for taking steps to build the hotel. It seems to me that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central does not wish to have any project at all in the north, because he predicts that everything we have up there will fail. He is wondering what will happen this time next year, and because the Honourable Prime Minister could prove to him where it is making money, he said these are the only three good months, wait until the hard times come! He was predicting a failure. He really would like to know that the hotel fails, but I believe that with the good management we have down there, and the planning of this good Government, they will succeed. I am sure that we in the north feel very happy about it, and I am sure the taxpayers of this country will all agree that it is money well spent.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. A. TRUSS: Sir, in response to the few questions that have been raised.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One moment, please. Is the Honourable Minister winding up this debate now?

Hon. A. TRUSS: Yes, I am, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution? The honourable Member may speak, if he wants to, but it is not a winding up of the debate.

Hon. A. TRUSS: Fine, Sir. I think in all fairness everyone has had a chance to express his opinion. Those who have opinions have expressed their opinions twice, so in all fairness it would not be unreasonable for me to take the position of making a winding up speech on this side.

There are a few things that have to be clarified, arising from what was said by both the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and the honourable Member for St. Philip North. The CHM has to provide detailed monthly cash flows to the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation, so there is that measure of balance and policing as far as the Government is concerned. The Tourism Investment Corporation has to approve the budgets which have been put up by CHM, and it cannot be exceeded without the approval of the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation's Board. There are certain checks and balances that have been placed in the agreement. This, basically, deals with the agreement and at the same time answers some of the queries that have been raised on the other side.

The CHM pays the General Manager and the Financial Controller out of the management fee which they receive, so it is important. We discussed earlier how much they receive in the first and second years and third to ten years, but out of that money the CHM has to pay the General Manager and the Financial Controller. The CHM cannot dispose of any of the assets of Heywoods without first securing permission in writing from the Board. The CHM must provide the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation with a financial report on a monthly basis that accurately reflects the operating expenses and profits, if necessary, of the hotel, and the general operation of the hotel on a monthly basis has to be dealt with by CHM management and handed in to the Board. All the expenses incurred by CHM while managing the hotel must be granted permission by the Board, and the CHM has to provide the Board with quarterly forecasts as well as updates on their marketing plans.

From the Board's point of view, based on the agreement which the Board entered into on behalf of the Government of Barbados and CHM, it is a checks and balances situation. CHM just cannot do as they like, they have to refer certain basic matters to the Board.

The Board, of course, under instructions from the Minister, will give directions where necessary.

The point made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in relation to gross operating profit means just that. It means that all operating costs relating to the operation of Heywoods over and above that, whatever the profit is, with the exception of the capital cost, just as in the case of the Hilton Hotel. The management of the Hilton Hotel, when the Democratic Labour Party built the Hilton Hotel, did not incur the infrastructural cost, the developmental cost. That was separate, to be covered separately by the Government of Barbados, and the interest on that was separate. The same principle applies to Heywoods. The development cost of Heywoods is a burden which the Government and the people of Barbados quite rightly must bear, but all aspects of the operating cost of the hotel itself, other than the developmental cost, are considered gross profits, and from that they will derive their 22½ per cent.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that he has warned the Government in predicting that such a large expenditure perhaps would never pay off. I am not in a position to say whether he is right or wrong, but I do know one thing which he said which is correct, that sometimes Government has to become involved in projects, though not necessarily money making ventures, but for the sake of infrastructural development of the country. In the DLP Manifesto of 1981 – I just browsed through it – which is already a document of the House, they have claimed projects such as the airport, the Post Office, Oistins Development, the Pulverisation plant, the flour mill, Harrison's Cave, the Community College and several secondary schools. We, on both sides of this Honourable Chamber, know that these projects are infrastructural development projects proposed by the Democratic Labour Party, and there is no way under the sun that either one of these projects can ever pay for itself. Under the old Barbados Labour Party regime we built the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Deep Water Harbour. It was never envisaged at the time that the Deep Water Harbour would pay for itself. Ultimately it ended up not only paying for itself, but making money, so I am not in a position to say whether or not Heywoods will or will not make money.

I have a feeling that when you look at the overall picture, in the final analysis money is not necessarily the only thing that counts. In the early debate when we were talking about culture, that was made very, very clear. Certain things have to be done by Government in order to stimulate the economy, be it in business, or the hotel industry or whatever direction the Government appears to be going in at the particular time. The Government has to spend some money. The major thrust will have to go

in a particular direction to develop a particular industry, be it manufacturing or industry or tourism or agriculture, but the salient point is that the Government cannot always behave in the way that private enterprise would and say we are going to do this because we will make money. If we did that, the Transport Board would not operate, and several of the institutions that you have in this country would not function, because they do not make money. This is why we come every year with Estimates, and with taxes to offset the losing propositions, the social services, things which the Government has to provide for the people of this country. In my view, Heywoods falls into this category.

8.15 p.m.

There is a projection for November to October of 1984–85, to deal with the specific request of the honourable Member for St. Philip North. The total sales projected for the year is \$16 121 000, in round figures. In November, it expects \$920 000; in December, \$1.843 million; in January, \$2.32 million; in February, \$2.48 million; in March, \$2.336 million; in April, \$1.42 million; May, \$768 000; June, \$741 000; July, \$744 000; August, \$805 000; September, \$733 000; and October, \$975 000. When one subtracts the expenses from the revenue, we project that at the end of the financial year 1985, we would make \$765.4 thousand.

I do not want anyone on the other wide to come back in October or November of next year to haunt me with the figures that I have just given. I believe that honourable Members are intelligent enough to understand what projections mean and why you go to the trouble of a projection. The whole idea of a projection is to try as closely as one possibly can to project the expenses and revenue of a particular business, but these are subject to changes, particularly in the hotel industry, especially in relation to the international recession, and other things that affect Barbados over which Barbados has no control.

We may well end up losing money over the next year. Also, we may end up levelling the projected profits. We shall have to wait and see, but the point is that no stone is left unturned in terms of the management structure of Heywoods to ensure that it will operate at a profit. We did not enter into the venture to lose money, and if we have to lose money in the first or second year because of circumstances, certainly, we will try to make it back in the 3rd, 4th and 5th years, like any other business. As I said, the projected profit for the financial year 1984–85 is supposed to be in the vicinity of \$765.4 thousand.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85 NO. 34
\$2 354 950

Head 83 - Civil Aviation and Tourism Division was called and passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85 NO. 35
\$114 383

Head 14 - Establishments - \$4 383 - was called and passed.

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE - \$110,000

Subhead 3: Conferences and Delegations.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Sir, I rise to express my concern over this further increase in the Conferences and Delegations Vote by another \$110 000. Only a short while ago, that Head was increased from \$1 089 553 to \$1 589 553. So a few weeks ago this Parliament voted another half a million dollars for the Conferences and Delegations Vote, and now the Government is asking Parliament to approve another \$110 000. I believe this is asking a bit much of the taxpayers.

I am not going to go through the same debating process which I did only a few weeks ago when I expressed grave concern, including the concern expressed by the honourable Member for the City (Hon. B. A. Miller) that she could not get a room to herself and had to interview people in a bedroom or something like that. I did sympathize with her on that occasion when travelling abroad. However, I believe that, first of all, this is extremely bad manners. To come to the House for \$1 000 000 in March, then within six or seven months to come back for half a million dollars, and now to come back for \$110 000 certainly indicates that there is something wrong in the Ministry of Finance, that they are not properly projecting their expenses. It may have nothing to do with the Minister of Finance, but there is certainly something wrong because I believe that it is as much an embarrassment to the Minister, having been severely chastised by those on this side and having been requested to exercise some control over expenditure under this Head, to come back now a few weeks later for another \$110 000.
8.25 p.m.

There is a longish Addendum on this occasion. It talks about costs to send missions to CARICOM meetings in Guyana. How much money do you need to send any-

body to Guyana? I believe you could get Guy. \$6.00 for Bds. \$1.00 in Guyana. I do not know what the official exchange rate is at the moment, but I am reliably informed that one has no difficulty whatsoever.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You know the black market rate!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But who is going to buy Guyana dollars on the black market, unless you are in Guyana?

I do not see any major expenditure in sending a delegation to Guyana, because we benefit substantially from the exchange rate - it is very favourable to us. We also benefit very significantly from our exchange rate in relation to Trinidad and Tobago. I am a little concerned. When I see this long Addendum, and I see this thing particularly tied to expenditures in Trinidad and Guyana, I believe I smell a bit of a rat here. I believe that there has been some overspending in this area, and that there is an attempt now, before the end of the financial year, to try to cover that over expenditure.

We are asking so many demands in terms of taxation on the taxpayers of Barbados that we must certainly exercise greater restraint in spending on the part of the political directorate and, if necessary, in terms of civil servants. If you have to carry smaller delegations, carry smaller delegations. If you have to go for shorter periods, go for shorter periods. I am not going to bother today with the class of travel and that kind of thing. I have already expressed my views on that.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: When you say 'travel' do you mean economy or first class. I would not go anywhere in the world for the Government of Barbados unless I go first class. The Chairman of the Boards go first class, and I am to go double class!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am quite happy travelling economy. It is not a problem.

I think we must seriously look at this Vote in the Estimates coming up. The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has to do something to stop the growth of expenditure under this particular Head of expenses. After all, in a short period of time this has multiplied by almost 300 per cent.

(Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You are repeating yourself!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not said that before. I have not related.....

Sir, the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) is provoking me and aggravating me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That same Member for Christ Church West, I heard him on many a platform supporting the position taken by the Right Honourable Prime Minister when they said that the Democratic Labour Party Ministers were paid too much, that they flew all over the world, that they were not doing the people's business, that they were subsidizing their salaries out of travel.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is misrepresenting my position. I always said that for the work most of them do, they did not deserve to go anywhere anyhow.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Well, you heard what the honourable Member said. What I am saying now is that they are spending almost three times as much, because if my memory serves me right, the largest amount ever spent by the Democratic Labour Party under that Vote was somewhere in the region of \$600 000. Now, we are way in the region of \$1.6 million, put there by the same people who promised this country that they would curtail public expenditure. That is the way they are going to curtail it!

This is going to be an election issue. I will make sure that I get copies of the speeches made by the Member for Christ Church West and make sure that I go into Christ Church West and read them out. I am also going to get copies of the speech that you made in this Honourable Parliament on the last occasion you spoke on the Conferences and Delegations Vote.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Did the honourable Member say he is going to contest against the honourable Member for Christ Church West?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, he is my representative and I have every democratic right to question any position he takes in public life. I will make sure that I bring to the attention at least of my neighbours the kinds of different positions he has taken at different points

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Do you mean the Indian man that I see you go at when I am jogging on mornings?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You walk around what? You cannot walk.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, do you really believe that the honourable Member for St. James North

is capable of walking from one end of Golf Club Road to the other? I do not believe it. I do not think he will make it.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I do not walk — I jog!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I think it is a matter of record that our position has been consistent on the escalation of this Vote, and I hope that next year we would not see a recurrence of this kind of extravagance. I do not think it speaks well for the Government, and I believe that the Minister of Finance himself is as embarrassed as we are by the current situation.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER (City of Bridgetown): Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate a point. We do this every year. We are going to be in here next month doing Estimates, and let us not get into the futile exercise of underestimating this Vote and fool ourselves. Hotel costs go up, airline fares go up, the Government has to do more and more business with agencies and other Governments abroad, and it is the style of Government in the western world, as we know it today. So do not let us fool ourselves that we do not have to travel and that we do not have to travel in a certain style, although all Ministers do not have to travel first class all of the time.

I just hope that, when we do Estimates next month, we do not, as we have been doing all these years, both under the Democratic Labour Party Government and under the Barbados Labour Party Government, underestimate this Vote. Let us be realistic about it and vote a reasonable sum of money that is going to carry us through. This Vote — and this was a point made already — does not only cover the cost of travel of Ministers and civil servants, it covers the cost of some of the entertaining which is done by this Government, which has to be done. We have to reciprocate. When delegations come here from abroad, they have to be entertained in a certain style. Even now, I am not always satisfied that we reciprocate in like manner as has been shown to us. Sometimes, I am a little ashamed at the way in which we return hospitality to those who have been hospitable to us abroad.

So do not let us now get all this hypocrisy time and time again. I really do not want to hear any foolish talk when we get to this subhead next month in Estimates.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You are talking to the Minister of Finance!)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): I think most of us have spoken at length on this Head from time to time. I think the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central really gave the basis of his objection — political expediency. He thinks it is proper and that it is probably vote-catching to talk foolishness about increasing the vote under Conferences and Delegations.

He smelt a rat. He did not say what sort of rat. He left it in the air, offered no real valuable discussion under the Head, missed the substance of the Resolution and merely threatened to read my speeches in Christ Church West.

As a good constituent, I hope he is always reading my speeches and that they have been enlightening. As a matter of fact, I am very pleased that in the street in which he lives, I get all the votes, with the exception of the Chinese Embassy, because they cannot vote, and one other person living in the area. I hope it is not the honourable Member, because I hope he would have more common sense than to vote for the Opposition candidate as against me. When Mr. Bernstein used to live there, I probably would not get another three votes, but now I get all the votes in the street. The speeches are well read!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order I am absolutely sure that I get all the votes in Philip Drive. 8.35 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member believes that he gets all the votes in Philip Drive. I will ask some of my neighbours if they vote for him next time, and let him know.

I would like to congratulate the Government on taking the initiative in going to talk to the Government of Guyana about very pressing and substantive matters of trade. I hope that the conclusion of those discussions would be to the benefit of Barbados, and that we will be able to use the negotiations as a means of reducing the substantial debt which the Government of Guyana owes under the CMCf at the moment. I think it is very vital that Barbados should be in a position, by way of trade, to reduce the indebtedness of a CARICOM neighbour which has obviously fallen on very bad economic days, and if in the process we can also increase our capacity to trade and expand our trade with the other Eastern Caribbean countries, this is much to be desired. I think the expenditure is worthwhile, too, if we use the opportunity for further bilateral relations with Trinidad and Tobago.

The Government has been criticised on the political platform for its relationship with these two CARICOM neighbours, although we are all conscious of the fact that the Government has been taking concrete measures to better relations, and although we ought to be conscious of the fact that the Barbados Government, consistently since 1976, has been in the forefront of generating ideas for the deepening of the CARICOM relationship I do not think there is one other CARICOM country that has made more tangible suggestions and more efforts at compromise in the interest of CARICOM than the Barbados Government has done from 1976 to 1985. Not that there have not been difficulties and probably some

errors on the part of our Government, but, by and large, our performance has been outstanding, and we have pursued the CARICOM effort with great zeal, enthusiasm, and dedication. This is not surprising for a party such as ours, which has consistently expounded the federal idea and the federal ideal, and I congratulate the Government for having the guts to come to Parliament for a further supplementary for this Vote, particularly if the bulk is going to be used for such a worthwhile purpose.

I would hope that my parliamentary representative for St. Michael South Central would look at these substantive matters, because I would hate to have to read his speech in St. Michael South Central. The results may be disastrous for him. I hope that he will give me better representation, and instead of fritting away this Committee's time and smelling rats, that he would be putting forth concrete ideas for the solution of the difficulties within CARICOM and not arguing about a Vote as small as this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Honourable Prime Minister going to wind up the debate?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: (St. Thomas): I would like to do so, Sir.

I regret that Parliament has been asked twice to supplement this Vote. It is a matter which causes me as much distress as Minister of Finance as it causes me regret as Prime Minister in charge of the Cabinet Office that it should have to be done. Nonetheless, there were one or two unusual circumstances which have contributed to this.

The Commonwealth Senior Officials Meeting at Heywoods cost a good deal more money than was thought. We had to pay for 30 rooms in the end. We had to pay \$39 000 to a local taxi co-op for transportation. This Vote is not all for the Ministers to travel and live well overseas, it covers on-lending amounts as well. The additional conferences that were not anticipated in October include the bilateral meetings with Trinidad and Guyana, which will cost around \$40 000, they include a meeting which cost about \$10 000, a meeting of a working party on a scheme for mutual assistance and the security of small states in the Bahamas an unexpected meeting which is starting tomorrow and we did not expect to have to go to the International Youth Conference and World Youth Festival of Arts in Jamaica — I have my doubts about that anyhow — but that will be \$10 000. All of these are unexpected amounts, and these, in addition to escalations and to meetings that have already been held, for which we offered hospitality — we had a seminar on Valuation of Real Property Taxation which costs \$6 000 at the end of last year — these are the things which have

caused the unexpected supplementary today. It is only fair to tell Members of Parliament that we are quite determined that there is no danger of bursting the vote within the next two months and, therefore, the supplementary that we have asked for allows for the \$35 000 extra, because you do not know how many meetings there will be between Trinidad and Barbados, and you do not know what expenses that might arise out of those meetings. You really do not know the number of quality of CARICOM discussions that we are likely to have in the next two months, and we want to be on the safe side.

I regret as much as anybody else to repeat, that this Vote has got so large, but Barbados now belongs to many national organizations. We try to cut to the bone our attendance at prestige meetings. For me, it would not matter if we never went to another Non-Aligned Meeting in history. The further away, the more distant, I am happy to have members of the Cabinet and others stay from it. We try to cut those meetings. We do not carry exaggerated delegations to the United Nations.

Our record does not include the payment of daily allowances for a Minister to travel on the North Point from San Francisco through the Panama Canal to Barbados at the princely speed of six knots, rising to eight, with a following wind and tide. All of that form part of the record of the Cabinet immediately below ours. Our Minister responsible for the Post Office has never spent six weeks in Tokyo attending a series of meetings, at enormous expense to the Government. That is the biggest attendance ever undertaken by Mr. Boxhill. It was many years ago. That is the longest ministerial absence at a conference ever. Capt. Fergusson's in the North Point was the longest ever of all, but that was just terminal vacation, I reckon; Mr. Boxhill's was merely salary supplement.

We have tried never to go back to those days, but air fares cost money. Since November, we have paid \$167 000 in air fares. Travelling is not easy. I have directions that we must travel by Caribbean Airways if we go to London, on which there is no First Class. Other than that, we try not to have excessive travel.
8.45 p.m.

Bitter words are spoken at Cabinet about travel sometimes, and as far as possible I try on occasions where travel may be necessary to charge the travel on specific votes occasionally. For example, if we go somewhere to sign a loan, I try to make the travel expenses a part of the loan expenses, that sort of thing. Not to get it off budget or off the Conference Vote for the sake of keeping the Conference Vote down, but to assign the travel to a cost that can be readily recognised.

It is necessary for the Minister of Finance, so I am told by the Solicitor General to travel to Japan next

week. Only the Minister of Finance can sign under the Statute, and therefore.....

Aside.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. AGAMS: I thought of that, and I would have acted during his absence. I thought exactly of that, but I was told that all the negotiations have been postulated on the basis of my coming to Tokyo. We have no Japanese translator who can translate the documents, so I have to go to Tokyo for convenience to sign the Japanese loan. That travel is being charged on the loan account of our agents in Japan, because I think it is a justifiable charge on the loan. You are going to finish the loan, so you charge it on the loan.

I am not suggesting that this is something that happens often, I am just suggesting how we try to make sure the Conference vote is not abused. It is still true that the cost of travel is the largest single item, and the cost of subsistence to non-Ministers is the next largest item. Ministers come really quite a far way down the end of the line. One's hotel bills are paid, and the subsistence rates which have been recently raised are really not substantial at all.

Time was when I travelled to New York that I would go and have breakfast at the Chock Full O' Nuts, or whatever, leave the hotel and walk out to find it, but I was persuaded that this was not the best thing to do, although there is a little cafe in Seventh Avenue to which I resort when I am in New York, for breakfast occasionally. I am sure that is what the honourable Member for St. Michael South means. He may have seen my wife and I having breakfast in there from time to time.

I do not know if it is convenient for a delegation leaving Barbados to have to be walking about from a hotel looking for somewhere to have a meal in the United States for five dollars or whatever. Time was when maybe that was possible, but it not something that is particularly convenient to do in this day and age. And I must say that the Ministers from Barbados by no means have a reputation for lavish living overseas. I have known Ministers from other CARICOM countries who have run up bills at hotels they could not pay.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will tell the honourable Member this. I spent Christmas in London entirely at my own expense. Even then, when I was staying at the Ritz Hotel, I did not walk about looking for a snackette to eat in. I ate my meals there and entertained people there without a thought — well, I thought, but without any suggestion of walking about to look for a cafe to eat in. It is just not a matter of convenience for people in certain positions, and I do not believe the House wants that.

I hope I have explained it, without too many personal allusions. I ask the House to accept the Cabinet Office's apologies for its under-estimation last October, and to vote this Head.

The question that Head 15 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of six money Resolutions in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House I should like to give notice of a Resolution which came down on a Supplementary Notice Paper.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$46,480 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1984-85, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984-85, No. 36, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, that brings us to the end of today's sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, February 12, 1985 at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, January 29, 1985. 1906

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS. 1906

The Passports and Travel Documents (Fees)
Order, 1985.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 1906

Statement re USAID Housing Programme.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 1959

Resolution to grant the sum of \$46 480 from
the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the
disposal of the Government to supplement the
Estimates 1984-85, Part I - Current, as
shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1984-
85 No. 36, which form the Schedule to the
Resolution.

ORAL REPLIES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 1906

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 1907

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85 NO. 30
- \$321 305 1907

HEAD 38 - MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND
CULTURE 1907

Mr. Craig, 1907; Mr. Taitt, 1907, Mr.
Franklin, 1908; Mr. Tull, 1909, 1917; Mr.
Forde, 1911; Mr. Simmons, 1913; Dr. Haynes,
1915, 1918; Mr. Barrow, 1920.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85 NO. 31
- \$90 000 1921

HEAD 50 - POST OFFICE 1921

Mr. Franklin, 1921, 1929; Mr. Taitt, 1921,
1922; Mr. Craig, 1921, 1923, 1924, 1928;
Mr. Tull, 1925; 1926; Dr. Haynes, 1926; Mr.
Forde, 1928; Mr. Johnson, 1929.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85 NO. 32
- \$85 698 1929

HEAD 80 - MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND
CULTURE 1929

Mr. Barrow, 1929; Mr. Tull, 1930; Mr. Taitt,
1932; Mr. Johnson, 1934, 1938; Dr. Haynes,
1936; Mr. Sandiford, 1939; Mr. Franklin,
1941.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-84 NO.
33 \$2 430 757 1942

HEAD 41 - CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM
DIVISION 1942

Mr. Taitt, 1942; Mr. Adams, 1943, 1947;
Dr. Haynes, 1944, 1951; Mr. Craig, 1946;
Mr. Truss, 1949, 1953; Mr. Franklin, 1951;
Mr. R. E. Brathwaite, 1953.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85 NO.
NO. 35 \$114 383 1955

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE 1955

Dr. Haynes, 1955; Miss Miller, 1956; Mr.
Forde, 1956; Mr. Adams, 1957.

SUSPENSIONS 1919, 1950

ADJOURNMENT 1959

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)
BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)
BLACKMAN, H. A. (St. Philip South)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)
BRATHWAITE, His Honour R. E. (Deputy Speaker)
(St. Lucy)
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)
HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Central)
MILLER, Hon. B. A. (City of Bridgetown)
SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)
SIMMONS, N. K. (St. James South)
TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)
TRUSS, Hon. A. (St. Michael Central)
TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)