
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981-86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 15, 1985.

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

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Speaker)

His Honour R. E. Brathwaite, (Deputy Speaker)

Hon. H. deB. Forde, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.

Mr. L. E. Sandiford, M.A., (Econ.), J.P.

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

Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and Lands)

Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)

Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour, Social Security, Sport and Community Services)

Mr. M. A. King, LL.B., Q.C.

Prayers were read by Rev. D. Stapleton.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of January 8, 1985.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that subject to any errors, corrections or omissions, the Minutes of the meeting 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.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay:

The Consumption Tax Order, 1985.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES and Mr. L. A. WEEKES entered the Chamber and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to approve the revision of salaries of certain posts of the staff of Parliament.

A Resolution to approve the revision of salaries of the posts of the Prime Minister's personal staff.

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Health Services Act be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. A. TRUSS and Dr. R. C. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took their seats.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I should like to move that the item dealing with "Obituaries....."

Mr. SPEAKER: "Congratulatory and/or obituary speeches"?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Be reopened?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Clerk please call Item (m) again, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN entered the Chamber and took their seats.

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY
SPEECHES

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Speaker, the late James Tudor passed away at very short notice to many of us, because, up to recently, he certainly retained all of his faculties. I think it is but fitting that the House should take more than passing note of his demise, he having been an honourable Member of this Chamber and having also contributed substantially to the political, social and economic development of Barbados.

Many of us had heard the name James Tudor before we were able to recognize ourselves or possess faculties enough to understand the history of our country. His contribution in the economic field was phenomenal, particularly coming at the time when he rose from rags to riches, from poverty to success. The significance of that for this country is that he came at a time when black people were not able to break down economic barriers and to truly lend to the development of Barbados.

I think if I had to single out one factor in his life, it would be that he gave pride to black business in Barbados. But it is not only the contribution which he made in this respect. I believe that the late James Tudor participated fully in the political life of Barbados, and he was not afraid to stand up and be counted on the side of the downtrodden and the underprivileged. His contribution in the Thirties and beyond is well-known, and I believe that when other honourable Members on both sides speak, particularly those like the Right Honourable Member for St. John, who had more personal knowledge of the political contribution of Mr. Tudor, they will no doubt expand on this aspect of his life. But as I saw it, he fought for the poor, and at the same time he

fought for Barbados in his political life. Many of us have learnt from his example in this regard. On the social side, he was one of the most affable gentlemen that I have known. He always found time to speak to the simplest, the humblest or the highest person. I have never known him to speak a word in anger to anyone.

I had the privilege of sitting alongside him when he served as the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. Although he was quite advanced in years at that time, his faculties were as alert as anything. I was able to learn tremendously from his business acumen and his perception of the development of agriculture and other aspects of Barbadian life. Many of us who sat with him on the Board then got to respect him even more than we had done before.

Sir, the late Mr. Tudor also gave to Barbados a son who rose to become the Deputy Prime Minister of Barbados, and who has performed more creditably in the political and diplomatic life of Barbados. Like his father, he was a member of our Party, the Barbados Labour Party, but on a matter of conscience felt obliged to launch out and become a leading member of the Democratic Labour Party and one of the architects of their victory at the polls in 1971. Whatever political differences one may have with him, he is perhaps one of the most versatile gentlemen that one could meet. I think that is a quality which he inherited from his distinguished father. I regret very much his illness, and I am sure he, more than anyone else, would have regretted not having been able to have been present at his father's burial.

I am sure that this House would wish to take due note of his passing and express our condolences to his relatives. They can take courage in the knowledge that he has performed excellently, that he has given everything he could to this country, and that he goes to the Great Beyond knowing that his contribution is more than well marked in the history of our island.

I believe that Barbados has had a shining example of the best qualities in our public life from the late James Tudor. I think he has given more than he has got from his own country. I think that he has made more than enough by way of sacrifice, and I believe that he has done so in the knowledge that it was his to give rather than to receive.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, today we are paying tribute to a former representative for the parish, as it then was, of St. Lucy, a Member of this House, a person whose life stretched from the nineteenth century into the twentieth century. There are very few persons today in politics, if any, who have covered that kind of time span.

12.30 p.m.

During that period of time, there have been many dramatic changes on the political and social scene in

Barbados. What we can say about the late James Arthur Tudor is that he did not wait until the beneficial effect of a particular change became a conventional matter acceptable to the generality of the population of this island, and in particular to the political directorate. The significant thing about the life of James Arthur Tudor was that he was an instrument of change himself.

I have had many long conversations with him from the time I was a school boy, trying to understand his unconventional approach towards religion and philosophy, and I think it took me a considerable amount of time and a great deal of travel and exposure outside of Barbados to come close to understanding what he was trying to say. What I do know is that in the late Twenties and early Thirties, long before the black man and woman in the United States began to regard themselves as human beings, right here in Barbados James Tudor was demonstrating to all the down-trodden and under-privileged in Barbados that they were worthy of being considered as human beings in their own right.

I do not wish to open any wounds by telling people of the present generation the kind of indignities which people suffered and put up with unnecessarily in this country of ours at the time when I went to one of the so-called leading schools in Barbados. I remember one youngster who was one of the best off-break bowlers that I have ever seen in my life and would ever hope to see. He nearly did not get into my school because his mother bore a different name from his father, and apparently he was the only boy in that particular institution who suffered that disability.

On another occasion, when I arranged a match between the elementary school, a very distinguished elementary school which I had attended, and the school I was then attending – I am not prepared to call the name of the school because people always tend to sort of pride themselves that they went to Harrison College. There is nothing to be proud about. We are getting back to that same thing now when we bring back people from overseas to preside over our children's education – in the middle of the match when I was captain, the headmaster returned unexpectedly, and we had the full co-operation of Mr. Frank Parris – it was an unofficial match – and he stopped the game and asked who gave me the authority to bring the elementary school boys on the hallowed grounds of Harrison College. That was the kind of period we had to pass through and the indignities we had to suffer at the hand of ex-patriate people, and I hope that we are not getting back into that stage. I do not want to go into that right now.

As a young child, leaving school at the age of eight years – somebody said 13 the other day – that is closer to the school leaving age now – Mr. James,

as I called him, told me that he went into the cotton fields in St. Philip. The reason why children were tossed into the cotton fields was that the adults found it difficult to stoop down and pick up the cotton. I told Mr. James on one occasion that one of the eminent Methodist ministers, in the 19th century when they were trying to introduce legislation to stop child labour and to prevent children from going into the coal mines, got into the House of Commons and said that to support a Bill of that kind would be cruelty, because by permitting the children to go into the coal mines at the age of eight, their backs would become naturally bent by the time they were grown up. But if you said they could not go into the coal mines until they were 14, you would be inflicting hardships on them because they could not bend their backs that easily. That was the kind of era that James Tudor grew up in, but I have never heard him make a grammatical mistake. I hear the debates in this Chamber are replete with words of incomplete predication and what we call green verbs. If you go and look at the debates when Mr. James was making a speech, you could not find a grammatical mistake made there. Therefore, nobody created Mr. James Tudor. He made himself into a man – and a full man.

His achievement is remarkable in that he kept reminding people where his roots were, and it was not particularly surprising that when the Universal Negro Improvement Association was founded here in Barbados, that Louis Sebro, Kenneth Wood and James Arthur Tudor joined other stalwarts like J. Martineau in promoting the Caribbean movement, as I said, long before the idea of "Black is Beautiful" was popularized in the 1960s in the United States of America. When you walk up and down Roebuck Street, you saw businesses on both sides, one after the other, being owned, managed and run by people who James Arthur Tudor had trained in business. Most of the proprietors of the large, black, successful supermarkets, the entrepreneurs and such, were people who came and passed through the hands of James Arthur Tudor. At a time when there no Indian peddlers going out onto the highways and byways, and the outskirts of Bridgetown peddling their goods, James Tudor took service to the people long before the commission merchants saw the profits to be made by catering to the small man. James Tudor had established something like 82 retail outlets in places which did not even have electricity in Barbados. He took people whom he thought had a certain amount of talent and put them in charge of those places, and agricultural workers. He was a complete social service institution in his own right.

12.40 p.m.

We are not today merely speaking about somebody's father or somebody who represented the parish in which I was born. We are speaking about a creative humanist, an individual who was very proud of

his origins and never allowed his children to forget the roots from which they had sprung. I frequently deplore that whereas I could hear the former Foreign Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honourable Ernest Bevin, get up and tell a crowd of us at a Labour Party meeting that he could never forget that he went to work in the coal mines when he was eight, I have never heard one single politician outside of James Tudor get up and say that he went to work in the cotton fields at the age of eight, or that his father or mother were agricultural workers; not one of them. They are more concerned now about catering to the rich and mighty and making people believe that they belong to that ilk rather than inspiring the people who have not yet arrived and who have not yet come out of great tribulation.

I remember Sir James Tudor walking from the landing steps on a Saturday afternoon with Chrissie Brathwaite, a former Member of this House, Mr. J. A. Martineau and others, and marching in the hot sun with Marcus Garvey up to the Steel Shed in Queen's Park. That is indelibly imprinted on my mind and I know that Marcus Garvey landed in Barbados because of the efforts made by James Tudor to get him here.

I am not going into the speech made by Marcus Garvey. Marcus Garvey is now being hailed as a liberator, as he rightly deserves to be, holding probably equal pride of place with Simon Bolivar — maybe, in many respects, when you look at the wider world, his influence probably is spread beyond that of the great liberator himself — but it was people like James Tudor that people like Marcus Garvey could derive comfort and inspiration from, because these were the people who were independent and who were able to say, "Go ahead. We are behind you". That was the contribution that he could make, and from time to time when it became necessary to speak out, James Tudor was always to the fore. To me, he was a great Barbadian.

I should like to feel that we could still produce people like James Tudor. I do not see many of them on the horizon. The business has become almost exclusive today. Instead of becoming more liberal in its recruitment, I still deplore the fact that in many business places in this island, people accept a situation in which the majority of our people are still being excluded.

We are the greatest "keeping out" society in the whole wide world. James Tudor was not a "keeping out" person. He was a "bringing in" person, and James Tudor opened many avenues to many young people who, today, have reason to be grateful for his courage and his inspiration.

I, therefore, congratulate the honourable Member for Christ Church West, in having the courage in the kind of company which he is forced to keep, to get up and tell

the truth about our great compatriot. I support him wholeheartedly in the tribute which he has made.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, when we got to item (m), I looked over on the other side to see if there would have been any movements made by anybody to get up and speak on this item, but nobody moved. I was also very reluctant because I do not know, and none of us on this side understand, the actions of the other side. Sometimes it is difficult to even try to find out what is going on because they are rather reticent in certain matters.

We on this side of the House get up and salute a great patriot. We do not get up from this side and seek to settle scores or to deal in racial matters. The late James Arthur Tudor was a universal man. Barbados was too small to confine such a man; he was a man of the world and the world was his country. Although he was a black man in pigmentation, he was too big and broad a man to be seen only as a black man. He was a giant spiritually, and a man who is a spiritual giant must rise above petty things, because if we believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, we do not see the question of colour and things like that.

On listening to the Right Honourable Member for St. John, Mr. Speaker, one would have thought that the closing of the doors rather than the opening only came about from 1976. But I do not want to get into that arena here this evening. This is, in my view, a solemn occasion.

Unfortunately for me, last Saturday I had another engagement, which was long planned, in my constituency, and therefore I could not attend the function of the late worthy gentleman. Otherwise, I would have been there.

I knew Mr. Tudor for many years, I spoke to him on a number of occasions, and he has given me very good advice, as he has given a number of people in this country. Mr. James Tudor has been an inspiration to many people, and on occasions such as this, when we rise here above all the pettiness, I would hope that we would be able to liberate our minds from the problems which we would have been suffering from, liberate ourselves from our mental slavery, which he sought to liberate himself from, and spiritual slavery as well, and rise above all of that and to pay tribute to a worthy compatriot.

Mr. Tudor was a philanthropist — that is what mainly he was — an extremely kind man and a man who sought in every way to improve the lot of his less fortunate fellow man.
12.50 p.m.

I do not think that in that exercise, the late Mr. Tudor would have excluded any colour from what he

would consider compassionate treatment. Much as he was a proud man of his race, I am sure he would not want it to be felt, even in his grave today, that we allow this debate to sink into a racial exercise. We in this Government regret his passing. We are proud that the country gave birth to such a noble man and that he has made such a contribution to the life of our beautiful land. I am particularly happy that I came to meet him and I am grateful to him for any inspiration that he would have given to me. We hope that he would have taken satisfaction in the fact that he had lived a rich life and that he had made a noble contribution to the people whom he had met in his life.

This Government supports entirely any Resolution of sympathy to the family of the late Mr. James Arthur Tudor. We wish the family to know that we share with them at this time of sorrow the deep grief which they have felt over his passing.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I rise on this sad occasion to say a few words on behalf of a great Barbadian, a man who, by his life, his work and his beliefs, has placed himself in a generation of our countrymen who have raised this country on their shoulders, and who by their effort, goodwill and their commitment to all that is good and beautiful have bequeathed to us a country of which we must always be proud.

I first met Mr. Tudor about 1946 — I was about ten years old at the time — and for various reasons I saw him quite frequently between then and 1957, and between 1967 and until his passing I saw him very frequently.

The first point is that he had a profound belief in God. It was not an abstraction with him. It was a motive force in his life which dominated his every action, whether in the economic or social field or in relation to his family life. It was a medium through which he acquired a very profound education, of which the Right Honourable Member for St. John spoke so eloquently. Indeed, it is a reminder to all of us that many persons of that age group, by committing themselves to a firm belief in God and allowing that to be the axis around which they total life revolved, have been able to become a major success in every aspect of their lives. So I should like to remember him, as I believe we would like all Barbadians to remember him, firstly as a man deeply committed to God, deeply committed to religion and one who recognized the totality of religion in his life, the life of the community and in the total being of the universe.

The second thing to note, and I believe this is the order in which he would like to be remembered, is his total commitment to his family. The honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) indicated that

it was with great regret that he missed the funeral ceremony on Saturday afternoon. It was one of the most moving occasions, not only because it was different from any other funeral I have ever attended, but the participation of the Tudor family in that service is something that should be an example to every family in Barbados. What you saw there was that spiritual family connection which he had somehow created and had clearly bequeathed to an entire family.

I am aware that it was because of his personality that he was able to succeed in business. He did not succeed because of a drive to acquire more and more wealth. That was not his motive force. His motive force was to find a medium in which he could meet the immediate needs of himself and his family and at the same time make a major contribution to a much wider area of Barbadians. It is that type of development that has allowed a whole generation of businessmen, black and white, to develop in this country, recognizing that by contributing to others and by the slow but sure development of capital within a business, the business would grow from strength to strength. Not for them the exercises which modern businessmen get themselves into whereby within twelve or fourteen months they expect to reap the same kind of rewards as people who had dedicated a lifetime into a business, a profession or otherwise. It is that example of business acumen, of commitment to the growth of a business and the understanding of the perspective of business activity within the totality of the society, where we find he would have made his biggest contribution in the business life of this country.

I have had to speak to many people who have been in business, many people who have gone on to greater business successes after he withdrew from the business scene. Invariably, you hear the remark from time to time that his example in business is one that every Barbadian should seek to follow — those early years of investment, work, growth, development and sharing with the total community.

1.00 p.m.

So, Sir, I believe what we have witnessed here is the passing of an individual who, because of the type of person he was, because of his commitment to a belief in God, was able to be so guided through life that he was able to accept at all times the levels of achievements which he attained and to make sure that that achievement was passed on to all. He is an example of many other Barbadians who have passed on. Their examples have been followed by some, and they, too have become successful. They have been ignored by others, and they have been the failures of this generation.

I certainly want to associate myself with any motion of condolences to his sorrowing relatives. I think that Barbados is all the poorer for the passing of Mr. James. Even in his last days in giving advice on matters which one would consider to be intricate and delicate, he was able to cut through all the delicacies and intricacies and focus on the central point at issue, and in his last years I can assure you he was able to advise a lot of people in a direction in which they should be going.

Mr. SPEAKER: I, too, would like to join in expressing my sympathies and condolences to the family of the late James Arthur Tudor. In this respect, I would ask us to note the Resolution which has been prepared:

"Be it resolved that this House places on record its profound sympathy at the death of James A. Tudor, a former Member of this House.

Be it further resolved that this Honourable House place on record its appreciation of the outstanding service James A. Tudor rendered to this country.

And be it finally resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his respective relatives."

Mr. SPEAKER: As a method of passing this Resolution, we will all stand for one minute in silence.

(Members stood for one minute of silence.)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: When the House adjourned on the last occasion, the Leader of the House indicated that some time would be given today to discuss a matter relating to the upsurge of violence in the country. I should like to know whether any provision is being made by the Leader of the House and at what time, for such a discussion to take place. I am aware of Your Honour's ruling, but from my understanding this is something being done by arrangement and not being discussed today as an urgent matter of public importance, but as something which the Leader of the House felt sufficiently important that some time should be given today for that purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing on the Order Paper today which, in my view, would allow any discus-

sion of the matter which arose in the Resolution which was attempted to be dealt with last week. I take the statement made by the Honourable Leader of the House to be an indication to any Member who would want to file such a Resolution. According to the Standing Orders of this Honourable Chamber, a matter of that nature could only be debated if there was a Resolution on the Order Paper or if notice had been given of the Resolution. No notice whatsoever has been given of any Resolution, which, in my view, would allow such a debate to take place today.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I want to give the assurance to the other side that if the matter is put on the Order Paper, as you have indicated, for the next sitting of the House, Government will be willing to deal with it then.

Item No. 2 please.

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: May I enquire if the House would be prepared to give leave to deal with the Resolution which I sought to have introduced on the last occasion?

Aside.

Mr. M. A. KING: It is not on the Order Paper, but I am asking if the House would be prepared to give leave to deal with the matter today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that we can break the Rules of the House to deal with that. When we are dealing with Resolutions, there are certain provisions made for giving notice. There is no notice given of any Resolution on the Order Paper. If the House so desires to provide sufficient time to debate a matter which is not on the Order Paper, that will have to be an agreement between the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition. They will have to ask leave and provision will have to be made for it. But nothing has been told to me, and there is nothing on the Order Paper by which we can have such a debate.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Speaker, the position, as will be recalled, is that last Tuesday the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) attempted to move a Resolution to debate a matter, and you ruled that while it was a matter of public importance, it was not urgent. The Leader of the House then said.....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would be grateful if you quote me correctly. I said that I was not convinced of the urgency of the matter. I went on to read the relevant

Standing Order which says that with the approval of the Speaker and leave of the House, the matter could be debated.

1.10 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I am not in disagreement with anything that you have said. You did say that it would be with the leave of the House, meaning the majority of the House, and permission was not granted by the House to proceed with that matter.

There was a clear undertaking given last Tuesday that the Government would provide opportunity today for discussion of that particular matter, and it was said more than once. Now on this particular Tuesday, apparently there is no provision for debating the matter.

This is not the private business of the Opposition.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): On a point of order: Is there actually any matter before the House on which we can either speak now, or on which the Government could deal with, in pursuance of an imaginary undertaking alleged by the honourable Member? If there is nothing before the House, on what can it be undertaken? There is nothing to be done, absolutely nothing!

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): It seems to be very clear that if we are true to ourselves, we would know that, as a matter of procedure, if you bring a Resolution and you seek to have the Resolution dealt with as a matter of urgent public importance and the Speaker rules that it does not come within the Rules, you, the mover, are then under an obligation to go through the process of giving notice of that Resolution on the particular date or at any subsequent date. It then goes on to the Order Paper, and then time can be allocated.

We are not responsible for the fact that there was a procedural slip on the other side. So it seems to me to be very unfair, and a true distortion of the proceedings that took place last Tuesday, for any honourable Member to get in here and give the impression that we gave an undertaking that we would waive the Rules of the House and allow a motion to be debated today, when the mover of that motion has failed to comply with the Rules, which are very clear. If they do not know the procedure of the House, do not try to involve this Government in any alleged breach of faith and undertaking. Learn the Rules!

Mr. SPEAKER: I will draw to honourable Members' attention Standing Order 22, which deals with the manner of giving notice, and I say that no notice was given about this Resolution. There is nothing on the Order Paper set for today which would allow debate of anything other

than what is on the Order Paper. I further draw attention to Standing Order 22(3):

"Not less than three clear days' notice of a motion shall be given unless it is Government Business introduced in the name of a Minister, in which case one day's notice shall be sufficient."

I go back and draw attention to Standing Order 22(1), which deals with how a notice should be given:

"(a) when the House is sitting, by being handed in at the Table or (b) when the House is not sitting, by being handed in at the office of the Clerk within the hours prescribed for the purpose."

I repeat, no notice was given, and therefore I can find no room on the Order Paper for the debate of any Resolution.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think that our real problem today seems to stem from the fact that the Leader of the House seems to have been relieved temporarily from his duties and is not in his place to clarify the issue.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, to suggest that somebody is relieved of his duties is unworthy. Do you mean you have come in here today with all of your nastiness again?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To say that the Leader of the House has been temporarily relieved? Well, where is he? You mean he is absent without leave? What is nasty about it?

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He is ill.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member is getting on like he is up in Malvern Plantation yard. Let us have a little decorum inside here.

I said that the problem really stems from the fact that the Leader of the House has been temporarily relieved of his duties. If it is permanent, let me know. He is not here, in other words. Who is the Leader of the House today? He has to be relieved for somebody else to do it. What are you speaking about nastiness? Are those all the words you have in your mouth?

Let me address you, Sir. I cannot worry with him.

The problem is that the Leader of the House, much to our surprise, not after Your Honour's ruling, but long after we had debated several other things, got up, as far as I can remember, just about the time of the adjournment of the House and served notice on us that he intended to discuss this matter today, said not to think that he is frightened and to come prepared.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the House cannot debate anything which is not within the Standing Orders.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying that is what the Leader of the House said.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable Members of the House allow the Leader of the House to brow-beat them, that is their business.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: All right, Mr. Speaker. He got up in his usual way and said he was serving notice, so we can only take people at face value. When there was no discussion of the issue, he got up and repeated several times that he intended to discuss the matter today. I do not know under what guise or under what Resolution he intended to do it. Therefore, we thought that there was some great Government measure coming down in the form of a Resolution.

I have drawn Your Honour's attention to the impasse that we have arrived at. Unfortunately, the Leader is not here, and therefore we have to leave the matter where it is and get on with the rest of the business.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about an item that may or may not go on to the Order Paper. That matter which is being discussed in terms of controversy between the Opposition and the Government, but it is a deeper matter than that. This is a matter relating to the law and order issue that has so occupied Barbadians during the last few months. It has to be clear to the Opposition, to the Government, to the Press and the public that such matters cannot be debated casually. We would have to have a Resolution so as to see whether we could agree with its terms or not and to whether we would wish to move an amendment to set out our speakers and this would require clearly a meeting of a Parliamentary group to discuss. This is an obvious fact to anybody who knows political life. This is not a supplementary for a service which has been in the Estimates for 100 years, with which all parliamentarians are familiar with and can marshal the arguments for or against at a moment's notice. This is a serious matter, and the public is entitled to a serious debate.

I was thinking of asking the Attorney General if he would wish the debate televised for the assistance of the public. Clearly, that cannot be done at short notice, and, of course, the Leader of the House would have to raise that with the Leader of the Opposition to ask him if he wishes to televise the debate.

These are difficult times. The Leader of the Opposition is as aware as anybody else of lawlessness. His house was stoned and he asked the Police not to make it public because he did not want to give the wrong

impression. So all of us are aware of the fact that crime is coming home to many Barbadians.

It may be that on this side we would put an argument that we must be careful; we must not do things in a panic, that decisions taken at a time of tension are not the best decisions. We will have something to say about the.....

Mr. SPEAKER: But we do not want a debate in the House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, I am not debating.

Mr. SPEAKER: We want to deal with the procedure.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We will have to say something about the Defence Force and the police. I believe that it is a debate which the Commissioner of Police would wish to be present in the Distinguished Visitor's Gallery to hear.

1.20 p.m.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To come to the substance of what we are talking about now, the general public is very ill-served by this incompetent Opposition. There are a lot of extremely experienced parliamentarians sitting on those benches.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There cannot be a point of order on a point of order.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I was not aware that he was on a point of order.

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: What is the point of order that he is making? He did not rise on any point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you please take your seat.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Study your work.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. There is nothing before the House on which a debate may be formed, therefore, the Honourable Prime Minister is speaking on a point of order. So there cannot be a point of order on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The substance is that in a serious matter, you approach politics seriously. If there is to be a debate, there must be something of which you debate. I have never before known the Govern-

ment ask to debate something that is not in existence. There must be some Resolution which we can debate. There is absolutely nothing before the House.

When I saw the Order Paper there was nothing on it. Up to yesterday afternoon, the Attorney General and I met with the Commissioner of Police to discuss the Police Estimates. I asked the Attorney General who should speak and so on. I spoke about an amendment and the Attorney General said, "Amend what?" That is still our position.

This debate must be joined in a proper parliamentary fashion, with something on the Order Paper, with the Government deciding whether it is critical and therefore if we are to have the right of last reply, with the Government deciding if to amend, with the Government deciding what time to allot and so on. This is not a casual debate to be entered into casually. There is nothing before the House on which leave could even arise. You cannot ask for leave for a purely future contingency.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, speaking of.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I rise on a point of personal explanation. The Prime Minister made a statement that my house was stoned and that I asked the police not to say anything about it. At approximately 11.15, fourteen days ago, somebody threw half of a six inch block through my bedroom window, shattering the glass. It took the police from Oistins a long time to arrive. I had to telephone to Central Station from the Democratic Labour Party Headquarters and the police arrived shortly after that. Before that, my Alsatian dog was poisoned, and far from asking the police not to say anything about it, I do not know how I could ask them not to say anything about it and then they find themselves constrained to report the matter to the Prime Minister, because he has got to be somebody too. He cannot be a nobody that they could report it to him. So that is foolishness.

I said that I hope that they would find the culprit, because it was obviously someone who knew my dog. I gave them that hint, and I made a statement that I think that one of the things we suffer from in this country is that people are too anxious to conceal crime.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it would be better if the matter is to be debated that the proper Resolution be submitted to Parliament within the scope of the Rules and listed on the Order Paper. As it stands, there is nothing on the Order Paper and there is nothing that can be debated today.

The honourable Member for St. Andrew.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker,.....

Asides.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter is closed.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: All right, Sir.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the other side that we are quite amenable to support them if they wish leave to have "Private Members' Notices" reopened so that they can give notice now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is quite prepared to reopen "Private Members' Notices" in case the necessary Resolution will be given today.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, in respect of that matter, may I ask that we be permitted to deal with the matter of getting leave at a later stage today. I would like to review the text of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish you would follow the usual procedure.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, the Government will be amenable to such at a later stage.

THE SALE OF PROPERTY SITUATE AT PINE HILL IN THE PARISH OF ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 2 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve of the sale of the property known as "Marlborough House" at Pine Hill, St. Michael to Mr. & Mrs. Andrew Gaskin.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, in moving the passing of this Resolution, I want to give a brief outline as to the reason that led to the sale of the property. I believe that the time has come when a lot of properties that concern Government and are lying in disuse should be sold off, because you find that you are paying a fortune ever so often to have these buildings rehabilitated although they are bringing in little or no income.

This house, as might be known, was at some stage owned by a bank. I think it came into the Government's hands when the Barbados National Bank took over certain assets of a particular bank in Barbados. This house was in a very bad state of disrepair, and a number of contractors were called in to execute certain repair work. One contracting firm charged \$98 000, another one \$150 000 and another \$82 824. The building was advertised, tenders were offered and the Gaskins submitted the best tender offer.

We are also looking at other properties that are owned by the Government. For example, Buttals in St.

George is creating a problem, because you have to have watchmen there night and day because the Rastas have moved in and started to destroy the buildings. We consider that the time has come when that property should be sold as well, because we do not believe that we are going to have need of that property in future to service a medical officer for the district, as used to be done in the past. We are also looking at "Delmany". A number of offers have been made for that property.

(Aside: Which property?)

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: "Delmany". That is one in Pine Hill opposite the school there and around a corner, on the road which will take you in to the place where the Chief Justice lives.

The Government has recently spent a considerable amount of money on that property, but although a lot of money was spent, we found that it was difficult even to attract a good tenant, even though it is a very desirable property. I feel that it is a property that should be kept. Nobody seems to be willing to pay a rent that I would consider equal or nearly equal to the value of the property.

I think the time has come when we have got to make some arrangement with respect to the sale of the properties which are bringing in no income and are serving no purpose beyond falling into disuse and disrepair. We are therefore having a comprehensive look at all the Government properties to see which we can put in good shape, and those that people will rent, we will rent. We will want to make sure that all properties are properly utilised. I just give that as

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: How much is the sale price?)

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: The sale price? The sale price is \$180 000, and the land is 4 892.643 square meters.

(Asides.)

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.
1.30 p.m.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Speaker, I should like the Minister to give this House some indication of the cost of the recent repairs to the property, and to state if they were carried out by the Crown. I am seeking this information because I know that this property cost the Crown some \$225 000 in 1981. Having acquired that property in 1981 for \$225 000, and

the property was restored to the state it is now in, I am wondering if the market was tested enough to allow the Government to feel at ease in letting go this property at \$180 000. The Honourable Minister will know that carries some 60 000 square feet of land, and at least 30 000 square feet of that land can be taken off without interfering with the property as it is now.

There is also the location, and I want to be assured that the Crown is satisfied that they have got the best return on that property, and, most important, that the Crown is satisfied that the market was fully tested. I would like the Minister to let us know the dates on which the property was advertised and the tenders that he received, so that I can satisfy in my mind that the market was properly tested and that the Crown has got the best available price for that property that they are now disposing of.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Governments normally do not sell properties, governments buy property, especially in a small country like Barbados, where we were not a conquered colony and, therefore, all the land is vested in the Crown. We had no Crown land as such. Government has had to assiduously acquire agricultural land, building land, properties for public officers and properties for at least the Prime Minister, and then other properties like the property next door to the Governor of the Central Bank; I think between the Scylla of that residence and the Charybdis of the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, a substantial area of land, well wooded, and so far kept in reasonable condition. I am sorry to hear now that the Government wants to dispose of a property like that as well, because we did not pay any money for that property, as far as I can remember. We acquired that property in lieu of estate or succession duties from some people who did not have any assets in Barbados at the time. The owners had owned substantial amounts of property in Pine Hill, which was supposed to be one of the most select residential areas.

What I am concerned about is that for the sake of saving, say \$150 or \$200 a week for a watchman, we allow places like Sherbourne to become dilapidated, with the roofs torn off, the windows shattered, people catching fire in the middle of the floors and that kind of thing. It reminded me very much of a property about two houses away from where I used to live, in more peaceful days in Black Rock. I think there is a Government housing development there now. I cannot remember the name of the property, but I saw that property systematically dismantled, shingle by shingle, post by post, because the members of the family who owned it, could not get together and decide to have an amicable settlement over that property. I actually bought a property belonging to the aunt of the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, and I think the property belonged to Jackman/Jones' family. I was absolutely flabbergasted that that kind of dilapidation and deliberate vandalism

could take place, although that was an isolated incident in those days.

Ilaro Court is kept in impeccable condition, and they always have had watchmen around there. Notwithstanding the rumors of ghosts, the watchmen are at least kept within piling distance of Ilaro Court, and I have not heard of any dilapidation at Ilaro Court. Was it asking too much for the same watchmen who were around Ilaro Court before it was tenanted to go up to Sherbourne's next door and to ask the policemen to drive around there periodically? I am wondering whether the Minister of Finance would not consider setting up a department — we had a gentleman called Mr. Dean Spencer who used to look after, first, school buildings, a custodian of Government property — with a staff, of security guards, with watchmen not only to safeguard Government properties, but to keep them in a tenantable state of repair. That is what we really need.

There is another thing which I tried to initiate, and I think the honourable Member should investigate it. We had a very highly qualified — on paper at least — gentleman called Dr. Imbert who promised me for seven years that he would get a terrier of all Government lands, and the only terrier of Government lands that I see now is a gentleman called Mr. Bowen down at the Deep Water Harbour, occupying all the little pieces of Government land all the way up the President Kennedy Highway.

Is it beyond the capability of the Ministry of Transport and Works to draw up a terrier of Government lands? A lot of the land, for instance, at the back of what they call the Bridge Road is land which belongs to the Government. The railway line, which stretches down here in Fairchild Street all the way up to Belleplaine, is being invaded. I drew to the attention of the Minister some months ago that a gentleman was installing a new railway on Government land in the parish of St. John, the constituency which I have the honour to represent. Nothing has been done about that at all. I even indicated that the railway was supposed to come from Guyana. This gentleman was bulldozing along the railway at Glenburnie in St. John and advertising that he is going to have a halfway house where you could have refreshments, or where you would be forced to have refreshments, because from the distance covered walking back, you would have to stay there and buy refreshments if you wanted to go on the train. All that kind of nonsense is taking place.

1.40 p.m.

We have an excellent wayleave whereby we can bring natural gas all the way from St. Andrew, along the railway line, through Flint Hall all the way down into Bridgetown itself. But people are pushing back their palings day by day and in some places the railway line has been obliterated altogether. Only in certain parts of St. Philip where the plantations find it convenient to use

the old railway line for hauling their canes has the integrity of that particular piece of Government property been preserved.

I am very concerned as a taxpayer that a building, to take an example, that housed the Regional Council of Ministers and later was used for housing the Community College, and later accommodated the spill-over from one of the schools in the Pine, today is open to the skies, the weather and the elements, and more depredations are taking place on a daily basis. Nobody in the Government Service is concerned about that, so it is time that we make somebody responsible for all Government buildings, those which are occupied and those which are unoccupied, because every time we allow that type of dilapidation, we are eroding the pockets of the taxpayers.

As far as this Resolution is concerned, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee I am only concerned that the proper procedures have been observed, that you have gone out to tender. If you have gone out to tender and you did not get a better tender, that is it. I can give the Minister an undertaking that he will not be hauled over the coals by me as long as he has followed the procedures, but if I find that there is the slightest departure, I would reserve my right to come back in here and haul the Minister over the coals for it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, the Leader of the Opposition has raised a number of points, and I think many of them are cogent ones, but I might draw the opposite conclusion from what was implicit in the start of his speech. My conclusion from the fact that the Government owns a number of houses which deserve preservation and which are not properly preserved, is that the Government has too many old houses for which it cannot find an adequate use, and, therefore, selling them in the end is the best form of preservation.

Addressing the general tenor of what the Leader of the Opposition says, we do have great difficulty preserving old houses. In this tropical climate, an old house deteriorates very rapidly if no one lives in it. Indeed, they deteriorate when people live in them, and all over Barbados there is evidence that the houses built 100 years ago — the 1860s to the '80s did see a lot of big house building in Barbados — are deteriorating, in many cases very, very rapidly.

There is also the phenomenon of the Rasta community to think about. The Rastas do occupy many of these houses, but not in such a way as to preserve them and to preserve their fabric. Many private owners are all too well aware of this. A well known house is Belfield in Bay Street, stricken by not family disputes, but by matters arising out of claims over the title because of family difficulties, that house is in ruins.

A permanent watchman at Sherbourne, would, in fact, have stopped the damage which, as far as we can judge, was caused by persons going inside and lighting a fire, not apparently to burn down the house but for other purposes — perhaps, only drawing a match, for all we know — which has apparently destroyed Sherbourne to the extent that it is doubtful it should be repaired. The fabric is not ruined, it could be repaired.

In defense of the watchman at Ilaro Court, I would say that the six or eight acres of land that lie between Sherbourne and Ilaro Court were covered in light jungle when it was decided that Ilaro Court become the Prime Minister's residence, and even despite two bulldozings, the area is covered in bush that was impenetrable during the day, far less the night. I am astonished, although we live in a tropical island, at the speed at which bush grows. The land was cleared — some of Sherbourne's land is added to Ilaro Court so it could be looked after — and a fence was put up. I think it was completed in October. I walked up that way for the first time since the end of November last week, and could not get to the fence in some places. In a matter of two months, the bush has grown to such a level that you cannot even see that there is a wire fence there — the wire fence is entirely covered. This hampers watchmen even with the best intentions.

I am looking at Buttals in St. George, which is now unoccupied, with sad eyes, because I believe that despite the watchman, we are going to have some kind of tragedy at Buttals. There is going to be overgrowth so that the rot somewhere in the house is not going to be observed until it is too late. We are going to get leaks in the roof and so on. We always knew we had Ilaro Court, it was always watched, but the roof at Ilaro Court had to be entirely condemned and some \$300 000 spent on reroofing the property, an expense which was necessary to make it viable again as a structure of any sort, whether residence or for some other purpose.

I think that Government must get rid of the old residences for which it has no real use. Government has been trying to get rid of the house in Pine Hill, not Marlborough, for a long time.

On the matter mentioned about the misuse of Government property by persons seeking to lay down a new railway, speaking as a private citizen, I am sure that no sensible Government should be angry with somebody who rebuilds a railway as a tourist attraction. I know that the Tourist Board received advice that the restoration of the railway along the old railway line would be a very major tourist attraction to the island. I would have no objection to leasing the land along the old railway line to someone who wishes to restore it for that purpose. I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition would object to it either as an addition to the facility.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I agree. It would have to be done with permission in a proper way.

The honourable Member mentioned the use of the way-lead over the railway line for the conveyance of natural gas. It may have escaped the honourable Member's memory, but even before he was Premier, as far as I recall, sections of the railway line had been earmarked for use by the Natural Gas Corporation. Certainly when he was Premier, natural gas pipes were laid along the way-lead from St. Philip right up, surely, to Flint Hall, and perhaps further in. What has not been done is to use the other part of it to lay natural gas out to St. John and Bathsheba, which is something, I presume, that could be done, if the demand in St. Philip at Fortesque and other places where there is permission for subdivision can expand, I would have no doubt that the Barbados National Oil Company would find it possible to use the old railway line to carry natural gas to the east of the island. He is really preaching to the converted in that regard.

As far as Marlborough House is concerned — the Minister of Housing knows all the details — it was under the control indirectly of the Ministry of Finance at one point, but it belongs to the Barbados National Bank. A bank manager was supposed to live in it; some officer, a lady, did live in it. The bank then decided that it wished to sell the property, and it is from the bank that the Government bought the property for \$225 000. So, in a sense, it was a transaction of sale, but in another sense it was not entirely arm's length.

1.50 p.m.

In this case, the person who may have benefitted from its not being arm's length was not the purchaser, but the vendor. Our subsequent experience with Marlborough House has convinced me that we overpaid the Barbados National Bank for it. There were other transactions going on, but I think that my right hand, as Chairman of the cabinet, overpaid my left hand, as Minister responsible for the BNB, when we bought it.

The subsequent history of the property does suggest that it would never have commanded that in the open market at the time. I think there was an auction, and the Government did not get anything like that at the auction. If my memory serves me correctly, we rejected the auction results, when we should have accepted them in the end. I would imagine the Minister of Housing has all those details. I say this to assure the honourable Member for St. Philip North that the market auction was pursued to the bitter end by the Government, and I am satisfied that the Ministry of Housing did the best it could.

I would say something that the Minister of Housing might not say. If the Ministry of Housing in the end took a loss on the property, it is as much because the Minister's colleagues interposed their judgment between him and the best bargain, as due to any fault in the Ministry itself. I think that it was the Minister's colleagues who felt that since we paid the \$225 000 for it, all he had to do was to try and try and sooner or later somebody would give him the same or more. Housing of that age and condition, attractive though they are when in good repair, are simply not commanding that kind of price on the open market when they are not in good repair.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): I just want to say a few words on this, because it illustrates the difficulty that the Government finds itself in in dealing rationally with the attitude of the Opposition on property in Barbados. I well recall not so long ago that the other side constantly criticized the Government on the question of land acquisition and what they regarded as the failure of the Government to pay property compensation.

The Treasury of Barbados is not a bottomless pit. You cannot criticize the Government when it acquires property for not paying compensation promptly and at the same time criticize the Government for selling property which is a surplus to its needs. We had this out at the Planning and Priorities Committee, the body that deals with Government planning and the implementation of projects, and advisers of the Government pointed out that, just as we were acquiring properties for new developments, we should also look at properties which were in the Government's hands and were surplus to its needs, so that you would be able to get a fund of money not for the purpose of putting into the Treasury, but for the purpose of doing justice quickly in relation to those people whose properties you acquire. So Government must be looked at, from the point of view of property owner, as being like people who are in property development — sometimes you buy and sometimes you sell. That is the position.

On the question of what price you achieve, the Government went through that, and the Government took on a procedure. We decided that the property should be advertised and that you would have a reserve bid, and if it did not reach the reserve price, it would have to come back to Cabinet and thereafter Cabinet would try again. We did that.

Anybody who looked at Marlborough House would recognize that there was a great deterioration of that property taking place. As a matter of fact, a lot of the properties along that area are deteriorating. As for the other one at Pine Hill, we are constantly beseeching the poor Minister as to when he is going to dispose of that.

The fact is that the bids that come in for these properties are too low. Only a professional person with the earning capacity of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central could afford some of these properties, because you do not acquire these properties because you want them to live in, you use them as a device for saving tax. If you are a professional man earning \$400 000 a year like the honourable Member, you buy one of these properties and spend \$100 000 to \$120 000 repairing it, and get off the amount of money for repairs. At least, you used to do that.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: But the honourable Member knows that today he has to rent out the house if he is to get back all of the repairs. The rent pipe flowing along in that area will flow somewhere in the vicinity of \$3 000 a month because I understand that up the hill, there is a newly built property for which one very eminent accountant has been able to command a rent somewhere in the vicinity of \$5 000 to \$6 000 or \$7 000 a month.

When you take into account that the property in the pipe will flow somewhere in the vicinity of \$40 000 a year, that \$40 000 now has to be added on to the \$400 000, and the interest and the repairs then have to be taken off. So it is not as attractive a proposition as a tax avoidance scheme in the past. That is why we do not have so many bids from people of the ilk of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: How did I get in?)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am not blaming you in any way at all. You are a very fortunate man. You belong to the higher echelons of earners in Barbados. You have exploited your profession to the hilt. There is no problem with that. You ought to be commended.

What I am saying is that when we look at values today, we must look at values in the light of the fact that the number of people who are in a position to buy these properties has been greatly reduced. Therefore, unless you can hit on an embassy or on a company that is willing to buy these properties to house directors, or managers, or other people who have special status in Barbados, you will find few people willing to do it.

The honourable Minister will deal with the details, but on the question of the terrier, I am sold on that. One of the first jobs that I had when I worked as the legal adviser to the Southern District Council was in conjunction with the late Mr. Rogers, who was a solicitor trying to compose a terrier for the Southern District Council. We did reasonably well. We believe that we got some 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the properties of the

Southern District Council under a document which set out a brief description of the properties and the source of the title. Some like the Oistins Fort and things of that nature gave a lot of trouble.

I know that the honourable Minister is trying to get these things sorted out, so the question of the creation of a property management sector and all of that is being addressed. But it takes time to be able to get used to it. Obviously, if the Government is to pay compensation quickly, it must dispose of some of the surplus properties. 2.00 p.m.

I remember that when we came into government, I went up in Paradise Heights – I will never forget this – and I saw a house in Paradise Heights with a tree growing through the kitchen window. Somebody up there told me that those houses belong to the Government, and I came back thinking that it would be an easy exercise to find out who they belonged to. After some considerable period of time, it was found out that they did, in fact, belong to the Government, but not the Ministry of Housing or the Ministry of Works, but to the Ministry of Agriculture. They had bought them when Paradise was being sold for some Chinese-Taiwanese Mission that was here. The experts used to live in these houses, and when they went away nobody remembered that those houses belong to the Ministry of Agriculture. Obviously, the experts must have been growing some kind of tree in the kitchen and the tree grew up and went through the kitchen window. It is a fact that the DLP Government owned two houses in Paradise Heights which were occupied by the Taiwanese Mission, and when they left, no officer in that department or anywhere in the Government thought of the houses. It was only the neighbours who were able to throw some light on that matter.

We have experience in dealing with these things, and now that we have the environmental machinery in order, we can find out a lot about houses and who they belong to. If they are in a derelict condition, you put the notice on them. The only problem is that the poor Minister of Housing may very often find himself in a very embarrassing position, because many of the derelict houses unfortunately belong to some Government department.

SUSPENSION

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 2 p.m. This sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 p.m.
2.05 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now question time.

There are no questions nor answers to questions available today.

We now move to Private Members Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no item of Private Members Business, therefore, Government Business is now resumed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, we gave an undertaking that we would re-open Private Members Notices in order to facilitate the Resolution by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave is granted for Private Members Notices.

PRIVATE MEMBERS NOTICES

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice of the following motion:

"WHEREAS there has been an increase in the number of serious crimes throughout Barbados. AND WHEREAS it is essential that public confidence in the ability of the Police Force to function professionally and efficiently be restored and maintained.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House expresses its support for the efforts of the Commissioner of Police to control increasing lawlessness and the criminal activity in Barbados and urges the government to take the appropriate action to ensure that the Police Force is adequately equipped to perform its functions."

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that brings us to the end of Private Members Notices.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am one of the Pine Hill residents. I live quite near to Marlborough, and I am quite familiar with Delmany. In fact, Delmany abounds my own property at Philip Drive. There are two things that should be borne in mind in relation to properties of this nature. I think the points made by the honourable Members on this side are quite valid points. Once houses are shut up for a long period of time, the rate at which

they deteriorate is quite significant, and so the cost of restoration of old houses is phenomenal in relation to the cost of building a house with a similar square footage at today's sort of prices. I agree that when the market is an up market, like a couple of years ago, in 1980 and 1981, and the cost of building is significant, one could possibly command a higher price than you would command today. It is possible to buy a plantation of about 50 acres and a dwelling house today for between \$200 000 and \$250 000. In fact, looking at some of the plantations which have been passing hands, you are getting about 500 or 600 acres of land including, some 300 to 400 of arable lands, passing hands at half million dollars and less.

I believe that one has to take these considerations in mind when dealing with the sale of Marlborough. The tragedy of Marlborough is that ever since Wolf Mankovitz left Marlborough, it has had very mixed fortunes. The Bank of America bought it and spent some money on it, and then left it in a state of disrepair until it was taken over by the National Bank as one of the assets of that bank. I believe the National Bank kept it in a state of disrepair for a considerable period of time, with the roof of the house posing tremendous difficulties, and if I am right, I do not believe that any repairs have been carried out by the National Bank or indeed by the Crown.

In relation to Delmany, which is one of the houses in that area, I have witnessed the complete pulling down of the cottage because of the damage which was done by termites. The Right Honourable Member for St. John mentioned the fact that the Government did not pay actual cash for Delmany. He is quite correct. Delmany was actually taken in exchange for the death duties owed by the estate of Mr. Wright. But the point is that in relation to Delmany, a large portion of the land cannot be built on since it is part of a cave area, and Mr. Wright's sister-in-law, from next door, would be able to tell you that the cave went to some 88 feet before it was filled in with debris, and the trees which abound my land have grown there. So the Government has to be conscious of these limitations on some of its properties.

We do have a real problem with trying to maintain some of the even historical properties owned by Government. I am not aware that Marlborough was a historical property. I think it would have been built at the end of the '30s, or early '40s. Places like Sherbourne was mentioned in the debate. I want to mention Bath, and to ask what is the policy of the Government in relation to old properties like Bath. Bath is of historical significance and it is certainly of architectural prominence, unlike a house like Marlborough House. I would suggest that if the Government has no present use for houses like Bath, or Newcastle, the Government should either in relation to those that are worth preserving, hand them over to the

National Trust or put them out for sale by tender or public sale, so that they will not continue to fall into further dilapidation.
2.55 p.m.

I believe that Newcastle, which is of tremendous architectural and historical significance, is one such house. I believe that the Child Care Board is, by degrees, not continuing to use that house. It ought to be restored to its pristine glory, probably by the National Trust. I doubt whether any independent person today, except a non-national, would have the resources to restore a house like Newcastle to its pristine glory.

On this subject, perhaps the Minister could tell me whether the Government has any intention to acquire Pavilion House, which is in my own constituency, and which has been burnt by fire but is worthy of preservation for its historical interest to the island. Likewise, the Minister may be able to say something about the Government's policy towards Codd's House, which was the old Waterworks Building. That, too, fell into a tremendous state of delapidation, but it has a great deal of historical interest, and it is the only building in Barbados that still has a fish roof on it.

In this vein I want to ask about Farley Hill. If there was a house which was of tremendous value to us it was Farley Hill House. The cost of restoring Farley Hill, in my view, would be between \$2.5 million to \$3 million today, yet it should be preserved. It is obvious to me, therefore, that Government will have to dispose of some of their old houses for which it has no use. Whether it be Marlborough, Newcastle, Bath, or some of the other houses at present which are occupied by the Agricultural Development Corporation, it seems to me that you will have to deal with those, to sort out those which the Government can use, either because it has to provide housing under its Technical Assistance Programme or otherwise or for officials, or because some ought to be preserved in the national interest.

I do not believe that on the open market, before the current repairs which are still going on at Marlborough House, anybody could pay for Marlborough House the sort of figure being asked. I am aware that there was a public action on this, and that tenders were then invited, but it seems to me that, given the state in which the house was and the condition of things there, even the suggestion of my friend, the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin), would not really come off very much. Given the nature of some of the land, which runs down, and the fact that part of Marlborough is in a water area, I think the honourable Member, who is very familiar with property valuations, would recognize that if you walk along Pine Hill, the wall at Marlborough as indeed the wall at the house next door, has to be constantly repaired because of water problems in

that area. I believe a lot of the drainage coming through Pilgrim House, going across the road under what is now the residence of the Governor of the Central Bank and then it cutting its way through the Marlborough area, finds a outlet in the Constitution River. I do not think it poses any problems to the foundation of the house, but it certainly will pose some problems to any substantial residential development of what I call the garden lands, or the remaining land attached to the dwelling house itself.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to represent the constituency where this property is located. I am very pleased to see some very varying views on the other side.

First of all, let me deal with my good friend, the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde). I have always advised him that there is a time for buying and there is a time for selling property. The question is to know when to buy and when to sell. The honourable Member for Christ Church West has not taken my advice over the past eighteen years, and I think that he regrets that he did not take my advice in certain instances, but I am very happy to see that he has recognized that there is a time to buy and a time to sell.

To be very serious, on this particular matter, I am very strongly in favour of any measures taken in this House at this time in the history of Barbados to cut back on public expenditure. I think that there is a crying need for greater prudence in public expenditure, and if it means that Government has to divest itself of assets in the form of old houses, then I am all in favour of it.

For some time I have been saying that property values in that particular area have gone down and have not gone up over the years. In that cluster of houses as you come up the Pine Road and turn right, including the Everys, for example, and then you go around to Marlborough House, and up to Erdiston and beyond, there are many that have been on the market for some time, and if you look at the prices which have been set for those houses going back over the past four years, you would be surprised to see the extent to which the value of those properties have fallen. They have not been increasing in value.

I was privileged today to hear the Honourable Minister of Finance concede that property in that area has fallen in value, and therefore this transaction could be recommended to the House on that basis. Yet, the same Minister of Finance has been quite happy to increase valuations in that same area to over 40 or 50 per cent, despite the fact that he has clear, undisputed evidence before him — he has gone to the market, put it up for sale, there have been various methods to get it sold for the \$225 000 or thereabouts for which it was bought

from the National Bank, as he said, with his right hand, and after testing the market, he could only get \$180 000 for it.

I am satisfied that this transaction is above board. That is the best test, and it is testimony to the fact that the people in the Pine and the people in Belleville are paying too much taxes and they need to have their taxes slashed.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not come into this Resolution and I am going to warn honourable Members now that if they persist in that vein, I would have to have what they say struck from the Record.
3.05 p.m.

We are dealing with a Resolution for the sale of a property. It is nothing to do with taxation.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am talking of the price of a property.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is nothing to do with taxation.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To get back to the price of the property, I am one of these people who do not worry if somebody gets what appears to be a good deal. I say "bully" to the person who gets it, because sometimes what turns out to be a good deal, in the long run could be a lot of trouble, as the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister knows only too well.

I think that if the Government is going to get \$180 000 for the house, in cash up front, I have no difficulty whatsoever, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, once proper procedures have been followed, and it appears to me that they have been followed, nor have I got any difficulty with the question of disposal of Government property. If the property is useless at this time, I say, "Sell it", and when you need property again at a different time, buy it. It is as simple and straightforward as that. That is my position on the whole question, because the money that you sell it for now, if used and invested effectively, would probably buy property when you go to buy in the future. But there is no point keeping properties and allowing the properties to run down.

Asides

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not know the property was on the market. I might have put in a bid, you never know, because I figure that if anybody bought the other property, the one in the back on to Pine Road, and added on to that property, then they would be really in for a very good deal.

The \$180 000 would seem to me to be reasonable, providing the house has not been repaired, and I

understand that that is the case — there was some slight misunderstanding when the Honourable Minister introduced it — because I know that at the corner there was another house there — I suppose I can say this — the house which is owned by the British High Commission, which I understand they have been trying to sell for some time, with an interest in a property near where I live, but they have been unable to get it sold at a reasonable price. I gather that they have to go through the process of repairs and maintaining the property. If you go further up the hill, you have similar problems. Another bank had a major problem disposing of another property. It was only because they came across another Henry Forde — I mean the one from the United States — that they have been able to get rid of it.

A peculiar thing is happening to property values in that area. I believe that it is because people have been caught in a very delicate situation when they are buying housing properties there. On one hand there is Erdiston School, as you go up the drive and come across, and then there is Pine Road, which is rapidly becoming part of Bridgetown, rapidly becoming commercial. So those houses are wedged between what is evidently a commercial development, or what has become a commercial area, so there is always a problem with those houses. I am not quite so sure that I would be inclined to put up risk capital of \$180 000 for that property at that time unless I wanted to live in the house and repair it.

I certainly would not put up the money as an investment, because you would be caught between two stools. It would not really be an ideal site for commercial development, and then you are faced with a problem over time of maintaining and keeping a house in the hope of getting a capital gain in due course. It could only be a personal investment to make any sense to me, the person wants to buy it as a resident and take the risk on capital gains or losses in the future.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: May I develop my argument, Sir? The Right Honourable Prime Minister said that he, in his capacity as Minister of Finance, with responsibility for the Barbados National Bank, which is owned by the people of Barbados, sold the property to him for some \$220 000 and he paid for it with his left hand. It is all the same thing basically.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is like a deed. If you bought a house from your grandfather forty years ago, you cannot now contend today that your grandfather has an interest in the house.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I agree.

Mr. SPEAKER: He had.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Perhaps you did not hear the Honourable Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not dealing with the National Bank today.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Good.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Let us put it this way. If we were to have another bank, it might be a suitable house for a bank.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not going to deal with the bank in this Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If we were to have a financial institution, Sir, one wonders whether.....

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not dealing with any financial institution and the housing of its members.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In other words, there is no way of getting around it.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. Not at this point.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of discussion on this Resolution, and this is how I think it should be. The Crown Lands Vesting Act makes it necessary for Ministers of Housing and Lands to bring all of these matters before the House of Assembly. But I would wish that since, sometimes, the names of people are mentioned in these matters, the Attorney General might well want to look at the need for acquainting Parliament of all these matters, or the Accounts Committee, without necessarily having to come to Parliament at every stage to discuss the sale of these matters, because sometimes you have to call the names of persons. I want to throw that out as a suggestion. People do not always like their names bandied about in matters such as these.

I want to assure the Right Honourable Member for St. John that, with respect to the development of the train line in St. John, when he gave me the information, I acted upon it, and Mr. Johnson who is the Executive Officer with the Ministry of Housing and Lands took immediate steps to look at it. I want to assure him that in Mr. Johnson we have a very good and valuable officer looking after Government properties.

I want to assure the honourable Member for St. Philip North, (Mr. W. O. Franklin) that the Government

did not spend any money on the building, "Marlborough". At one stage, after a deposit was paid and there were problems with respect to bringing the matter to finality, representation was made in the Ministry concerning the property falling into decay, and arrangements were made whereby permission was given to them to carry out certain remedial work on the building, to prevent water from coming inside the building and damaging the floors further. This might not be the best of arrangements, but in the circumstances, we thought that we should allow this to happen.
3.15 p.m.

Another thing is that a substantial part of that property, the land itself, is under a covenant with the building opposite, which is owned by the British High Commission, so they cannot build on that land. It also has a water course and, therefore, nothing could have been done about it.

On October 6, 1983, a notice appeared in the *Nation*, the *Advocate* and the *Official Gazette* giving notice of the sale of this property. Only two people showed any interest in the property, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Gaskin and a gentleman whose name I do not wish to call, because he was not considered. His offer was \$160 000 and their offer was \$180 000. Before that, they had showed quite a bit of interest, and it was at that stage, when they had made an original offer and the offer was taken to Cabinet, that Cabinet decided that the best approach would be to put out the matter to public tender and allow people to tender for the purchase of the house, and that was done. The public had an opportunity to come forward. There is a limit to what we can do in terms of advertising. Advertising is very expensive, and we could not go on advertising forever. People knew it was for sale, and those who were interested came forward. I think the best we could do was done.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde) said that he would like to know what we are going to do about Pavilion Court, and whether the Government is going to buy it. While we might have interest in Pavilion Court, you can buy gold or diamond too dear, and the owners of Pavilion Court believe that the Government has a bottomless pit of money.

It is all well and good to talk about the National Trust and let the National Trust handle things, but the money must come from somewhere, and the National Trust is expecting that the Government will give them the most of the money, if not all, to put all of these buildings into shape. I do not think we can do it.

The house at Bath is in no condition to be regarded as a property that you would want to put into shape. It is not a property with any value. I would hope that the

National Trust did not consider this to be a property to be preserved, because I would certainly want to examine their heads with respect to Bath Plantation House.

With respect to Newcastle, I suppose there is something about that that we may be able to preserve, and Government might want to look at it. I would prefer to see that place bought by somebody who is in a position to pay for it and keep it in good shape. Government might well decide to enter into some arrangement, a covenant if necessary, in order that they will continue to preserve the building and keep it in the shape that it is in. The National Trust can come in in that respect.

With regard to Codd's House, we have looked very carefully at Codd's House. While Codd's House is of historical value, I do not know how far we can go in maintaining all the buildings we have around. I do know that there is a special interest in Codd's House, and Government will do all that it can in order to bear in mind the views advanced by the honourable Member for Christ Church West.

I think it has been a good thing that this Resolution was debated in the form in which it has, but I must again stress, as I said just now, that I think the time has come when we could well look at the Crown Land Vesting Act and see what amendments can be made to the Act, whereby even though we come to Parliament with respect to these Resolutions, we may not consider it necessary at all times to discuss people's names and property holding to ridicule. I do not like it, and I am sure that honourable Members in here might not like this approach.

I want to thank the honourable Member for St. John for saying that he believed the right thing has happened and he does not think he would want to summon me before the Public Accounts Committee. I assure him that if he finds it necessary to call me not only on this matter but on any matter, I am willing to come, because I do not think I have anything to be afraid of, nor to be ashamed of.

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

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.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1984-85 No. 23

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND
PLANNINGSUBHEAD 1: GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
- \$67 000

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, this is a supplementary arising out of the increase in salary and regrading relating to public officers. The entertainment allowance for all Permanent Secretaries has been raised to \$600 per month, and this supplementary is to provide the funds to pay the arrears for those grades.

It has also been decided that all officers on the level of Chief Technical Officer and other officers in the S2 grade, the Commissioner of Police, the Chief of Staff and others, will also receive the new entertainment allowance.

I beg to move that Head 19 stand part.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1984-85 No. 24

HEAD 16 - PART 1 CURRENT - PRIME
MINISTER'S OFFICE

SUBHEAD 1 - ITEM 6 - UTILITIES - \$18 567

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, this is for the cost of the telephones in the Prime Minister's Office, plus a telephone allowance for four public officers connected to the office.

I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 16 stand part.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I do beg your pardon. That is only Item 6 under Subhead 1.

Asides

3.25 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to say more about it?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have to speak on Subheads 2 and 3, and I have a figure to move in for Subhead 3.

Subhead 2: Central Emergency Relief Organisation

CERO is being upgraded and an additional member of staff has been added. The amount of \$2,152 is required to supplement the vote in order to allow the CERO staff to travel to make inspections all around the island at emergency centres and hurricane shelters.

Subhead 3: Prime Minister's Official Residence

A supplement is required for the Prime Minister's official residence, now that the Prime Minister has moved in, to meet the cost of telephone and electricity services for the remainder of the financial year.

There is a lot of security lighting. There is a little telephone exchange down in the basement that is permanently airconditioned. It works only sporadically, which is why when people telephone Ilaro Court they often have difficulty in getting an answer. The ten or eleven phones that are up in the PBX very seldom ring but we have to pay for them nonetheless.

I have to make a move-in. Under Item 10 under Subhead 3, which now stands "Supplies & Materials \$10 000", I wish to move in a supplementary sum for Item 10 of \$15 000.

The supplies of linen, crockery and tableware at Ilaro Court prove to be insufficient. The Prime Minister has been using his own stocks of these items, and I am sure it is undesirable to mix the Government's property with the property of any individual in so intimate an area as crockery, tableware and linen. An inventory is being drawn up with a view to purchasing for the house the necessary dishes, pots and pans, glasses and such that make ordinary life within a home tolerable.

I have given instructions that all my things are to be packed away and separated from the Government's things.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In preparation?)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Not in preparation for anything. I have other properties. I am sure that no one would wish to see these things confused.

Apart from everything else, I do not think the Government regards itself too cheap to buy a collander, or a mixer, or a coffee-making machine, or proper carving knives, or a cleaver, or brandy glasses. I discovered last night, when I was trying to drink a little brandy, that there was no brandy glass in the place. Those who came to do the inventory have discovered that all the brandy glasses belong to me, and they packed them away, so I had to drink it out of a tumbler.

Under the item of Maintenance of Property, the supplement sought was \$80,000. As a result of the enclosure within the Ilaro Court compound of several acres of Sherbourne — there was no wall, no paling — this necessitated the building of the fence of which I spoke earlier, and the vote will be inadequate for the landscaping of the new property.

There is a great deal to be done with the Sherbourne property. It has a lot of rubble on it. There are open wells. It turns out that, buried under the undergrowth, there is enough flat land virtually to make a cricket pitch. It is actually adjacent to Two Mile Hill, whose nature was really hard to comprehend when Sherbourne was in use as a Community College and when Ilaro Court was first bought by the Government, and it is necessary to move now to clear the land and lay it out in a form in which it can be kept clean, neater and properly maintained. The National Conservation Commission estimated in September that \$80 000 would be required just to carry out their functions. Since then special work had to be done to make the place proper for Independence, and the clearing of the Sherbourne lands have necessitated an increase, and I am moving to increase this sum from \$80 000 to \$110 000.

This is giving employment to a couple of dozen people who are there very busy every day while this part of the work goes on. But it is not anticipated, once the work is done it should be done within the next six months — that sums of anything of this amount will be required by NCC in order to keep the grounds clean.

When the area is fully landscaped, I intend to open what will, in effect, be a fairly large park. I intend to open it, within limits, so that the general public can have the opportunity to visit the premises. From time to time I do give the National Trust permission to show Ilaro Court to the general public, and they charge a fee for the privilege of showing people around, but when the landscaping is completed, I intend to open the house, initially to give school children the opportunity of seeing it and the park around it.

I am endeavouring to put together a collection of maps of Barbados and paintings by Barbadian artists, and I have put my own books and my father's books, a fairly complete collection of books on West Indian topics. You will find every one of the old histories of Barbados there. One or two belong to the Government, such as Clifford Hughes' and Foyer's History, and a number of others which are now my property can all be found at Ilaro Court. I do think that the historical benefits to be derived from the collection of works of art and historical artifacts is such that I should make it possible for school children to see the premises. I hope to be doing this during the next summer vacation if the grounds can be finished by then.

I think the money will be well spent. I am satisfied that the gardeners have the eye of a keen master on them, and that they are not sitting down under the trees and doing nothing, that they are working actively in making Ilaro Court the premises of which the country can be proud.

I beg to move that with those additions, Sir, that Head 16 stand part.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Prime Minister has just told us that he is taking in a section of Sherbourne and he is now landscaping it. I wish to know whether or not the remaining section available to Sherbourne will make it worthwhile to be used otherwise. I just need to get an indication about how much he is taking in as Sherbourne and if the remainder is viable for any other use in the vicinity.
3.35 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member may be interested to know that what is left with Sherbourne still makes it one of the largest properties in St. Michael. We have not measured it, but Sherbourne, I would estimate, must have been a property of twelve or fourteen acres, and Ilaro Court seems to me only to have taken in about five acres.

I do not think honourable Members are aware of how much land there is between St. Barnabas and Two Mile Hill. There is a gully that runs from St. Barnabas Churchyard — it used to run right down into the Pine Plantation but it now runs virtually into Ilaro Court, because it was interrupted when Ilaro Court was built and a wall constructed, but there is still an outlet to the gully. If, in fact, there had not been a well, you would get a waterfall coming out of Ilaro Court when the rain falls. Ilaro Court has a waterfall running right through it, quite deep in places, and on the boundary between Sherbourne and Ilaro Court, I estimate that the water course must be 30 feet deep. There are bridges over that water course at the back of Sherbourne.

The land goes up towards St. Barnabas. Immediately the other side of Sherbourne there is a large vacant field, which I estimate, from looking at it, to be four or five acres. Going up towards St. Barnabas Heights, which is Government land, there is a quite steep hill that falls sharply down into Sherbourne Gully. The depth there would be more like sixty feet, I would think. Going up towards there, there is a lot of land.

We have made a boundary at St. Barnabas Heights with the Ilaro Court wall. It comes in, then it has gone back out again, and then it goes down the gully and

comes out quite near to Sherbourne House. I have said that the Government's tenants at St. Barnabas Heights should buy the land because some of them are growing crops. I do not know if the Ministry of Housing has done this yet, but the Ministry of Housing is quite free to take up the land, some of which was owned by Ilaro Court, some by Sherbourne. Further, I have suggested that the Government can have a few more house spots sites at the back of St. Barnabas.

So, far from Sherbourne being non-viable, we have been able to take off some of the land to add to St. Barnabas Heights, take off some of the land to add to Ilaro Court, and we still have enough land inside. It embraces all the old Community College buildings, plus a playing field-sized piece of land that is much overgrown and covered in bush, and this is next to even more vacant land.

The Government is now considering what to do with this land. From time to time, I have consulted with the honourable Member for St. Michael East (Dr. D. G. Blackman) but we are just considering the options for what is a very large piece of vacant land in St. Michael. The land is masked by the ribbon development between Chapel Gap and Sherbourne. It appears to be dense because there are houses all the way down, but right behind those houses, there is vacant land right up to St. Barnabas Churchyard. There is a lot of vacant land there. At some stage in the future, I am sure the Government will find a use for it.

The National Conservation Commission has, in fact, been hinting that we really should landscape the gully between Sherbourne and St. Barnabas Heights and give the public access to that. If there were a playing field either on the Ilaro Court side of Sherbourne or the Sherbourne side, we could have access from the Pine through the gully to that playing field, as well as access from the main road. So at some stage in the future, undoubtedly there will be development. Certainly there is room for development up there, and a very great deal of land on which to develop.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, since if my memory serves me correctly, the original expenditure on Ilaro Court was incurred under the heading of Education and Culture, it is but fitting to agree with the Right Honourable Prime Minister that brandy, particularly good brandy, does taste a bit different in the appropriate glass, and we cannot complain about the glasses.

But there are one or two things that worry me about this. I think that the Government made a fundamental error long ago in not coming straight to the country with its plans for a new official residence. I think the way it was done was wrong, and I think it makes it

very difficult for us on this side to deal with these problems in the manner in which they probably should be dealt with. I think the Honourable Minister of Finance would probably be the first to agree with that.

As far as I see here, the total cost of Ilaro Court this year will now rise to just around a quarter of a million dollars as opposed to \$114 500, as was approved in the Estimates earlier on. Part of that money is for landscaping. I presume you can call that a capital vote, so I am not going to make any major complaint about the capital expenditure on the grounds of Ilaro Court.

I am concerned about the very heavy expenditure on utilities, because we would have spent somewhere in the region of \$28 000 already this year on public utilities at Ilaro Court, and now we are being asked to vote another \$22 000, which means that we are spending some \$50 000 this year on utilities at Ilaro Court. Surely this level of expenditure has to be explained to the House, because it seems to me that in a residence of the type of Ilaro Court that you should not be involved in expenditures of this kind. It is over \$4 000 a month for water, electricity, telephones and gas. That is a lot of money, and this is at a time when the Government's official policy is one of energy conservation. Even if you could rent your house out for \$8 000 or \$10 000 a month, inclusive of energy charges, and you had to pay \$4 000 towards energy and public utilities, I do not think it would be much of a deal.

I do not know what obstructions have been put in the way of ventilation in the renovations and so on, but I feel that it is probably the kind of house that is largely self-cooling, apart from maybe a bedroom or two. I do not know what emphasis has been put on conservation of energy in the renovations, but I believe it is the kind of house with high ceilings, the old type of house — I do not know — which with modern fans, very decorative fans, can make the rooms look very dignified. These are the modern decorative Hunter fans, with 26 inch blades, that can use large volumes of air and probably keep the rooms cooler, healthier and better ventilated.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the honourable Member would give way: There is no air-conditioning in the bedrooms at Ilaro Court.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I think there is need for an explanation then of how we are spending \$50 000 this year under utilities. I would not explore the area of energy saving devices any further. It certainly seems to me that the bill is quite high.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Maybe the honourable Member should visit Ilaro Court.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is another matter.
3.45 p.m.

I believe, as I said earlier, that we have to look at every single area of public expenditure, and one has to hope that his \$50 000 this year would be an unusual expense in relation to public utilities. Sometimes the meters are wrong, and very often at some public buildings people do not go out and check that they are being overcharged. So maybe only \$25 000 is being spend and that the meters need to be checked. But I cannot see how you can spend \$50 000 in a single year on water, gas, telephones and electricity in the context of an official residence.

On the question of the remaining money, I think it was \$110 000 for landscaping. From the acreage of land, I believe that is possible, because landscaping is an exceedingly expensive thing in Barbados whether it is being done privately or being done by the National Conservation Commission. No matter what part of the island you go to, it is a very expensive business. So I can well see that that cost there is correct.

On the question of the drainage of the area, I am very pleased to see that the Honourable Prime Minister has recognized that care was taken in the past to make sure that Ilaro Court was not overrun with water, and I am sure that they had the advice of a hydrologist, because having thundered on the floor of this House, and having denied that because he went to school and pitched marbles with the daughter of a hydrologist, a hydrologist would be of use to St. Peter, yet he has turned around and commissioned a hydrologist to study the St. Peter problem.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not Watson; Clarke. That is a fact.

I had to get in that little side-swipe at the end. I really have to get back to that after his attack on the whole question of hydrology, and if I have to return later on, I will come back.

I hope that we can get an assurance that these are really unusual expenditures this year, and that figure of some \$250 000 will be substantially reduced in years to come. I am not trying to embarrass anybody in this matter. Public expenditure is a matter that we all want to curtail, and it is absolutely essential that we do that.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has concluded his speech since he is not addressing the Chair. Will he please take his seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will conclude by saying that I would like to have some idea of what will be the proper

levels of recurrent expenditure on Ilaro Court after these initial expenses.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I must confess that I am very doubtful about the utilities also, because at the time the supplementary was being prepared, we were in credit with the Water Authority. We must be the only people in Barbados who ever succeeded at that. The Water Authority has a rule that it constantly overcharges the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.

The telephone service charge is \$1 300 a month. I have had very serious doubts as to whether that level of telephone service is required at Ilaro Court, and I have questioned this. It is \$1 338 to be precise. I have questioned this, especially since there is a hidden charge in that the telephone system is installed in the basement in an air-conditioned room, so you have to pay for air-conditioning it. It is explained to me that to have telephones where they can be answered in a big building, you must have a PBX, and that Ilaro Court is so large that you will not hear telephones ringing outside a quite limited area, and I certainly can confirm that you cannot hear a telephone ring if you are downstairs in Ilaro Court.

The fact is that Ilaro Court is used for business purposes as well as residential purposes. Other departments of Government also use it for hospitality, and it is therefore desirable to have an extensive telephone system. There is a private internal branch exchange, because all the phones ring internally. You can ring from one room to another. The police can ring from the gate to a room and so on, and a very useful service it is too, because I would have never heard, for example, of the vessel full with munitions of war if it were not possible for the Permanent Secretary of Defence to call the police to ask them to ring the rooms until he could find me, to take a recent example.

The electricity has been running at \$2 200 a month. I think that that is not going to be the size of the bill in the future. Ilaro Court has been for a long time illuminated by emergency lighting that uses 1 500 watt illuminators, and it uses them in many parts of the ground. We have built permanent outside lighting which uses bulbs of a more reasonable consumption, and I, therefore, think that the electricity bill will decline.

I also note that an allowance has been made for \$5 000 in overseas calls. I certainly do not make any calls getting anywhere near \$5 000 in overseas calls from my home telephones. So it may be that there is some over-provision under this item. Over-provision under utilities is not as harmful as it might be under somewhere else, because with utilities all you can do is pay the utility bill. You can only pay the waterworks, telephone company or the electric company and natural gas, as the

case may be. But I agree with the honourable Member that it seems like a lot of money.

The honourable Member can understand why that will come to \$15 000 or \$16 000 a year, if it is thought necessary to provide a very large number of phones. Security lighting is always expensive, and Ilaro Court had some unusually expensive security lighting. Therein, I think lies the answer. I do assure the honourable Member that when the landscaping is completed, the cost will be reduced for the cutting of the grass and the tending of the plants. Indeed the staff will be reduced by more than half when the landscaping has been completed. At present there is a very considerable amount of people working on the grounds, a few dozen from MTW and NCC. There will be no more than six when all the work is finished.

The question that Head 16, as amended stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984-85, No. 25

HEAD 15 - PART 1 CURRENT - CABINET OFFICE

SUBHEAD 1 - GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

ITEM 11 - CONTINGENCIES - \$25 048

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS (St. Thomas): Mr. Chairman, this matter comes under the head of Cabinet Office because this is the vote from which the funds are paid, but it really relates to the office of the Attorney General, and with the permission of the House, I will let the Attorney General move this Head.
3.55 p.m.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Chairman, this money is to meet the cost of disbursement of professional fees as a result of an incident arising out of a shooting between the police and a citizen of this country.

On September 12, 1981, a Sergeant of the Royal Barbados Police Force on duty in the Silver Sands area in Christ Church, was looking for a criminal that he believed was in that area. As a precaution, he was lawfully armed, and at the time the Police Sergeant saw a gentleman in that area who was driving a motorcar, suspected the man, who was driving without a licence, stopped the car and an altercation ensued.

A number of people gathered. The report I got from the Commissioner of Police was that the Sergeant was speaking to this Mr. Bartlett and other occupants of the car when they began to throw stones at the police officer. During the stone throwing, the Police Sergeant heard a shot and he ran away, and while he was running, the Sergeant allegedly fired a shot in the air with his own gun, and Mr. Bartlett was shot in the abdomen.

It was alleged, further that Mr. Bartlett is the one who shot him, but the medical report from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital indicates that the bullet was never found. It was therefore not possible to determine scientifically from which gun the bullet was fired. But, from all the surrounding circumstances, it would appear that the shot was fired by the policeman.

There was a law suit and the matter went before the courts. On the 31st October, 1984, the matter was heard in the Supreme Court and judgment was given by consent of the two parties to the sum of \$20 000, with costs for the counsel.

There are other details surrounding the incident that perhaps should not bear statement at this time. I want to say that the police try, as I am advised, to exercise the utmost caution in the use of firearms, where lawfully in possession of firearms, in the execution of their duty, and I hope that the type of action which occurred on this occasion will not be repeated for a very long time to come.

There will be some criticisms in some sections of the public about the way in which the police on these assignments carry out their duties. But I would caution that the responsibility of the police in pursuing armed and dangerous criminals is a heavy one, and those who sit back in their living rooms and in the comfort of their private bars, and pass easy judgement on the way the police should operate in these circumstances, are, perhaps, doing the Police Force in this country a serious disservice.

We are going through a period of turmoil, when there is a great deal of public concern about the amount of dangerous crimes in the community. I will use the opportunity during further debate of a Resolution of which notice has been given today, to go into a great deal of detail as to the state of police activity and crime in this community, and I would hope to back up a number of statements I have to make by hard facts and statistics. At this point, I only want to say that there is a great deal of concern in the community about the nature and level of dangerous crime in this community, and indeed with a consciousness of events that have happened in the past few weeks, there is a great deal that is required of the public in the support of the police as they carry out their investigations during this period.

There are a lot of people, people whom I thought were perhaps balanced and sensible, who have been making a lot of foolish and reckless statements in relation to the activities of criminals and the police at this particular point in time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not anticipating the Resolution?

Hon. L. R. TULL: No, Sir. I am dealing with the shooting of a Mr. Bartlett by a policeman on duty with a gun. I am dealing only with that aspect of police activity. I will deal with other points relating to when foolish people tread in areas in which they should not tread. I will deal with that another time, but it would be almost irresponsible of me, if in the current climate, something such as this came before Parliament and I just moved that it stand part of the Resolution and did not volunteer a few statements. After all, I have responsibility for the police, a fact that is not always understood by some people in the community. Nonetheless, that is my position.

I think that during this period when there is concern about rising crime, particularly dangerous crime, that it is incumbent on everybody in the community to give the utmost co-operation to the police, and all of us responsible for maintaining law and order in this community. It does not serve the community well when a number of people who should know better make a number of statements that are irresponsible to the extreme, and seek to stir up more problems and more difficulties for those who have that responsibility.

I do not want at this time to deal with the alarming number of things which are written in the newspapers. I think that we deserve better from the media, and people who write articles at a time of public concern about rising crime to cause dissension and tension between the various sectors of the community, and indeed, various sectors of the Government, should begin to think a little bit more seriously about their responsibility as informers and opinion makers in the community. But more of that later.

I only want to say, finally, in introducing this section of the Resolution that the Government is doing everything in its power to make sure that the recent surge of housebreaking, and let me say quite clearly that there has been no significant increase in crime in Barbados in the past year except in the area of housebreaking.
4.05 p.m.

The general increase in crime in Barbados for the past year is not out of normal. It is just under six per cent, and that is the normal annual increase. But the increase in the amount of house breakings is some 37 per cent, and that is what is causing us this great deal of concern.

I am in constant touch with the Commissioner of Police about these developments, and he has given me his word that they are getting things under control, and that they are heading in the direction that might guarantee a favourable result. I say no more than that.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Head stand part of the Resolution.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three money Resolutions in Committee with amendments.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, that brings us to the end of Government Business.

I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 22, 1985 at 12.00 o'clock.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Speaking on the adjournment, I wonder whether the Honourable Acting Leader of the House, the distinguished and honourable Member for St. Andrew, would accede to a suggestion that a full day be set aside for debate on the sugar industry Resolution, which I understand will come up next week.

I believe that it has been suggested by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham), from time to time that while we have had several Bills and several debates on the sugar industry in the context of specific items in the past, he would welcome the opportunity to have a fullscale debate on the sugar industry.

I would be grateful if the Government would consider that suggestion and set aside next Tuesday for a fullscale debate on the sugar industry, apart from the other Resolutions that they have in mind.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am trying to express the views of the Minister of Agriculture who has from time to time been deprived of the opportunity of introducing sugar Bills and matters related to his own portfolio in this Honourable House. I have to defend honourable Members

on this side, or join in their defence from time to time, and I am prepared to join in the defence of honourable Members on that side from time to time. That is all I am doing. Thank you very much.

The question that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday 22 January, 1985 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly at 4.15 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Confirmation of the Minutes of Tuesday, January 8, 1985	1754
---	------

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE	1754
-----------------------------	------

The Consumption Tax Order, 1985.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE	1754
-----------------------------	------

Resolution to approve the revision of salaries of certain posts on the staff of Parliament.

Resolution to approve the revision of salaries of the posts of the Prime Minister's personal staff.

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

FIRST READINGS

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE	1754
-----------------------------	------

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

OBITUARY SPEECHES RE THE LATE JAMES TUDOR	1755
---	------

Mr. Forde, 1755; Mr. Barrow, 1755; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 1757; Dr. Haynes, 1758; Mr. Speaker, 1759.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Barrow, 1759, 1760, 1761, 1762; Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 1759; Mr. King, 1759, 1762; Mr. Sandiford, 1759, 1760; Mr. Adams, 1760, 1761; Mr. St. John, 1760.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESOLUTION RE SALE OF PROPERTY AT PINE HILL, ST. MICHAEL	1762
--	------

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 1762, 1770; Mr. Franklin, 1763; Mr. Barrow, 1763; Mr. Adams, 1764; Mr. St. John, 1766; Mr. Forde, 1767; Dr. Haynes, 1769.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984 - 85: NO. 23	1772
--	------

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING	1772
--	------

Mr. Adams, 1772.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984 - 85 NO. 24	1772
---	------

HEAD 16 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE	1772
---	------

Mr. Adams, 1772, 1773, 1774, 1775; Mr. Franklin, 1773; Dr. Haynes, 1774.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1984 - 85 NO. 25	1776
---	------

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE	1776
--------------------------------	------

Mr. Adams, 1776; Mr. Tull, 1776.

PRIVATE MEMBERS NOTICES

Mr. M. A. KING	1767
----------------------	------

Notice of Motion re Crime in Barbados.

SUSPENSION	1767
------------------	------

ADJOURNMENT	1777
-------------------	------

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 1777; Dr. Haynes, 1777.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ADAMS, Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. (St. Thomas)
BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)
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)
KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
St. JOHN, H. B. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)
TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)