
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981-86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 21, 1986

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock on Tuesday, January 21, 1986.

PRESENT

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

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

Hon. L. S. Craig (Minister of Information and Telecommunications and Leader of the House)

Hon. B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education and Culture)

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

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

Hon. L. R. Tull, Q.C., M.A., (Minister of Commerce, Industry and Consumer Affairs)

Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour and Community Development)

L. L. Sisnett, Esq., (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office) (International Transport)

Hon. A. Truss, (Minister of Tourism and the Environment)

O. S. Arthur, Esq., M.Sc., (Econ.), Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, January 14, 1986.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, January 14, 1986 be taken as read.

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

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions, Sir:

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Speightstown, St. Peter, for the purpose of providing an access road to the proposed fisheries complex.

A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister for Finance of the repayment of the sum of \$15 000 000 and of interest thereon borrowed by the Barbados Development Bank for the Sixth issue of National Development Bonds.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

I may also add, Sir, that I am prepared to do any Private Members' Business that is on the Order Paper, any at all, Sir, that is on the Order Paper.

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

The question that those several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. B. M. TAITT and Mr. M. A. KING entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 1, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1.

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

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

COMMITTEE

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985–86, No. 20

HEAD 39 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT – \$902 000

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW (St. Michael South East): Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks parliamentary approval for the sum of \$902 000 to assist the Ministry of Labour and Community Development in carrying out its responsibilities. There are three subheads under this particular Head, a sum of \$2 000 for the Labour Department, a sum of \$200 000 for the National Sports Council and a sum of \$700 000 for the Child Care Board.

The National Sports Council has during this year expanded its programmes and as a result has had to employ additional staff to cope with the new and added responsibilities which that Council has undertaken. There were a number of projects that were undertaken during this year, and on this occasion I wish to take the opportunity to mention that there were playing fields during this financial year provided at Durham's in St. Lucy, Connell Town in St. Lucy, Bridgefield in St. Thomas, Bailey's in St. Philip, Parkinson in St. Michael, Gibbons in Christ Church, Content in St. Thomas, Indian Ground in St. Peter, Waterford in St. Michael. There were two pavilions provided, that was in 1984–85, at Wildey in St. Michael and Holy Innocent, St. Thomas. During that same year Sion Hill, St. James, Wildey in St. Michael and Boscobel, St. Peter were the hard courts provided.

In this present financial year, the following projects were undertaken. Farnum's Land in St. Michael, Checker Hall in St. Lucy, Diamond Corner in St. Peter, and Black Bess in St. Peter started. Pavilions were provided at Orange Hill, St. James, Dash Valley, St. George, Content in St. Thomas and Gibbons in Christ Church is under construction. May I at this time also state that in today's newspaper the tender notice for another pavilion to be constructed at Waterford, St. Michael is being advertised, and another one, which will be erected at the Elks pasture in the City, is now before the Tenders Committee and one hopes that by next week we will have the tender notice published.

The National Sports Council has also built hard courts at Dayrell's Road in Christ Church, Content in St. Thomas, Jessamy Avenue in St. Michael as well as Haggatt Hall, St. Michael, and has upgraded the following hard courts: Folkestone, St. James, Dover in Christ Church, Rock Hall, St. Andrew where the basketball poles were provided and Eden Lodge, the poles were supplied.

All this, Mr. Chairman, speaks for itself,.....

Aside.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: that the Government feels that sports is a very important area since it gives the youth, and people in Barbados generally, the opportunity to develop healthy minds and healthy bodies. We also feel that it is compatible with our policy to promote sports and to promote Barbados as a sports haven, and as a consequence of this particular objective, Government has taken the initiative to provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure so that Barbadians, all and sundry, could participate in sports.

12.25 p.m.

I need not mention the athletic track which was done last year. I need not mention that. But in addition to the capital work undertaken by the National Sports Council during the past 2 years, the acceleration of these programmes really occurred during the past 2 years. We feel that it is only fair that supplementary provisions be provided, because with the building of pavilions, the pavilions have got to be taken care of and it is necessary to employ additional staff. The grounds and the playing fields have to be kept in good shape and it was necessary to employ additional staff to provide proper grounds for the sportsmen.

In addition to all of this, the National Sports Council has had to extend its programmes to more schools, and not only has the National Sports Council been providing more and more coaches for schools in Barbados, but the Council has had to supervise or maintain several grounds belonging to the schools. This additional work and responsibility demanded of the Sports

Council additional staff, and in this Resolution allowance is made for sums of money to defray the cost of the additional staff which I am sure all of us in here realize is necessary.

Let me state, before I move that this Head stand part, that there were 9 playing fields provided in 1984–1985 and so far this year we have 5 additional playing fields. We were not able to accommodate all of the requests, and I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that there are several outstanding requests from community groups and other representatives who have made representation to the Ministry and the National Sports Council. But with the limited funds and at the same time the limited resources, it is impossible for the Ministry or the National Sports Council to undertake all of the work in any one financial year. But I give this Honourable Chamber the assurance that in the next financial year provision has already been made to undertake additional capital projects which will see more hard courts, grass courts, pavilions and playing fields, and it is hoped that this Government will be able to continue to provide these facilities for the development of the youth and community of this country.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is? The honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise, first of all, to say how pleased I am for all the young people who live in the areas that have been the beneficiaries of these 9 playing fields in the year 1985-1986. That is 9 and 5–14. I wish the Minister was in a position to indicate, since I had asked him over and over again for such an indication, when the people who live in the vicinity of St. Michael West could anticipate getting at least a hard court. I agree with him that the minds and bodies of the young people in the country should be expanded. I would think that he and his Government would agree that the minds and bodies of the people who live in St. Michael West and in the environs would be similarly expanded if they had the opportunity to practise on a playing field that had been provided by the Government.

The National Sports Council apparently is involved in the provision of the playing fields, and so I am going to ask the Minister if he could please indicate, so I can tell the people in St. Michael West who asks me from time to time, when we could expect to get at least a hard court. Let me say to him that if he could find a small amount of this money to put up a hard court at Hindsbury School, the people who live in the Hindsbury

Road area and that part would play on the Hindsbury School because there is no where else to play.

Aside

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But a hard court, even a little tennis court, road tennis. We are not too avaricious or anything; just give something that would allow them to feel that they, too, are part of this society.

Over in Lands End we have a small problem. As the Minister well knows, the fellows in Parris Gap and in those areas took some time to fill in the swamp. There was some swampy land down in Lands End and we spent a lot of time making....

Aside

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, I was in there, too. We, the people in Parris Gap and I, spent a lot of time filling in....

(*Aside*: Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Nassar and that crowd!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Minister knows what I am talking about, because I discussed it with him 3 or 4 years ago when it was just swamp. We filled in the swamp and the boys in the area spent a lot of time turning it into a playing area, so that we have a playing area down there. There is a canal that goes right through it and the canal was not constructed too well, and as a result it floods from time to time. But the Lands End area up until recently provided a playing field of sorts. I do not mind saying, Mr. Chairman, that I have assisted the youngsters in that area with equipment so that they could clear the area, cut the grass, and that sort of thing. Recently, however, private enterprise has stepped into the area and they have put up, or are in the process of putting up, a warehouse, and in that process they have taken a piece of the playing field. It turned out that that part of the playing field belonged to the owner that owned the tenantry and the new company has purchased the tenantry. The result is that we do not have a proper football field now, and whereas they used to play cricket, the cricket will be restricted in one area of the field. I believe that the Government is in a position to assist in restoring the playing field to a point where you can play games on it. I think that since there are so many hard courts being put down out of this vote, it would not be unreasonable if a little hard court were put in the Land's End area.

12.35 p.m.

I will say nothing of Richmond Gap because I would be accused of dealing with parish pump politics, but, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the children and

young people in the Richmond area get to play on the hard court at St. Leonard's Girls' School which was put there by the Parent-Teacher Association, and so we are at the sufferance of the Ministry and the headmistress, who is fairly generous and allows the youngsters to play, but it would be useful if, as indicated almost ten years ago, we can have the land at the bottom of Passage Road utilised for the purpose for which it was acquired. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that that land at the corner of Passage Road was acquired with a view to making it into a play area for the catchment of persons living in the vicinity, both from the City constituency and from the St. Michael West constituency and beyond. Sometimes it is impossible to even get the National Sports Council to come and cut the grass, but I suppose that they have so much to do in these other areas, none of which touches on any of the constituencies represented over here, but that is purely by coincidence, I have no doubt. It must be by coincidence that none of them will fall in any of the constituencies over here. But even to get the grass cut — as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I cannot recall a time when they were able to get any governmental agency to cut the grass, except on one occasion when I literally begged the Minister to use his influence to see if he could get the grass cut for us. I keep saying to the people in my constituency it is only a matter of time now before they are in a position to get some of these goodies from the taxpayers' money. But, Sir, I hope that the Minister will give us some idea, since he said that the plans for 1986 have already been on the drawing board — I am sure he will be able to tell us what plans the people of that area can anticipate as part of this build up for the healthy mind and body brought about by recreational activity.

I will leave that, Sir, and turn to the Child Care Board. The Minister did not say anything about the Child Care Board's \$700 000 and the memorandum seems not to be too explicit. It says here "The sum of \$700 000 for the Child Care Board is to enable the Board to meet the ongoing cost of operating day care centres and day nurseries." I would not dare to ask for a day care centre in that area I was just describing. I think that that might be presumptuous, to ask for a day care centre, but I wonder if the Minister would be a little more specific and tell us why in January of 1986 we need \$700 000 when the Estimates should be coming some time in March. Why do you need \$700 000 in January? This information here is too sparse for me to understand, and I will not speculate, because if I speculate I might say it is for the wrong purposes, and I am trying very hard, Mr. Chairman, to be reasonable as we examine this until I hear from the Minister. Seven hundred thousand dollars in January for day care centres and that sort of money seems to me to be a lot of money suddenly, but I am sure he will explain.

I will draw this to this attention, too, that in the final analysis the location of services for the people of Barbados ought to be done on rational grounds. There should be a systematic approach to determining where you are going to put either recreational facilities, day care centres or other similar services which are made available for the people as a whole. I am of the view that it is cruel for persons to live in a catchment area and to look around them and wherever they look in a certain direction they see services being provided in plenty for some people, and in their particular area they see no services at all.

Mr. Chairman, let me say once again for the record that the constituency I have the honour to represent has no day care centre, no social service centre, no recreational facilities. It has nothing that has been provided from the public purse. If you take the area which stretches from the Globe Theatre in the south to the Catholic centre in the north; it stretches from the harbour in the west to Bank Hall in the east, there is not a case that can be made to suggest that that area is either so built up or so saturated with private sector services that there is no need for public sector services in that area. It is a disgrace that I have constantly to be making this case in this Honourable Chamber about matters which ought to suggest themselves to any decent, moral, respectable and responsible Administration.

A lot will be said in due course on the political platforms, but I am putting it on the record again. This is about the 15th time that I have made this particular speech in this Chamber concerning the lack of services in the St. Michael West area of St. Michael. I do not know how else to say it, Sir, except that the people do not have to wait as long now as they have waited. I will rest, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, I rise to address this matter before the House which seeks to provide an additional \$200 000 for the National Sports Council when the Parliament of this country has already in this year voted \$2.15 million for that same organisation to carry out certain duties in respect of sports in Barbados. When I heard the small list of Capital projects carried out by the National Sports Council in this year, I believe there were only some nine playing fields. What has happened to the rest of the \$2.15 million? We have to show some concern for the money of the taxpayers in this country.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable Member is not really fair. I did in my presentation mention that in addition to playing fields, hard courts as well as pavilions were provided. The honourable Member should not now be asking what has become of the money, imputing improper

motives. He should know better, but I will deal with him later.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am not imputing improper motives to anyone. I want to know what has happened to the rest of the \$2.15 million. I want to know how many people were employed at the National Sports Council as the beginning of this year, how many people are employed now, and whether public funds are being used for political slush funds in Barbados. That is what I want to know.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order, I believe the Member for St. Michael South Central was in here long enough and he has recognised over a period of time that we have given Members of the Opposition and back-benchers replies to any questions which they bring before the Chamber immediately, Sir, to the point where there is not even one on the Order Paper. What he is asking the Minister about how many people have been employed at NSC, and all of these can be brought by a simple question. This is all he has to do. What is this about he wants the Minister to tell him now how many people? Are you some school master?
12.45 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am charged with the responsibilities within our democratic parliamentary system as Shadow Minister of Finance to look very carefully and see how public funds are being expended, and this is truly my constitutional duty.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Public Accounts Committee is to do that, not you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have three — not one, but three — honourable Members on their feet. This is very interesting. Please take your seats. All honourable Members please take your seats!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, am I in possession of the House or not?

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to give the honourable Member the answer to his question. There are 10 general workers, 2 supervisors...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not finished with my speech yet.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am replying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member — that is no point of order. Please take your seats, both honourable Members.

I am satisfied that that is not a point of order. The honourable Member may continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, the problem is that we always find ourselves with these problems and difficulties in explaining how public funds are employed when we allow public policy to be determined politically rather than in terms of the needs of the people out there. This is particularly cruel. It is particularly wicked. It is particularly disastrous when it affects the youth of this country, and I will tell you why.

In St. Michael South Central, we have tried over the years to attract the interest of the Government in two playing fields — one is in Gully Field in Carrington's Village — and, to this day, they have done nothing. What they did in 1981 is that they allowed their candidate to walk around with a plan telling the people at Carrington's Village that a playing field will be put in Gully Field, and now their candidate is walking around with the same plan that the one walked around with in 1981, and they walked around with the same plan in St. Peter and the same plan in Brittons Hill. Sir, this is cruel and wicked as far as the young people of this country are concerned. It is wickedness. It is deceit. I am ashamed to think that a party like the Barbados Labour Party would seek to abuse the young people of this country in that particular manner.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, not only would they do nothing in terms of the development of Gully Field, but they would not even repair the basketball court there. I had to find sponsorship to do that. Sir, they would not even cut the grass. Do you know what they did? I even went to the point of having to get a member — I had better not say that — I had to work a little "do-flicky" in order to get the grass cut, and when the equipment was on its way, somebody called up and forced them to return back to headquarters. That is a fact.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It happened three days before Independence Day. When the people of Carrington Village were trying to celebrate Independence, they tried everything in order to get that playing field cut, and then we

had to resort to sponsorship again in order to get someone from Bank Hall, in the private sector, to cut the playing field. But I will tell the people of Carrington Village this, that when the Democratic Labour Party is returned to office this year, there will be a proper sports facility placed at Gully Field. On top of that, there will be a community centre built adjacent to Gully Field.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, this is an area that has contributed so much to sport, that has produced so many outstanding people in this country, that the least we can do is to bring some public policy to assist the young people in the Carrington Village area.

I now turn to Valerie. I am a very fair person. The Minister has indicated that he is going to do Valerie in this year's estimates. I publicly thank him in the Press of this country for doing it, although I have been asking him to do so for many years. But he says he is going to do it. I want to know whether any of this \$200 000 that we are voting today will be going towards the improvement of the facilities at Valerie. I say this, the Minister has to do something at Valerie. Not only because I am asking, but because Valerie is used as much by people in his constituency and by people in my constituency. Almost every week you can find a game going on at Valerie between some team in the Pine and some team in the Brittons Hill area, so that I have a vested interest in making sure that the young people in Brittons Hill get some of this money, that they get some improvement in the facilities at Valerie.

I go further and say this, that I want to make a further pledge from the floor of this House that when the Democratic Labour Party is returned to office this year, the whole of Valerie would be made available to the people of Brittons Hill, to the people of the Pine and all the surrounding areas, including Wildey, to make sure that there is a proper community centre development there, along with a playing field, hard courts and the lot. You are talking again about a heavy concentration of people in the Brittons Hill area, in Wildey, in the Pine and in the adjacent areas, in Collymore Rock, and I am quite sure that when you look at the relatively small sum for which the whole of Valerie, including lands and buildings, has been acquired by the Government of Barbados, that could well be made available to the people and be upgraded. There is a tremendous demand in that area for sports and cultural facilities. The people in Brittons Hill have nothing apart from Valerie, and I hope that that area would not be developed as housing, because it would be a serious blow to the young people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the young people of Barbados have been repeatedly betrayed by the Barbados Labour Party. It is the future of our country, your future and my future. The future of Barbados resides with the young

people of Barbados, and it is the intention of this Democratic Labour Party to ensure that our policies, not only in relation to recreation, but in relation to the overall development of the country, are securely routed in the development of youth in Barbados. When we speak of youth, we are speaking of the present. We are speaking of the future. We are speaking of Barbados as we see it down the road, and it is for the Barbados Labour Party to make sure that they abandon the politicisation of the provision of cultural and sports facilities and ensure that the work done in the country is for the benefit of the total community.

I see the Honourable Prime Minister is now taking his seat. He is now taking his seat because he sits satisfied that he has appropriated enough money this year, and last year, for cultural development in his constituency, but he will still lose his seat. I was at Oistins last night, and I am quite satisfied that.....

12.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The debate has nothing to do with who will lose their seat and that sort of thing. That is beautiful for the platform, but let us get ahead with the Head, Ministry of Community Development.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I recall the Prime Minister on the floor of this House not so long ago virtually getting up and saying he has got this big development at Wotton, he has got everything that he wants. But what about the rest of the country? It is not fair. If you go up into the Pine, what do you see there? Around every corner you see a hard court, and you see floodlights all over the place. What has happened to the other 26 constituencies? What has happened to the constituencies that we represent over here? What has happened to the constituencies represented by the Democratic Labour Party in this Parliament? Are you going to force us to vote against this measure? I want a firm assurance on the floor of this House today that there will be an end to any political determination as to the siting of sports and cultural facilities in this country, and that public funds will be allocated on the basis of need, and that none of this money being voted today will be used as slush funds to try to rekindle the image of a dying Barbados Labour Party.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Chairman, it really does not fit well in the mouths of the Opposition to make the kind of charges that we have heard being made by the honourable Member who just sat down. But, of course, this is mad dog season and one would expect to hear a lot of foaming at the mouth, particularly on matters such as this. The Democratic Labour Party has a particularly bad record in respect of the services they delivered to the young people of this country.

When we took over the Government in 1976 the Democratic Labour Party had \$50 000 approximately to be spent for the development of culture in this country. Five years later the figure had gone up to over \$4 million. Fifty thousand dollars was allocated by the Democratic Labour Party in the 1976-77 Estimates for Culture. Five years later there was a figure of over \$4 million by this Government! And it was not a question of spending money without a plan. We went before the electorate in 1976 with a plan for national cultural development. At the time when we started, Mr. Chairman,.....

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) is in trouble. But he can talk as much as he likes, he has to listen today, because he kicked up a foolish debate, Mr. Chairman, over the policy of services provided for the young people of this country, and we are going to talk about it. When we started, Mr. Chairman, there were three people, a Clerk, a Typist and a dancer, employed.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: They want to know. I see a figure here for recreational and sports facilities in Barbados.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member is so dumb as not to understand the vital link between culture, sports and recreation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, I draw to Your Honour's attention the rule of relevance. The honourable Member during this Committee, whatever may be his views, cannot make a substantive speech on culture when culture appears as a subhead under the Ministry of Education, and we are debating a subhead under the Ministry of Labour. I submit that the honourable Member is irrelevant.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept that. The honourable Member has just started and is about one minute into his speech, and he has every right to continue and develop his arguments as he sees fit. I cannot at this stage accommodate the objection raised by the honourable Member.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will be speaking for you, Mr. Chairman, and for myself. They have to listen. I will deal with the matter, culture, whether they like it or not because I am going to integrate this whole thing.

The Democratic Labour Party, as I said, cannot in any good conscience get up and make the kind of state-

ments they made in here today. We understand the circumstances. The honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw) has on more than one occasion, including today, spelt out in detail the kind of facilities that were provided across Barbados over the past three or four years, and he has given in detail what other plans are in the pipeline in this very financial area, the completion of what he started some time ago. He talked about pavilions, playing fields and hard courts, and God knows that these hard courts, pavilions and playing fields now are the measure of how successful representation is. I really believe the people are a little bit more concerned about other things. I do not believe that this is their sole consideration, or even an important one. They are only a minor part of the development of the quality of life in this country.

I want to deal, Sir, specifically with some of the other reckless statements that have been made by the honourable Member who just spoke. With respect to Gully Hill pasture in Carringtons Village, I do not believe that any honourable Member in here knows more about it than I do, not even the person who represents that area. I get around, Sir, because, unlike the honourable Member who just spoke, I still have my strong connections with the people of the area from which I came, and one of the things that is very significant about the Gully Hill is that the people around the area, those who live on it — because the number of houses on the Gully Hill are actually on the pasture itself — there are a number of chattel houses right on the actual pasture — and there are people who live around there who are hostile to the further development of the playing field, and they have brought that to my attention. The playing field there can only be properly developed and expanded if you go into the gully, which interferes with the water course, or you remove a number of houses that is currently existing there, or you close a road. On the western side is the gully and the water course; on the southern side is a road used more as a water course than a road; on the eastern side is a road, and it is on the northern side that there are a number of houses that has encroached on to the playing field, and it is the people in those houses who are not in favour of further development.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: I believe there is a Standing Order that says that the House should not be misled. There is only one person on the northern side who has ever complained about the further development of that playing field. There are no houses encroaching on the playing field, and on the eastern side there are largely dilapidated buildings that are not occupied.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear what the honourable Member said, I was listening to a little bit more wisdom, coming from the left, so I did not understand or hear much of what the honourable Member said. I believe, Sir, that I can reiterate that the people on the northern part of the playing field have told me that they do not want that kind of development because it is a little bit dangerous to them in their homes. If the honourable Member has other information, let him say so. You can ask the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman because he knows more about Carringtons Village than the one who just spoke. Every time I go through Carringtons Village I see the honourable Member for St. Philip South at a place approximately as the crow flies from the place, so he knows more about it.

1.05 p.m.

(*Aside:* Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: So therefore you should not lie about the pasture. There are no houses encroaching on the pasture.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Now, Mr. Chairman, Sir.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am lost somewhere. Is the honourable Member saying or suggesting that it is the honourable Member for St. Philip South who is complaining about the conditions in Carringtons Village?

Laughter.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I think he is perfectly happy with conditions in Carringtons Village, Sir. When I see him there he is smiling.

I also want, Mr. Chairman, to mention in a cursory way that the accusation that the Government has not been fair in distributing the facilities to the young people across the country is nothing more than a malicious lie, Sir, because repeatedly the Minister of Sport spells out the provisions of facilities all across Barbados. I may say parenthetically, Sir, that I want to thank the Minister for providing a facility at Dash Valley.....

(*Aside:* Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Drax Hall.)

Hon. L. R. TULL:.....and the facility at Drax Hall. But that is just by the way.

I want, Mr. Chairman, to also mention the point of the Government's expenditure, the \$2 000 000 and the supplementary today. It strikes me that the honourable Member was quarrelling because people were given jobs. I understand that is what he is saying, Sir. He is grumbling that the Government is spending additional money to provide jobs for a number of young people in Barbados.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: He never said that.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: You can tell me as much as you like that he never said that. That is what I heard and that is what I will repeat in here and out there. He wants to know why we are coming with \$2 million and \$300 000 now, and how many extra people are being employed to earn this money.

(*Aside:* Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: True!)

Hon. L. R. TULL: I want to know why it is that the honourable Member should be complaining about the Government providing money for young people to get jobs. I thought that is what he said. I want to know what is wrong with that.

He also made the point that he is the conscience of this Parliament and of this country, that he, and he alone, is concerned about financial probity in this country and how the taxpayers' money is being spent. He has appointed himself as guardian of all things. But you have an Auditor-General who can say at the end of the year whether the money is spent properly or not. You also have a Public Accounts Committee that inquires into the expenditure of Government.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The Right Honourable Member for St. John, the Leader of the Opposition, is the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. He has a lot of power. He can summon anybody to give evidence in respect of Government expenditure. One thing I know, Mr. Chairman, is that ever since we were in Government, almost ten years, the Public Accounts Committee, chaired by the Leader of the Opposition, has never found any fault with the expenditure of Government funds. I challenge any.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member is saying that the Public Accounts Committee has not found any fault with the expenditure of Government funds in ten years. I wish to say that for the record that that is not correct. I am a member of that Public Accounts Committee. I am just saying that the honourable Member is not correct.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think the Member should know better than that. He just cannot get up and make a statement. Could he tell me what year the Public Accounts Committee has ever entered an adverse report against the Government accounting during the last ten years? I am a member of the House, Sir, and I have never seen any documents, any complaints, official or otherwise, as to the public accounting and the expenditure of Government money. So to get up and make that kind of statement is totally unworthy of the man.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Which year?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not wish to get into an argument.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On a point of?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I, as a member of the Public Accounts, gave the Chair an assurance that what the honourable Member was saying was not correct. It is not proper for me from that position to delineate any of the factors. My colleague as a member of that Committee, can confirm that.

Sir, I think that the honourable Member is introducing an unfair element into the debate to suggest that as a member of that Committee, I am to get up and give details, which you know, Sir, would be contrary to the Rules of this House. I am merely saying to the honourable Member that he is not correct.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not know why the honourable Member is wasting my time, Sir.

Hon. A. TRUSS (St. Michael Central): On a point of order, Sir: I would like to state that I, too, was a member of the Public Accounts Committee and I cannot agree with the statement of the last speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael West. To my knowledge, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition, who is the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, during the period that I sat on the Public Accounts Committee from 1976 until my appointment as a Minister, has never ever found anything wrong with the public accounts of Barbados. I agree entirely with.....

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. On a point of order!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member spoke.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am on a point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: You cannot have a point of order on a point of order, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not having it. I am not entertaining it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There can be no point of order to a point of order. Please continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not understand, Sir, why he does not learn the Rules. He has been in here so long and does not understand anything about how things are done!

(*Aside:* Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: How Truss got up after Branford?)

Hon. L. R. TULL: The dogs are barking, Mr. Chairman. Sir, I hope that when you calculate the time I have had in speaking you would calculate all these myriad interruptions on needless things.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am staying for a moment with the contention of the honourable Member for St. Michael West, and I am saying that it is totally unworthy of him to get up in here and make that kind of statement, which he knows to be untrue.

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

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am a member of the Public Accounts Committee and I am saying that the honourable Member for St. Michael West is telling the truth.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. No point of order, totally irrelevant! Continue, please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, you and I know very well the Member for St. Michael South Central and his reputation for veracity. We well know this, and we know how to deal with this.

I want to get back to this question of the provision of recreational and sporting facilities in Barbados. Only yesterday, Mr. Chairman, we had the good fortune to be present at a public event where significant recreational facilities were being earmarked for the central part of St. George. I think that it is entirely appropriate that we should at this time, Sir, join the general litany. I speak for you, Sir, you are in the Chair, you cannot make any speeches. It is significant that at this particular time those kinds of facilities are being provided for central St.

George, and the significance lies not in the season, the season that is obviously affecting the honourable Members of the other side, but because it represents the culmination of the plan articulated by this Government during the General Election of 1976, which is now coming to full fruition.

(*Aside:* Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: 1976?)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I want to say further that it was also announced that there will be the construction of a multi-purpose youth centre in central St. George at some time during this coming year. It will be the first of its kind in Barbados. These things need to be said, Sir, because we are going through a phase now where we are going to use community centres not in the traditional way in which they have been used, or under-used in many cases, but we are going to build multi-purpose centres, starting in St. George, that will meet the needs of traditional community development purposes, cultural purposes, skills training and general all-purpose services not only for the youths — but for the total community.

1.15 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: This is private sector project! This Government has the resources, the creativity, the brains to come up with these kinds of programmes, and this is a Government project that I am talking about, Sir.

Again, Sir, I cannot understand the honourable Members on the other side who get up and make these noises about our lack of concern for the needs of the young people in this country. We just finished the International Youth Year, Sir, and during that year a committee was set up by the Ministry that was then responsible for it, the Ministry of Information, a committee approved by the Cabinet, a committee that embraces many sectors in the community, and worked out a development plan for young people not only to provide the physical facilities for their own physical development, but also to bring them within the mainstream of public planning.

I had the honour, Mr. Chairman, to present the feature address at the opening seminar earlier in the year, and I was able on that occasion to throw out the challenge to the young people of this country that they should get off the sidelines and get into the arena and take part. That is happening, and it is not happening because a lifeless and inert Opposition can only quarrel about a hard court occasionally. It was because of the transcending vision of the Barbados Labour Party that young people, badly neglected for a long period of time by the Democratic Labour Party, should finally have their

day in the sun. They shouted that they are the people who chase young children out of school at the age of 14. It was the Democratic Labour Party which chased 14 year old children out of school....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute.

Hon. L. R. TULL: and it was this Government, an enlightened Government, which extended the school leaving age to the age of 16, when they can go straight out of school into the work force. It was also this Government which introduced a Skills Training Programme that would allow those children who were not great academic achievers, and who had some difficulty in finding a place in the traditional labour market, to be better equipped to find a place out there in the job market. And it was this Government, Sir, that conceived of a National Youth Service, bitterly criticised by honourable Members on the other side for one reason or another, so that we could bring a measure of training and discipline to the young people of this country to better enable them to be useful citizens in this community. These are all part of the things we have been doing for the young people in this country. And then you hear some jokers, at this season particularly, getting up and making all kinds of insipid statements to catch a headline!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time. You can come back again. Order, order please!

Hon. L. R. TULL: Has the time gone already, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The question is.....? The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, the complaint by Members on this side of the House about this Resolution is that it seems that playing fields and recreation areas which are being provided throughout the country are being provided where they are provided not necessarily on the basis of the needs of the people over the country as a whole, but largely on the basis of political expediency. This is the major concern which we are having over here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is the opinion expressed by the honourable Member.

Mr. M. A. KING: It is the opinion expressed by us.

The Minister talks about playing fields being provided all over the country, and, yet, when he points to the areas where playing fields are being provided, we cannot see them in all of the constituencies all over the country, although there are large sectors of population in many constituencies all over the place.

This debate has tended to descend to the level of the parish because everybody is concerned about the playing fields in their area, but I will make a reference to Christ Church West Central purely for the purpose of illustrating the point which I am making. All points, Mr. Chairman, must be demonstrated by hard facts. Christ Church has a reputation for being quite good at sports generally, and a lot of effort has gone into the development of football at the local level in recent times. We find that, despite the lack of good facilities in the Christ Church area, the Christ Church young people have been able to develop their football skills at a commendable level. The Pride of Gall Hill, for instance, has been able to do extremely well, despite the fact that the playing field which they had, and on which they thrived so well, has been taken away from them.

Aside

Mr. M. A. KING: By this Government. That was correct.

The fact is that we hear talk about all the playing fields being established all over the place, and in Christ Church West Central, where there have been a number of playing fields traditionally, we are the ones who are losing the playing fields, because the Gall Hill playing field is gone, the playing field in Apple Grove which was acquired, I believe, just before the last election — the acquisition was in the Bill and it was completed just after the last election — the proposed new road is running right through that playing field so that playing field is disappearing. So in one election the land has been acquired and in the next election the new highway is running right through that playing field and that playing field is lost.

I am calling on the Ministry responsible. I believe that the Government has a lot of other lands in that area, and I am calling on the appropriate Ministry to take the necessary steps to provide alternate lands in that area to replace the playing field which will be lost as a result of the road going through the existing playing field.

Now what about Sargeants Village? Sargeants Village is one of the older playing fields in the Christ Church area, but it is also one of the most inadequate playing fields, because it is an extremely small and cramped playing field. Yet, despite that playing field being so ridiculous and so inconvenient for the needs of the people, Sargeants Village young people can produce football at a commendable level, one which can match any of the teams in Barbados at the local football level. The honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw) would know what I am talking about — Sargeants Village.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, that in dealing with this concept of providing playing fields and recreation

areas, the overall needs of the people in Barbados as a whole be addressed on a national basis. Look at the populated centres, look at the requirements of people all through the constituencies and provide playing areas and recreational facilities as meets the needs of the people.

While I am on this question of recreational facilities and playing fields, I would like to raise a question which I wonder if the Government can answer at this time. It has been drawn to my attention that there is a proposal to put some facilities, hard courts of some kind, I hear about swimming pools and so forth, in an area near to the Drive-in. I do not know if the proposal is to put these facilities on lands owned by the Government just in the back of Regency Park, but I know that some of the residents in the area have enquired and want to know about the plans for utilising the area for the allocation of playing fields or swimming facilities, and I would like to know if there are any specific and concrete plans which the Government has for providing playing fields, recreational facilities, swimming pools or hard courts of any kind in that area.

1.25 p.m.

Now, I would like to deal with one or two points which the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) made, one or two ridiculous points, which he is wont to make from time to time. Any time the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) has spoken, you can guarantee that the Member for St. George South will get up and take him on. The Member for St. George South has made the point, or he has said — not true at all, mark you — that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has been complaining about jobs being provided for the young people.

Aside

Mr. M. A. KING: You said that he said that, which was entirely ridiculous. What the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was querying was the fact that at this time when we are in an election year, suddenly we see a whole lot of jobs being provided for the young people which are giving them no security of employment, and which are being provided purely from the point of view of political expediency.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member should fight his own battles. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said nothing about an election year, he said nothing about security of jobs, and those are the cardinal points the honourable Member was just making. He did not say that, Sir. Why do you not fight your own wars?

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the honourable Member is quarrelling about. It is

clear that that is what the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was talking about. Can you imagine it! You have heard from time to time the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central calling on the Government to provide secure employment for the young people particularly in this country, and yet you are talking about his complaining on the other hand about providing jobs?

What we are concerned about is that type of employment which is provided for the young people of this country should not be employment of a mere passing nature, like the debushing experiments which are going on now, providing jobs for one and two months and three months. We understand that, but we are saying that you are the ones who have said all along that you do not believe in crash programmes. What is going on now?

(*Aside:* Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Is the fisheries project a crash programme?)

Mr. M. A. KING: An environmental crash programme. There is an environmental crash programme now which is providing a lot of jobs, but I think the young people of this country have to understand that these are jobs of a very temporary nature. We are not worried, we understand what the problem is, we understand what the approach is, but we say that the young people of the country must understand what the position is and recognise what is being done. We are glad that the young people are getting employment and getting some money in their pockets today. We support the fact that they are getting employment, but what we want to be sure of is that the occasion is being provided for them to get lasting and secure employment so that they can be happy in continuing employment as a matter of course.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) obviously has not paid a visit recently to that important area of his constituency which comprises Silver Hill, Gall Hill, Kingsland and Briar Hall. Had he paid a visit there he would have known that Senator Trotman, the Minister of Education and the Prime Minister had made sure that any difficulty which the people in Gall Hill had as a result of the utilisation of the very small playing area in Gall Hill in the past by the distinguished football team, the Pride of Gall Hill, has been removed by the fact that, in the interim, arrangements have been made for the Christ Church League to carry on their football matches at the mammoth playing field in that area of Christ Church which borders on St. Philip South, which borders on Christ Church East, and which is part of the national sporting facilities of Barbados. In addition, we have the Wotton playing field, which is situated within 100 yards of the playing field that the honourable Member

spoke about. Finally, the honourable Member ought to have observed that part of the Wotton-Kingsland estate has been acquired, the canes removed for the purposes of surveying to ensure that not only will there be an additional playing field space provided to substitute for the small bit that was lost at Gall Hill, but also to provide for that area at Briar Hall which is next door, which was to have been a playing field but which can no longer be a playing field because of the need for that area of land to be part of the major highway from the airport to the west coast.

We cannot parish pump about these matters. The honourable Member cannot seriously expect that he can secure any political advantage of any kind by trying to suggest that the Pride of Gall Hill football team has been deprived of playing facilities by losing an acre and a half of land when they have access to some 14 acres of land of new playing field facilities within 100 yards in one case and within less than 300 yards in the other case. The point is that we site playing fields in areas which are so situated that the maximum use can be made of the facilities by all of the surrounding residents, irrespective of what political persuasion they have. There is nothing permanent about politics. The honourable Member must not forget that he is sitting in a seat which, until the last election, voted for the Barbados Labour Party, and will vote for the Barbados Labour Party in this election.

Aside

1.35 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is rubbish. It is nonsense. Some time between now and September you are going to have the opportunity to know.

Obviously, an area as large as Briar Hall, Gall Hill, Silver Hill, Wotton and Kingsland, has to have playing fields of this kind. We are all proud of the fact that we have such a large area as Wotton, 6 acres of land in playing fields, used by the constituents from all the surrounding areas.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am going to bring some of my constituents up there).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No problem at all, absolutely no problem. They will get beaten in whatever game they come up there to play.

The position is that I do not think anybody can seriously look at the Government's record, no one who knows Barbados, and say that we have not sited playing fields in areas which were absolutely deserving of these. There are no playing fields that we have not built, and the record is very clear — Wotton in 1981/82, Murphy

Pasture, Buccaneer, St. James, Orange Hill — all of these were done in 1981/82, 1982/83, 1983/84 — playing fields — Durham, Connell Town, Parkinson, Gibbons, Ridgefield, Baileys — I am not stopping, you know — Content, Indian Ground, Lowthers, a major upgrading, Belfield.....

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: Call one in my constituency and I will give you \$500.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, if you happen to live in or represent a constituency in the middle of the urban area where there is no land available other than for the cemetery, do you expect us to dig up the graves and make it into a playing field to satisfy your needs for a playing field? We have reclaimed land on the seaside, and if you go down there, thanks to the initiative and effort of your opponent, you will see that we have made use of some vacant land there so that the people can play on it. What do you expect?

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: But if your constituency is so jam-packed and full of houses, do you want us to remove the houses for you to come in here and say that we have moved the people out of your constituency because we know that they vote for you? We cannot have our cake and eat it. There are certain areas in Barbados which, because of the historical development, are so built-up with houses, or with commercial buildings, or with factories....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member would give way — he was not here when I made my speech — on a point of elucidation: There is an area of land at the bottom of Passage Road, 7 acres, completely free of any graves, completely free of anything. We have been trying for some time to get some kind of facility built. They would not even cut the grass.

(*Aside:* Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You are accustomed to cutting the grass).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is right. I will continue to cut the grass. I will beg for anything. Right now we would take a road tennis court. You are perfectly right. We do have a cemetery and we do play road tennis in the cemetery. You are perfectly right.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The honourable Member, obviously, has not been paying much attention to what is going on. That area is the area we have designated for a gymnasium, a high quality facility. You know that we were negotiating with the Chinese Government for the provision of the facilities there as part of an aid programme. Up to a week ago, at Cabinet, we discussed the final proposals that have been put, and because of the fact that the cost is in the vicinity of \$15 million to \$20 million, and also the terms and conditions at the present moment, which are under negotiation, we are not in a position to give a definite date for the commencement of

it. But you blame us. If we go and try to get good advice in an area of sporting facilities from people who have an international reputation in this area, if we try and persuade them to help us to be able to partake of their advice, you are now going to criticize us. The honourable Member knows that that area is earmarked for that, but you must have some patience.

We have rejected suggestions for the use of that area for other things. We have moved the Sanitation Headquarters and the Workshop from that area to Wildey specifically because we wanted to earmark that for certain type of recreation facilities, and all that is holding up that is money. If we had \$15 million or \$20 million on terms and conditions that it would not be an undue strain on the economy of Barbados, we would give the go ahead. On the one hand, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central accuses us of recklessness in expenditure in Barbados, and, on the other hand, the honourable Member for St. Michael West tells us that we must spend money and build this high-powered facility there without reference to the cost.

The point is that area is earmarked, but the record of the Government is so good, that when matched against the record of the Democratic Labour Party, theirs can bear no comparison either in respect of numbers, in respect of quality or in respect of where they have been sited in relation to the population. If it happens that with all of that siting, there is not a facility in particular areas of Members' constituencies, what Members should be doing is to encourage the young people, try to get across the concept that the Government cannot provide all, that the Government having provided the facilities, the young people are under an obligation, through self-help efforts, to keep the playing fields clean by buying motorised lawn mowers, as they have done at Wotton out of their own money, by trying to keep the pavilions in good condition and saving maintenance costs so that more money can be spent to build new ones. Those are the things that we have to do.

You cannot bring politics. If you want to fight the election on this kind of area, we can push you anywhere we want to push you because our record is far superior to your record in our 10 years of Government, and as to the point of culture, I leave that to the former Minister of Culture. He would know how much we spent in that area.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Prime Minister mentioned the land at Passage Road. I just want to make one comment on that land at Passage Road, and it is that the Democratic Labour Party acquired that land in 1975 for recreational purposes. The Barbados Labour Party came into power in 1976 and they vacillated and wavered, and did all sorts of things for 9 years, and they have now got

back around to putting back that land for recreational purposes, something that the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) has striven for for years, so the Prime Minister can take no credit for that.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a lot of speeches today. As my colleague for Christ Church West Central has said, the honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) whether he has anything to say or not, believes that whenever the Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) speaks, he should speak. Today was one of those days when he had nothing to say. We on this side always know when Members over there have nothing to say. They get up and they say that the Democratic Labour Party has a bad record on this and they have a bad record on that. Whenever you hear them saying that, they have nothing to say.

The people in Barbados decided in 1976 that the Democratic Labour Party should be removed from office. They have so far given nine years to rectify the errors, real or imagined, and nine years after, whenever you can find nothing to say, you get up and say that the Democratic Labour Party did this and the Democratic Labour Party did that. The people are not going to judge you in the coming election on what the Democratic Labour Party did in 1964, and it is time that you all understand that.

1.45 p.m.

Getting strictly to the Resolution now, the first point I would like to make is this. I cannot understand, as my colleague for St. Michael South Central said, how the National Sports Council, having already been given \$2.15 million, finds it necessary now to come for a further \$200 000 in this financial year which expires on March 31. I would like to know, and I would like to hear from the Minister, how this money is being distributed and what is going to be done with it between now and March 31. We on this side, Mr. Chairman, do not believe that this present Government is distributing and providing recreational facilities in an equitable manner, and I can give you an example of any sort of facility, but I am sticking now to recreational facilities and facilities provided by the National Assistance Board, Child Care Board and all those Boards.

About nine months ago, I complained to the National Assistance Board and to the Minister responsible at that time about an incapacitated person who was living in Marchfield in a house that was going to fall down on him at any time. Mr. Chairman, the house has fallen down on him, and up to now the house has not been repaired. I will tell you this. There is a certain candidate for the Barbados Labour Party who, within two days after he was told he was running for a constituency, went into that constituency and saw a house which was in a bad state, and within four days after that he got a lot of people from the National Assistance Board with their picture taken along with him and put a house on that

spot, I am saying that these things are not done equitably. This person's house in Marchfield has fallen down on him.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two honourable Members on their feet.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The Resolution certainly does not deal with anything.....

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The honourable Member must make his point.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir this, problem which the honourable Member is complaining of really is not relevant, because, to my mind, this does not come within the Resolution. We are dealing with the Child Care Board, not with National Assistance. This deals with the Child Care Board, not the National Assistance Board. That is all I am saying. If you are saying that the man is a child, I can appreciate what you are saying, but you to me look like the child, not the old man. It is the Child Care Board we are dealing with.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: You all do not want to hear about that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Philip South may continue to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Let me go further, Mr. Chairman. About 10 months ago I took it upon myself to advise the relevant Minister at that time that the young people of the Six Cross Roads Housing Area, and I have spoken about this in this Honourable House already, have been playing volleyball and basketball on a strip of pasture, but they say they have to play out all the matches, because when the rain falls, they cannot play there. I have already made my representation to the Honourable Minister. I told the Minister that even if he did not give the people a hard court, at least he should send some person up there and let them let them get the impression that he was doing something. I told the Minister that, and up to this day not a single person has gone. We are asking why it is that in St. Philip South not a single recreational facility has been put there. Do not tell me about Charnocks. Charnocks has become part of St. Philip, because for the last election you decided to take Charnocks off the honourable Member for Christ Church East and add it to St. Philip, so that has nothing to do with St. Philip. That was done in order for the honourable Member for Christ Church East (Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham) to win back a seat. That is when it got into St. Philip.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Member must be heard in silence.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I listened to the Honourable Prime Minister a while ago reading out all the recreational facilities that that Government has provided since 1981, and there was not one in St. Michael West, not one in St. Philip South, and 98 per cent of them are in constituencies held by Barbados Labour Party members. Are you telling me that that is an equitable way of providing facilities for Barbados? It is not equitable.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Philip South were ordered by Mr. CHAIRMAN to be struck from the record.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I would like to know if any honourable Member on that side honestly believes that the way these facilities are being provided and distributed is an honest and a moral way of distributing these facilities. We have to understand something, as I was saying when I was interrupted by the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central (Hon. V. L. Johnson). Since the whole of Barbados has to pay a lot of taxes, a lot of levies and all these things, I believe that when you are sharing out these things that there has to be some criteria used to distribute them. The only criterium being used today, it appears to me, is that the constituency is being represented by a Barbados Labour Party representative. I may be wrong, but I want to put the minds of the people outside at ease that the taxes they are paying are being used to provide facilities for them, because lots of people in Barbados do not believe this is happening.

Finally, I will say this, Mr. Chairman. I started by saying that I find it alarming that the National Sports Council should be already in receipt of \$2.15 million and finds it necessary to come for a further \$200 000 to spend between now and March 31. I believe that this Honourable House needs to know why there is necessity for that because what I see in this Resolution is that it is mainly to enable it to meet the cost of additional maintenance and supervisory staff. I am wondering, when I take into consideration the number of sports facilities that have been provided, how come you need all of this maintenance staff and supervisory staff for the number of facilities that I hear the Honourable Prime Minister enunciating? There are only nine, and they should always have been staffed. What happened suddenly that you need more supervisory and maintenance staff? As the honourable Member for St. George South said, this is the time of what did you call it?

1.55 p.m.

(Aside: Hon. L. R. TULL: Mad dog rush.)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mad dog rush. That is what they are doing. A mad dog rush! The Barbados Labour Party believe that they could go on for four years and do nothing and then wait until six months before an election and come and do everything and feel that people in Barbados are going to accept that nonsense all the time. You see, people have suddenly awoken, and it is time you all stopped that. You cannot keep people suffering for all of those years and suddenly say "come" and think that because a man has been out of money for a long time and you put \$100 in his pocket, he is going to be so thankful he is going to say, "Vote for them." Those days have finished.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I say that we need a lot of explanation about this money, about how it is going to be spent.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Aside.

(Aside: Hon. L. R. TULL: I am going to ban you from Carringtons Village.)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened to the....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: While I am aware, Sir, that the Standing Orders are suspended, I draw to Your Honour's attention that, even when the Standing Orders are suspended, around this time it is usual for a report to be made if we are in Committee, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If an honourable Member is thirsty, I am sure there is some provision there for that. Please continue.

Asides.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened to the intervention.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, on both sides of the House.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: of the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) with a great deal of interest, because he is a speaker who generally generates a lot of heat on just about any subject in this House of Assembly.

(*Aside:* Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Nothing wrong with that. Substance, though!)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: We are waiting still for him to see if he can direct some of those energies to generate some light.....

(*Aside:* On what?)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: on any topic that he speaks about.

(*Aside:* Take off your glasses!)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Sir, I often wonder where the Democratic Labour Party gets its authority from to criticize the policy or the performance of the Barbados Labour Party. They impute motives to us which are not proper. They ask questions. Can you in fairness tell me that it is an honest policy — that is what the honourable Member asked — is it morally just for the Barbados Labour Party to embark on a programme such as it has embarked upon leaving out constituencies that are represented by the Members on the other side? Mr. Chairman, this party's programme in community development is without parallel anywhere at all in this region and, when compared with the meagre performance of the Democratic Labour Party, stands as a signal and as a model for other persons to follow.

When they were in power for 15 years, 15 long years.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I draw to Your Honour's attention the rules against any honourable Member repeating and constantly repeating a speech that has been made before in the same debate, and making points that have been made by other Members. That is a standing rule of all Parliaments, including this one. I submit that the honourable Member is repeating the speech made by the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, the speech made by the former Attorney-General, the honourable Member for St. George South, and therefore, Sir, is in breach of the Rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Irrelevance, please. Please continue.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Labour Party was in power for 15 long years and during that period of time they had ample opportunity to address their minds to the question of

community development in Barbados. They addressed their minds to the subject and they came up with a miniature pavilion in Eden Lodge,.....

Aside

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: in a seat held by the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves). A miniature pavilion!

(*Aside:* Mr. P. M. GREAVES: That miniature pavilion got people in football, Intermediate cricket.)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: They addressed their minds to the problem and built a microcosmic pavilion in Lower Estate on lands that did not belong.....

Asides

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. Continue.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Submicroscopic! They built a submicroscopic pavilion in Lower Estate on lands that did not belong to them or to the Government, and they did it at the instigation of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes). I invite you to go down there now and tell me if that pavilion is there today and tell me what function it serves, if it serves a function. They addressed their minds to community development by the building of a pavilion in Gall Hill, St. John, in the seat held by the then Prime Minister. Then, they built a pavilion with slightly more imagination in Grazettes, in a seat held by the Democratic Labour Party. That was the sub-total of the programme of the Democratic Labour Party in the 15 years that they were in power.

(*Aside:* Shame!)

(*Aside:* Disgrace!)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Not a single facility was built or imagined for any seat held by the Barbados Labour Party — not a single one — and only four built, for themselves, in the 15 years that they were in power. Now where do they get the moral authority from to come in here and indict this Government on its programme of community development?

Our programme for community development is predicated upon a firm understanding of how a community grows and what facility it needs to facilitate that growth. It is based upon a firm understanding that, in order to develop a healthy community, we have to proceed on a holistic programme. We do not only provide recreational facilities but we have a balanced programme. We develop their heads, we develop their hearts and we

develop their physical forms, so that our people are well-rounded, and that programme of community development as it relates to playing facilities is balanced by our school programme and it is balanced by the other programmes of Government, all designed to bring Barbados into a full stature of national manhood.

2.05 p.m.

Sir, the programme of the Barbados Labour Party by contrast is dazzling. It is based not upon a parochial understanding of the problems of community development, but it is based upon a firm appreciation of the catchments, and that is why, Sir, we have built a major facility in Black Rock.

Aside

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Yes, in Belfield. The honourable Member might be interested to know that the Wibisco Stars, the people up in Eden Lodge, all come down to Belfield in order to use the hard court facilities down there. That is the way it is to be. You cannot have a little miniature pavilion in every constituency. You build a representative facility large enough and well conceived enough to cater to the needs of the people that live within a radius that makes it convenient for them to use that facility. So the facility in Black Rock, even though it is located in Belfield, caters to people from the Farm, Fairfield, Wavell Avenue, Free Hill, and up in Grazettes. The people from St. Michael West are always down there.

Aside

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Not Hindsbury Road, the people from St. Michael West go down there, and for the first time in the history of Barbados the people themselves got together and had what is described as a St. Michael Constituency Fair. They got together and they sponsored it — private people. It had nothing to do with the politicians. I was not in it. They only invited me to be present. They did it themselves, but they all were of the St. Michael constituencies, all represented in a central effort, and that is what we attempt to do. We do not build the little barriers and little separate villages where people engage in tribalism and say to a man — this is my pavilion, do not venture on it. We want to build Barbadians as a nation, bring them together as a nation, so that they can interact with one another without feeling that they are outsiders and aliens in a part of their own land.

Belfield Pavilion was a pavilion, I am very pleased to say, that was conceived in my mind, planned in my mind, and designed in my mind, getting together with the architects and sitting down together, and I telling them what the people down there tell me they wanted. When

we had done it as a mock-up, we took it down there and we put it on the pasture and showed it to them so that they could understand what we were designing, and we were designing something that would meet the needs of the people rather than something that we imposed on them. That is why it is such a popular facility.

Sir, it makes me sad that a major component of that facility which was designed as a part, a very essential ingredient to make it as a whole, has up to now not been completed, and I refer to the children's playing park. That was designed with the idea in mind that while adult activities are going on in the main complex, the children who, for want of something to do in their own area, would intervene and get themselves mixed up with the players and get injured perhaps, should be by themselves in their own little compound engaging in play and in what other activity they chose to engage themselves in. It should have had swings, it should have had see-saws, it should have had those domes, and when I left the Ministry of Sport that programme should have been implemented.

Another key component is the children of the Nightengale Home who are residents right on the Belfield playing field, you may say, who would have had a facility where they could go for recreational activities, structured and supervised, separate and distinct from the main complex. To date, that part of the programme has not been completed, and I would like to appeal to the Honourable Minister responsible to make sure that when he is seeking funds for the carrying out of the legitimate programmes in the Ministry of Community Development, he does not forget that he owes Belfield the rest of the facility that was designed for the people of that community, because it will not function in the way it was intended to function with that major component left out. There are funds provided for it but, to date, it has not yet been addressed in any serious way. I would like to make sure that that gets looked after.

Sir, I know that we get very excited when we address these matters, because we treat them as parochial matters, and we have a right to fight to make sure that our constituents are served in terms of their interest. But we have to be realistic about the whole matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two minutes.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: The resources of the Ministry are not limitless, the Government is not limitless, and, therefore, we have to make sure that what we design is designed not selfishly, but is put on the fringes of constituencies like the one we are talking about in St. George serving one community in Haggatt Hall and the other community in Dash Valley. That is how we site them, not parochially but designed to cater to more than one group. That is not a selfish programme, Sir. That is

a programme that takes fully into consideration the total holistic community needs, and I would like to congratulate the Government for taking this measured approach and for providing the very elaborate range of facilities that have been provided during the 10 years that this Government has been in power.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION

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

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

The question that the House do now stand suspended until 3.15 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.
2.15 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (RESUMED)

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

We are on Head 39. The honourable Member for St. Philip North caught my eye.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I am indeed grateful for the contributions of two Members on the other side, for various reasons. The honourable Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) gave me a term I wanted to find, "mad dog rush." He said this is a period of mad dog rush. The Honourable Prime Minister and Member for Christ Church East Central for the first time provided the information I was seeking so badly when he told this Honourable House that in the parish of Christ Church, at Wotton, there is an area being bulldozed now for the preparation of a school, I believe, and a playing field.

Mr. Chairman, some time before Christmas I was driving along that road and I was the most surprised man to notice some 15 acres of ripe canes being bulldozed. I could not understand what was happening in this country. Here it is that in the month of December — the crop traditionally starts around late January, early February — about five weeks away from reaping season, a Government that has placed a levy on land owners in this country if they have land that is not cultivated, a certain amount of money per year, because of the mad dog period would be so insensitive and such bad managers of the people's money that they would bulldoze 15 acres of ripe canes in Christ Church, when they could have waited for a short time, could have waited for five weeks more, and bring revenue of some \$60 000 into the kettle of Barbados, valuable foreign exchange that could be earned by that sugar. How else can we explain the season but a mad dog season? I am glad that the Honourable Prime Minister is the one that brought before this House the fact that it is his Government that has made such an irrational decision that they could not wait five weeks until those canes were cut before they proceed with whatever planning programme they might want to do. Five weeks; that is all it would have required, and I am certain the compensation took into consideration those canes, so the Government is some \$120 000 the poorer today because of that irrational decision.

Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before us is for some \$200 000 for the Sports Council, and I am not surprised that the Sports Council would need this, because if you take the way they have managed some facilities, you would understand what is happening. Let us take the facility they had started to provide in Bayleys, St. Philip. They got to the stage where they bulldozed it and they levelled it, and then, for some unknown reason, they immediately abandoned the facility before they grassed it. I was up that way last week and you cannot now understand or see that any work at all has been done on that facility, so it means now that whenever they get back to Bayleys, they have to start the work all over again at tremendous expense, when they could have continued and finished grass Bayleys and allowed the young people to use it. But they, for some strange reason, just abandoned Bayleys and rushed off to some other places where they have been carrying out their work. I am saying that those types of decisions make it absolutely necessary for the Sports Council to have to come back for additional funds, because they are not following through their projects. I would not like to interpret any reason, I can only say that the funds must have run out.

Now that additional funds are being granted, I hope that Bayleys will be one of those places that will be completed before it costs you more money to do it. The young men in that area could use it for football

or cricket, but right now it cannot be used because the grass is some three or four feet high, and I am saying that with some of this money I expect you to get back to Bayleys and once again have those grounds in a state that they can be used by the young men. It is certainly an oversight, to put it mildly, to get to the stage where you raise the expectations of the people in the area that there will be a playing field available to them, you went in and you bulldozed and you levelled, and then leave it, at the stage where it is of no use to the people in the area, such that the Sports Council will have to come back at some time in the future and spend a lot more money on it than they would have spent if they had continued the programme at that appropriate time.

I have spoken already and asked the appropriate Ministry for the area of land in Blades Hill that at some time was before this House and was acquired for recreational facilities. Unfortunately, in Blades Hill you have not even got as far as Merricks, because nothing has been done to the land. It is still there with some old ratoons, and I am asking the appropriate Ministry that in these funds to find if they can provide some funds to bulldoze, level and grass Blades Hill so that the young men can make use of it.

This is my contribution, that, hopefully in this new allocation before Parliament, those two facilities will get some money so that the people in St. Philip can make use of those two facilities.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am just going to demonstrate once again the honourable Member's opinion and value that is not worth a bad penny. The area of land that the honourable Member talks about is an area of land that has been earmarked for well over a year for the siting of the Wotton school. It was known by the plantation owners that the road would bifurcate that field, so that between the road at Silver Hill the plantation owners themselves were making application to the Ministry of Planning for some considerable period of time for subdivision.

He says it is \$120 000. On what evidence is he basing that? In his usual style, guestimates! He has not told you how many tonnes of sugar, how many tonnes of cane and what per tonne he expected.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is not a cane valuer).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Of course not, but he proposed to come in here and pontificate with no rational basis for his pontification and trump out a sum of money. No fertiliser went into the canes. Was it first, second, third, fourth or fifth crop? In any event, it is a known fact that in today's world, with the price of world sugar at five cents a pound, it pays you better in some instances to get paid out at the time when the cane has

not been reaped, because the cost of reaping it is greater than the end product and the end value. That is a fact. Up to 90 000 tonnes of cane that rule does not apply, because we have preferential markets for that.

In any event, it is from members of the honourable Member's other profession that pressure came for time, because they said they could not survey the land unless the canes were removed. That is what the surveyors said. They also said that if you wanted the contour plans drawn so as to allow the architects to get on with the business, it had to be done by a particular period of time, and the only reason why it was not done before was because of the extraordinary rain we had and because we were negotiating with the World Bank to put Wotton as part of the World Bank scheme rather than building out of our own money.

I will tell the honourable Member this. I am perfectly happy to debate with him in here or anywhere the wisdom of the decision. It is a guestimate that he talks about, and in his usual style he cannot justify it when it is subjected to the test of examination. Those are the facts. It is a World Bank school for Wotton, because you had to move the school from where it was, which was flooded, which was a potential floor area; because of the fact that the area in any event, because of the road, was going to be the subject of a change of use, and the best area for putting the school, in our opinion, was there, notwithstanding the fact that it was moved from one constituency into the other; and thirdly, that if you had to reap the cane in today's world, having regard to the fact that this particular year there is a surplus of production in Barbados in relation to the guaranteed prices, when you balance all those factors into account and the delay that would occur, it was better to do what the Government did. That was the advice we had and I believe it is better advice than the one the honourable Member has just given, because the one the honourable Member has just given is one put forward with a purpose of attempting to discredit the Government.

3.30 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I sat here in absolute amazement as I heard the Honourable Prime Minister speak. I cannot believe that the Leader of the Government, the Prime Minister, has just made that extraordinary speech he just made. Who is running this country, the World Bank, the Surveyors or the Government? The surveyors told him that they have to get the canes moved in order to survey the land. The World Bank says we have to get something, so we push down the canes, and then he says that, given the price of sugar today at five cents a pound, it is better — I do not want to misquote him — it pays you better to get paid out at a time when the canes have not been reaped.

I have never heard a clearer invitation, to burn down canes than that. Never heard a clearer invitation! It is better to get paid out before the canes are reaped because at five cents a pound, it is a waste of time reaping the canes, because it is going to cost more! That is why we came in here and gave the people all of that money in subsidy. We have given them \$20 million this year, \$18 million last year, \$20 million the year before precisely because the price of cane is such that it is not worth the while to reap them, but we say to them, in the interest of the development of this country, you have to reap the canes so we are going to give you some of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to entertain a full debate on the matter of cane prices or anything of the sort. You will understand that we are sticking to the question of grants to agencies, the Sports Council and that sort of thing.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. We are dealing with a field in which there were some canes. I am only responding to what the Prime Minister said, and I take your point that we are not going to discuss the subsidies, and I apologise for taking the debate in that direction. But, Sir, you can understand my consternation as I heard the Prime Minister himself, in an attempt to villify the honourable Member for St. Philip North, in his attempt to castigate the honourable Member in his professional capacity — he commits a cardinal sin according to the Prime Minister — get up and make that kind of speech.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Wait until I get up, I will deal with you).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is tempting me. He is sitting down in his chair now telling me, "when he is finished with me!" Well, we are going to see.

It strikes me that what the honourable Member said is valid. With five weeks to go before the crop, it seems to me that the Prime Minister could have called the surveyors and told them, 'This is the position, we are going to reap the crop. We will see that it is the first crop that is to be reaped when the crop starts. We cannot afford to set the example of having bulldozers bulldozing ripe canes in Barbados.'

This is a party, as you know, which is always discussing the cane blade speech, and now here it is he is saying that it is all right to bulldoze some ripe canes if you have to put up a school in order to get into the World Bank Project. The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and all the other agencies outside of Barbados are more important than the principle that we, collectively, have been trying to imbue into the people of this country, that the development of agricultural

resources are important to the development of this country!

He raises questions about the ability of my colleague to value! My colleague is not a quantity surveyor. He is not a valuer of sugar canes. There are very few people in this country who know how to value sugar cane. But I would argue this. The Prime Minister may be an expert in that field.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is an expert in fishing, Sir, not sugar canes, but he might know how to value canes.

When you are a professional valuer, you have to seek further expertise before you can put a price on sugar cane, so if the honourable Member says it is \$60 000 and it turns out to be \$30 000, the principle of what he is saying is still valid and to get up and try, in the manner in which the honourable Member has done on more than one occasion, to question the honourable Member's professional competence as a valuer, I say it is unworthy of a man who, himself, is a professional, and who would expect persons to regard his professional competence in a certain light. I object, in the context of this Resolution, to the remarks by the Prime Minister about my colleague's capacity and ability as a valuer. He is the only one of his kind in this country, and in the same way that when you go to a doctor and the doctor gives you an opinion, whether you like it or not, that is the doctor's opinion, he is the only one of his kind, and when he gives an opinion as a valuer, that is a professional opinion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has not been the subject of the debate. Let us get on with the debate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the honourable Member, the Minister, has not had a chance to respond to certain matters. I have no doubt that he is going to respond before this debate is finished, but earlier, Sir — and this is really the reason why I got up — the former Attorney General and Foreign Minister, the honourable Member for St. George South, led this Committee to believe that I was giving information that was not valid, that was not worthy. I have subsequently handed Your Honour some information, and I merely wish to say for the record that the information which I gave to Your Honour confirms that, had I been in the mood to contest the comments made by my colleagues on the other side, I would have been able to put information before this Committee that it is not necessary to put. I just want to say, for the record, that I brought to Your Honour's attention the information to substantiate the point I had made.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am sure the honourable Member would appreciate that in the context of this particular year we are now in, when the likely production of sugar is 110 000 tonnes, the situation has to be looked at in the light of what price one would get for any tonne of sugar produced beyond the preferential price. And I say this, the honourable Member can well appreciate that we are in this position because of the decision made by him. If the honourable Member in 1975 had not been a gambler, as he was then, and had agreed when we were able — I see the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central smiling, enjoying it in anticipation — like how Fiji did, like how Mauritius did and how others did, and had, for the future, committed us to a greater amount of sugar in the European Economic Community price system, the position on prices would be different today for us but I say that when the honourable Member gets up in here and says that \$60 000 or over \$100 000 is lost, when you question that and you look at it and you see that when you talk about the difference between the delays that arise on a project, the honourable Member is exaggerating greatly, and his opinion as a valuer must be questioned with regard to that exaggeration. That is the point I make. His opinion as a valuer must be questioned.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member has given way. He has given way on a point of elucidation. In fact, we are in Committee, so once he has given way, I can make this speech now.

The honourable Member, I think, realized that it was not a good tact and he turned off. Surely, in 1975 we were considered to have made the best decision. He himself just said that when the experts advise you, you take advice. The sugar producers were our experts, and we, by making sure that 50 000 tonnes of sugar had a guarantee market, which at that time was lower than the world market — at that time, if you would recall, we got a bonanza from selling our sugar on the world market. We produced in excess of merely over 100 000 tonnes. We could not commit more than 50 000 tonnes to a guarantee market which, at the time, was much lower than the world market. We would have been in trouble over the three years following, and I predict that in the next three years the price of sugar, as it has always done, will go up, and had we put 75 000 tonnes into a guaranteed market, we would be at the mercy of the EEC, whom the honourable Member has to negotiate with and knows they do claw back as a matter of course, and we would be worse off. I am sure that on another occasion we can have a debate on that, but I do not think it is fair for the honourable Member to start talking about gambling. It was not a gamble; it was a calculated, well thought out, reasoned decision made in the context of everybody in Barbados who had an interest in the industry.

3.40 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have heard all sorts of legalistic type of defences put forward by the Honourable Prime Minister in this Honourable House. What he is seeking to do is to justify an act of vandalism by the Government which, in effect, has resulted in the virtual malicious destruction of ten acres of ripe cane two months before the canes could be reaped, and now he is saying that the canes had no value, and tries to relate that to the ultimate price that may be fetched by sugar on the world market.

The fact is, Sir, that the land has intrinsic value. According to him, that value relates to the current use to which it is put under the laws of Barbados, and the land is being acquired under that value. The second fact is that the canes have an intrinsic value, and if the canes were reaped and the canes were sold to the factories, the owners would get a given price per tonne for that cane. Where the losses go in terms of the overall national thing is another matter, but the point is that there is a value attributable to the canes and that value has been wantonly vandalised by the present Administration, and I am sure it is because of lack of co-ordination between their planning for the use of the land and the point at which the acquisition was made. So you have to accept that, by cutting down the canes, you have incurred a loss that you have to pay for, just as you have to pay for the land, and therefore it has got to be an immediate loss to the Treasury however you compute it, because the fact that the canes have been grown — whether they had fertiliser, there must have been some labour input, and the land must have been used for the purpose during the previous year or so — means that the canes have an intrinsic value, so therefore what you are doing is, you are not only taking agricultural land out of production. This Barbados Labour Party is now taking agricultural land, land that is extremely fertile, producing canes, canes of high fibre and low water content, canes of high sugar yield out of production, and now, Sir, is coming to tell us that the canes have no value.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Canes may not have value, but there is a time limit.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I know, Sir, but this kind of argumentation must be dealt with, because if you are going to tell me that if I have ten acres of cane in Barbados today and that they have no value because the world price of sugar is going to be five cents, I say you are wrong. I say I am going to get the price for those canes when I sell them to the factory, and at the end of the year, I will probably get an additional bonus, depending on the price support or grant mechanisms and so on during the year.

I hope that has dealt with the kind of legalistic distortions rather than arguments which you get from the

Honourable Prime Minister from time to time. He was at his worst today. I have never heard worse arguments yet. Can you imagine he is telling all the people in Barbados that there is no point reaping the canes. He is saying they are getting 90 000 tonnes and that all the canes in Barbados over 90 000 tonnes should be ploughed back into the land because they have no value, they should not be reaped. That is what you are saying, and I do not believe that any Prime Minister of this country should be putting across to the public that kind of position, because it is incorrect, it is wrong.

What you have done is that you have messed up on the acquisition. Your timing has been wrong. You failed to indicate to the growers on the plantation that they probably should not have put the land back in canes this year, and you will have to pay them and compensate them for their canes, you have to pay them for the land, and the taxpayers will have to pay the additional money, five cents or no five cents per tonne. You know that perfectly well.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get back to the Child Care Board and the National Sports Council.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I am talking about the cost of acquisition of the land for the purposes of a playing field. What I am saying is that one reason why we have to come for this \$200 000 is because the Government has been so wasteful in spending public money that they have now cut down ten acres of cane and have to pay the people for the cane, and all they had to do was to wait for two months, wait until February 3, and reap the canes. Then, they could buy the land at a lower price and would not have to pay for the canes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This has nothing to do with the acquisition. Nowhere does it talk about acquisition.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I am being assaulted by the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw) a verbal assault, and I seek your protection.

Sir, to make the final point, the first person in this House to present a distorted argument as to the allocation of our sugar yield in 1975 was the honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. I cannot let you continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will not bother with that. I will wind up at this point in time. I believe I have made the point and I have dealt very effectively with the bad reasoning, bad argumentation by the Honourable Prime Minister on the floor of this House.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the honourable Members on this side in calling for more equitable distribution and allocation of resources in terms of providing sporting facilities not necessarily on a constituency basis, but certainly as regards the people of this country, where they live in communities.

Some time ago I made a speech here, and I said that I can have no quarrel in terms of playing fields for the constituency of St. Michael North. There are three playing fields in St. Michael North, two reasonable size ones and a very small playing field, but, Sir, the sporting facilities provided are indeed inadequate, and it is time that some of the funds that have been allocated under this vote be expended to be of service to these communities. Take, for example, the Eden Lodge area, which is an exceedingly large community, a very big community. There is a playing field there, a small playing field and a small pavilion as the honourable Member for St. Michael West said, but that very small pavilion has assisted the young boys at Eden Lodge in reaching the level of First Division football in the BFA competition. That same small pavilion has enabled the youngsters in Eden Lodge to reach a very high standard in the Barbados Cricket Association's Intermediate Division, I think it is, or maybe the Second Division, so that is what that small pavilion has done. That very small pavilion that was established by the Democratic Labour Party in our time has served the community of Eden Lodge in a number of ways, not only cricket and football.

In that very area of Eden Lodge there is no hard court facility, and it is a very big area. The youngsters have to play their basketball using one basket only, and everybody is shooting towards that single basket. Yet, we have a very large community in the Eden Lodge area. The place up there is crying out — and it seems to be falling on some deaf ears — for some hard court facilities like what I understand have been established in the Bay Land area, like what I understand have been established in the Pinelands area, or in the Belfield area. Up there is crying out for those kinds of facilities because the youngsters, the young boys and the young girls in that area, really need facilities to give them the enthusiasm for these kinds of sports.

3.50 p.m.

The same thing in a slightly different way, Sir, applies to Grazettes. About 1974 some hard courts were established in Grazettes. Somewhere about 1978 and 1979 the National Sports Council sent someone and dug two holes in those playing areas which they refilled very badly, so now we do not have an even surface. In other words, Sir, the surfaces up there need resurfacing. At the same time, the sports clubs that use the facilities, particularly for volleyball and netball, need some

assistance. They asked the National Sports Council to assist them in terms of floodlighting the area, but up to now, although the floodlights have been promised, that has not been forthcoming.

In Cave Hill, there is a playing field which is to serve the community of upper Lodge Hill, Cave Hill, St. Stephen's Hill and probably parts of Wanstead, because there is no playing field in that area. I would like to see that playing field extended. Some time ago, about ten years ago, that playing field was made smaller. Parts of the playing field were taken in for road extension, and the fence that was around the playing field was removed and never put back. Subsequent to that, a pavilion was taken and put on the playing field, making a small playing field still smaller. I believe that there is enough room up there in that Montgomery area for extending that playing field so that we can have a bigger playing area, a field of accepted standards for the youngsters in the Montgomery area.

I would like the Minister responsible for Sport to give some attention to the points I have just made because I do not think we can stress sufficient the contribution that sports have made to the total development of the people of Barbados and wherever sports are played. I want the Minister to pay some attention to these points.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the Minister may wind up.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I think I should get up and say that Rome was not built in a day and that would have been the end of the matter, because when I introduced this Resolution, I was at pains to point out that there were a number of facilities provided during the past year, nine in the 1983-84 financial year and another five in this 1985-86 financial year. I do not understand the term, "mad dog rush". How could there be any mad dog rush idea when more playing fields and facilities were provided in the past financial year than in this financial year?

(*Aside:* Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Louis, he said it!)

(*Aside:* Hon. L. R. TULL: I said mad dog foaming at the mouth.)

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: The honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) talked about mad dog rush. I think it was in this context that he used it. I want the honourable Member for St. Philip North and the other Members on that side to know that we on this side have nothing to fear. I do not allow political consideration or emotion to influence my judgement when it comes to playing facilities for the young people. The young people of Barbados, I am satisfied, trust my judgement, my integrity and my honesty as far as delivering the facilities to them. Not even one of you on that side can get up and question it, though you may try to throw aspersions on people's integrity and character.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: Facts.)

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: The point is this, the honourable Members never had any policy. They never did much for the young people, and now they see the young people participating in sports as they have never seen them before, they are jealous. Do not worry. The young people have signalled to you that they are not interested in you because you made no provisions for them. This Government is going to continue to provide recreational facilities in terms of playing fields, hard courts, as well as pavilions. And while I am on the subject of pavilions, I have already gone on record as saying that the pavilions will not only be used for sporting purposes, but they will also be used to accommodate the Government Skills Training Programme and used as community centres. I have said that they are multi-purpose and therefore we should not seek.....

Aside.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, that the vote of \$200 000 is Current. The honourable Members from that side did not take time to do their homework, because if they had done that they would see that there is a sum of money coming in another Resolution coming for Capital, and it is on that that they should have addressed their remarks and their debate. This is for current expenditure. I will not duck my responsibility. I will explain why we are asking for the \$200 000.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is all we are asking you to do. Do not get upset.)

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: It is not a question of bringing on people at this particular time, because, as honourable Members would have imputed, elections are around the corner. Yes, there was another re the staff. We built pavilions and it was necessary to provide supervisors, maids and watchmen for these centres. We provided extra playing fields and we have had requests — I, as Minister, have been told by the sportsmen — that the fields need proper levelling and I directed the National Sports Council to appoint supervisors and take on additional ancillary staff so that the playing fields could be properly kept. If I am going to be wrong for taking that decision, I stand condemned. But I know that my judgement is correct. The sportsmen have complained that they suffer a lot of injury because of ill-prepared playing fields, and I felt I owed it to myself, to the Government and to this country to rectify what I consider to be a wrong. So the money will go towards paying the watchmen, the supervisors, the ten persons that were employed to repair the grounds and to keep them in good shape. A Superintendent of Works is in the National Sports Council. It never had a Superintendent of Works.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: What is his name?)

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: And since we are carrying out more capital projects, I felt it was absolutely

necessary to have an officer who will keep watch on the projects as the contractors provide and build for us. That is the decision. So what are we quarrelling about?

Aside

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: The honourable Members are part and parcel — he is their colleague — of a fellow called Cameron Tudor, because it was Cameron Tudor, Mr. Chairman, who wrote in one of his articles, and I quote from the *Nation*, that “the Government pays the incredibly high sum of \$400 a month for storing the plywood which the National Sports Council has”. I say this categorically, that is a blatant untruth. But he belongs to the Democratic Labour Party, and that is why honourable Members, influenced by that sort of release, that sort of stuff coming out of the paper, would come in here and question why the Government is asking for \$200 000. We paid not one cent. The storage facility was offered to the Government free of charge. But it does not surprise me, because Cameron Tudor is a member of the Democratic Labour Party. Birds of a feather flock together!

Mr. Chairman, let me also address the question of the Child Care Board. The Child Care Board asked for a supplementary sum of way in excess of \$700 000. At the beginning of this financial year when we attended Estimates Meeting, in an attempt to make the Child Care Board operate on a budget which was considered to be reasonable, a decision was taken to invite it to look at ways and means of operating within its budget. But the work of the Child Care Board has increased. Fostering has become an additional burden on, and responsibility of, the Child Care Board. The Child Care Board is handling more cases of child abuse and other areas which are of concern to this country.

4.00 p.m.

The services provided by that Board have increased considerably. It was, therefore, necessary, with the amount of work and other responsibilities, that additional funds be given to that Board to carry out its responsibility. Am I being asked here by members of the Opposition to cut back on the funds of the Child Care Board which is trying to investigate and reveal cases of abuse in this country inflicted against the children? Am I supposed to sit in here today and hear the Opposition asking for an explanation, when they are fully aware or ought to be aware of the responsibility and the charge of the Child Care Board? I say this. Are they not aware that the trade unions that represent the workers asked sometime ago for protective clothing, shoe allowances and laundry allowances for the workers of the Child Care Board, and in honouring the agreement it was felt that the necessary funds would have to be provided? Therefore, it was absolutely necessary for me to invite this Chamber to approve part of the \$700 000 which will go to defray the cost of the increments that were negotiated and agreed to by the Child Care Board.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I wonder if the Minister will give way for just a minute. Since the Minister is giving us information for the first time, I wonder if he would be a little more specific. He said that the case load had increased and he talked about the improvements in the conditions of work. I wonder if the Minister, for our information, could be a little more specific and give us an indication of the number of increased cases that have occurred in the last few months, and also the costs of these new agreements with the trade unions. I think it would be very helpful. I think the information which he is giving us is very important, and I wonder if he could be more specific.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to be specific at this stage because, as the honourable Member knows, that will take me a lot of time. But I promise the honourable Member that I will provide him with the information in writing, and I will do that as early as tomorrow morning.

But the honourable Members from that side must not be allowed to get away with cheap debating inside here. I have set out here and explained why it was necessary to have additional staff. I set out to explain why it was necessary to have additional funds, and therefore, I could not see why the honourable Members on that side would have sought to give the impression to the public that, because this year is known as an election year, this Government or this Minister will be following a very bad precedent of trying to bring on people, and pad up the work list in order to win cheap political votes. I stand by honest principles, lofty principles, in the discharge of my responsibility, and I take very strong objection to anyone from that side or anywhere else imputing improper motives in the discharge of my duties, Mr. Chairman.

The question that Head 39 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985–86 No. 21

PART II — CAPITAL

HEAD 81 — MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW (St. Michael South East): Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it is necessary for me to go into much detailed explanation on this particular Head, but I wish to say that this really falls under Capital.

Much has been said in the previous debate. All I will want to say at this stage is that the sum of money asked for can be put into a category like this. It is a refund of Stamp Duty of some \$37 000 which was paid for material for the new athletic track. The Ministry of Finance and Planning had indicated that the duty would have been waived, but when the material came for the laying of the new athletic track, which, as we all know, was laid just leading up to the CARIFTA games last year,

the National Sports Council paid the duty and now we are asking for reimbursement.

The second part of my explanation is that, last year, everyone wanted Crop Over to be held at the National Stadium and it was a question of protecting the track which was newly laid. It was felt by the experts that it would have been very dangerous to have people parading on the newly laid track, and hence the National Sports Council was directed to acquire some plywood to place over the track so that no harm could be done to the surface. I felt that the plywood could be used for other occasions, as was seen at the Youth Rally when Her Majesty, the Queen was here. On that occasion the grounds were extremely sloppy and the plywood was very handy indeed.

The other part of this Resolution or explanation centres on the fact that for the visit of Her Majesty the Queen, we had to undertake some brushing up work, some painting of the stands, in particular the VIP stand, and I think providing the Royal Box. That involved some \$32 000. We are asking, since that money was taken out of the original allocation of the National Sports Council, their Capital allocation, for reimbursement of that sum of money.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that that explanation satisfies all honourable Members in this Chamber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Second the motion.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): I rise to second it, Sir. I would have hoped that the Member for St. Michael South — before he goes — would have asked for something for the constituency of St. Michael South. I know that he himself, after 15 years there, has only put down one hard court and a very small pavilion which ought to be extended. I believe that, in respect of the facilities in a place known as Jeslyn Avenue, he will be justly proud to see how a dump heap which had all rats and garbage, and bush and so on, has been transformed through the imagination of a friend of the people into a minipark, which is known, I am told, as Lighters Park. I would have hoped that he would have had an opportunity to mention something about this as well as St. Paul's Avenue, where for some time he has been asking for some form of recreational facilities. I am very happy to report, if he does not know — unless he asked Miss Grimes to tell him — how well they have been getting on out there, not with Government funds but with the imagination of friends of the Government. Sir, I would invite him to make a few comments on this. I would imagine you would be happy to say something about it.

Aside

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, I have something to do, not to say. I have done something.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I really do not wish to get involved in this little aberration which goes on from time to time.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance is not in his chair, but I think that there is something not quite right about the system we have. It would seem to me, if the National Sports Council is laying a track, that they really ought not to be required to pay out money for Stamp Duty and then for the Parliament to have to pass a Resolution to refund the National Sports Council, when, if my memory serves me correctly, this matter could have been handled by a simple administrative decision. It simply does not make sense for us to be passing a Resolution now to refund a statutory corporation for the payment of stamp duty. It is administratively cumbersome, to say the least. I do not understand it, and if we are likely to have this kind of thing again — it is true that we are not likely to have a track laid, hopefully we will not have a track laid at the stadium for some considerable time, but I have no doubt that there are other similar administrative snafus, if you will pardon the expression. It is a waste of taxpayers' money for us to come in, to print this up, and go through the whole process. God knows it was probably 27 minutes by 37 people going from this person to the other person, from one Ministry to the other in order to get this refund. It does not make sense to me, and I am calling on the Minister of Finance to take administrative steps to ensure that we do not have to go through this again.

4.10 p.m

Sir, the Minister has indicated that the plywood has been used for the visit of Her Majesty and therefore I will not ask the question which I was tempted to ask as to whether he or anyone knew where the plywood was at this time. It is my understanding that storage of the plywood might be a problem, and as a result of not having anywhere to store the plywood, it may be stored in several places.

Aside

Mr. B. M. TAITT: All right. My colleagues are saying that what I am saying is not satisfactory and I should ask the Minister to state to the House where is the plywood. It is a lot of money for plywood and, based on information which has reached us, it does not seem as if the plywood is in any one place that we can identify, so, perhaps, the Minister could tell the House if he knows, or if anybody knows, where the plywood is, because we seem to be paying a lot of money for plywood.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, just let me briefly respond. I have been informed that the

Council took a decision to have the plywood stored at the Belle. There is some warehouse or some storeroom in the Belle. I think the honourable Member will appreciate that, from time to time, a sheet or two may be required to do something else. They did not bring all from the Belle on the occasion of the Youth Rally, so from time to time, like any other thing and any other case, all the plywood will not be used. If you are insinuating that there is any irregularity.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I am merely asking where the plywood is. I am not insinuating anything. The Minister seems now to be suggesting that there is the possibility the plywood has gone for a walk. That is not what I was saying at all, but I am willing to listen to the Minister now if he has new information on the plywood. We merely wish to know where the plywood is. He has told us it is at the Belle, if I understand him correctly.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I think the honourable Member, when he starts looking across here and across there and around in politics, he had better know who he is talking about and with. I want you to understand that. Do not get up in here and make any imputations, because it will come back, smack in your face.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Minister himself should not be interested or know where the plywood is as a Minister. The Minister now is discussing the plywood in specific terms. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that when I ask him a question, as a Minister, I expect him to turn to somebody and say "where is the plywood?" But it seems to me that he has specific knowledge about the plywood.

Certain remarks exchanged between Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW and Mr. B. M. TAITT at this stage, were ordered by Mr. CHAIRMAN to be expunged from the record.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to your attention that debating time for any one Resolution is three hours. I wonder if the Clerk would draw this to your attention. I am quite sure we have been debating this matter for more than three hours.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is winding up. I am well aware of the time limit on debates.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I will continue to wind up. I am being informed by the Director that the plywood is stored at the Belle. It is stored free of cost, no charge to the National Sports Council or Government, and contrary to what has been said already, I prefer to take the word of the Director on this occasion. I think the honourable Member will appreciate that.

The question that Head 81 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86,
No. 22 - \$5 000 000

HEAD 79 - MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to give the appearance that I am in any way being discourteous, but I suppose that everybody has had a field day and therefore they may not want to jog themselves too much as far as Housing is concerned. As a matter of fact, the operations are going on so well and the machinery is so well oiled that I do not think anybody would be concerned at the moment, things are running so well.

I would move, Mr. Chairman, that this stand part. Any questions which are put to me I will be very willing to answer. As a matter of fact, I do not think, having debated Housing so much in the past, that it is totally necessary to debate it now.

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

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Chairman, I am certain the Honourable Minister would like to give us a little information, because I note that, within recent times, the Ministry has switched emphasis and most of the work is now being done by private enterprise. I just want to get some indication on the present \$5 million, what it is earmarked for. I believe some would be for Maynards that they were completing, and I understand that they might be doing Lammings, but just for the records and for the enlightenment of the House, I want to know what direct programmes National Housing will be engaged in over the next period of time by this supplement.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): The honourable Member has asked the question very gently, but, Sir, I honestly do not understand how, after passing the Estimates last year and allocating to the Ministry of Housing, the National Housing Corporation, this sum of money, we could get a Resolution that comes in and merely says "Provision in the sum of \$5 000 000 is required to supplement Head 79(2) Ministry of Housing and Lands: National Housing Corporation - Grants to Public Institutions, in order to meet expenditure on the Capital Works programme for the remainder of the financial year 1985-86."

4.20 p.m.

Now \$5 million is not five cents. Is it that you have had a rethinking? Have you re-ordered your priorities? Have you changed your pattern? What new factors have arisen that have caused you, to the extent of \$5 million two months before the next Estimates in which you should be asking for a maximum amount of money, and which you should get, because housing in this country needs some kind of help, to come to us now, and all you say, at this stage is that you are supplementing the vote by \$5 million. Well, in this country, \$5 million is a lot of money.

Asides

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Not for you and him, but for me \$5 million is a lot of money, and I will not be shunted away from what I am saying. I think that the Minister tried to have this Resolution passed without too much heated debate. He probably genuinely believed that there has been a lot of debate on housing, but when you come and ask for \$5 million, I think you have to tell me what new is happening. Is it that you underestimated programmes at the beginning? Have you gone into additional programmes? Are you starting an entirely new project? Or is it simply that the National Housing Corporation has such a poor ability to estimate that their estimates were so far wrong?

If you examine the amount of money which they have got, you will see that \$5 million is a substantial percentage of the total amount spent for the year. I am going to sit down and allow the Minister to explain.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to speak on this Head?

Asides

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution at this point?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that I may wish to make another contribution after I hear the Minister, I am not in a position to say so until I hear the Minister.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, if I am to behave like the honourable Member who has just spoken, I will again move the Head, but I am not going to do that. I just want to assure him that the momentum has been so great in National Housing that, obviously, we have taken twice the amount of money that I came for.

In my Ministry, the amount that you may get in a vote might not necessarily carry you half way through, especially when you are moving seriously into things. A number of new things have come on stream and,

therefore, we have to make provision for them in addition to other things. You will appreciate that, since the last Budget, a number of things have come into being, for which provision was not made. For example, when you are working on projects, you have to employ people, and there are certain things for which you have to make provision. When the Budgetary Proposals are made, they are made after the estimates are done, and you have to make certain provision, for example, for things like insurance, travelling allowances various things like that. But I am not even putting forward that as a serious argument since that would only take a small slice of this request for a supplementary.

I suppose we are all aware that Maynards is at the moment on stream. We are providing 34 units, 28 three-bedrooms and 6 two-bedrooms. We are also making provision for Lammings in St. Joseph. Lammings was delayed for some time, and it is the view of the Government that the time has come when Lammings should be restarted. It was started and then stopped. Lammings will have 15 three-bedroom units, and if you use the figure of \$50 000 per unit, I think you will get something like \$750 000. I am not much of a mathematician, but I think it would be about that. At Rosemont, we are providing for 10 three-bedroom units. Ponside, which is a new innovation as well, was originally slated for the provision of 75 units, but representation was made to me with respect to the density, bearing in mind the limited land area, and I thought that the representation was worthwhile and proper representation in the terms of density, so we have cut back by 25 units. Therefore, there will be 50 units at the Ponside.

In addition to what I have just said here, we have been doing quite a lot of development in terms of land preparation — Gall Hill, Christ Church; Walkers, St. George; Oxnards Heights, St. James; Oxnards Crescent, St. James; West Terrace Gardens, St. James — 526 lots; Apes Hill, St. James — 39 lots; Lammings, St. Joseph — 50 lots; Parkinson Road, Grazettes — 20 lots; Spooners Hill, St. Michael — 20 lots; Maynards, St. Peter — 70 lots; Husbands Heights, St. James — 70 lots; Wanstead Terrace — 6 lots; Checker Hall, St. Lucy — 64 lots; Husbands, St. Michael — 98 lots; Orange Hill, St. James — 10 lots; Parish Land, Christ Church, Phase 1 — 62 lots; Golden Mile, St. Peter — 112 lots; Harmony Hall, St. Lawrence, Christ Church — 68 lots; Simmons Land, Rendezvous — 76 lots; Barclays Tenantry, Christ Church — 10 lots, Coverley, Waterford, St. Michael — 8 lots.

I do not know if you want me to give you an idea of other lots we are looking at. If you want me to do that, I can give you.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way: Could you tell us what is the cost

approximately per lot for these preparations, if you have the information? If you do not, one would appreciate that. It is one thing to call 64 lots at Checker Hall, but one wishes to know what exactly is happening with these lots. Is it going to cost \$7 000 to prepare each lot, or \$700, or what?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable Member could have the advice very close to him, immediately to his left. I am not a developer. I have an idea about land development and what have you. There are certain figures which are used in the development of land and a question of something like \$2 per square foot, some people say, for roads and water. Some people say \$2.50 per square foot. I believe the honourable Member for St. Philip North might very well say \$3.00 per square foot. I cannot be sure. They vary from point to point. I do not know if that is the information which you really want. If you want to get the figures in respect of the houses, I can give you the budgeted costs, but I cannot help you any more.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, if the honourable Member will give way. I have a problem. When I look at the Estimates for the whole year, if I read it correctly, under this Subhead 2 — National Housing Corporation — I just want to be certain — my understanding is that we used \$7.8 million for the whole year, and that included "construction of Rental Units at St. Cecelia, Maynards and Lammings and road works at Ivy and Rosemont. Provision was also included for the Sites and Services programme, office accommodation, home and estate improvement, and plant and equipment, which includes the purchase of a computer." That was \$7.8 million for the whole year.

4.30 p.m.

Now, in the second half of January, I am asked to vote \$5 million, and it seems to me that something is not in proportion, because you are also repeating some of the same projects that were included. So it would seem to me that we are going to be voting, in the end, \$7.8 million plus \$5 million, which is \$12.8 million, as opposed to \$7.8 million, and the last two months will call for \$5 million. I am not trying to be funny. I am just drawing to the Minister's attention the disproportionate nature of the size of this supplementary and asking him to explain it.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I can understand your concern, but there are charges on the corporation by way of outstanding accounts, which must be made. When the Estimates were dealt with last, consideration was that the lots which were prepared would have been sold, and sold probably much quicker than has happened. As a matter of fact, there are still a lot of lots available for sale, and Government has been giving consideration to a

methodology whereby people who are in the lower socio-economic group might be able to get assistance by way of mortgages through the National Housing Corporation or some other means. So the provision in the Estimates was projected on the basis that your income would come in, which would make up for the difference between what was voted in the Estimates last March and what your expenditure would be. Your income has not been generated as you expected, and therefore you have got to look for the cash to pay up front.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest something to the Minister. The Minister is aware of the fact that the market has changed a little bit and lots are now being developed on terms where you can pay down \$1 000 and the rest over five years, so National Housing is going to have a problem if they do not offer comparable terms to the open market to get their lots sold. Their projection, therefore, is going to be faulty because they are not competing on equal terms with the private market. The whole real estate market has turned full circle to the stage where they are developing land now on terms, and therefore I am going to suggest to you that the National Housing Corporation has to find some way to compete with the open market or your income flow is going to be a lot less than they are projecting.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I want to give the honourable Member the assurance that we have looked at this and we are working towards that end.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86

No. 23 — \$54 000

HEAD 19 — MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, this is for Town and Country Planning. As honourable Members will recall, a number of things have occurred in Planning before it was transferred. The inspectorate came into operation and they are entitled to travel. Twenty thousand dollars are required. We also had a revision of the travelling allowances from July 1, 1984, so we have both an increase in the amount of travel paid out plus an increase in the amount of people to pay.

I want to make it clear, Sir, that the inspectors that were appointed are people who are there to perform a constructive exercise. They are there to help people, to guide people in relation to the laws on town planning.

They are not there to persecute people. There is a big distinction. They are there for a creative purpose particularly, and we have increased the number recently, particularly to take into account the fact that we had to bring the question of the control of chattel buildings under the purview of the Town Planning Act. We found a tremendous number of activities taking place in relation to putting chattel buildings in gullies, in water courses and in other areas which were deemed to be flood areas and publicised. We also have to make sure that we are not by the laxity of our effort in this direction creating problems for future Governments by allowing this situation to go on.

A review is going along of the fees in relation to this matter, both the fees that are charged by the so-called draughtsmen and others, and I can assure the House that no one is more interested than I am in trying to ensure that the object of the law is carried out with the minimum of dislocation and expense to the people.

Every effort will be made to make sure that, if necessary, the plans are drawn by these advisers, by these people. Every effort will be made to ensure that before the houses are put up, or as at early a stage as possible, advisory services will come into play. I have no quarrel at all with the efforts of the Town Planner in this direction. I know that both the Minister of Housing and the Ministry of Planning have explained in elaborate detail to the Town Planner that while we accept his suggestion, that we put these buildings under control, we must be continuously monitoring to ensure that no difficulty arises.

I beg to move that Head 19 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, I am very glad for the Prime Minister's statement, and I wish to suggest to him that he has another word with the Chief Town Planner and invite the Chief Town Planner to have a word with the inspectors, because sometimes the best laid plans of men and mice, etc., and with all the goodwill in the world, sometimes a single officer or two can put an entire policy in jeopardy.
4.40 p.m.

I do not believe that anyone in Barbados will quarrel with the objectives of having planned development, and to the extent that chattel houses have to fall within the ambit of such planning, again, no one who has the interest of Barbados at heart will have any quarrel with that. However, I wish to relate to this Honourable Committee that in the last few weeks I have had complaints, and I have been inundated – inundated may be too strong a word – I had five or six persons in my constituency who have had less than the sympathetic

treatment which the Prime Minister is suggesting is the policy, and which I believe. I believe what he says, that he is concerned about it. I am going to believe that. But I am saying, Sir, that the letters which they received.....

(Aside: Yes, very strong letters.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: are not letters of sympathy. I go further and say that in one instance, two, I believe, the person who went on the property to inspect did not even say, "Good afternoon" to the people who live there. I told them they should have called the police because he was a trespasser. He cannot walk on to anybody's property without indicating who he is and what he is going to do. If he has a certificate of identification, he has to show it. He walked on and when the lady, terrified now because somebody told her he is from the Town and Country Planning Department – this particular lady was terrified and so, Sir, you would know I am not being dramatic here, I already drew this to the attention of a senior person in the Government and asked them for advice on it – asked who he was, he did not even explain to the lady in question what he was doing. Apparently some disgruntled neighbour had called the Town Planning and told them that somebody was improving on something and encroaching on something, in the usual manner that Barbadians do from time to time – I may lose that vote, but I mean, truth has to be told – and as a result the person from the Town Planning Office turned up like a soldier or a policeman – not a policeman because policeman are polite these days – like somebody from in the 19th century, face "mek up" and terrorized the woman. If it had only been one person I might have been minded to think that it was a flash in the pan but I have had another complaint from a similar person in another area of the constituency and they both brought the offensive letter, ascetic in its make-up, which tells people, "you have violated the law and we propose to take action against you if you do not do something in 28 days." Well, for a lot of the people concerned, they do not even know. They had no idea that building on from the back with the wall and going forward was a problem, once they got permission from the landlord. They have always seen this happen in Barbados.

I would suggest to the Prime Minister: That he has a massive publicity campaign about this matter; that we instruct the people whose responsibility it is that they have an added responsibility when they are dealing with people of a certain level who could not possibly know anything about Town and Country Planning law. I make bold to say that there are very few people in this country who know anything about Town and Country Planning law, and very few people who know what the requirements are for improving their property so far as the Town and Country Planning Act is concerned. And while it is a truism to say that ignorance of the law is

no excuse, we live in a humane society and the law was not designed to terrorize people. It was designed to make everybody equally happy in the long run.

Sir, here is the bottom line of what has happened with those two persons. I have had to become agent for one of them in an application to the Town and Country Planning Office to retain a development that had already occurred. It cost them \$350 to get the "plans" drawn and \$200 for the application, that is \$550 for a person whom every honourable member in here would know was striving to pay the lumber yard and trying to make ends meet. We all know about that. I do not think I am original in pointing out that this is how people do their improvements. We have to move with speed to set up some kind of public office where persons can go in and do what the Prime Minister says it is his objective to do — as a matter of urgency — so that plans can be drawn at a reasonable price, because I do not think that if I seek a private person to draw my plan, even though he might not be an architect, if that is his way of earning a livelihood, that he should be changing his fees because it is a poor person. But I think there should be a public office; just as there should be a public defender, there should be a public office for this kind of development, if we are going to insist on orderly development for the reasons which have been stated. I think that the sooner we get that kind of office going, the better it is.

I am not sure that the purpose would be served by having the inspectors as the same persons who would be drawing the plans. I think that you may have to have a separate set of people doing the drawings from those who do the actual inspections because, by its very nature, persons who do inspections take on a police attitude. Persons who are carrying out some aspect of the law when it comes to inspections, have a tendency to feel that they have to demonstrate that they are tough and cannot be easily taken care of in one form or another. It is not right that, suddenly, out of the blue, poor people in Barbados — and I use poor advisedly — should feel that the Government has turned against them or that the authorities have turned against them, when all they wanted to do is to improve their dwelling place.

As I said, Sir, I speak with full authority. I do not hold myself out as any expert in the field, but, as a representative, you would know, Sir, that there are certain things you have to do, and I have become an agent for my people so that they will not be terrified to apply for this retention. I cannot imagine that the Town and Country Planning Office, if all the requirements have been met would wish to refuse the permission, in which case I would give the Minister notice that I would be coming to him, because, unless someone has blatantly interfered with the line or the property of his neighbour, there really ought to be a sympathetic approach to the permission which is given to people who have already embarked, especially those who have already embarked

on the improvement of their property. I, therefore, am suggesting to the Minister that he treats this matter as a matter of urgency, because on the scale or probabilities, if there are five or six that I am aware of in my constituency, there are probably another ten that I am not yet aware of, and if you multiply that by 27, you will know that there is a substantial number of people in the community who might be suffering the same fate. For what it is worth, I put this information before this Honourable Committee, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 19....
The honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I too, welcome the assurance given by the Honourable Prime Minister on this matter, because, like my colleague, I have had about three or four of these situations within recent times, and I have taken the opportunity to speak to the head of the section, from an administrative point of view. I suggested to him that maybe they could do two things. The first warning to the house owners could be a little more gentle than it is. The letters that are sent out according to the letter of the law if any of you have seen them, are frightening letters, particularly to people at this social class of the society, people who are striving extremely hard to put up a little chattel house. I suggested to him that, administratively, what they can do is to just write a little note asking the persons to come in to the department in the first instance, explain to the persons what the problems are and suggest ways and means of going about it.

The second suggestion I would like to put out, and I think they would have to have the approval of the Ministry, is that for chattel houses, I think the Town Planning can get away with far less elaborate plans for chattel houses than they need for more expensive houses. The normal Town Planning application requires a floor plan, a location plan, a site plan and elevations. I am suggesting that, in the case of chattel houses, you could dispense with the elevations and only submit locations plans and floor plans. The location plan would allow the position of the house on the lot to be shown, and the floor plans would allow the Ministry of Health to examine to see if the toilet positions are properly placed. If this can be done as an immediate measure, it would reduce, by at least half, the cost of preparing plans for Town Planning. So I would invite the Honourable Prime Minister and his technocrats to consider, in the first instance, minimizing the quality of the standard of plans needed by the Town Planning in respect of chattel houses.

4.50 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, if one were to listen to the call-in programmes on the various stations in this country, one would

recognize that one of the problems agitating the poor people of this country, is the financial and other impositions placed on the owners of chattel houses when they wish to build or improve on them because of the recent legislation in relation to Town Planning approval.

I have heard the Prime Minister's statement welcomed by two Members on this side. However, typical of the attitude of the Prime Minister and his Government, when the proposal was being made from this side by the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) just trying to indicate to the Government that they might achieve the objectives of the Town Planning requirements by reducing the cost to the poor man who owns a chattel house, namely reducing the requirement only to the need to submit a location plan and a floor plan in respect of chattel houses rather than to go through the whole gamut of other aspects of the plan, such as elevation and so on, they would not even listen, and I do not believe that they care about the impositions that they imposed on the poor people of this country. The task has always fallen to the Democratic Labour Party to defend the poor man in this House.

We have no quarrel whatsoever with the Town Planning legislation. We have no quarrel with that. But what I am saying is that if a Government was knowledgeable of, and sensitive to, the needs of the poor man, then they would have known in advance that poor people cannot afford the additional costs of having plans drawn and filing those plans with the Town Planner. They know that it is a costly process. It is a costly process to the poor. Two hundred dollars, \$300, \$400, or \$500 is a lot of money to a poor man. You all have become so accustomed to wealth that you do not understand that, for a lot of people, \$200 is a lot of money. That is the point I am trying to get across — \$200, \$300, \$400 can be a lot of money even at today's prices.

What the Government should have done if they were aware of, and sensitive to, the needs, would be to look and see, on the one hand, what are the planning objectives of the legislation and, secondly, what will be the cost of compliance with the legislation by the poor people of this country, the people who build chattel houses and the people who would be improving on chattel houses. If they had looked at that, Sir, they would recognize that they had a duty to put in place the administrative process which would allow for two things — first of all, allow the poor man to have his plans drawn up without any cost to him and, secondly, have a machinery whereby these things can be speedily processed. As it is now, they have thrown the whole burden of the cost on the poor owner of the chattel house and, at the same time, they have made absolutely no provision within the Town Planning Department, where, for the past 10 to 15 years, there have been

repeated complaints of inordinate long periods of waiting in order to get Town Planning permission. They have put this additional work on the Town Planning Department without any increase in staff to handle the situation within the department.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: My information is that you have not increased the number of officers in anticipation of the increased number of applications that must come before the Town Planning Department if there is total compliance with this legislation.

So that what we are seeing here, Sir, is a Government which is prepared to pass legislation, legislation which in itself is not bad, but is totally insensitive to the needs of the poor man in Barbados. That is what is coming across quite clearly to me. And when you try to articulate their problems on the floor of the House, they laugh at you, they do not listen to you. They say "you are representing the poor, we do not want to hear you, we do not want to hear anything from you." That is the kind of message that is certainly put out on the floor of this House.

Sir, I believe that the Government should recognize that poor people cannot afford this additional cost, and therefore, they have a duty, if they pass the laws, to provide the administrative framework so that the poor man can have access to someone to do his drawings for him and submit them to an authority within the Town Planning Department, and have them approved at no cost to him. You cannot pass laws and place these financial impositions on the poor people of this country and expect to get away with it.

I will tell you this, Sir. They are obviously so insensitive to the needs of the poor people and what is going on in Barbados that they do not even realize that this is a major issue with the poor people in this country. All my colleagues on this side have spoken of the kind of emotional trauma inflicted on people when they received those letters. That is only one aspect of it. But if you were to listen to Gutterperk, in particular, you would hear the number of people who call in and try to articulate this problem that they have. And the Government seems to be doing nothing about it, except to come in here today and say the policy of the Government is to minimize the hardship, to have inspectors go out there who should be seen as persons helping them and, hopefully in the future, the inspectors will help them to draw their plans. That is not good enough. That should have come first. It should not come now. It should have come first. It did not come first. The inspectors might be there, but the people have to pay to get those plans drawn up.

Look, Sir, with a number of people that I know who are trying to improve on their homes, every cent is gone by the time they put in a few blocks, and they wait 6 and 8 weeks so they can raise \$100 or \$200 to go down to the lumber yard to get a few more pieces of lumber or go somewhere to get a few more blocks. This is a common scene in the constituency that I have the honour to represent, and when you call on a person like that now to find \$400 and \$500 to satisfy the administrative requirement, I think it is wrong. I think it is fundamentally wrong, and I think that it needs to be looked at. As a matter of fact, I will say that until the Government has an administrative organization in force where the poor people can go and have their plans drawn up free and have them approved by the Town Planner free, the whole thing should be dropped. That is what I would suggest, because while we are standing up here talking, the fact is that there are a lot of poor people out there who have to find \$200, \$300, or \$400 to pay draftsmen and then have to go and pay to file the thing with the Town Planner, and all that kind of thing.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not know what it is, but you have to pay money, and I know it is going to cost \$200, \$300, \$400, or \$500, in some instances.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is not the point. The point is this, that you have placed the impositions on poor people and you should not have done it.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Look, I am not saying that you should not have the law. I said you should have proper town planning for the orderly development of the country. All I am saying is that when you pass a law that results in financial impositions on poor people, when you can easily have set up an administrative framework — for example, you could have set up a department within the Town Planning Department which would deal specifically with these applications, and the people should be able to go there and say 'I am Tom Sawyer from Bentham's in St. Lucy.' This is my problem and have the whole thing processed within a week or two without having to pay anybody a cent. That is what I would like to see happening, because it is unfair, it is unjust, and I would urge the Government to drop the whole plan until such time as you make it possible for people to have their plans approved by the Town Planner free of cost. That is what I am saying.

5.00 p.m.

This is where I question the genuineness of the statement of the Prime Minister. If he says that it is a policy that it should be cheap for the poor man, that he

should have maximum help, then I say you have the opportunity to do this now. Suspend the application of the requirement until such time as you have a special department within the Town Planning Department set up where anyone building or modifying a chattel house can go and have it done expeditiously and free of cost.

This affects all of us who represent poor constituencies. It affects the people of St. Andrew, I am quite sure. It affects the people of St. Lucy, I am quite sure. It affects every single person in this country and we have to have a conscience. I think it is wrong to do it, and this is what happens all the time in this country, that we come in here and pass laws and we do not look and see either the administrative requirements, or, secondly, the burdens that we are placing particularly on the poor people in Barbados.

Sir, there is one other point I want to make. I am not going to deal with all the problems in the Town Planning Department today, because I cannot, but it seems to me that something has to be done to speed up applications when they are made to the Town Planning Department. Something has to be done. It is quite clear to me that you have some problem applications, which, in any process, would take time because of the type of application, maybe change of use, maybe location problems, traffic problems, all sorts of problems. But then you have the majority of applications going into the Town Planning Department, which are simple, straightforward applications and, yet, those applications can take months. You just cannot get them out of the Town Planning Department, and those delays in a developing country can result over time in considerable costs to developers and other persons in Barbados. Sometimes it may cost an individual interest on money which he has borrowed from the bank and have sitting down there because he cannot get going for four, five, six, eight months, so he is paying 10, 11 and 12% on money waiting for a Town Planning application. This is not fair, it is not right. It is a legal requirement, the person has conformed with the law and therefore it is an obligation on the part of the Government agency to deliver to him approval or non-approval as expeditiously as possible. It is not right that those costs should be passed on to private individuals or developers in Barbados because of the administrative and other problems within the Town Planning Department.

I understand there has been some restructuring and some changes in that department, probably as a response to public complaints and public pressure, but it is still not good enough, because the same thing happens. Whereas in the first part of my contribution I was dealing with the effect on poor people, I am talking now about the effect on the total community. Heaven knows what the ultimate cost to the community could well be if you have several million dollars in development plans, probably involving

five or six hundred people, held up for an average of six or nine months longer than they should be held up.

These are real problems. These are problems that, eventually, affect the taxpayers and citizens of this country, and it is your duty as much as our duty to ensure that the resources are made available to the Town Planning Department so that when citizens comply with the law and have paid their fees, they should be able to get a decision out of the Town Planning Department as rapidly as possible. I am being extremely fair, I am being fair to everybody. Let us all comply with the law, but let the Government and the Government agencies function in a manner which would be fair and reasonable.

I will tell you this, Mr. Chairman. Enough people do not sue the Government and Government agencies in Barbados. That is one of the problems we have. In many other countries where developments are held up unreasonably and where significant costs have been incurred, the Government would have to face the people in the law courts. But the trouble in Barbados is that people take these things, they cry and they come to the representatives, or go to the Press or they go to Guttaperk and they do not go to the law courts in Barbados and have their wrongs righted there.

This is my brief contribution, and I hope the Government takes the fundamental point. The fundamental point I am making is that if you are dealing with the rich or you are dealing with the poor, then you cannot create legislation and not have the administrative structure to make sure that any cost flowing from that legislation is not minimized by the administrative machinery which you should make available.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I hasten to rise to correct the irresponsible and concocted statements of the honourable Member. When the question of bringing the chattel house within the purview of the town planning law arose, discussions took place in the Ministry of Finance and in the Ministry of Housing and in the Town Planning Department as to what machinery would be necessary to ensure that the fundamental objective of the law be carried out with the minimum of inconvenience.

The first thing that was done was that the fees were amended, and the fee for an application for the erection, alteration of a chattel building was changed. There was none before, because you did not have to apply. It was treated separately and the large sum of \$10 for the application was put. Ten dollars is the fee for the application. It is Statutory Instrument, Supplement No. 73, and the law is No. 174 of 1985:

“Residential —

- (ii) the erection of, alteration or addition to a chattel house or for the carrying out of any works on lands used therewith \$10.00”

Therefore, I defy any man to truthfully represent to anyone in Barbados that a Government which imposes a simple charge of \$10.00 is a wicked, monstrous, Government, indifferent to the interest of people who are less fortunate in this community. It is less than a consultation with a doctor.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member will give way. The honourable Member just read the Statutory Instrument, and I think that there is a little confusion, because, according to what he read, it would seem to me that the fee for retention of a plan for improvement to a chattel house ought to be \$10.00. I am saying to the honourable Member that the Town and Country Planning Office is charging \$200 for retention, and then treat retention for chattel houses and other buildings in the same way.

I am not questioning what the honourable Member has just said. I am just drawing to his attention that I just paid \$200 for retention on a chattel house. So that whereas the Statutory Instrument says \$10.00 — and the words which the honourable Member just read suggest to me that it should include improvement to, Sir — they are applying the law as it applies to retention for any building. That seems to be the problem and it needs straightening out, but I just paid \$200, and have a receipt for it, too.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, if the honourable Member paid \$200 and has a receipt for it, and he gives me that information as we leave in here or anytime in the future — I can assure the honourable Member what the law is — we will see that the person gets back his money.

The basic position is very clear. I have no quarrel with the honourable Member who just sat down who spoke. It is the irresponsible tones of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that we have to deal with, because he is not dealing with the case upon the basis of the law. He is dealing with the case on manufactured facts, impressions!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: I will say that the honourable Member is misleading this House if he is saying that a person with a chattel house.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: How do you mean it is not a point of order. You have not heard me yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It could not be a point of order. Please take your seat. The direction in which you are going points clearly to no point of order. Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You have not heard me on my point of order.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: After you have heard my point of order.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Are you defying the Chairman!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will have another chance to speak, but you must please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Without hearing my point of order, Mr. Chairman? What kind of ruling that is?

(*Aside:* Send him out!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member must take his seat now.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is only three months to wait out there anyhow.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, the position is very clear. I am reading, and I give the source of what I am reading from — I am reading from S.I. 1985, No. 174:—

“Residential

- (ii) the erection of, alteration or addition to a chattel house or for the carrying out of any works on lands used therewith \$10.00.”

That is all I am saying, because I know the Honourable Minister of Housing and the Ministry of Finance had considerable discussions with the Town Planner on this before it was introduced. We had a lot of discussions on it, because we had the problem of advising people that there were certain areas in Barbados that were flood prone. We moved off houses off them and people went and put them back there, and when the floods came again, you had to move their houses, so we had to bring the question of the regulation of the chattel houses into purview. We had to do that, and that was one of the objectives.

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: In addition to that, we anticipated at the time that we would need to have additional people in the Town Planning Office for the purpose of helping people to channel through their application. We expected this. An additional three

positions were created. We asked the Town Planning Department, ‘how many you think you need?’ An additional three were created. Those jobs were approved. Now, how can you, when all of those are the facts, turn around and accuse the Government of not attempting to change the machinery when we specifically adverted to it, we amended the law and we have added to the establishment to deal with it?

It is all right to sit here and talk about the Government creating this and creating that, and dictating this and dictating that. I heard the honourable Member make a speech in here about four weeks ago in which he said that one of the scandals in Barbados was the cost of professional fees. The honourable Member said that they were too high! He said if you had to clear your land, you had to pay \$600. You had to rent a bulldozer.

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: But the honourable Member is one of the people who started to set the pace in this country on professional fees. You are one of the people who set the pace in this country on professional fees. You started it. But in Barbados we have to recognize that in these areas, the Government has machinery to ensure that people who wish to build buildings have access to loans. They have access to advisory services.

I genuinely believe the points raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, because there has been some confusion, not only with respect to chattel buildings, but with respect to other buildings, too, about retention. There are a number of buildings in Barbados which were built prior to town planning laws, and today, if you go to repair those very buildings and substitute wood for wall, the Town Planner says you must put in application. I have always challenged that, because in my opinion, that is a permitted development, once you do not increase the size. I know that you have it with a lot of areas. You have it in a lot of streets in Barbados. It is a legitimate area of grievance in Barbados as to whether you should really, in those circumstances, when all you are doing is replacing wood for wall, have to go for Town Planning permission. All of these matters we took into account:

We are trying to have a public inquiry — the Government has nothing to hide in this. We are having a big public inquiry into the Town Planning Laws of Barbados, so there is no bigger critic than me of the town planning laws in Barbados, and we have tried to mitigate the impact of those laws, and I am going to deal now with the question of applications. I am saying that at this junction in the history of Town Planning in Barbados, applications are processed faster than at any other time in the history of town planning in Barbados, because we have set standards. With the exception of

the conversion from agricultural lands into other lands, the Government has told the Town Planner repeatedly that we expect that you can give your decision within the statutory period of two months, or whatever it is, and what is more, if you do not give your decision, you must write and tell the people, 'appeal against my failure to give a decision', and we have guaranteed that that appeal will get a hearing. Do not let us fool ourselves about modification and town planning laws and trying to change.

5.20 p.m.

The honourable Member grudgingly — sometimes even his own conscience hurts him and he has to come out with some of the truth. Not that honourable Member! I am exempting you from this. Your speech was reasonable; your speech was one that anybody could sit down and understand. But the honourable Member, because of this time of the year and because of this year, tries to exaggerate — and we must not allow him to exaggerate — because he has not cited to us two or three instances or what percentage of the applications that go to the Town Planning take this 9, 10 and 11 months. That does not exist, except for a very small minority of cases where there is a conflict as to whether a decision can be taken at the present time, because of the changes and modifications of town planning regulations. There are a few of these changes in which a decision cannot be taken because there is a conflict as to how the Town Planning Development Plan will be modified, and we had a few cases where difficult decisions had to be taken, and that had to await the public inquiry that is going on now. That is what we are doing; we are having a public inquiry now into the modifications of the development plan. That is going on today.

Aside

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: As far as I am concerned, it can take ten years. We will carry through the legal process. The lawyers, the semi-lawyers, the constitutionalists, anybody can go and play lawyer for a couple of days. There are a lot of frustrated, play lawyers going down. All of this is taking place. Anybody can go down. For publicity, the honourable Member can go down, too. The honourable Member can go down and get some free publicity. Go down before Mr. Justice Rocheford and get some free publicity. Be a public defender.

I really want to reiterate the position. The Government has as a policy that this matter of the control of tenantry development should take place in a manner that is a minimum level of dislocation to people. That is a fact. We need it. We need it because of the fact that experience has taught us that you cannot rely only on exhortation with this question of chattel building and placing them in areas which are not suitable for development. We will investigate any case that is drawn to our

attention where a fee larger than the \$10 is charged in respect of chattel building. We give the undertaking that once we can prove that, you will get back the difference between the \$10 and whatever the amount is. Further, we will have checked the facts with respect to how many incidences there have been of enforcement notices being given to people in connection with chattel buildings. We can check that because we know that under the Home Improvement Loans, under the USAID Scheme, \$2 800 alone have been disbursed for chattel buildings, and we have not heard of one enforcement notice in respect of that.

There is another point that the honourable Member must take into account, and this is a very valid point: today, in order for us to get a flow of finance for chattel buildings from the banks, the banks themselves are saying they want to know exactly how the buildings that they are lending money on are going to square up in relation to the town planning law. The banks are asking for that, and you cannot blame them, because what you are trying to do is to make a security out of something which, during your time, they could not get anything on other than a seven year personal loan at 22½ per cent interest rate and things of that kind. We are trying through the Mortgage Finance Company, through USAID, through all kinds of devices to let the banking community understand that this is an asset; that when you lend money on it, by the time you go to collect your security, tradition in Barbados is that it will be greatly improved. All of this we are trying to do, so do not try to give the impression that this law is a wicked law. It is not a wicked law, nor is it being administered wickedly, nor is it being motivated by any wicked intention.

Aside

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I will debate with you any place at any time on this. I know you are catching at straws now. That is the position with respect to the law.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I believe that one or two signals will go out to the public, and I believe that the Prime Minister of this country must be exposed on this occasion. He knows perfectly well that if that law says that the cost of an application is \$10, that means when that piece of paper is handed in it is \$10, but in order to submit that application, certain steps have to be taken; a drawing has got to be made of the property. At the moment it is a question of the location plan, a floor plan, elevations and there are charges attached to that process.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not care by whom. The fact is that before that plan can be handed in to the Town Planning and you pay the \$10, you have to incur

those expenses, otherwise you cannot get Town Planning permission, you cannot get it unless you have those plans. What you are saying today again may be legally correct. The law may say that it is \$10 for the application, but the cost to the individual who is submitting that application could be several hundred dollars, and I challenge you to deny that. I challenge you to deny that the professional charges for drawing up these plans prior to submission to Town Planning can run into hundreds of dollars. I am not saying that personally. If you listen to Gutterperk or any of the other call-in programmes, people call in and say it. I am not just saying this on the floor of the House.

What you can do is tell the people of Barbados that if they have a chattel house and they wish planning permission to modify or otherwise, it is \$10, and that any expenses in excess of \$10 is unlawful. What I am saying is that the facts are that unless you provide the administrative machinery to assist these poor people with the drawing up of these plans in a manner that is acceptable to the Town Planning Department, you have imposed costs on the poor chattel house owners in Barbados, and no amount of sophistry, no amount of legalistic arguing, can get away from the fact that, consequential on that piece of legislation, the man who is making an application to Town Planning has to incur these costs. He cannot get permission unless he submits a drawing, and there is no way he can get a drawing done unless a friend does the drawing for him. except he is going to pay for it. And it all stems from the law, because, prior to the application of the law, there was no need to do it.

So that when the Honourable Prime Minister gets up on the floor of this House and seeks to give the impression that the case is being exaggerated or overstated by us, he shows further insensitivity to the realities of poverty in Barbados. That is the problem. The problem is that you feel satisfied that when you read a piece of paper and it says \$10, in the real world out there it is \$10. It is not so. The requirement generates unnecessary expenses on the part of the poor people, and it is not right that you should be doing that.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It would appear to me that there is a further \$10 there for the inspection of the commencement of building operations of chattel houses. So even in the law you are wrong! You read the law; you only read part of the law and did not read the other section of the law. There is another \$10 for the commencement of building.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: As long as I am on the floor of this House, I shall be defending to the death the interest of poor people in Barbados.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What do you know about poor people in Barbados?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that this sitting be suspended for 15 minutes.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 5.45 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
5.30 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

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

HEAD 37 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Object No. 8 – Rental of Property

Object No. 24 – Purchase of Vehicles

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: This matter, Mr. Chairman, is rather straightforward and I beg to move that it stands part.

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

The question that Head 37 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86 No. 24

HEAD 74 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES – \$1 355 750

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Government set out its policy at the time of the budgetary exercise early last year of encouragement for diversification in agriculture. I announced then that a revolving fund of \$1 million would be created for the purpose of providing incentives for export of non-sugar agricultural products. After very mature consideration of the best vehicle to administer this fund, and bearing in mind that when we created the Export Promotion Corporation, there was a clear, unambiguous position adopted by the agricultural industry that they would be the masters of their own fate and that they wish through their own instruments, free from bureaucratic red tape, to do their own export, the Government specifically exempted from the new Export Promotion Act any question to do with agriculture. Of course, we knew that there was in existence the Barbados Marketing Corporation Act which had provisions which were wide enough to facilitate, from a governmental point of view, the export of agriculture.

Since then, there have grown up a number of institutions dealing with the export of agriculture. There is ATCO, which I believe is a subsidiary of an institution called BAS. There is CATCO, which I know is an arm of the Caribbean Food Corporation. There is BSIL, the Barbados Shipping Industries Ltd., which is also interested in the export of commodities. There are at least four private sector companies.....

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: They are the ones making the money!)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN:..... which are buying and selling on the export market within grading standards that have been established by the Marketing Corporation. I think it is now very clearly understood by all and sundry that, whatever they wish as far as the question of certification is concerned in many country, there has to be some kind of governmental agency that will put on the stamp. They are not going to allow self-stamping, certainly not the LOME Convention Agreement, although the U.S. may allow the importer there to deal with it.

I feel it is true to say that, today, it is well recognized that market intelligence, advice on packaging, advice on grading and things of that kind, are necessary if our thrust is to reach the limit as fast as we want it. And do not let us fool ourselves, in this area market forces are not going to do the job.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: Tell them.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: They do not know how to do the job to start with; and even if they know, they do not have the money to do the job, so Government has to help.

We are building, of course, on experience here which has been going along for over 20 years in some areas. But the interesting thing that we have is that there are one or two promising areas – and I say promising, I do not say successful – because when you study the efforts of other parts of the world in this area, you will recognize that there is intense competition within the winter vegetable market, both in the European Economic Community and in the United States market. Similarly, in the Canadian market the competition from Mexico and those countries to the north of the Caribbean is very intense, certainly in relation to North America.

We have identified and have been exporting a number of crops over the last three years in addition to the crops that we have been exporting, the root crops and the original crops – onions for many years previously, and the new crops, sweet pepper, aubergines or egg-plant and, of course, recently, we have gone back into the export of cotton. There is now a clear indication that, at long last, there is an abundance of interest and desire on the part of all land owners in Barbados, and I think that this is a significant departure from what the position was in the past. There is a significant desire on the part of all land owners in Barbados who wish to continue as land owners to participate in this export drive. So the Government is helping by way of funding, on a revolving basis, and on a grant basis – because it will partly be revolving, partly be grant – and this year's Estimates will reflect more the grant element of establishing this fund, and we are going to lay down the guidelines after all the consultation is completed.

I am not telling this Honourable House that the Government may not have to come down finally with the guidelines which have not been agreed by everybody. There is a difference of opinion among a few people as to whether all of the existing agencies should be participants or not. I think honourable Members may have read about the efforts at collaboration between the BAS and the BSIL. The latest information that I have is that this effort is continuing, but has not reached any degree of precision for us to say that there has been an effective merger.

The exercise that we are going to continue to do and to improve is the packaging capability in Barbados. Everybody is agreed that the advisory services which are being provided with respect to packaging are excellent. The cold storage holding facilities that are being provided at the airport are indispensable to a successful transfer of the field temperature to the cargo plane temperature to the temperatures in the other countries. The seminar teaching that goes on to ensure that there is proper handling, all of that is excellent. So that I can say that progress is being made, and the Government wants to continue to help this progress.

One other area that I wish to emphasize is that when we say "agriculture," we are using it in its widest sense, and part of this money will be used also to help the export of flowers, help horticulture. There is some doubt as to whether the Act does not include it already — I have no doubt in my mind about it, I think it is wide enough to include it — but, if necessary, we will have that clarified. The point is that part of this money will be used to help the effort and the export of a limited number of horticulture products in the form of floriculture products which we know we are capable of growing in Barbados and on which we are starting an export effort.
6.00 p.m.

This is an expanded area of activity that we wish to encourage. I am sure that the honourable Members on both sides will support it, and, as it develops, greater and greater resources will have to be put towards the effort with a view to identifying markets abroad and educating our people to the standards that they have to meet in order to exploit the markets. No one else in Barbados is going to do it. They do not have the money to do it and the Government, therefore, has to do it.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is..... The honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will not, and this side will not, oppose this Resolution, because we believe that this Resolution is a vindication of a position taken by the Democratic Labour Party over the years on the question of the development of agriculture in this country. I have lived to see the day when the chief spokesman for the Barbados Labour Party, in the voice of the Prime Minister, makes a statement with which I agree, in which he says that, "Market forces will not do the job. Government has to do it."

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that, for some considerable time in this country, the Barbados Marketing Corporation formed the football for a game that was being played in this system of our country which redound not to the credit of the country as a whole, but to the

benefit of a few persons in this society, and many of the masses in this country did not realize that those who sought to make the Barbados Marketing Corporation into a football were, in fact, seeking to look after themselves at the expense of the community as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I well recall that when the present Government came to office in 1976, lured by a certain gullability which was born of inexperience in Government, they allowed themselves the luxury of closing down of what was then called the Development Division of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. Within many years subsequent to that decision, I have come to see that all of the activities that were centered in that division are being carried out in Barbados by one or other agency or sub-agency and, in fact, in the words of the Prime Minister this evening, the 20 years experience is now being called upon to implement this programme for the export of non-sugar agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I remind this Committee that there was a time when we exported yams from Barbados to the United Kingdom, a species of yams that was peculiar to Barbados, when, under the aegis of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, we introduced the concept of grading and packaging, in such a way that, after a while, the Barbados yam became a very highly sought after delicacy in the European markets for the European palate. Yams had been going into London but they were invariably African yams, and you know, Sir, that the African yam can be distinguished from the Barbadian yam, and, in fact, the Barbadian yam has a peculiarity all of its own, even compared with other Caribbean islands. You will recall, Sir, that we had pioneered and begun to perfect the art of exporting onions from Barbados. In the context of the Caribbean Community and the common market services for the Agricultural Protocol, we had started to see a development of the onion industry in this region that was making all of us proud, and we had seen, as a concomitant development, such things as the development of so-called English potatoes in St. Vincent.

I recall very well that certain sectors of this community spearheaded attacks on the Barbados Marketing Corporation in the context of its profit-making capacity and its ability, a factor that has never been reconciled in any other part of the world, where, as should occur, the public sector takes the initiative in the development of the agricultural sector. Mr. Chairman, in every country in the world, whether it is communist or capitalist, it is the Government sector that leads the way in the pioneering and the development of agricultural diversification, and especially in the area of exports of agricultural products, it is the Government sector that takes the initiative. An example, Sir! The United States is the most prolific producer of wheat in the world, and when the time came for the Russians to purchase wheat from the United

States, it was not the private sector on the world market that was dealing with the purchase, that was negotiating the price — it was the Department of Agriculture in the United States Government that was involved in the discussions and, finally, the negotiated price for the wheat which Russia bought from the United States. As a matter of fact, Sir, to sell or not to sell was the decision of great political importance in the United States, and, as you know Sir, it is ironic that President Carter presided over the failure to sell the Russians wheat whereas President Reagan, who is supposed to be more conservative than any President there has ever been, was the President who determined that the wheat should be sold to Russia. It is only in countries like ours, where we are buffeted by a very pristine, but elementary, ideological conflict....

(Aside: A very good terminology!)

Mr. B. M. TAITT:..... thank you.....that is created in the minds of people, who themselves are uneducated in these matters, that we have this problem. You can read in any newspaper in Barbados the most puerile statement thundering forth as an authoritative statement on matters of which the person, or persons, who perpetrate the information is or are, totally ignorant.

Sir, in Barbados it was said that the Barbados Marketing Corporation was weighing down the community, using up the taxpayers' money, and not showing a profit. I have lived 10 years later to see that at no time during that ten years has anybody been able to produce a document of any kind showing that the Barbados Marketing Corporation had made a profit. They have been able to demonstrate, as we had been able to demonstrate, that the supermarket was a profitable exercise. But all supermarkets tend to be more or less profitable, depending on how much space they have, what is the range of their product, how much money they can spend on publicity and how much pilferage occurs. In any governmental institution the level of pilferage tends to be higher than anywhere else, because Governments are supposed to be humane institutions, and when Governments find individuals within their charge behaving in a particular way, they are not as brutal as the so-called private sector will behave when, in fact, profit is threatened by pilferage.

6.10 p.m.

But that is not the gravamen of my statement. I am discussing the very clear ideological implication of this decision that is being made to add yet another million dollars from the public purse into the agricultural sector, and I am saying that we on this side have no quarrel with the decision to inject a million dollars into this sector. We are going to monitor it. We are going to insist that the guidelines, whenever they come, fall within certain parameters, and we will be like hawks as we watch to see that there is no fall out as a result of faulty imple-

mentation of these guidelines. But, Sir, we could not let this opportunity pass without drawing attention to the fact that these are the vistas which we envisioned back down the road when the Barbados Marketing Corporation Act was passed in this Honourable Chamber under the aegis of the Democratic Labour Party. These were the visions and we are only part way there — we have a long way to go. This country has a long way to go before it can firmly be rooted in an agricultural base to help fulfil its potential as a country.

Sir, when you look at the milk plant in Barbados, the milk plant is a clear example, it is the best of its kind anywhere in the developing world. I well recall that when the Barbados Labour Party were seeking to lock us up in the Duffus Commission, Sir Herbert Duffus took some time out when I was on the stand to discuss the milk plant, because, as he said, he was extremely impressed with the idea embodied in the concept of the milk plant, furthermore to see it functioning and working as well as it does. As of now that same milk plant is supplying all of the fresh milk that is used in Barbados. It became the sole importer of whatever milk is imported into Barbados, and together with the private sector, the co-operation between the public sector and the private sector has resulted in the development of one of the best cattle industries in any developing country of this size anywhere in the world.

I turn, Sir, to an institution like BARPAC. I recall that when BARPAC first came into Barbados, again there was an attack, or series of attacks, on Government's attitude and Government's position on BARPAC. We had the courage, as some honourable Members would recall, to stay with the concept. Today in this country, I challenge any honourable Member of this society to be able to tell the difference between Barbados-produced ham and ham from elsewhere, and whenever you find the difference, the advantage is with the Barbados-produced ham. The reason is that, if you will pardon the expression, we have the best pigs anywhere in the world.

(Aside: Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: How do you know?)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Even the ones who bred from the other side, Sir.

Sir, the point I am making is that we were able, because we stayed with it, and that Government, in spite of their early errors on the question of BARPAC, when they reverted to the policy that had been tried and true with the Democratic Labour Party and they followed those policies, they, too, have contributed to seeing an industry that is functional and working well.

So that I was surprised to see the other day that we have a package in this country now of ham with a French label on it. I wish to explore that a little more carefully, because we are, in fact, packaging ham in Bridgetown for Canada. Not many people are aware of this — I read in the newspapers every day about various business enterprises and I have never seen anything of that in any of the newspapers here — but there is a French package of ham, Barbados ham, which is going into the European Economic Community and into Canada, from what I read. Sir, that is a long way from the days when the ham used to spoil when they attempted to make it back in 1974 and 1975. But it was necessary for some ham to spoil in order for us to reach the stage where we are now and we in Barbados, believe it or not, Mr. Chairman, have a situation where non-sugar agriculture is making the greatest contribution on a cumulative basis to the development of agriculture in this country. Even as the Prime Minister talked about sugar at five cents a pound on the market, we are able to talk about good, solid, hard currency to be earned from exports of non-sugar agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a vindication of the faith which the Democratic Labour Party had back in the years when we had the responsibility for agricultural diversification. I doubt that we will have any controversy over the question of where the diversification started and how it started. I doubt that anyone is going to try to make that into an issue. We do not seek to make it an issue, we are merely saying that we feel justified in accepting this very clear vindication of a well thought out policy not only by the Democratic Labour Party — Sir, let me hasten to say it was not the political genius of the Democratic Labour Party — because, in the final analysis, most of the experts who function in the Ministry of Agriculture were the experts who functioned in the Ministry of Agriculture then. So let us not try to take all of the credit for any activity which is going on now. Let us say that we had the political will and the political courage to stick to the decisions in spite of some very vehement and sometimes wicked criticism of our position. We have come to see the present Government going full cycle, and we believe that they, in so far as non-sugar agriculture is concerned, in any of the successful policies they have had, are now *ad idem* with decisions taken by the Democratic Labour Party as far back as 1972, 1973 and even farther beyond.

Mr. Chairman, this million dollars is only the beginning, and I would make bold to say that if this is operated improperly it will be a better expenditure than any subsidy which we can give in the vicinity of ten and twenty million dollars to prop up other areas of agriculture. What we need to do is to follow Polypack — I do not think he would mind if I call his name — let us get more of the development of the frozen vegetables. I have cooked them, and so I speak with authority.

(*Aside:* Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: You can't cook, man.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Johnson, you have lived in America and you know that all of us who lived in America can cook. You are always interfering with me. How do you know if I can cook or not? Ask any of the young ladies who have eaten from my hand and they will tell you that I can cook very well.
6.20 p.m.

I will not waste time with the honourable Member, because he is rigid in these matters. He believes that cooking is for women. He does not understand that, in the modern trend of things, men, now-a-days, are, in fact, better cooks in some respects.

I am saying that the Wakefield vegetables compare with any 'vegetables I have seen from the United States. We should have more frozen vegetables, and we should produce them in sufficient quantities that the producer can make a decent living, can have a decent profit and that the price is not prohibitive to the masses of this country, because it is not sensible to be producing for export when we have large numbers of people in Barbados who do not have the benefit of being able to eat vegetables. The reason why many of them cannot eat vegetables at that level is because they are still relatively expensive.

I am saying that we need to develop our own market here, and we need to have a proper import policy. You cannot have a good agricultural diversification policy if it is not linked with a concomitant consumer and trade policy, and I stand subject to no correction on that from any quarter. You cannot have, I repeat, a good agricultural diversification policy if it is not linked — there must be linkage — with your import policy.

The hotels in Barbados must feel bound to use the agricultural products of Barbados. The visitors to Barbados must be able to go back to their respective countries and say to the people, "there are better vegetables in Barbados than there are in Quebec, or Timbuctoo or wherever." That will only happen if Governments have the courage, in the first instance, to insist on a policy of linkage for agriculture and commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I run the risk of repeating myself if I go any further on this, partly because I feel so strongly about it and partly because the evidence of success is always so sweet that you tend to get carried away. I believe that this policy which the Prime Minister has articulated today is a policy which was routed back in the early 1970s, and it is a justification for the position which the Democratic Labour Party has always taken on the agricultural diversification in this country. So, on our

side, we would have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting this Resolution.

Thank you.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I was a young student of Management, I was compelled to read an article by Professor Levett from Harvard University appearing in the Harvard University Business Review, the title of which was "Management Myopia." Professor Levett was talking about the fact that the railroad industry in the United States, regarding itself as a railroad industry, failed to capitalise on the growth in development of transportation in general, and, therefore, ended up with a lot of broken rails, wrecks and relics in trains. They had no stock or share in the improved transportation facilities available in the contemporary world. When I read that story, Sir, I thought it was a particularly unsightful piece of writing, that was until I came to Barbados and participated in the developmental process of our country and concluded that that management myopia is a condition that afflicts all developing societies — regardless of what has transpired before, all of us seem destined to make the same mistake over and over again.

If I may relate that now to the experience of Barbados in agricultural development, I point to the fact that, even today, although we see evidence of change, social and economic change, that compels a shift of the imperatives which we once held dear — even though that is happening before our eyes — it is still very difficult for a number of plantation managers and other agency people to accept the fact that agriculture is not sugar cane. Agricultural production and diversification is something which we all must come to grips with in the development of our economy, and as long as we remain wedded to the notion that agriculture means sugar cane production, we are bound to suffer a great deal of hardship and loss as a consequence of our unwillingness to heed the times in which we live.

When this Government came into power prior to 1961.....

(Aside: Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Trents is mainly grass).

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Trents is a viable dairy estate, a very viable dairy estate. Sir, not to be diverted, that is an example of diversification. We came out of canes and have gone into dairy. Grass is essential to dairying.

Sir, the point that I am making is that we came into power and the Barbados Marketing Corporation came out of the fertile imagination of this Government, this one over here. Prior to 1961, it was the Barbados Labour Party Government that brought the Barbados

Marketing Corporation Act into fruition, set it on the Statute Books, formulated at that far date the concept of agricultural diversification and made provision at that time for the time when Barbados would become an agricultural export society — we would not just be exporting sugar cane, but we would be exporting other agricultural produce. It was done way back then, and then again, when we had another opportunity in 1976, we continued the policies which we dreamed about in 1960, and in 1976 the Barbados Marketing Corporation again began to concentrate on that area which was the main reason why it was established, and that is, agricultural diversification and export of agricultural produce.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt) referred to the Development Division that was changed. He does not seem to remember that the most lucrative contract ever negotiated in the history of Barbados for the export of any single commodity other than sugar was negotiated at the time when I was Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and we made that deal with United Fruit, the largest single fruit handling company in the entire world. They came to Barbados with agronomists, marketing people and plant pathologists, and we sat down and not only negotiated a contract for the export of yams, but they also gave us information as to the varieties to be grown in order to satisfy the demands for the American market. We revitalised the fumigation plant that had long laid inactive, and we made our shipment of yams to the United States, the first time we had ever gone into the United States market with green produce.

That contract was a signal, but I say, Sir, that in order to have these things succeed, one has to be able to get the cooperation of the primary producers, and, at that time, I suspect that we had not become sufficiently mature as an agricultural community and, therefore, the opportunity was missed. After a few shipments it was not possible for Barbados to meet the commitments of United Fruit, and therefore they went elsewhere to get the produce that they needed. 6.30 p.m.

When we went to the Barbados Marketing Corporation in 1976, it is useful to remind people who have forgotten that we used to import major vegetables that we take for granted in Barbados today. In those days tomatoes used to be \$4 a pound and they had to be imported from Miami and Canada. I do not believe anybody can remember that. They seem to believe that Polly Kinch was producing tomatoes from the year one. The fact is that out of our stimulation, out of our development programme, emerged private entrepreneurs who were crafty enough to spot that there was a market in Barbados for produce, and he pioneered, virtually, the modern, mass polypack system that we are now talking about. But we used to import tomatoes, we used to import cabbage, we used to import lettuce. Iceberg

lettuce had to be imported by the plane load — CARIB WEST was then the carrier that brought in produce — on a weekly basis to Barbados. Carrots had to be imported. That was in 1976, 1977 and 1978. But because of the stimulation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation under this Government, we provided the opportunities and the environment under which private entrepreneurs in agriculture, apart from sugar, could be developed, and we have people like Polly Kinch and the people at Friendship Plantation. That is a positive fact.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West will have forgotten that it was the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the same one now which we are talking about, that in those very years, 1976 — 1981, for the first time in the history of Barbados, on a regular weekly basis exported breadfruit to the United Kingdom, again a contract negotiated with a major marketing agency in the United Kingdom that took not only the yams, but breadfruit, even cerasee bush. There was a heavy demand for cerasee bush because it is one of those exotic herbs over in the United Kingdom, and we got a good price for it. We got a good price for these produce.

The honourable Member talked about onions. We used to have a major supply of onions going into CARICOM, particularly into Guyana and Trinidad. We do not claim credit for the onion programme, because, in fairness to the honourable Member for St. Michael West, the onion project was started before our time. It was only because we were having difficulty getting the money out of Guyana and Trinidad that that business fell through. In any event, Barbados is not sufficiently competent in the production of onions in order to altogether satisfy the local market, let alone export.

I just want to cite those historical facts in order to demonstrate that the point at which we now find ourselves did not just emerge. It was a developmental process. I can remember, Sir, when we made the first export of okras to the United States of America, another product that was exported for the first time in 1979. It was because, again, of the fact that — the traditional attitude to agriculture was so deeply entrenched — it was difficult for Barbadian farmers to see that there was an alternative to sugar, and the discipline that was essential and the trial that was necessary and the failures that would be consequential upon entry into a new endeavour, all of these things were too painful and many of them took the first tentative steps and dropped out.

We tried to set up, in conjunction with the private sector, a packaging facility. We went ahead and bought the land at Lower Estate, 21 acres. The honourable Member for St. Michael West knows this, but he does not want to recall it. We had Halco and Partners, a major firm come to Barbados, and on a consultancy, design a packaging plant, an abattoir, blast-freezing facilities,

onion-drying facilities, all packaged and all designed in one complex to be sited at Lower Estate. Short-sightedness and tentativeness are the reason why that project did not get off the ground, and I believe that now we are recognising that the Barbados Labour Party's brain is so fertile that it is usually light years ahead of the Democratic Labour Party when it comes to planning.

Aside.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: It is designed, the land has been purchased, plans were drawn, but the private sector was not satisfied that the Government had any input at all to make in a facility like that. They were reluctant to come and join with the Government on an exercise of that sort, but that is only because the Democratic Labour Party told them not to trust the Government.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West knows the initiatives in this direction, the other honourable Members do not know. I am giving you credit, because you know that in the United States of America the Government takes an active part in the marketing of produce, particularly of primary products like wheat, beet and corn. The United States Government, itself, is deeply involved. The United States Government has silos for the purpose of taking off surpluses. It has generous subsidies.

When we sit down and vote money for the purpose of supporting agriculture, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) gets up and gives the public of Barbados the impression that this is a criminal waste of Government funds. But, listen to me carefully, any country that appears to have a viable, agricultural economy is heavily supported by the Government. New Zealand, the United States, Canada, have generous price support facilities. They have generous subsidies which they make available to the farmers so that they can produce food, because long ago they recognised that food is very essential — as a matter of fact it is the most essential — commodity in terms of the sustenance of human life. When there is no food to eat, people become desperate, and they have to go and commit hard-earned foreign reserves to purchase food from extra-regional sources which ought to be grown locally. This Government, with this money that is to be voted here for the support of alternative agricultural crops, is demonstrating that it has an understanding of what is necessary in order to develop in Barbados all the resources that are essential and vital to the sustenance of the life and well-being of our people. Sir, I am very pleased to support the Resolution.

6.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Chairman, I was very surprised to hear the honourable

Member who just sat down give as an example of the foresightedness of the Barbados Labour Party — these are exactly the same words you used

(Aside: Hon. L. R. TULL: Foresight.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ...the purchase of 21 acres of land at Lower Estate for the purpose of setting up a section of the BMC and a packaging plant. Sir, he seems to have forgotten

(Aside: Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: That what?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ...that the Democratic Labour Party....

(Aside: Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Did what?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:....had already identified a location in St. Thomas for the same purpose, and all the Barbados Labour Party was doing was moving the project from St. Thomas to Lower Estate in order to facilitate the cutting up of Lower Estate Plantation in order to bail out one of their supporters.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: On a point of order, Sir: That is unparliamentary.

(Aside: Mr. P. M. GREAVES: What is?)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: What I can say is that you all put it up at Edgehill and you were paying the price of, I believe it was \$21 000 an acre for agricultural land. That is why we moved it from up there. Twenty-one thousand dollars an acre for five acres of land up at Edgehill! That is what you all were doing...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To continue

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: because Wes Packer was the owner of Edgehill Plantation. That is what it is.

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

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: That is all that happened.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You know St. George, I know St. George. It is the lot on the left as you go up towards Lears up there, that is the part they were cutting off, and the justification was, of course, a relocation of the same project. That is what you are referring to as Barbados Labour Party project. I remember only too well what happened. I will not call the names of the two parties but you know who they are. I will continue, Sir.

I was very surprised to hear the Prime Minister state to the nation not so long ago that this aspect of

his Budget — he is very fond of the little Budget which he brought into Parliament last year and which has really had no effect whatsoever on Barbados — was one of the things he said was wonderful in relation to his proposals in agriculture, how the revolving fund was established and what not. He has not come to Parliament for a cent until today! There has been no fund! It is now January and he will be telling you in two months' time what a wonderful job it performed in the last twelve months. Typical of the Prime Minister and typical of the Barbados Labour Party.

The facts are as follows, Mr. Chairman. Barbados has been under sugar for many years because it was the easiest and the most lucrative crop to grow. People were able to produce sugar, and once they delivered their canes to the plantation, there was an agro-industrial process, the manufacturing of sugar that took place thereafter, and then a combination of private sector and Government interest took care of the export and the marketing of sugar. So that when it comes to the involvement of the public sector being given points in the agricultural process it has been there for many years in sugar. All that has happened in Barbados, and this has nothing to do with the Barbados Labour Party, is that because of the significant decline in sugar and earnings from sugar and sugar production, and because of the chaos in the world market situation with sugar, the plantations have found it necessary, absolutely necessary, to go into non-sugar production for their own survival. As a matter of fact, if some of them are to rescue their plantations out of bankruptcy, they have to get into the area of non-sugar production. This is nothing that was coaxed along. This is out of economic necessity.

What has happened at the same time, Sir, is that as soon as the plantations went into non-sugar production, you have got the situation in Barbados of over production for the domestic market needs of non-sugar crops. This therefore, created a demand for local marketing and a consequential demand to deal with excess in terms of export in terms of non-sugar agricultural products. These are the economic logistics of what has taken place in Barbados over the past ten years, and it is consequential on the Barbados Labour Party's failures in the area of sugar.

Laughter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There can be no doubt, that whether or not it be a revolving fund, it is a mechanism of financial aid to assist in the export of non-sugar agricultural products. Whatever form it takes will depend very much on how it is administered and how it is targeted to the various market forces which exist.

As I see it, Sir, what we have in Barbados today is an economic situation in agriculture which has led to the

over production of non-sugar agricultural products. This is creating a need for several streams for agro-industrial development, and I believe that that linkage between agro-industrial development and exports represent an important, firm linkage in terms of export earnings for Barbadians, and not enough is being done in that area. A lot more can be done in the area of agro-industrial development, because when you start getting into the area of exporting tomatoes, exporting crops of that nature, you have a lot of problems — problems of quality, problems of volume, problems of schedules, problems of delivery — and there is a whole lot of things that just have to go right if you are to survive in that market.

I know, Sir, that a small place like Barbados would do well if it looks at two things. One is agro-industrial development, and target that to the domestic market, CARICOM market and the non-CARICOM export market. The second area is to look very carefully at the ethnic markets in North America and in Europe, because in that area you have largely a captive market, which tends to match your capacity to deliver in terms of volume, and the quality demands are not necessarily the same as the wider markets in the industrialized countries.

Did you know, Sir, that if I were not so busy I could make a dollar at this time of the year by exporting sugar cane, actual canes, to Europe? I have had one or two enquiries, and this is not against the law as far as I know; you cannot export sugar, but you could export sugar cane. But if you go into London now you would find people selling a piece of cane, about a foot long, for £2 and £3. This is what I mean when I talk about a captive ethnic market where the quality demands might not be the same as the wider market, because it is not an easy thing to export fresh vegetables and so on and compete in those markets.

I know, for example, that in some of the ventures which we have embarked on in Barbados, produce has been exported from here and condemned on arrival. In many instances, it is doubtful whether it should have been condemned at all, because you are also in a business where there are a lot of crooks, and unless you have supervisors and supervision at the point of arrival, then you could be in a lot of problems. If you were to check the people who are involved in food imports and exports in places like Miami and so on, you might as well be looking at "Miami Vice" from time to time.

(Aside: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You know that well.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is a fact. I know what I am talking about. I know of the Jamaican experience in relation to exports from Jamaica to Miami, and I know what can be done in order to frustrate major and potentially good projects in countries like Barbados and the Caribbean when you come in contact with that wide a market.

6.50 p.m.

Sir, I believe another area in which we should be putting far more effort is in the area of export of fish; agro-industrial development in the area of fisheries and the export of fish. I will tell you that there is almost an immediate market in Canada and the United States.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, it is going on in trickles. I am talking about in large volumes.

Last night, Sir, I went down to Oistins. I spent an hour and a half down there, and the person who was there with me spent an hour and a half trying to get \$35 in fish to put into cold storage. I have not gone there before — to export to Antigua. Now that is not efficient. But they also told me that the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central will lose Oistins. That is what I discovered last night. I spent an hour and a half down there. They told me that. Several people!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is he going to lose it to Antigua?

Laughter

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is a fact. I did not see that lady.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, to continue. This is just a minor financial inducement, although I am concerned that I heard the word "grants" coming from the mouth of the Minister of Finance when I see nothing in relation to grants in this Resolution. There is nothing here to suggest grants. We talk about soft loans and interest free loans. During your speech you mentioned that in doing the guidelines there is a possibility of grants, and I hope that that would have to come before Parliament if that step is being taken.

Sir, the honourable Member thinks that there is not enough money in the private sector available for this kind of activity. I would say that there is a lot of money in Barbados involved in the importation of food and in the food business in Barbados. There is a lot of money there, and I have always felt that taking the same kind of expertise developed over the years by a small group of people in terms of the importation of food and the fact that they have built up a substantial resource base, with appropriate fiscal incentives, probably by differentials in tax liabilities and so on, it may be possible to involve those same people in your domestic distributive effort and in your export of surplus effort and to re-orientate them to get them involved in agro-industrial development.

This party, Sir, has given a lot of thought over many years to a plan to see how we can harmonize the activities in relation to food importation with the export effort in agriculture. We believe that there is an area of tax incentives within there such that you can get the large corporations and make it more profitable for them to buy local, to market local, and to export than to import. I believe this can be done. I am a great believer in the concept that where you have expertise available to you, you should try to make the best use of it. I do not think that this has been examined. You are probably talking now, Sir, of a flow picture of well over \$150 million or thereabouts through, in and out of Barbados. That is the kind of figure that you are really talking about. You are talking about the whole mass of investments in Bridgetown and related investments in agriculture and so on in Barbados.

I believe the money is there. I believe that where there is no foresight is with the Government, where the Minister of Finance has failed in not recognizing that the whole dynamics of the economics of agriculture has been forced into a changed position and that you are now in the driver's seat. You are now in a position where, through fiscal incentives, you can use that pool of money, which will be spent anyhow, at a foreign exchange cost, and use it to earn foreign exchange or minimize the loss of foreign exchange. It requires a lot of thought, but the money is there, and I am quite happy about that.

But, Sir, you have to be careful. Now you take a thing like okras. The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central has said that one of the major contributions that he made to this country was to export okras. Sir, okras are delicate produce, and I am telling you as a fact that those okras were exported in the winter, and when they arrived in England they were all frozen.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: They were hard?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what I mean, Sir, by the delicacy of that operation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But we do export frozen okras. Your time is up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much. This is a good note to stop on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Prime Minister wind up please?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir. I am going to be very short, Sir, because it is obvious that all sides are agreed that we must provide money to help to develop the expertise in the public and private sector for the export of non-sugar agricultural products.

I note that there was no comment on the fact that we intended to use some of this money also to encourage the development of flowers. There was some comment on fish, but I think the honourable Member who just spoke should recognize that one visit to Oistins is hardly the basis upon which he can form a judgment as to the inclinations of the people of Oistins.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: You are worried.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am not worried at all. I know that Oistins is a very famous place for the Democratic Labour Party. I am sure that the honourable Member's informant is probably the same person who proclaimed at a famous meeting in Oistins their pleasure at introducing the Leader of the Opposition as the world's biggest dictator.

Sir, the Government has been trying to help market research, packaging and finance in this area. It is not an easy area in which to operate. It is easy to say here that, given the proper incentives, \$150 million is probably the order of magnitude in and out. What has the Government done? The Government has given the incentives. A little later in the day another of the Budgetary Proposals will be implemented, where for every dollar of export there is a rebate in the tax. The Government has given the incentives not only in Income Tax, the Government has given the incentives by permitting the use of its infrastructure at the airport, at very concessionary rates, both in the IDC estates and in the old terminal building, for the purpose of being used for packaging, as a package station. The Government has given incentives by this very measure here that we are introducing. We also have the Industrial Credit Fund. We have been giving fiscal incentives. Some of the firms that have been called as typical examples of agro-industrial development all have fiscal incentives. They all get their tax holidays out of this. They have all borrowed money from the Development Bank.

Sir, if you provide all of those services, it is fairly obvious that that is really indicative of your intention. But the honourable Member skirts around a fundamental problem. Whatever incentives we give from our side, however good our growers are here in producing the quality of the products, there are two things that we have little control over — firstly, the price that you sell it at and, secondly, access to the market free of bureaucratic regulation, whether arising from protection or otherwise.

One of the reasons why we have gluts in Barbados of some of this agricultural produce is because of the protectionism that has crept into CARICOM. There cannot be any doubt about that. Protectionism in CARICOM has hindered the diversification and the agro-industrial development of Barbados. We had more

dialogue than anybody else in trying to remove this. It has taken time. Few people recognize that it was in Port-of-Spain in 1983 that the Heads of Government Conference first talked about a replacement protocol for the then existing Agricultural Marketing Protocol. Everybody was shocked and surprised when one of the greatest proponents of the unsaddling of the bureaucracy was none other than the late President of Guyana. It took us two years to get that in legal form with respect to the 40 or 45 products that we are capable of growing competitively in the Caribbean, and, to this day, notwithstanding the fact that we implemented this since last year, we still have to be in the persuasion game of trying to get everybody else to implement it. Five or six territories have done it. We hope that not only will there be the passage of the legal mechanisms but there will be the removal of the unnecessary bureaucratic machinery that is in place, and has no place there if you want to have a genuine free trade in agriculture to reduce the billion U.S. dollars in food that is imported into the Caribbean. I am not suggesting that you can replace all of that, because a good part of that consists of bean products and other products that we are not capable of producing. We have absolutely no control over that. We can persuade, we can argue, but we have no control over that.

7.00 p.m.

There is a similar situation that we have to deal with in the United States of America. I will say that some progress has been made since the Caribbean Basin Initiative has been passed in this area, and the first market that everyone looks at is obviously the ethnic market. For the last two years considerable effort has been made, and some success achieved, in marketing processed flying fish in Canada and within the Caribbean. You only have to go down to Atlantic Fishmongers and see what is taking place there. You only have to go up in St. John, underneath St. John's Church, at the National Trust house, Clifton Hall. There are another two. I understand there is one in Baxters Road and there is another plant going. All of these things are taking place — improved packaging, the utilisation of ice, the bacteria count taking place to cover the standards of Canada. Already this year, I am told, we have exported more in the first month, so to speak, of the season than we did for the whole of last year, as a result of contacts built up.

So it is not too difficult to rebut the suggestions that are put forward that nothing is being done, or that more can be done easily. It is not an easy job, but we have faith in it. We have some good contacts in respect of specific products — sweet peppers, eggplant, melons, together with the traditional yams and sweet potatoes — but we have difficulties along the way. We have had to develop a virus free yam in Barbados because of consumer rejection of the dark specks that came in some of our traditional yam, but now that we have developed the

virus free yam, there is still another problem that has reared its head, and it has not been proven yet whether the disease we had in certain areas of yam this year as a result of the fungus caused by the extraordinary rains only attacked the virus free yam or not. You have to continue trying all the time, so the Government will continue in this area.

I want to give the honourable Members the assurance that we know it is not easy, and we are not going to be dissuaded by any suggestion that we are only following the policies that had been outlined previously. So much the better. That means that we have a bipartisan approach. If you say they are your policies and we are implementing them, so much the better. We have a bipartisan approach in Barbados.

There is just one little point of correction I would like to put on the record for the benefit of the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B. M. Taitt). I think he will find that the Barbados Marketing Corporation Act happens to be an Act 1961—40. I think that if he looks and checks, he will see that Act had its origin in the same kind of bipartisan approach to the talk then, the same kind of thing.

It is true that it is a difficult task to convert importers into exporters. By allowing losses to be carried forward for seven years, by allowing the receipt of 150% expenses on marketing to be charged off income — and we are looking at some other incentives in that area — we are hoping to convert some of the importers into exporters. We are hoping. As the competition hots up between the importers and the margins reduce and reduce and reduce, simple economics will force them to become exporters.

(*Aside:* Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Or to be manufacturers like Hill).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We have given them all kinds of incentives to become manufacturers. That is the position in relation to that.

I told the honourable Members when we had the Budget Debate that we were looking at a mechanism to ensure that income earned from services to export industry could also be treated in the same way as the income from the actual receipts of the exports. Of course, it cannot be double counted. You will have to get the income from the export services defined in such a way as only to include that proportion of expense the exporter has as income. We are looking at that. It is a difficult thing to draw, but the principle is clear in our minds that we wish to help. We will even do the services. I have not forgotten the services, but we are working on it.

The question that Head 74 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 79 — MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS — \$355 750

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Chairman, there is just one part of this Head 79 I am very concerned about, and I draw it to the Prime Minister's attention. I do not believe that the repairs to the roof of the Hilton Hotel should find its way in this Resolution. This says "renovation and construction of Government offices." The Resolution is very badly worded, because this is not a Government office by any stretch of the imagination. We, meaning the people of Barbados, own the property, it is true, but there must be some other Head where the specific amount of money to be used to repair the Hilton Hotel roof should appear. I do not think, for your purposes, you should allow this to go as part of the Resolution. It is a peculiar looking thing, to say the least, and I draw it to your attention.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): I understand that there is a central vote in the Ministry of Housing which deals with Government buildings. As superior landlord, as the Ministry of Housing is known now today, we brought this under control in the new Property Management Section, and this is the central vote.
7.10 p.m.

You will see here that they have the Supreme Court Building. I am told this vote is used to repair all property which is not property which was on a list that was in the old Ministry of Works. You have to remember the historical development of this, there was an old Ministry of Works. So that although it says "Subhead 7, Head 79 — Renovation and Construction of Government Offices", my understanding is that the Estimates themselves speak of Government buildings.

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Let me check it. The Minister of Housing is going to speak, but I am told that the vote is so defined to include all Government buildings, and the Hilton is a Government building.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order: I can check it for you. It also says in the main Subhead 7, "of other Government offices and buildings", so I think we should simply amend this note accordingly. Instead of saying "and the cost of repairs", I think that if you move

an amendment to say "as well as the cost of repairs to the roof of the Hilton", that would be sufficient.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I understand that there is going to be need for an amendment and it is "renovation and construction of Government Buildings". "Subhead 7: Renovation and Construction of Government Buildings".

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if you will bear with me, let me pass this to the Minister because the original says "Offices." I do not think we should change the Head.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Subhead 7, Sir, — thank you for passing it — "Renovation and Construction of Government Offices" Read now: "Provision is included under this subhead for the purchase of two prefabricated units from N.H.C. for the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation, the cost of refurbishing Marine House, as well as the improvements of other Government Offices and Buildings." So that under Subhead 7, remember when we add this supplementary in, the description as set out there, would include the words "Government Offices and Buildings" and Hilton is unquestionably a Government building. So that although Subhead 7 is Renovations and Construction of Government Offices, when you view the description it will be "provision is provided under this Subhead for improvement of other Government offices and buildings." That is what it says. That is why we put it under that because it has "and buildings."

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Before I go, I understand what the honourable Member has said, but, if I remember correctly, the Hilton was vested in the IDC.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Never! They had an instrument of delegation of management of the property which was revoked, and the instrument of delegation is now in the BIDC. It was never vested. It has always remained in the Crown. The lease is in the Crown's name. It always remained in the Crown. We never handed it over, never.

Asides

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is perfectly correct, because I thought so at one stage too. It was never. The Crown Solicitor's Office never vested it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If you would bear with me, Mr. Chairman. Do I take it then that the IDC stopped managing and the Hilton went into the Tourism and Investment Corporation? They now fall within the ambit of the Tourism Investment Corporation?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: They are the Government's agents for the carrying of the lease from the landlord's

position. Instead of IDC, it is BTIC. It is like the Dover Convention Centre. The Dover Convention Centre remains the property of the Crown in the right of the Government of Barbados. The managing agent is the other. That is why you see it under them. The money goes in there.

Let me tell you one thing about the Hilton. Normally, the BTIC would have received enough money from the Hilton to be able to do the repairs and then the Accountant General would allow an offset. But last year, and this year, as a result of heavy rains, there are a number of cornices of that roof — it is 20 or 21 years old — and despite the efforts of trying to use hot asphalt and so on — that was done about eight years ago — it is still leaking again.

We have done a very thorough survey of it. They say that the only answer to it — it is moving concrete — is to build a new roof over the existing one, so that you will now seal the one underneath it and you will have a double roof. It is a secondary thing and they will utilize energy conservation, because this one now will be cooled. The sun's rays will be protected. That is \$162 000.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Should we not give the money to BTIC for these repairs? I am asking, because, in terms of the tidiness of it, it would seem to me that when the Hilton pays its profits, it pays its profits to the BTIC. Whatever monies the Hilton pays to the Government for the use of the property and the franchise, etc., that money goes to the BTIC. In other words, that money does not go into the Consolidated Fund?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No. The BTIC is only the conduit pipe, like the Hilton was only the conduit pipe. That is all. They do not even get a percentage for looking after it. The IDC always used to argue that they were entitled to 2% for looking after it. We have never considered it. They have to take it and hand it over to the Accountant General. He is very, very strict on it.

They are named as the agent. Under the lease, the Government must nominate an agent, and the BTIC is the agent nominated. The agent also sits on the Board of Directors of a thing called "The Hilton Barbados Limited," which is the lessee of the place. The Government has the right to nominate one director.

(Asides: Mr. B. M. TAITT: Who the lessee pays?)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The lessee pays the BTIC Account, Government of Barbados, and that has to be handed in to the Accountant General. They cannot pass it through their accounts.
7.20 p.m.

It is on a straight agency basis. That has been going on with IDC, and the way how it was set up was that

the Hilton was made to incorporate locally, a separate company. Government is entitled to a member on the Board. The Ministry of Finance originally used to do it. Mr. Harcourt Lewis used to do it originally, then it went to IDC and he happened to have been the nominee that IDC used to put on the Board, and then when the BIDC was formed, it was put into the BIDC. The Dover Convention Centre is the same thing, but Heywoods is different. Under Heywoods, under the agreement with CDB, you had to vest the land with Heywoods into the Corporation. If you look at the Act you will only see one bit of land vested, never the Hilton and the other one.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 8.10 p.m.

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

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

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting in resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 2.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BOURNE'S LAND, ST. CHRISTOPHER, CHRIST CHURCH

Order No. 2 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Bourne's Land, St. Christopher, Christ Church, for the extension of the playing field at St. Christopher Boys' School and the relocation of houses.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to make provision for an additional playing field and the resiting of houses in that area. The area under consideration is a large catchment area. Anybody who knows the general area of Silver Sands

and the surrounding district will understand that there are quite a number of people there, old and young. If I am to believe the statistics, Barbados has a very young population, because it is said that 50 per cent of the population is below the age of 25, and in that general area there is a considerable amount of children and young people as well who desire to have adequate playing facilities.

We have heard a lot about games of all kinds today and the provision which is made for them. I feel that we do not have to go over the grounds which we have already trod, and therefore I do not want to say much more beyond to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, there are one or two questions. We do not have a location plan of the acquisition that we are being asked to approve, but I do notice that it is in Christ Church East in Bourne's Land. I know that for several years the people of Christ Church East have been making representations to have this facility made available to the children in the area, and I know that very little was done by the present Administration over the past nine years to meet the wishes of the people.

It is significant that it is on Bourne's Land, because I know it is very dear to the heart of a very prominent and distinguished Barbadian, the candidate for the Democratic Labour Party in Christ Church East, Mr. Bourne. I am quite sure that he will be very pleased to know that all the hard work that he has put in since his return from Canada would have found fruition today when this Resolution is passed through Parliament.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): I did not hear what was said. I did not get the name. I missed the point. Would you repeat what you said? I did not get that point.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Speaker, I note that the Resolution states that there will be relocation of houses. Could the Minister inform us where these houses to be relocated are now situated?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: The houses, Mr. Speaker

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Minister replying?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution? The honourable Member may now reply.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, unless you know the area, you might not very well understand the general physical layout of the area, but the lands that will be acquired would be the lands which are contiguous to the existing playing area and to the school. What is planned is that we will remove the houses from the space which they now occupy, because they are done in a very craggy way, the siting of them at the moment, develop a portion of the land and put in a road so that the people will continue to be in the general area where they have always been. It would be just moving them around and shifting them here and there. There is a lot of open space there, but it is just that the houses are not particularly orderly in the manner in which they are sited. 8.15 p.m.

A plan was not asked for. It has been my practice since taking this portfolio over to make available to Members on the other side any plans which they ask for. As a matter of fact, I am not in the habit of coming to this Parliament except I come with a plan. I believe that there should be a plan and Parliament should be entitled to ask for one, and Members should have a clear picture as to what is being acquired. A plan is here, and if anybody wants to see it, I will make it available, but the houses will be in that general area where the acquisitions are being made.

Getting back to the point made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) with respect to the request being made and the long period that the request was made over and the fact that it took a distinguished person, when I heard the name, I was thinking of a Professor Bourne, a Barbadian who has distinguished himself, I think, in medicine. I was wondering if this was the person that my friend was thinking of, and I was listening to hear the outcome, until he laboured for a considerable length of time and produced a mouse. But, of course, that seems to be the habit now from the other side.

With respect to playing facilities, Mr. Speaker, we in the Labour Party have got a lot to be proud about. We have heard a lot today and a lot more can be said. During our Administration, just over nine years, we have been able to produce about 63 to 64 pavilions, playing fields and community centres as against what was said was done by the other side, and, therefore, we have a lot to be proud of. We are happy to think that we are in the vanguard and that we are out front as far as the provision of recreational facilities for the youth of Barbados is concerned. We are happy about that.

I hope that what I have said would satisfy most honourable Members on the other side with respect to the points which they raised.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 3, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1986

Order No. 3 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, for some time the Government has announced its intention to create the post of a fifth judge in Barbados. The Attorney-General's office has advised that, under the existing Laws of Barbados, we need an amendment to the law to provide for this eventuality.

It is not possible for us, when the law is amended, to create this post immediately. It cannot come into force before April 1. A court has to be prepared for the judge and either today or previously a sum of money was voted – I think it was today – for the conversion of what was formerly the Assistant Court of Appeal, then the Petty Debt Court and subsequently the Civil Debt Court. It is that area of the existing Registry building which is the covered way, and at the same time, at the higher level, the junction between the old Town Hall and the Registry.

It is envisaged that as a result of the creation of this fifth judge, it would be easier to form a Court of Appeal in Barbados, and I wish to reiterate the Government's interest in another arrangement for a Court of Appeal. In the meantime, however, we have also been assured that, with the creation of this additional judge, there will be little need to call upon the services of the Registrar, the Solicitor-General, the Director of Public Prosecutions or any other public officer to join the Supreme Court Bench on a temporary basis when leave takes place. There will be a sufficiency of numbers for a Court of Appeal to be formed and, at the same time, to have enough Supreme Court judges for work to take place at a level and in an amount necessary to prevent the building up of arrears. We have been conscious of the fact that work is increasing in Barbados and it is necessary for us to provide additional manpower.

A little later we will be bringing legislation which will provide for the separation of the Supreme Court Registry and the creation of the Registrar of Intellectual Property and Corporate Affairs as well as the addition of the Deeds Registry to the Land Registry. So that we will

have three registries in operation as soon as the new financial year starts and adequate provision is made for the separation of some of these functions. In fact, at the present moment, the Intellectual Property and Corporate Affairs office functions as a sub-unit of the Registrar of the Supreme Court. The Deeds Registry is also an integral part of that unit, but I am hopeful that the relevant authorities will make the appointment of the Registrar of the Land Registry very quickly. After we have the benefit of his advice – because that post has already been established – we will then be able to bring in the amendments to the Registration Act that are necessary to have the Land Registry section of the existing Registration Office transferred to the Land Registry. So that the Registrar of Deeds and Lands will be like the Registrar in many other countries of the world, responsible for the totality of the law that relates to the transfer of property whether that be a Deeds Registry system or a Lands Registration system. Overnight we just cannot have all the deeds converted into a Land Registry – it will take some period of time, and I think that the best way to introduce that is to have your Registrar of Deeds and Lands. April 1 is the target date that we have.

8.25 p.m.

The other consequential effect of this will be that we hope that the Divisional Court, Full Court – what do we call it? – the Divisional Court – will be able to function more regularly, that cases will not take so long, and that the Supreme Court Registrar will be able to handle in a more relaxed atmosphere the taxation of costs and all of the interlocutory work that a law suit entails.

There are some amendments to the whole of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, which are known as the Bourne Revision, which can be brought into force. But it is entirely a matter of the advice from the Judicial Advisory Council, the Chief Justice and the judges. As politicians we only provide the money and a few of the policy decisions. The vast majority of the decisions take place in the Judicial Advisory Council, bearing in mind the separation of powers.

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1-3 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ACT, 1985

Order No. 4 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, honourable Member will recall that, at the time of the Budget, considerable emphasis was placed upon the reform of the law of Income Tax in this financial year so as to provide incentives for saving, incentives for generation of exports and incentives for the increase in employment. This Bill seeks to put in legal form the concepts as have been set out in the Budget and the policy decisions that were contained therein.

There are one or two slight changes in the proposals that were announced at Budget-time, and they came about as a result of consultations with relevant interests subsequent to the announcement of the provisions in the Budget. One of the difficulties of operating in small territories like Barbados is that it is impossible to share your Budget secrets with everyone before they are announced in Parliament. But once you announce the principles I see nothing wrong in the translation of those principles into law improved if good advice comes subsequent. That relates mostly to the area of the incentives. From dollar one of export income up to 20% of the total export income will now attract the tax rebate, and 80% and up will attract the full rebate of 80%.

I do not think that it is generally recognized, the beneficial effect of this particular principle. It means that a non-fiscal incentive company that is in operation, if it exports outside of CARICOM, takes advantage of the provisions. It also means that for a fiscal incentive company, enclaved, in particular, that continues to export all of its production to the extra-regional markets, the effective tax rate is considerably reduced from 22½% to less than 9%. When you take into account the expenses that are allowed for marketing and other areas, it is envisaged that the effective tax rate will be somewhere in the vicinity of 3% or 4%, if fully exploited. I think that this is a considerable incentive for exports.

The only reason why we cannot count CARICOM as an export area is because of the Fiscal Incentive Scheme, which is supposed to be harmonized. We have been working consistently to try and get a replacement mechanism for that. I am told that the private sector and others had consultation recently with the Secretariat in that respect. But the target and the aim of this legislation is to encourage incentives for export to the extra-regional markets.
8.35 p.m.

The two other important principles I wish to mention, Sir. One is that we are continuously working with draughtsmen and others – experts, advisers – on the question of widening the definition of exports to include services of a wide variety so as to allow that to attract the income. We have found some precedents, and I am hopeful that we will be able to come to a conclusion on that soon. That, obviously, could not come into effect for the past tax year. It will have to come into effect, if anything, for the current tax year.

We also wish to emphasize the important advantage of the concession which is being granted by this legislation to promote the concept of worker participation in ownership of the shares of the work place. The difference between the purchase price of share option schemes when they are created and realised will be subject to special tax treatment.

Other than those two areas, Sir, there is one other area that I would like to speak on, and that is the area of losses. This is a very, very thorny question, and we are studying the impact which this provision, together with some other provisions which arise as a result of the coming into operation of new companies legislation, will have on the tax eligibility and amount in Barbados. The intention of the Government is to encourage prosperous companies to be pioneers, so to speak, but we must ensure that in this encouragement we are not allowing unreasonable claims to be made on the revenue for what one would call non-commercial operations.

There are many limitations in other countries in the world; for instance, if you have associated agricultural activity, whether by an individual or a company, whether it is automatically allowed as a loss to be carried forward or as a loss to be set off, if it is not genuine, if it is not commercial, if it is only of a hobby nature. We do not want to restrict anything that we have, but what we want to do is to ensure that companies which are existent, which wish to move from one area of activity to another area of activity, and lose some money, if they incur losses in the early years, that they will be able to offset them over the profits that they have. We are working on this. We are quite clear in our minds that there is a need for reform, but the question is how it can be done.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the Chair was taken by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill which seeks to amend the Income Tax Act to accommodate *inter alia* the budgetary proposals of the Minister of Finance of May 7, 1985 presents some special problems for us on this side. Firstly, I believe that it is more in the nature of the British Finance Bill, because what we do have in this Bill are different sections in the same Bill addressing different problems, and therefore there is no unified principle, really, to which you can speak in terms of a second reading unless you apply a second reading to each clause within the Bill. This is unusual in our Parliament. I think the normal procedure would have been to bring separate Bills so that they could be addressed separately. I have no problems with a Finance Bill, and if the general practice is going to be to introduce a Finance Bill to deal with budgetary measures, then we will be only too happy — and preferably — to debate the Budget within the context of a Finance Bill, as happens in the United Kingdom.

I believe it is because of the varying nature of the various matters addressed within the Bill that we have had such a sketchy and incomprehensive presentation by the Honourable Minister of Finance. I recognise that he had a particular difficulty in trying to apply a general principle to matters which are only marginally related and, therefore, I do not propose to go down that track.

He said, Sir, that these measures address the problems of savings, employment, exports and investment as parts of his dear little Budget, which has had no impact whatsoever on the economy of Barbados up to the present time. He still has a couple of months to see what will happen. The only thing I see that could have any impact in respect of unemployment is massive public sector spending for election purposes.

Sir, I think I will have to confine my remarks, because the way the Bill is presented, it also creates problems for me, in terms of having to match the amendments against the substantive Act. One would have welcomed a much more comprehensive presentation by the Minister responsible for Finance, particularly as he has indicated to this House that, on better advice, he has made changes from the original proposals made in the Budget. I think he said that, although the principles remain the same, the details have been improved in the present legislation. Now if that is so — after all, we are talking about a financial matter, we are talking of a budgetary matter and I hope

that this would attract considerable publicity — I believe that that change should have been spelt out very carefully, so that as of tomorrow all of the accountants, all the businessmen and all the people in Barbados would know that what the Minister of Finance brought before Parliament is not exactly what he said in May of last year. Whereas I do not quarrel fundamentally with the general principle, I think I must express concern that more details were not given as to the nature of the change.

On the whole question of employees participating in shareholding of companies, I have no difficulty with that in principle, but when you are giving incentives of this nature, I believe it is important for Government to look at the totality of the situation. In respect of public companies in Barbados, as far as I am aware, this will not be a problem. As far as private companies are concerned, one has to be very careful to look and see what protection the workers have when they buy shares in those companies and they are encouraged to do so by tax incentives.

8.45 p.m.

It is my certain knowledge that, over the past few years, many companies have gone under. They have carried with them the National Insurance contributions of the workers. They have carried with them other deductions from the workers that should have been transferred to the public purse and which were never made. Some of them have also carried with them the money which the workers have put into those private companies on the basis of workers participating in shareholding. In other words, you can have a situation in which, when the cash flow gets tight, when the bank no longer accommodates your overdraft, you get all kinds of internal arrangements where the workers are induced to buy shares in the company — they will be told that they will get a particular tax benefit — and then, of course, the workers are robbed in the long run.

We do not have any stock exchange in Barbados at the moment, and I believe that if any company is offering shares to its workers on the basis that the workers could benefit from any financial inducement by Government, there should be an independent authority which would inspect the books of those companies and let the workers know or have some idea of what is the value of the shares they are buying, what is the real position of the company and what would be a reasonable forecast for the performance of that company.

There are many persons in Barbados I know who are not managing directors, but who are directors of companies who have found themselves in positions where they have not been actively involved in this process, but basically, have been associated with a company which had fraudulently extracted money from the workers on

the grounds of share participation. So that when you are trying to encourage workers to buy shares in corporate structures in Barbados, particularly private corporations, it is important that you should offer them some protection. I believe that if we had a stock exchange, that kind of arrangement in Barbados, then we would be in a position to have an authority which could examine the status of the company and the value of the stock which is being offered to the workers. As I said, I have no basic problem with the principle of worker participation, but I know, for a fact, how that has operated in the past four years in Barbados in many of the smaller private companies in this country. So that the Government should be looking very carefully at some element of protection.

We in this country have to be careful how we follow precedents in other countries. The fact is that most working Americans, from the time they come up as children, hear about stock exchanges and understand something about shares. Most of our workers in Barbados have not had that exposure. They do not know what they are buying. All they know is that somebody says put up \$500 for 500 shares. And they are buying nothing, and the workers are not in a position to have a consultant to value their shares. I would, for example, think seriously of some mechanism whereby those people who want to offer shares to the workers under these circumstances, to benefit from this provision, should have some independent authority there to examine the value of those shares and the true state of the company at the time of purchase. Something has to be done.

It is difficult to see this applying to public companies, because the workers would have to buy at market value, so I presume that this sort of thing would largely apply to private companies. With public companies, they have to buy at the going rate unless the public companies make some special arrangement for workers. If they are allowed to make special provision for workers, then fair enough, and I think there is more protection under the umbrella of a public company within the context of Barbados today.

So that is the first thing. In putting legislation on the Statute Books, let us look at the same time and see how the thing can be abused.

The second point I want to deal with is this area of the building allowance. This says:

"Where a person carrying on a business has in an income year made a capital expenditure on a commercial building, then in calculating the assessable income of that person for an income year there shall be deducted as a building allowance an amount equal to 1 per cent of the improved value of that property."

Sir, this is a puny allowance. This is worth hardly anything. You are better off reducing the taxes on the land taxes than offering somebody this concession.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: One per cent on the improved value! If you look around Barbados at the moment — I do not know whether your car windows are tinted, mine are not — even in Oistins last night, I looked across the road and I saw commercial development taking place. A lot of people do not realize that Bridgetown is rapidly expanding, going down Fontabelle and going up past Hastings.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Bridgetown — going up towards Oistins and down the road, and I believe —

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is going past Worthing. If it gets to Worthing, it is all right with me. No problem!

What I am saying is that something should be done to assist that process, but the one per cent is certainly not enough. It does not address the particular problem and I would certainly like to see that one per cent substantially improved. In other words, the Democratic Labour Party is calling on the Government to increase the one per cent of the improved value allowed on commercial property, and the Democratic Labour Party also pledges that it will address this problem by a two-pronged approach, by looking (1) at a reduction in the land taxes, and (2) increasing the one per cent, when the Democratic Labour Party is returned to power.

The third point I wish to make, Sir, deals with Section 12D (1). This seems to address two problems. First of all, on exports outside of the CARICOM market one can recover up to 150% on expenditures on market research. We in the Democratic Labour Party — and you will note how our policies have been organized over the years — have always felt that Barbados should be primarily an export-oriented economy rather than an import substitution economy because, fortunately, the economy was so structured. Make no mistake about it, it is one of the reasons why a certain amount of resilience existed before the assaults by the Barbados Labour Party on the economy, and indeed it is one of the fundamental problems with economies like Jamaica, which have gone down a completely different route of import substitution. 8.55 p.m.

The question is, who will benefit from this provision? If you spend \$100 on promoting export sales, market research and development, you can get back \$150, as I understand it, for tax purposes. Now it would seem

to me that those industries which are already enjoying considerable tax benefits in Barbados will be the main beneficiaries of this, for the simple reason that there are very few local companies which even have the money, to start off with, to spend. You can only benefit from this after you have spent the money, and you have to have the money to spend. The inducement is there, but which one of the manufacturers in Barbados, who are in serious difficulties at the moment, can find money to spend to open up new markets? Which one? If you can tell me one local manufacturer, whether it is in garments or whatever you like, who, after facing the problems of wages, the problems of the purchase of raw materials, the problems of paying the bank for their long term loans and probably for their over-draft will have sufficient funds left to spend significant funds, say, in the United States, on promotion and marketing. I do not think there are many of those companies left in Barbados.

The point I am making is that this would hardly apply to the indigenous manufacturing sector, because the financial state of that sector of the economy at the moment does not lend itself to a situation where it can benefit from this. There are other things that can be done up front that could be far more meaningful, and maybe, assuming that there is a significant recovery in the manufacturing sector, assuming that the policy of export orientation towards larger industrialised companies should take place over the years, you can reach a point where I can see a few of our larger local companies benefiting from this. At the moment I do not know those manufacturers. If they exist in Barbados, let me know. I believe I know most of the manufacturers in Barbados, and I have some idea of the size of their operations and some idea of the size of their financial problems. You only have to look at the accounts of the Barbados Development Bank globally and you can see the problem, or you can look at the reports from the commercial banks and see the problems facing the manufacturers in Barbados. It is my considered judgment that the very people whom I presume you would like to help by this measure would not be able to take advantage of it. That is my suspicion.

I hope I have made my point. I believe that if you really want to get these companies re-oriented towards producing for the larger markets, you have to start with a restructuring of the financial base of the companies here in Barbados in terms of size, scale of production and quality. And a major re-financing effort is required, because it is a different kind of production effort that you need. That is my own view.

On section 12D (2) — and I am speaking on my feet, because I was hoping to get some kind of introduction from the Minister of Finance — who appears to be completely at sea in this matter — we were concerned, as you

will recall at Budget-time, that this is the kind of area that could be abused by unscrupulous people. It is very easy for a company to say that they have spent \$500 000 in promotion overseas and get the benefit of \$750 000 in tax reduction. This was a problem that we spotted, and I believe that this must be one of the areas in which the Minister of Finance was advised by more level heads that something has got to be done to beef up the principle involved here and to protect the Treasury of Barbados.

I do not know how the Executive Director of the Export Promotion Corporation is going to be able to certify that a particular company spent \$1 million in the United States promoting panties or brazzieres or something like that. I do not know how he is going to do it because it would seem to me that the way how this is worded, it leaves you wide open. There is nothing to stop an individual from taking a trip to the United States, and the way how these things are done — you know how they are done better than I do — he can easily demonstrate that he has spent $\frac{1}{2}$ million, $\frac{3}{4}$ million, \$100 000 or whatever you like. It would seem to me that all this lends itself to one of the easiest forms of abuse you can think about. And what is more, it is to be taking place outside of your jurisdiction, so there is very little you can do about it. I do not see how the Executive Director of the Export Promotion Corporation would be in a position to certify that the money was spent for that purpose. This has always struck me as an area in which it would be very difficult to police what is going on, and I do not think that the Bill is structured in a way that helps in that area of policing and protecting the Treasury, because remember I said earlier that the people who are most likely to be in a position to benefit from this kind of thing would be the larger, successful companies, probably foreign-owned companies, in Barbados. Let us face it. That is a fact.

The next point I want to deal with is this. I see that monies paid under the Transport Levy and the contribution made under the Occupational Training Act will now be tax deductible. This is just a matter of easing the burden for those who are better off. The fact is that the burden of these levies falls hardest among the lower income workers, the very people who have no taxable income. The workers at the bottom have no taxable income, so when you make what is paid under the Transport Levy Act tax deductible, you are not helping them in any way. What you have done is that you have reversed the effects of the tax credits that were granted over the years. You have now chopped off some of that; so what in fact you have done, looking at it from a principled point of view, is that you have really made the burden harder on the lower income groups and you have offered a little relief to the middle and upper income groups, because you can only benefit from this measure if you have a taxable income. I guess we are

agreed on that. The man at the bottom is left out, he is not helped in any way, and those who pay Income Tax will get some benefit from this.

That is a complete reverse of the approach to taxation which the Democratic Labour Party and most humane Governments and political parties have always had, that is, that the burden of taxation would fall heavily on those who are most able to bear that burden. Whereas the middle and upper income groups would get minimum relief from this measure, what has happened for those in the lower income groups, there is no relief whatsoever. This is not good enough. It is not good enough to bring in a measure in a country which is heavily overtaxed that those in the middle and upper income groups would benefit whilst the lower income groups would continue to bear the full burden of the taxation.

9.05 p.m.

We have committed ourselves to a policy in relation to the Transport Levy and in relation to taxation in general. I can say from the floor of this House that the Democratic Labour Party's position, as articulated again and again, will be, if returned to office, an overall reduction in taxation for the people of Barbados, particularly the lower and middle income groups. All will benefit from the drastic reductions in taxation. We will not tolerate this kind of legislation which discriminates effectively against the poor people.

I could understand it if the Government had come in here and said, "Look we are giving tax relief to the middle and upper income groups, to those who pay Income Tax, by making the Transport Levy and levies under the Occupational Training Act tax deductible, and at the same time, as we are giving relief at that level, let us look and see what we can do for the poor people." But no, nothing! Absolutely nothing, Mr. Deputy Speaker! They continue to pay the same. Tomorrow and after this Bill is passed they will continue to pay the same as yesterday. That is not right, and I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would agree with me that the principle behind this kind of thinking is wrong.

If this had been accompanied, say, by legislation which would make the levy more progressive within existing scales — that is, if you do not pass, the maximum could be struck at the lower rate of the levy for the lower workers, the \$5 and the \$50 a week people — then one could understand it. I just cannot understand what can inform a Government that in 1986 they can come before the Parliament of this country and bring in tax legislation which is clearly tax discriminatory against the poor people of Barbados. If you want to retain the levy — and just listen to my suggestion now — you can correct this error by probably maintaining the same percentages at the top but, say, for those between \$5 per

week and \$150 per week, who probably would not be paying any tax, reduce the levy by half or something like that for those poor people down there. I would readily entertain or suggest and support an amendment on the floor of the House now, probably to Section 11, 4 subsection (c) or 2 (a), making the levy half what it should be for those people from \$5 up to \$150. I am making a plea for the ones who have been left out. I am making a plea for the lower income groups of Barbados. I see that the honourable Member for the City agrees with me for the first time. She is obviously very surprised.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. A. MILLER: Why did you call my name? I am not even listening to you, man.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: She is obviously very surprised that her poor constituents in the City are being treated in this manner. She is very surprised.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to take exception. Somebody called "Sleepy" Smith came into the City and said the people were monkeys. Somebody else now is coming in and saying they are hungry and he is repeating it in here. I take grave exception.

Aside.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: That is only the opening shot.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said the poor people of the City.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. A. MILLER: Leave it out, man!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Are there not poor people in the city?

(*Aside:* Hon. B. A. MILLER: Leave it out!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Leave out what? The fact that you agree with me? But you always agree with me.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. A. MILLER: The DLP is always walking about trying to low rate the people in the City.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Who is doing that? I will have to deal with her another time. Sir, the honourable Member for the City clearly agrees with my position on this matter because they are being unfair to the poor people of the City and the poor people of St. Michael South Central, too, and of St. Michael West. They are discriminating against the poor in this particular matter.

Sir, there is another very important section in this particular Bill, Section 15. Unfortunately I am not in a position to respond to this as cogently as I would like. That is largely because this particular measure has to be

matched against other measures of the law and the Honourable Prime Minister and Minister of Finance was not very explicit when he addressed this problem when he started off his speech. As I understood it, what he said was that those who were exporting over 80% of their products — is that correct? — can get up to 61% benefit. I believe that is the general argument and I believe that is the sort of thing that was put forward in the Budget. I am a little unclear about this at this point in time, but what I do recall is that my immediate response at the time of the Budget was that if you look at the activities of most Barbadian companies, there are very few Barbadian companies, if any, which would be in a position to benefit from the higher levels under this particular arrangement, because there are very few Barbadian companies where over 80% of their manufactures would be exported, because most of them.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: If the honourable Member would give way, just for the purpose of getting the facts. It is 61% and over of exports but the rebate 80%.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much. I did ask for a clarification on the matter. Fair enough, but it was not very clear when you spoke. Even 61% is a high figure for Barbadian companies, because most Barbadian companies, as you know, have been geared first to the domestic market, secondly to the CARICOM market. If you want to effect that shift, if you really want indigenous manufacturers to benefit from this, particularly those who no longer enjoy fiscal incentives for one reason or another, then I think that figure should be reduced from 61% probably to about 41%, because I cannot think of many Barbadian companies that would even be able to commit 61% of their total output towards exports. Sixty one per cent is even too high for Barbados. And, here again, you come to the same problem, that the people who would benefit from this most would be non-Barbadian large companies.
9.15 p.m.

Sir, I am as familiar with the genesis of this legislation, or perhaps more familiar, than the Honourable Minister of Finance, because he was not Minister of Finance at the time when these discussions were started — but I can assure you that they started prior to the last Budget — and it was largely a group of accounting firms and a group of non-Barbadians involved in manufactures and exports who felt that these additional benefits should accrue to them. This is a fact. That was the origin of it. This was in the mill before you took over the Ministry. This is a fact, because I met with the people. They talked to me; they do talk to me, you know. This was before the Budget, long before the Budget. It was since 1984, and I was impressed by the fact that those persons did not seem to think that there were Barbadian manufacturers who could benefit from this kind of measure. There may be one or two, but I am talking generally, and

I think that you must take the point that, generally speaking, the way how our local industries are structured, they would not benefit significantly from this. So I would urge probably that the percentage be dropped from 61% maybe down to about 41% or thereabouts. Make it more reasonable, a little more reasonable, for the Barbadian manufacturer.

I regret, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that my response has had to be in not a studious structured form, but the Bill, as it stands, did not lend itself to a structured response, because, as I said, the Bill contains different sections dealing with different problems altogether, and is more like a Finance Bill in the United Kingdom which is not susceptible, of course, to the kind of debating techniques and methods that we use under our Standing Orders in this Parliament. We have to have a special Standing Order to accommodate a speech on a Finance Bill. That is the point I am trying to make.

One final point, Sir. I do not know whether this Bill addresses the problems associated with the inability of parent companies or subsidiary companies to share or carry forward the losses of one or the other. My understanding is that this has been a big problem in Barbados. I do not think the Bill accommodates this. In other words, it is a problem in relation to the Income Tax Department, Income Tax rulings. But it would seem to me that if the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central and I, for example — God forbid if we owned a company — it will have to be 51 to 49 if we owned a company — and it was a subsidiary which we totally owned and the subsidiary incurred losses or the parent company incurred losses, it would seem to me to be basically one and the same economic unit sustaining those losses and, therefore, the losses would be written off one against the other and be carried forward, because it is the same economic unit. But, as I understand it, in law it is a different corporate unit and, therefore, the Income Tax Department has ruled, I think consistently, that the losses one against the other cannot apply.

Sir, this does create problems. I believe that it creates the kind of problem which sometime last year forced the National Bank to assume something like \$10 million in debt that it did not wish to assume. This related to one of the larger groups in Barbados which, through a subsidiary, had lost a substantial amount of money in sugar and, because of the Income Tax ruling, they were able to take the position that they either close down and write off their losses or the National Bank lend them money. And the money had to be coughed up, because the parent company, one of the larger companies in Barbados, could in no way write off any of those losses. I am not putting the case to anyone, I am not susceptible to any lobby, but it does seem to me that whilst parliamentary time is being

spent in dealing with the question of writing off losses, carrying forth losses and so on, at the same time some effort should be made to deal with that problem in relationship to parent company and wholly-owned subsidiaries in relation to the sharing of losses for tax purposes and carrying forward of such losses.

It is getting late, Sir, but I believe that the opportunity should have been taken to look very carefully at the whole question of deferred taxes in Barbados, and deferred tax losses, and the carrying forward of those losses. I think that there needs to be a significant clarification of the Income Tax Act.

(Aside Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Press is not here.)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not too worried about the Press.

Now there is a problem. There have been companies in Barbados which have benefitted from the deferred tax provisions, which is a discretion of the Commissioner of Income Tax, as I understand it. I understand, for example, that Cave Shepherd and Company Limited was one of the first companies outside of the orbit of public utilities that benefitted from the deferred tax situation within the discretion of the Income Tax Commissioner. That is a fact.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not worry about the Press.

These are technical matters. I understand that the deferred tax provisions have been used in Barbados. But the difference between the deferred tax loss position in public utilities and other companies has been the fact that the other companies outside the public utilities had to demonstrate a turn around point when those losses would come to an end before they could enjoy the discretion of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, whereas the public utilities have not been required to do that. That is a matter that should be incorporated in the whole concept of the carrying forward of losses under the Income Tax Act of Barbados.

It is a matter of public record. I am prepared to stand on my feet at the shortest possible notice and address these problems, because you are familiar with them. I do not live on publicity. I do not worry about publicity. I do not make statements for publicity, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am sure that you have been impressed by the fact that over the years, I have never sought to do so in this Chamber, and would never do so.

That is the final comment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which I have to make this evening. I believe that I have

covered most of the points. What I have tried to do is to point out some of the weaknesses. I have tried to indicate how I think there can be some improvements in these bits of legislation, particularly in relation to the Barbadian industrialist and exporter, and also tried to see whether or not, even at this late stage, some benefit from the adjustments in respect of the Transport Levy could not spread down to the lower income groups in Barbados as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is getting late, and while I would normally have a lot more to say on these matters, I think that, in the interest of all concerned, I will rest at this point.

Thank you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: You may continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill embodies a number of proposals arising out of the Budgetary Proposals of last May. Unfortunately, Sir, I was not in the House at the time and, perhaps, was the only Member of the House not in a position, therefore, to make a contribution to that particular debate. I would not at this very late hour seek to do so but I would want to make a few comments about the proposals as they relate to the manufacturing industry in Barbados.
9.25 p.m.

We have over the past few years introduced a series of legislation that would create a better environment for commercial activity in this country. The Companies Act was in a long period of gestation, many many years, and finally came to a conclusion about two years ago. That has modernised the law in relation to companies and, among other things — it is relevant to this debate arising out of something that has been said — it has allowed greater protection to be given to shareholders not only in public companies but in private companies and family-owned operations. But I shall revert to that, Sir.

We have also tried, Mr. Speaker, to deal with other aspects of business law in Barbados to better regulate business and commercial activity in this island. Currently my Ministry is concerned with putting together a Sale of Goods Act that would provide greater protection for consumers in this country and would introduce a regimen for the transaction and sale of goods that is in consonance with a number of developments in this country in the past years.

We are also at the moment looking at the law of bankruptcy. I have set up, with the approval of Cabinet,

a committee incorporating the various interests — the accountants, lawyers and so on who will over a period of time study a draft Bankruptcy Act and make recommendations to me as Minister — eventually it will be put before the Cabinet — to bring a more modern and realistic bankruptcy law in this country.

Bankruptcy in the old days was conceived as a general principle for hurting defaulters. People who got into serious debt, both individuals and businesses — in some cases it was through their own fault and in other cases through no fault of their own — found themselves in tremendous difficulty, and the bankruptcy laws we have lived with from the time we had them, Sir, were penal in their operation. We have a new approach to bankruptcy in this country. This Government sees its role as providing opportunity and resources for companies that are in difficulty to be resuscitated, to be revitalised, to be guided towards new health rather than driven under the old bankruptcy laws, and we are looking at that. This is a different community, Sir. It is a community in which we are seeking to give all the people of Barbados a stake in the economic activity of this country, and that is one of the reasons why I, as Minister responsible for Industry, welcome a number of the proposals enshrined in this particular Bill.

We have been having a problem, Mr. Speaker, in the manufacturing industry that has been born out of a weakening demand for our products in the CARICOM region, and this has been the result of a wave of, in my view, irrational protectionism on the part not only of our major CARICOM trading partners, but indeed, at different times, because of ill-advised policies of one or the other members of the Community. We, for instance, have lost 50% in 1985 on our trade with Trinidad and Tobago as compared with the figures in 1984, and overall there has been a drop of perhaps 12% of trade in the CARICOM region. This Government, quite rightly, has embarked on a policy of trying to penetrate the extra-CARICOM market — if you define CARICOM as the region, extra-regional markets — and it is for this reason that we have set up an Export Promotion Corporation and have given it wide responsibilities to look well beyond the borders of this island and seek, by a study of the market forces and the patterns of distribution and trade outside the CARICOM region, to put Barbados in a position from which they can benefit from extra regional exporting.

We have also, Mr. Speaker, given the Export Promotion Corporation the responsibility to work with manufacturers in Barbados and seek to enable them to develop efficiency, quality of work, productivity and look at cutting out extraneous costs and so on to make themselves more competitive intra and extra-regionally, and we have brought in a number of consultants to the

Export Promotion Corporation. Through funds from the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation and the European Development Fund, we have been able to bring in a number of experts who have given us advice on a continuing basis, particularly in the garment and in the furniture industries.

One would have heard in recent times of the Shaney Project. The Shaney Project is a project that is geared to making more efficient the various garment manufacturing companies in Barbados. Not only are they seeking to make these companies more efficient, but they are also seeking to open up distribution systems in the United States and the United Kingdom, and they have done so with some success so far. They have targeted the south east in the United States for penetrations of top quality garments, and after a number of trade shows and some exposure of our manufacturers to developments both in Europe and North America, we are now at the stage where we are moving into the south-eastern United States in an important way with garment manufacturing.

Furniture. We have established a Barbados Furniture Trading Company.....

Aside

Hon. L. R. TULL: No, you have to listen to me all night. You listened to a lot of foolishness earlier, so listen to some sense now.

We established a Barbados Furniture Trading Company and it is a co-operative venture between private sector and public. The Barbados Development Bank, the Industrial Development Corporation, the Export Promotion Corporation, all these people are involved in this creative project with the furniture manufacturers in Barbados, and the Government has injected over \$1 million in the project so that we will be able to make a mark in the United States market.

We, historically, are master craftsmen, among the best in the world, and we, through the Barbados Furniture Trading Company, are manufacturing top class mahogany furniture for the United States market. We had a problem initially with the first shipment — that has been made fairly public — but since then, applying all the techniques we learned through the expertise we recruited from abroad, and the setting up of the Common Services Unit off the Spring Garden Highway with its common equipment, common kilns for drying, we are doing purchases and thereby reducing, by some considerable extent, the cost of raw materials. We have been able to send shipments in excess of half million dollars in the last few months to the United States, and have met the rigorous standards of the United States market. The result has been, Mr. Speaker, that our distributors in

the United States, the Pulaski Company, gave us an open-ended order. They said that they will take from Barbados all of the top quality mahogany work that we produce, for as long as we produce it, because what constitutes a massive order for us is a minute one for a distributor in the United States, and they can sell all that we can produce. We will continue to force ourselves through this little crack in the door that has been made in the United States.

9.35 p.m.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, I say in the context of the Budgetary Proposals that give a certain measure of encouragement to people who export outside of the region. It is not easy. Everybody knows that in a small country like Barbados, relatively new and unsophisticated in the manufacturing industry, a country that has limited information and contact with extra-regional markets, a country that experiences some difficulty with the costs of shipping manufactured goods to develop markets — because the cost of shipping and air freight between the Caribbean and developed markets is a tremendous inhibition to our success in extra-regional export trade — it is not easy. We also have the problems that are generally inherent in the cost structure of a modest operation. We do not have the benefits of economies of scale as you would get in countries with very large populations.

Only recently, Sir, I was talking with some people from Bangladesh who wanted to come into Barbados and set up a garment factory. They told me that they had garment factories in Dakkar with over 30 000 employees. So we understand the scale of the operations of companies in the Far East and South East Asia. But we are at a stage where we can benefit from the new quota restrictions that have been placed on the importation of certain goods, garments, in particular, from South East Asia and Japan. As I had an occasion to remark, Sir, one man's meat is another man's poison, and the restrictions by the United States Government, the quota system on the importation of garments from the Far East and Japan, has worked to the advantage of the Caribbean, and we are beginning to see manufacturers in the Far East coming into the Caribbean region, seeking joint venture operations with Caribbean countries, so that they can have the benefit of preferential trade access to the United States market through the provision of the CBI proposals, which also gives a certain preferential access to the Canadian market.

I sound a word of caution, because I am always cynical when it comes to the question of largesse from other countries. It is my view that we have to be very concerned about a possible turnaround of the United States Government policy in respect of the quota system if they perceive in the United States that companies rushing from the Far East into the Caribbean are defeating what they set about to do in the first place. But that

is not the position taken by the United States Government at the moment.

We have a further problem. The CBI was proposed for a 12-year period, and one has gone, or two, and investors, particularly from the United States and Europe, are generally nervous about entering into any serious and long-ranging investment in the Caribbean without the certainty of a time frame for the CBI. Ten years is a short time, and there are only 10 years left, so American investors do not want to come down in the Caribbean and put their money in big investment projects in the Caribbean to benefit through the CBI without knowing whether the 12-year provision will be extended at a future period. These are a number of the concerns of a place like Barbados at this particular juncture in our manufacturing history.

Now, dealing specifically with some of the proposals

Mr. SPEAKER: I am happy that the honourable Member has arrived at that point.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Sir, I was only following the precedents that had been set, and if other persons have been able to roam far and wide

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not in the Chair when that precedent was set.

Hon. L. R. TULL: No, Sir. The Chair was there. The Chair is always there when this House is in session.

One of the provisions, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, relates to the exemption from the payment of tax of the purchase of shares at less the market value by employees of the company. A lot was said about this. Now, I have my own views on it. I believe it is a wide and sensible provision because it has the effect of extending the ownership of companies to the people who work inside that company, and that must have a beneficial advantage. The effect is that it raises the staff morale, because if the staff have a share in the ownership of the company, it will undoubtedly improve the morale. It would, also, perhaps, develop a good attitude by workers towards management, because they would see themselves as one and the same. But it also, Mr. Speaker, provides the company with a wider source of equity capital. You can draw money from the wider ownership through your staff.

These things are important, Sir, and I believe that they are likely, contrary to what has been said by the honourable Member who spoke before me, to have beneficial effects on companies in Barbados, particularly when they want to raise money when the economy picks up again. The manufacturing industries are going to pick

up in the next few months, that is my prediction, and they will want money, and that is a good source from which they can draw it.

I take the point that in respect of a number of companies, those that are privately owned, family companies, a certain measure of protection must be given to workers who acquire shares in these companies, but the provisions of the new Companies Act have been extended wide enough, in my view, to provide the kind of cover in that regard. I do not want to say, Mr. Speaker, that nothing beats the ingenuity of man. Whatever laws you pass and whatever provisions you come out with for the protection of shareholders in companies, the ingenuity of a few wicked and dishonest people, directors and so on, can still frustrate the intention of the legislation, but it is my contention that the new Companies Act has provided greater scope of protection for shareholders in companies, private and public.

9.45 p.m.

We intend to set up a stock exchange or a securities exchange by the 1st April this year, and common sense tells me, Sir, that with the establishment of a stock exchange, there will be the encouragement for private companies to go public. It has happened, according to my reading and research, in all countries where stock exchanges are set up, and it gives an opportunity for one to know the true worth of stock, which it is difficult to know in a situation as obtaining in Barbados. So I think the setting up of the Stock Exchange will provide an opportunity for a number of private companies to go public and thereby meet the type of concern that was expressed by one honourable Member earlier.

The provisions in respect to this, contrary to what I have heard, will not significantly affect foreign companies, because foreign companies are, by and large, enclave companies, and my reading of the provisions in the Budgetary Proposals on this particular Act is that they are not brought within the ambit of this particular piece of legislation. The enclave industries are not included. To argue, Mr. Speaker, that small companies will not manage as well as the big ones is to argue an old age truism, that poor people do not make out as well as rich ones, but it is not within the total competence of Government to reverse the natural order of things. Obviously the big companies will benefit more because they have the resources to go into the extra-regional market in a way in which a small company, with one dozen or two dozen employees and very little capital resources, can do, and I want in this regard to mention the whole question of promotion and research for movement into the extra-regional market.

Some people's worth was mentioned in that regard, and it was said that the Executive Director of the Export Promotion Corporation was really not suited to monitor

the amount of money that was spent in external promotion by local companies. That may be partly true, because none of us, no matter what system we set up, can totally monitor the activities of business people, but there are a number of controls. For instance, for people doing business overseas, they have to get Central Bank permission for the removal of funds from Barbados. Now it can be argued that there are ways of getting around that, but, generally speaking, business people in Barbados are honest. I am not saying that there may not be one or two that do not move off the straight and narrow, but generally speaking, they are on it. So it would be possible for us to know what money they take overseas. And there are legal principles; the burden is on the local businessman to bring evidence of his expenditure in relation to external promotion, not the other way around. So I do not really think that that is a serious contention.

Section 12 is the amendment which deals with the allowance to companies which qualify for export rebate on sales to extra-regional markets. I think this is an important measure. It is an important measure in that it will assist local industry to modernise its plant. There was some talk earlier about the amount of cash flow available to companies. Obviously, the more concessions and subsidies you make to the manufacturing industry, the more money will be available to them in cash flow to do what they consider as priority matters. What has happened at the moment, and particularly in the garment industry, is that we have a lot of out of date and antiquated machinery in the factories, machinery that is totally unsuitable to do the kind of quality work at the kind of speed and productivity to make our people competitive with the Far East. And if we are serious not only about penetrating the extra-regional market, but indeed by keeping ourselves highly competitive in the CARICOM region, particularly with the low salaries paid in some of the LDCs and the effects of the devaluation in Trinidad now making them a little bit more competitive, we have to upgrade the existing stock of machinery in our garment factories so that we can drastically cut costs.

(Aside: Is the Government going to buy machines?)

Hon. L. R. TULL: You want to know if the Government is going to buy machines? Mr. Speaker, I cannot be bothered to reply to that. It is too late in the evening to take him on, but we have a situation where the old machines in Barbados are anti-diluvian.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I have a note here, Sir, that says to me that there is virtue in consistency. So if the Prime Minister made this speech two years ago, there are two things: it means that we are consistent on this side and it also means that I learn well and can remember.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of old machinery in Barbados, and, quite often, production stops in the factory in Barbados because the machines break down and we do not have technicians, sewing-machine repair people and so on, placed to repair these things. These are some of the things we are looking at, but I feel that this particular proposal in the Budget and as contained in this Bill will make it possible for a number of manufacturing industries in Barbados to re-tool and replace outdated and ill-working machines.

Mr. Speaker, I am like the honourable Member who spoke before me. It is getting late, Sir. I have a lot more to say in relation to these things, but I will save it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman has just two minutes to say a lot of things that he has to say.

Hon. L. R. TULL: In two minutes let me wind up.

The provisions in the Budget with respect to manufacturing — because that is all I have dealt with, I do not have time to get on to the other areas — will act as a definite spur to the revitalisation of the manufacturing industry in Barbados at this particularly difficult juncture in manufacturing industry in Barbados, and it is in accordance with the recommendations of everybody on both sides. Honourable Members on the other side only two or three weeks ago said what they would do for manufacturing if they were the Government — now that is so remote it is not anything to worry about — and only yesterday I had the pleasure to announce new subsidies both for training and for rent, adding to this a long list of concessions with subsidies already in existence with the manufacturing industry. There is a general air of satisfaction among the manufacturers in Barbados that there is a Government that is sympathetic and sensitive to their difficulties, and one which is taking serious and constructive steps to bring about the kind of revival that is so necessary at this time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There is only one point that I should reply to, and that is the question in relation to the rebate of the tax that one gets in respect of the levies. With all due respect, Sir, the ability of any taxpayer to write off any sums that he has to expend compulsorily as an expenditure by way of reduction of taxes is a benefit, and there is a particular class of person who benefits from that, the class that pay taxes. In respect of the other people, we have raised the amount of savings

that they can save in credit unions and get off their tax. So, by increasing that amount, we are taking out of the tax net a number of people who would have been in the tax net without that. I have no difficulty with that at all.

As to whether the rebate provisions apply to Barbadian companies, that will only be known in the light of experience of working the Act, but I will say this; that if you export \$10, you save up to 20 per cent of your exports profit as a percentage of total profit, 25 per cent rebate, and that is one of the changes that occurred between the drafting of the law and the original statistics in the Budget. From dollar one up to 20% you get your rebate, and I am convinced that between the 25%, the 35%, the 45% and indeed the 61%, a number of Barbadian companies would benefit. 9.55 p.m.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this brings us to the end of Government Business for this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member would have to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed before we leave it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that further consideration of this Bill be now postponed.

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

The question that further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now stand adjourned until February 4, 1986 at 12.00 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, February 4, 1986 at 12.00 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 10.00 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday,
January 14, 1986 3230

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 3230

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Speightstown, St. Peter, for the purpose of providing an access road to the proposed fisheries complex.

A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister for Finance of the repayment of the sum of \$15 000 000 and of interest thereon borrowed by the Barbados Development Bank for the Sixth issue of National Development Bonds.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Suspension of Standing Orders 3230

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86,
No. 20 - \$902 000. 3231

HEAD 39 - MINISTRY OF LABOUR
AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. 3231

Mr. Bradshaw, 3231, 3252, 3253, Mr. Taitt, 3232, 3248, 3253; Dr. Haynes, 3233, 3234, 3250; Mr. Craig, 3234; Mr. Tull, 3235, 3238; Mr. Truss, 3238; Mr. King, 3239; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 3242; Mr. Johnson, 3244; Mr. Franklin, 3247; Mr. St. John, 3241, 3242; 3248, 3250; Mr. Greaves, 3251.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86,
No. 21 3253
HEAD 81 - MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 3253

Mr. Bradshaw, 3253, 3254, 3255; Mr. Craig, 3254; Mr. Taitt, 3254, 3255.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86
No. 22 - \$5 000 000 3255

HEAD 79 - MINISTRY OF HOUSING
AND LANDS. 3255

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3255, 3256, 3257; Mr. Franklin, 3255, 3257; Mr. Taitt, 3255, 3256, 3257.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86
No. 23 - \$54 000 3257

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE
AND PLANNING 3257

Mr. St. John, 3257, 3262, 3263, 3274; Mr. Taitt, 3258, 3262; Mr. Franklin, 3259; Dr. Haynes, 3259, 3264.

HEAD 37 - MINISTRY OF HOUSING
AND LANDS. 3265

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86
No. 24 - \$1 355 750 3266

HEAD 74 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
AND NATURAL RESOURCES. 3266

Mr. St. John, 3266; Mr. Taitt, 3267; Mr. Johnson, 3270; Dr. Haynes, 3271.

HEAD 79 - MINISTRY OF HOUSING
AND LANDS - \$355 750 3276

Mr. Taitt, 3276, 3277; Mr. St. John, 3276, 3277.

LAND ACQUISITION AT BOURNE'S LAND,
St. CHRISTOPHER, CHRIST CHURCH. 3277

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3277, 3278; Dr. Haynes, 3278.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (AMEND-
MENT) ACT, 1986 3279

Mr. St. John, 3279

INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ACT
1985. 3280

Mr. St. John, 3280, 3290; Dr. Haynes, 3281;
Mr. Tull, 3286.
(f.c.p.)

SUSPENSIONS. 3247, 3265, 3277

ADJOURNMENT 3290

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, H. A. (St. Philip South)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)
BRADSHAW, Hon. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)
FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)

GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North)
HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Centa
KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)
TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)
TRUSS, Hon. A. (St. Michael Central)
TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)