

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 - 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 27, 1990.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. on Tuesday, November 27, 1990.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, J.P., (Speaker)
His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), J.P., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs)
Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.
Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B.(Hons.), (Minister of Health)
Hon. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)
Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.), (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General, Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign Affairs)
Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)
Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.
Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.)
Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of Education and Culture)
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)
Mr. E. BOURNE
Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, M.D.
Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M. (Minister of Tourism and Sports)
Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, B. A., (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)
Mr. R. L. MORRIS, B.A., Cert. Ed.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER
Mr. R. P. BYER, LL.B., L.E.C.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B.

Prayers were led by Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, November 20, 1990.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minutes for the meeting of Tuesday, November 20, 1990 have been circulated and I beg to move that they be taken as read.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I second that, Sir.

The question that the Minutes be confirmed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Defence (Rate of Pay, Loans and Allowances) Regulations, 1990. I am also commanded to lay the 21st Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank for the financial year ended March 31, 1990.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the Minister of Transport and Works, I am commanded to lay the Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1990.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. SpeakeffSir, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bartlett Tenantry, Christ Church for

the resiling of residents affected by the Sewerage Treatment Plant.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the payment of pensions, gratuities and other allowances be read a first time.

Hon. M. A. KING: I second that, Sir.

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for provisional and temporary registration of nurses and the prescription of temporary registration fees be now read a first time.

Hon. M. A. KING: I second that, Sir.

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

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to provide for the protection of children from exploitation be read a first time.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 134 is ready.

NOTICE OF A MOTION FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order No. 18 which makes provision for a Member to rise in his place and ask for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance and to note that your ruling in respect of the correspondence which I sent to you earlier in your view did not fulfill the requirements of this Standing Order. The business dealt with the illegal use of the resources of the Central Bank of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the Honourable Member rose on a Standing Order which I was prepared to hear read. I spoke to the Honourable Member in respect of that matter in

Chambers and, therefore, it cannot be brought at this particular point to the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I accept your ruling, Sir.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

**

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the following Standing Orders be suspended: Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44.

Hon. M. A. KING: I second that, Sir.

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

AM*

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

A BILL TO AMEND THE ROAD TRAFFIC ACT, CAP. 295

Order No. 1 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act, Cap. 295.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport and Works, I rise to move the Second Reading of this Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act, Cap. 295. ***

The object of these amendments which are before the House, Mr. Speaker, are to do a number of things. First of all, if I may just read from the Objects and Reasons, the Bill would make provision for:

- (a) the clarification of the law with respect to the issuing of registration number plates for vehicles used by the staff of diplomatic missions and of international and regional organisations;
- (b) the amendment of the definitions "minibus" and "motor omnibus";
- (c) the introduction of a limousine service under the Act;
- (d) the issuing of a driving instructor's certificate.

Now I will deal with all these issues as they appear, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, in relation to the limousine service, since the Road Traffic Act came into force a number of owners and operators of large taxi operations have been interested in providing limousine services in Barbados in % addition to regular taxi service. The purpose of the Bill would be to provide for the operation of that limousine service in the country. It means that a regime will have to

be provided for the operation of limousines and obviously appropriate regulations which define the class of vehicles and so forth would necessarily have to follow on this legislation. The regulation would set out the physical characteristics required for limousine service and so forth.

So that the legislative proposals in the Act are to facilitate the regime for establishing limousine services. The Bill which is before us then would provide for a definition of what a limousine is. It is a vehicle used to carry not less than four passengers and no more than seven passengers. 12.30 p.m.

The second major point about the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it provides for a new definition of "minibus" and "omnibus". The new definition of "minibus" is designed to fulfil a Manifesto promise which was made in the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto of 1986 where the pledge was made that minibuses would be permitted to carry a limited number of standing passengers.

The definition of "minibus" in the existing law would prevent the carrying of standing passengers, because the total number of persons which a minibus could carry was in fact limited. Although the Road Traffic Regulations did provide for permission to be given by the Licensing Authority for standing passengers, yet that regulation could not be carried into force unless there was an amendment to the Act itself.

Perhaps it might be useful, Mr. Speaker, if I indicated what the previous definition of "minibus" in the Act was to show how it became necessary to amend the legislation. Under the existing definition "minibus" means a motor vehicle that is adapted or constructed to carry from 11 to 24 passengers, and "motor omnibus" means a motor vehicle adapted or constructed to carry 25 passengers or more. So that within those two definitions, if you had a minibus which could carry 24 passengers and you permitted standing passengers in that minibus, then that minibus, because of the definition of "motor omnibus" being a vehicle constructed to carry 25 or more passengers, would by that administrative direction become a motor omnibus and would therefore be liable to all the obligations which motor omnibuses would have been liable for.

Under the existing Road Traffic Regulations, Regulation 54.7, standing room for passengers should not be provided on any motor omnibus or minibus unless the Licensing Authority so permits in the case of a particular motor omnibus or minibus, and the permission of the Authority shall be indicated by a sign placed in the omnibus or minibus in a conspicuous position indicating the number of passengers permitted to stand in the omnibus or minibus. Although that regulation is there, against the background of the provisions of the existing definition of "minibus", it was

necessary to amend the definition of "motor omnibus" and "minibus" so as to avoid any difficulty.

The present definition of "minibus" is that a "minibus" means a motor vehicle that is adapted or constructed to carry 11 to 24 sitting passengers and such number of standing passengers, not exceeding seven, as the Licensing Authority permits under regulations made under this Act. The regulations already exist which permit the Licensing Authority to permit standing passengers within the framework of the legislation, so that once this legislation is passed, all that is necessary then to do is for the Licensing Authority to permit, in accordance with Regulation 54.7, to indicate in relation to particular minibuses the number of passengers, not exceeding seven, which those minibuses may carry. It is necessary for the legislation to be structured in this way, because all minibuses are not the same size. Some may comfortably carry seven standing, some may not be able to carry seven comfortably, so that it leaves a discretion in the Licensing Authority to assess the capacity of the minibus to carry standing passengers and so regulate in the process of its administration.

The consequential amendment then to "motor omnibus" would take away the possibility of conflict in definitions, because "motor omnibus" will now mean a motor vehicle that is adapted or constructed to carry 25 or more sitting passengers and such number of standing passengers as the Licensing Authority permits under regulations made under this Act. As I have already indicated, the regulations already exist, so that all that is necessary now is for the Licensing Authority to act in accordance with the provisions of the legislation and permit the standing passengers in whatever vehicle is being considered and then the requirement will be that the minibuses and the motor omnibuses carry a sign placed in a conspicuous position indicating the number of passengers permitted to stand in the minibus or omnibus.

That deals with the second major proposal of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

There is nothing complicated about the third proposal, it regularises and clarifies the position in relation to the number plates of a number of Government vehicles and those of Statutory Boards, the vehicles of diplomatic and consular representatives. Your Honour will recall that from time to time the point has been made, certainly in this House of Assembly, that the green number plates with white numbers seen on the vehicles of Statutory Boards, for instance, were never in fact legislated for. That is in fact the type of number plate which the vehicles of Government and Statutory Boards use, but that description of number plate - dark green in colour and the borders and letters thereon white - was never in fact provided for in law, so that what the legislation is here doing is regularising a position in relation to vehicles of Government and Statutory Boards which had existed for quite some time.

Let me just make this point, Mr. Speaker. There are two clauses in the Bill which did provide that in case of moving violations where the police had stopped a driver of a vehicle and required him to produce his driver's licence or certificate of insurance, the draft Bill which has been circulated had provided that the production of the licence and/or the certificate of insurance should take place forthwith. 12.40 p.m.

Under existing laws, what happens is that in such cases a person has 48 hours to produce his driving licence and five days to produce his certificate of insurance. The original Bill circulated provided that the production of those documents be forthwith, but an amendment has been circulated today, I believe, to all Members where that aspect of the Bill is not being proceeded with, so that section 7 of the original amendment Bill which has been circulated and section 10 will be deleted. The consequential amendments in renumbering paragraphs will be made so that the original position, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the production of licences and of certificates of insurance will remain so that in case of a violation a person still has 48 hours after the passing of this Bill to produce a driver's licence and five days to produce a certificate of insurance.

There are, Mr. Speaker, some provisions in the legislation relating to the requirements for driving instructors. These appear in Part 5A of the Bill but the position in relation to these amendments, Mr. Speaker, as you will note from the final Clause 19 that the amendments in relation to driving instructors will not come into place immediately because the amendments in relation to this aspect of the legislation require the existence of a highway code and an instructors' code to be in existence. Preparations are well in hand, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the existence of a highway code and hopefully we should be able to have a highway code available for citizens of Barbados in the next month or so. The Ministry of Transport & Works is working on the instructors' code and it will soon be ready so that the provisions in relation to the requirements for driving instructors will not be brought into effect immediately but will be brought into effect by proclamation once the infrastructural arrangements are in place to make that aspect of the legislation effective.

Against this background, then, Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, we all understand that the purpose of bringing this Bill at this time is to try in some way to appease the minibuses operators and to correct

some of the wrongs inflicted on them. It is quite amazing, Sir, and I have listened very carefully to the Honourable Attorney General when he spoke, that the significant change is in the definition of a minibus which took in this piece of legislation four lines, sorry, four and one-third lines and it has taken the Honourable Member almost four and one-half years to bring four and one-half lines in legislation to this Honourable House. In fact as he has said, the regulations are already in place and the only problem was that if the standing passengers regulation had applied to minibuses under the old regulations some of them could well have become omnibuses and that they would have to bear the additional burdens that applied to that category of public service vehicle. So, in point of fact, Sir, it has taken the Honourable Member, the Attorney General, four and one-half years to make this minor amendment to the legislation in order to accommodate the minibus drivers. The question we must ask ourselves is why has it taken the Attorney General so long. Quite clearly, this is the kind of thing, Sir, that it would not take him one minute to put in place. There was no complicated law. There were no intellectual difficulties relating to the amendment, so quite clearly, Sir, it has to be a matter of policy to defer bringing this particular amendment at this point in time.

It is interesting, Sir, to note that it was brought today when the substantive Minister of Transport & Works is not in his place. I say this for this reason: this document is the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party 1986 General Elections which clearly sets out the Government's policy in relation to the minibuses. It said that it would reduce all licences and fees by 50%. Now that particular measure was put in place on July 15, 1986 when the July Budget was introduced and became effective from 1 January 1987. The manifesto did not put any date on that. What, Sir, the manifesto also said was that it was to permit a limited number of persons to stand in the minibuses as they now are permitted in the Transport Board buses. Four and one-half years have elapsed; the Government has sat by and witnessed the persecution of - not only persecution but persecution and prosecution of minibus drivers. 12.50p.m.

They did absolutely nothing about it until almost 1991. I believe that the Honourable Attorney General has a duty to explain to the public and to the minibus operators why it is that between the promise, the assumption of the reins of Government in 1986 it has taken four and a half years to come in here with an amendment which, in fact, spreads over only four and a half lines in order to put that particular policy matter in place.

It is my submission, Sir, that the Government has no clear policy in relation to the participation of small private businessmen in the public transport sector of the economy in Barbados. On the one hand an entire political party goes out there and Mr. Speaker, I was one of them who went out there and committed ourselves to the minibus drivers but

thank God they recognise that when I held responsibility as a Minister of the Crown whatever came under my responsibility was put in place immediately. They have publicly so stated.

Here a Government goes out and no question about it, they committed themselves to a policy position which would reduce the burden of taxation on the minibus operators and which would facilitate their operations, which would enhance the viability of those minibus operations by permitting them to carry a few more passengers. Four and a half years have gone by and in the meantime, all sorts of conflicting policy statements have been made.

What is the position of the Democratic Labour Party Government in relation to the minibus operators? Do they still believe that they play an important role in the public transport service of Barbados? Do they believe that as a Government they should be doing everything to facilitate their operations? Do they believe that they should be out there trying to strengthen that group of businessmen rather than trying to undermine their financial viability day by day with all sorts of harassment? It is my feeling, Sir, that the Government is in no way committed to the involvement of small business people in Barbados in the area of public transport.

Now, Sir, I wanted to make it quite clear that we are committed to ensuring that the minibuses continue to provide an adequate standard of service to the people of Barbados. If their service was not in demand, it would have collapsed long ago. We also feel strongly that the Z van operators should be allowed to participate in that area of the Barbados economy.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have passed 45 years would only be acutely aware that if there is one area where the small black businessman has intervened successfully in the economy of Barbados over time, it has been in the transport area. It is important to recognise that transport is an important sector of the economy. We only have to think of all the truck owners, the taxi drivers, the persons who own pick-ups, the Z van operators and the minibuses. We can see that whereas the pattern has changed over the years that it has always been one key area of the Barbados economy where small black businessmen have intervened successfully over the years.

I say that we have a responsibility as parliamentarians to recognise the contribution which those small businessmen have made over the years to the economy of Barbados to recognise that the transport sector is an important area for intervention by small business people, an area where small business people not only feed their families, school their families, raise their families but they also provide employment for a large number of people. It is one area where the small self-employed persons generate a considerable amount of employment in Barbados. It is my

belief that the minibuses have had a raw deal under this Democratic Labour Party Government apart from the fact that the fees were reduced by 50% as promised effective January 1, 1987. I would have hoped that today the Government would have taken this opportunity on the second reading of this Bill to announce a clear policy in relation to the involvement of small black businessmen in the transport sector of Barbados.

There was a time, Sir, when almost the entire sector of public transport, if you may recall, was, in fact dominated almost exclusively by small black business people. You will remember people like the Simpsons from St. George, the Rocks from St. Andrew, the Lucas' from St. Philip, the Massiahs from Christ Church and the Kills. I am saying that even in the bad old days that our people were able to identify this as an area in which they could make some progress in life. Despite all the difficulties, they were able to make progress and help a lot of people in terms of job generation in Barbados.

I believe where you have the history of a good performance by small businessmen in a particular sector, you are under an obligation if you are serious about promoting the cause of small black businessmen, to recognise that history and give them the kind of opportunity that they need. 1.00p.m.

I believe, Sir, that we should be going further. Now Sir, sometime about four years ago I did a fairly detailed calculation of the amount of money which up to that time the minibuses had put into the Treasury of Barbados and the amount of money which was transferred from the Treasury by way of subsidy to the public sector component of public transport. As it worked out, Sir, the minibuses were putting more money in the Treasury every year than we were losing in terms of subsidies to the Transport Board.

Sir, you only have to imagine the amount of money that rolls into the Treasury second after second. Just imagine, Sir, when a minibus switches on in the morning and with gasoline and diesel at present at outrageous prices, Sir, and so heavily taxed every second of the day hundreds of private vehicles involved in the public transport are putting dollars and dollars into the Treasury. Sir, many people just look at the licence fees. They look at how it became empty after that, Sir. Only God knows! Only heaven knows how anyone could empty a Treasury in those circumstances.

Now Sir, the point I am making is that here the Government has an opportunity where people are prepared to make an investment and, Sir, the investment is exceedingly high. We really need to look at this because the minibus drivers have to pay at least 100 per cent taxes. This is import duty on their vehicle.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Are you sure about that? Anyhow, over 100 per cent and that is the first imposition that is on. Then over and above that, Sir, they have to pay their licence fees which thankfully were reduced. Then they have the very punitive insurance fees to pay year by year. What bothers me is this, Sir. What is going to happen to the minibus drivers over the years? Because of taxation and other impositions they are not going to meet the most important and the heaviest cost of their operations and by far the heaviest cost of their operations which is the depreciation of the vehicle. In other words, Sir, apart from feeding their families generating jobs, they should be generating within the seven year period enough money to replace that vehicle if they are going to continue in business. All the minibus drivers, in fact, would have been removed by taxation in one form or another. It is not recognized that the highest cost is depreciation and those who impose taxes on them do not recognize that that particular aspect has to be dealt with.

I believe, Sir, that there is a strong case for reducing the level of taxation in terms of import duties, consumption taxes, and stamp duties on public service privately owned vehicles such as minibuses. I will tell you why, Sir. I believe, Sir, that it will be in the public interest because, if you look at many of the vehicles being used in Barbados today by the minibus operators, those vehicles were not designed for this kind of operation. They were designed, Sir, to run long distances maybe 50 or 100 miles on a level stretch and back. So that the wear and tear on those vehicles is very high. Then the second problem that you have, Sir, is that many of the vehicles are not sturdy enough so that when they are involved in accidents that they offer a sufficient protection for those people riding in the vehicles. However, Sir, the minibus operators cannot access the more sturdy and stronger vehicles which would be designed to operate within the context of short runs and so on because the cost would be prohibitive bearing in mind that each time they buy a minibus they are really buying two or more, minibuses. That is the bottom line.

I would urge the Government that in the context of an overall transport policy if you identify and you are satisfied as we are that there is a role for involvement of small businessmen in the public transport sector, then I think one needs to set about and create a fiscal and legal environment where there can be satisfaction on all sides. I think, Sir, that that is the kind of policy position which is being articulated by the Democratic Labour Party prior to 1986 and was promptly abandoned after 1987. I have heard so many hostile statements emanating from within the Democratic Labour Party in relation to the minibus drivers. You would never believe that they were the same persons that embraced the minibus drivers prior to 1986. These are facts, Sir. If there is a difference in policy positions, get up and say so. But we are not interested in any differences.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member just stated that he has heard a number of negative things emanating from within the Democratic Labour Party, Sir. He could only be discussing what is said in this House and I challenge the Honourable Member to articulate anytime when any of these Honourable Members on this side have done what he is now purporting that we did, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is a simple matter, Sir. If the Honourable Member wants to attack the Minister of Transport and Works, do it yourself. Do not ask me to do it for you.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. It is clear, Sir, that I could not possibly want to attack anybody because I have not spoken and I am now not speaking. If the Honourable Member is unable or afraid to be articulate in what he wishes to say, that is his problem. I never cursed the minibus people.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I will not be doing what the Honourable Member for St. Michael West wants me to do. I will do what I want to do and you can do what you want to do when you get up to speak. That is my position on that matter. The point I am saying is, Sir, if there is a difference of opinion in relation to the general principle of promoting the minibuses as an important part of our public transport system, then I believe that the Honourable Attorney General when he speaks later on in this debate can tell us whether or not if there is any difference in the Government in what position to take in respect of the minibuses.

The second thing, Sir, is this. I believe, Sir, that if the Government had a clear policy a lot of the problems that occurred over the past four years would not have happened in Barbados. For example, Sir, I think that the minibus operators would welcome a specific legal framework and a proper understanding of their relationship with the Government, Transport Board, and so on. 1.10p.m.

I believe that it should not be beyond the resources of a Government to sit down and work out the legal framework in which minibuses can operate. I am sure that they also would welcome an appropriate regulatory framework rather than put up with the day to day harassment and abuse by members of the Democratic Labour Party. They would prefer that, they would welcome that, and I would urge the Government that there is no point coming in here just before an election - and it looks to me, Sir, that we are really looking now at the last week of January or early February perhaps, or after March 31 -...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not speculated before, Sir, because I have waited until the Prime Minister has run out of options, so I can speculate now.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, it cannot be March. Mr. Speaker, it cannot be after February 15, it would have to be before February 15 or after March 31.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to appear as having any specific gifts in predicting what date an election would be. I am not really predicting, I am assuming that the Honourable Prime Minister is a responsible person and therefore would not hold an election and leave the country without money to spend by holding that election in March. That being the case, Sir, he would have to hold it late in January or early in February, so I am not predicting. That is the reality, but to come with this now just before an election, where there are numerous other issues that need to be addressed by the law.

There is a whole range of issues. All day we hear complaints about minibuses speeding, there are all sorts of accidents on the roads, minibuses stopping here and there, and all kinds of problems. I am saying that that is a symptom of a lack of leadership and a lack of direction in terms of policy provided by the Government of Barbados. If there was a clear policy that the Government supports the minibus operations, that they support the growth in minibus operations in Barbados, that the Government is prepared to introduce a regulatory framework in consultation with the minibus operators and with those responsible for enforcing the law in Barbados, I think it would be a much happier situation. In other words, Sir, the minibus operators have been forced to operate in a situation where they did not know whether they were coming or going, whether they had the law on their side or the law not on their side, and these gentlemen sat down in this country and allowed several persons to be fined and sent to gaol for carrying standing passengers, when it was their declared policy that they intended to bring down this legislation, and the Attorney General of Barbados sat in his office and did nothing about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, may I interrupt the Honourable Member here? He said these persons intended to bring down legislation. The only people who can bring legislation to this House are the Honourable Members on that side. You cannot say that they allowed people to be put in gaol. I am referring to Honourable Members.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir. I wish to withdraw that and would put it this way. Those Honourable Members over there, having declared it was their policy to allow standing passengers, sat silently over

the years while many minibus drivers were prosecuted and fined and, as I understand it, some of them were sent to gaol for the offence of carrying standing passengers. This is what people complain about when they talk about lack of leadership and direction, and I believe, and I am sure that situation arose because there was conflict within the Government as to in what direction they should go in relation to the operations of the minibuses in Barbados.

There would have to be conflict, Sir. I cannot believe, I refuse to believe that honourable and sane men would have postured in that manner unless there was a policy conflict situation. I may be wrong, Sir, I do not know, but I cannot think of any other reason. I have presumed honour, as I have to within the context of the rules of the House, but beyond that I have presumed honour. I have also presumed sanity, and in that context I cannot think of any other situation that could have applied. I believe that they should get up and apologise to the minibus operators in Barbados for what has transpired over the past four years.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No matter what the Honourable Member for St. Michael West asks me to do, I am not going to do it. The Honourable Member is; my good friend and I am not going to be attacking him at your behest. You have to do it yourself.

If I may continue, Sir. I do not want to spend much more time on this particular matter, except to say that I believe that one of the major stumbling blocks in people's minds as to the role of private individuals in delivering a public transport service is what will happen to the Transport Board. When the Transport Board had a monopoly, before the minibuses came on the scene, they were losing money. When the minibuses came on the scene they lost money, and if the minibuses and Z vans were removed from the scene tomorrow, it will continue to lose money. That is not the issue. I believe that the Transport Board would be assisted in the efficiency factors that are necessary to enhance that operation if it has to compete. I think that competition is good for the Transport Board. 1.20p.m.

I further believe that there would be an ever expanding travelling public in Barbados particularly as we all expect the NDP to win the next Government and provide another 20,000 jobs. That might well be another 20,000 people using the transport system on a daily basis.

We expect the demand for public transport to rise. We expect the cake to expand and I think that it does not make any sense to postulate that if you allow private sector intervention by small people in the public transport system that that will necessarily lead to the demise of the transport system. That is not so.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will be finished before twenty-five past one. The point I am making, Sir, is that I think that very often when we look at economic matters sometimes we start off with prejudiced assumptions and those assumptions often turn out to be wrong and I believe that if you have a private individual operating within the public transport system and you have a public sector component of the public transport system that what is going to happen is that people are going to have a choice. There are people who will always prefer to go on the Transport Board bus. There are people who will prefer to go on a minibus. There are people who would prefer to go by a Z van I am all in favour of opening it up. And over and above that Sir, if you are looking for money to pay for the social and a very necessary social component of your public transport then I think those operating within that sector put that money in the Treasury so that you don't have to look for any additional taxation. It is what the minibuses, what the Z vans, what those people put into the Treasury day after day that will help to subsidise the Transport Board which we all accept needs to be there and will need a subsidy and will need at all times to provide that social component in our public transport system. We all accept that, but I think when the argument goes into saying that because you have minibuses and because you have Z vans and so, that they are taking revenue away from the Transport Board, that is foolishness. Indeed, Sir, if you look at it there has got to be a reason why when you have an established Transport Board which predated the minibuses the people left the Transport Board and go to the minibuses. Because they liked the colour of a minibus? They left because the minibuses offered a service more acceptable to them. That is the only reason and therefore if you have...

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Again, I leave it to you to classify the service. You are not going to trap me in that. I am smarter than that. The point I am saying, Sir, is that these minibuses emerged after the Transport Board had a monopoly and therefore I see no reason why we cannot have a highly efficient Transport Board and a highly efficient private sector component of the transport system and allow the small business people of Barbados to contribute to the building of Barbados. You should not be putting any impediments whatsoever in their way and that is what the Government has been doing and you all know that I speak the truth.

The other night, Sir, I posed a question. I have been in politics all these years; and I have seen my friends on my left and my friends in front of me both advertising, Sir, that they are telling the truth. I started to wonder. Since the NDP only came on the scene about 21 months ago, I started worrying, Sir, who has been telling all those lies down the

years. I don't know. It is quite clear that the NDP is exempt from that.

I believe that if emerging from this debate there could be a clear statement by the Government of Barbados as to its attitude towards the involvement of small businessmen, those who operate the minibuses, those who operate the Z vans and so on in respect of their participation in the provision of a public transport service, I would be very pleased. I don't think, Sir, that we need to bother about the tidying up. The rest of this Bill, Sir, is largely tidying up and that is the basic issue which confronts the House now. What is Government's policy in relation to the participation of small black businessmen, in particular in that traditional area in which they have done well? I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I see this Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act as Government's intention to honour its pledges to improve the public transport system as it relates to the minibus operators.

I am not, Mr. Speaker, ever impressed by people who try to display bad manners at every time and at every turn and I would only hope, Sir, that the Honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown would recognize that when I sit in my place, I do not try to heckle any person...

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, I am trying to avoid this kind of confrontation. My view has always been, supported by the new edition of May's, that asides ought not to be taken as part of the debate and since it clearly says that all Members should remain silent or should converse only in undertones. I would take it those asides cannot be heard or written and what I am suggesting to Members is if you take up an aside and put it into the debate I have difficulty then as to how to treat that particular comment.

I am saying that the manners, decorum and dignity of this Chamber reside in the Chair and therefore the Chair does not need anyone's assistance. So, I would exhort Members to keep to the Resolution before them and avoid such interventions.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In 1986, Sir, as the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central mentioned, the DLP Government carried out one of its pledges to reduce the licences and fees of the minibus operators by 50 per cent. 1.30p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central who was then Minister of Finance accepts the praises for so doing. I think to be very frank and truthful, all of the Honourable Members who sat on the side of the Government, front bench and back bench, supported that particular bit of legislation. I would take credit also for supporting the measure that came down.

The problem I have is that the Honourable Member was part of the same Manifesto which offered the granting of duty free concessions for replacements on the same basis as now enjoyed by taxis. If all could have been done at the same time, Sir, I ask the Honourable Member why all was not done the same time? If you are saying the same way we granted the 50% concessions on the licences and fees that we should have done everything that we promised them at the same time then I would say that we were in 1986 not doing what the Honourable Member expected us to do.

Mr. Speaker, during the discourse advanced by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I would have thought he would have taken some time to look at what, as I hear and see from time to time, are the general complaints from people across this country about the behavioural patterns of persons operating the minibuses.

I wish to say, Sir, that I cannot support indiscipline in any form. I would wish, even though the Democratic Labour Party has promised to support the minibus operators, that we are also promising to encourage them in proper habits. I believe that the kind of behaviour we see on the road does not allow us as representatives of the people of this country to say that we are doing our duty properly if we do not tell those people who operate those vehicles that they are not serving the best public interest. The fact that they are operating as private entrepreneurs tells me that they are part and parcel of a general public transport service. I do not think that the code of ethics and the code of behaviour should be different when executed by the Barbados Transport Board as against what is done by the private entrepreneurs.

I wish, therefore, to encourage some consideration for bringing all the public transport in this country under a code of operation that the people of this country can feel justified that all persons are working in harmony towards the orderly conduct of public business and especially in this case, the public transport.

When I look at Section 2 (c) which provides that persons should have an uniform code of dress, I believe that their behavioural patterns should meet with the approval of all persons in this country. My support of this Bill is primarily because I think that it sets out areas in which some improvement in the general management of the public transport service in this country can be conducted.

Without spending too much time on it, Sir, I would just wish to say that I encourage those people who are making their living off the taxpayers of this country to recognise that the quality of service that the taxpayers require is the best possible service. I am referring to persons who own minibuses and persons who drive the minibuses. I am also speaking in that regard to persons who are using those vehicles.

One of the problems I have with the behavioural patterns is the indiscriminate overloading of those vehicles. All of us understand and know that vehicles are designed and built to certain specifications. If you overload a vehicle that its suspension and steering components cannot support it, anyone who drives in that vehicle is at risk. Not only are they at risk but there are persons who travel the highways of this country who are also at risk.

Since nobody believes that I am in this contribution beating the minibus operators, or anybody for that matter, I just think that as a leader in this country, as a representative of the people of this country, I owe it as a duty to them to speak what are their concerns so that people can put themselves right. I do not believe that we can play our politics cheaply to give people the impression that we are with them even when they are doing things wrong and badly. We have to lead by example. Therefore if we are going to lead them and lead them well, we are going to tell them where they are wrong. We are going to tell them where they are right. We are going to give them what we can afford to give them but we are going to demand for the people who use the service what they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, Sir, I did not intend to speak very long on this particular matter. I just wanted to give my support to it and to voice my concerns as I see them.

I thank you.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have been in this House of Assembly for a very long time. I wish to say that the very short statement just made by my colleague who just sat down is a sterling example of what a parliamentarian should aspire to be able to do and say. That is why we are sent here. I wish to offer my personal congratulations to him. In the Same vein and by the same token to register my abhorrence at the attitude adopted by the Leader of the Opposition as he came to address this matter.

Sir, the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party does not have any date written into it. It does not say that we are going to do "X" and "Y" by such and such a time except that it says "We will seek to accomplish these things during the period of the life of the Government which we have."

Let us assume that we had said we would do this at an earlier time. Let us suppose we had even put a time on it and we were unable to fulfil the mandate by that time. How dare the Leader of the Opposition in pursuit of the cheapest possible form of popularity come to this Honourable House and seek to give the impression that by fulfilling a mandate, that by carrying out a promise, this great party is somehow doing something wrong?

The Honourable Member is on record in this country as saying that the reason why he left the Democratic Labour Party was because they reneged on some promises they made. Now he comes in and he wants to approbate and reprobate at the same time. He wants to attack the same Democratic Labour Party because it is keeping a promise. The Honourable Member has to make up his mind. He cannot be like Twisty and Twirly weekly. 1.40 p.m.

He has to take a position and he has to demonstrate clear and moral leadership in this country and not waiting to see how the ball is going to turn before taking a position.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAUT: The Honourable Members know so much about integrity, Sir, that they need no prompting in these matters. So I shall not pick them up in any *sotto voce* remarks they make. But I want to say this, Sir, as an example of what I am talking about. The Honourable Member left an impression that the Democratic Labour Party was somehow responsible for those persons who went to jail for breaking the law. He left that impression, Sir. He wants to give the impression and put out among the population that the Democratic Labour Party is somehow morally responsible for persons who went to prison for breaking the law. If you examine the specific cases where persons were sentenced by legitimate magistrates and by an Appeal Court to go to prison for breaking the law, you will not find that any minibus operator went to prison for having seven standing passengers or less. The Honourable Member should know better than to try to give the impression in here or anywhere that were it not for the Democratic Labour Party somebody would not have gone to prison. He might be able to say that in another context, Sir, which is not appropriate for discussion at this time but not on minibus matters.

The other thing he tried to do is to give the impression that the only persons who own minibuses are the poor, struggling, up from the bottom black people who are barely managing to scrape a living and somehow the Democratic Labour Party deprived them of this capacity by not having seven standing passengers in their minibuses. How beautifully dramatic, Sir. How wonderful this new Sir Galahad for the poor black suffering people has suddenly discovered them, Sir. In a few weeks before the election, Sir, he is going to champion their cause as owners of the minibuses. But the same Honourable Member, Sir, while pillorying a former Speaker in the House, Sir, on this side had some other different things to say about minibus operators and about the ownership of minibus operators. I recalled when this House was turned around. The Honourable Member was down on this end speaking to them over on that end about minibuses, Sir. I recall that, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member, Sir, seems to be under the strange impression that I was making his speech for him at that time. I well recall what he had to say about them.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the feebleness of that intervention speaks for itself. I am saying that I recall, Sir, and I am sure all other Honourable Members recall that the Honourable Member's posture - his word, Sir - on minibuses and the minibus ownership, minibus mentality, and the whole aspect of minibuses was not always the one he portrayed today. Time does not permit me, Sir, to articulate his position in the way that I would wish. What I am trying to say, Sir, is that we have come with a very simple amendment to the Road Traffic Bill. I read today that the minibus drivers are all saying that they look forward to it. I read that today, Sir, in one of the daily papers. Therefore, Sir, it does not fall well from the lips of any Honourable Member in here to be castigating the Government for being too late with an amendment. The Government has an agenda.

Aside,

Hon. B. M. TATTT: The Honourable Member for the City is saying, Sir, *sotto voce* - you could not hear it, Sir - *** but he is asking me what is it. I am saying, Sir, the Honourable Member knows the agenda of the Democratic Labour Party because he articulated the agenda shoulder to shoulder with the rest of us up and down the length of this country. Even now that he is sitting in another place he has abrogated along, with his colleagues who are over there now, the same said, the very agenda and saying that it is theirs. They are now saying that it is theirs. So lock, stock, and barrel they now say that they have the better way or new path. So he cannot by the same token unless he is thoroughly and completely degenerate, be asking me what is the agenda. He knows the agenda. The agenda is to uplift the broad masses of people of Barbados to a level where opportunity is available for all those who would take it and that all in this country can live to the highest level of his or her potential in an environment that is governed primarily by a reference to good law and order. That is the agenda. We have been putting it in place systematically. Anyone who is not blind, wicked, or bias beyond measure can observe the Democratic Labour Party putting its agenda in -* place for the people of this country in the most trying and difficult circumstances which have not allowed even the Leader of the Opposition to catch his breath as he moves very swiftly from one position of attack to another. If one is to judge by the response which he and his colleagues are getting as they attempt to spread their message to the people of this country, one could only feel saddened as one •«* watches them stand before large crowds of 4,6, and 11. Sir, I am not going to discuss that in detail because this measure does not require it.

I would say that the other aspects of the Bill which have not apparently attracted any comment from the Honourable Members on that side would suggest that when this legislation goes through the House that the people who are in the transportation industry, the people who own the limousines, the persons who ply taxis by virtue of a change in the pattern of fees and taxi fares and by a number of measures would recognize that this is not only a matter of seven standing passengers, Sir. This is by way of taking a look at the whole area of the small entrepreneur in the transportation business.

The transportation business is not only Z vans and minibuses, Sir. We have a substantial taxi corp in this country that has been and will continue to be part of the backbone of the tourism industry in this country. The regulations which form part of the policy initiative does not come here, Sir. So that when the Honourable Member talks about a four and a half line amendment, Sir, to the uninitiated they will believe that that was all that was required or that is all that has been done. But he knows that the regulations, Sir, are not required to come before this House. He knows therefore, Sir, that if one wishes to assess this policy initiative that one would have to assess it not in terms of this amendment pure and simple. The Honourable Attorney General was at pains, Sir, to point that out. The Attorney General made an assumption of good faith on the part of all Honourable Members who heard him. The Honourable Member is only pandering to the uninitiated when he seeks to suggest that the only area of policy arising out of this initiative is the standing passengers when, in fact, a reference to the regulations and the accompanying paraphernalia with this small amendment, as he puts it, would put the issue squarely as one of policy.

The Honourable Member is raising questions about what is the policy of this Government on transportation. That has never been an issue before and will not be an issue. The policy of this Government on transportation has been articulated a long time ago. It is the most efficient public transportation for the people of Barbados. This Government has stated categorically that there will be no privatization of the public transport in this country because such privatization would result in the vast majority of persons living in the rural areas suffering in a manner that they used to suffer when the public transportation was in private hands. 1.50p.m.

The young people of this country need to know that there was a time in this country when the transportation system was privatised and there was no divide between the political parties on the issue of socialisation of transportation in this country, and any one who seeks to put a divide between the political parties can only be seen as a surrogate for those who would rape and plunder at every possible opportunity.

The public of this country has a right to transportation and the country can criticise the public transportation system for not being efficient when it feels that way, but there should be never any question about privatising the Transport Board. In the United States of America, in the great New York City, public transportation is not privatised. In London it is not privatised.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You cannot talk about service. What good service? The Honourable Member lived in Canada for 17 years and therefore is in no position to say that anybody living in Mississauga gets any bus any better than anybody living in Oistins? Let us not fool the people of this country.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Because you were never in New York. Whenever you came through New York you used to pass through and I used to make things right for you with the limousine, so do not worry to talk about whenever you passed through. Do you remember Mrs. Money? Do you remember Betty?

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Members on that side must be aware that transportation everywhere in the world forms part of public enquiry on an almost annual basis. Anyone who lived in New York City - the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East and the Honourable Member for St. George North - can confirm that almost every year at midnight on Old Year's Night, or New Year's Eve, the question as to whether the trains will run or not arises.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member knows that too, Sir. That is why I have to jog his memory to remind him that public transport all over the world forms ?-. issue both at the level of the citizen and at the level of the politician. The question of privatising transportation is not on, and therefore has only been used as rhetorical fodder for a number of persons who ought to know better. When the Honourable Member asks about the policy of the Democratic Labour Party, the Honourable Member knows that the policy was articulated a long time ago and reiterated during these four years.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Minister for Transport is, as I understand it, out of the country and I think it is a base slur to be suggesting that the Minister did not come in for this Bill. The Leader of the Opposition left that impression to

those who would not know better, and I say it is base for anyone to be even suggesting...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAUT: He said it was introduced at a time when the Honourable Member is out of the country. Who do you think formulated the Bill?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I have sat patiently and allowed the Honourable Member to indulge in flights of fantasy, rhetoric and distortion when it related to me, but when he seeks to involve another Member) all I said was that I notice that the Honourable Minister was not in his place. If you have noticed otherwise, deal with it

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is not all he said, Sir. He said that he noticed that the Bill is being introduced at a time when the Minister is not in his place, and there is a logical inference that flows from that, especially when it is connected with other inflections which he made during the course of his presentation. The inference is clear to a blind man on a trotting horse.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: About you I am concerned. I am concerned that after one term in the City you are going to run third. That is what I am concerned about. I am really concerned about that, because when I trained him, Sir, I did not expect him to fall back. He is now like Sir Grantley, the horse. He will not come out of the gates at all.

Sir, the point I am making is that when it comes to policy the Honourable Members on that side cannot question the Democratic Labour Party's policy on transportation, because it has always been well known. The policy on transportation for the minibus operators was articulated in the Manifesto and is being fulfilled. The policy for taxi drivers has been articulated from time immemorial and has been fulfilled and will be fulfilled. We are the ones who assisted the taxi co-ops in this country and put them in a position where they are now a formidable force, both at the airport and the sea port. The Democratic Labour Party is the Government that brought to the small man in this country the opportunity to earn substantial sums of money through the use of his own ingenuity and his own sweat and blood by way of private transportation. We have always said that a proper and judicious mix of the private transportation and the public transportation, operating at as efficient a level as possible, is our policy position.

I hope that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, whose direct knowledge about public transportation is restricted to what he reads, Sir, because there is no one who has driven more...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Member for St. Michael South Central does not read? That is not true, Sir. He is a doctor and by definition he had to have read. If he is saying that he has not read much beyond that, that is a matter for him to get up and say, but I am saying that the Honourable <* Member's acquaintance with public transportation would have to be in terms of what he has read, because before he was knee high to a grasshopper he was driving all through this country in his own private motor vehicle. From then until now he has been driving his own private motor vehicle, and in terms of the poverty that he is always describing, he would have no knowledge of that, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member for St. George North may recall the wonderful days we had on the Simpson's (St. George) school buses and so on. He will •» have remembered those times.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is true, Sir. It is a little too far back for me and I cannot remember that. I accept that, but do you notice that he did not recall the times with the Prime Minister? You will notice that suddenly he wants to go back to the times of the Honourable Member for St George to talk about public transportation, but I can tell you about the private transportation with his private vehicle. *» There are things which I will not obviously say here, Sir, but the Honourable Member has very little acquaintance with public transportation and therefore should be the last to seek to admonish Honourable Members over here.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: When I was ten years old, Sir, I could drive a bus, so what are you trying to tell me?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, that statement is as incredible as most of the statements he makes. I will put this to you, Sir. In the context of what we know about driving a bus, * you can now put all of the statements of the Honourable Member next to that statement. 2.00p.m.

It is pure fantasy, when he was ten years old he could drive a bus. What he means, Sir, is that when he was ten years old he could move a bus and almost anybody who has been ten years old has sat in some vehicle and moved it when the people weren't looking. And here he comes now - ' It is in that same vein that he lays claim to being an economist, Sir. He is as good an economist now, Sir, as he was when he was a ten-year old bus driver.

SUSPENSION

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 3.00 p.m.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, The Barbados Labour Party is supporting this Bill because we think that notwithstanding anything that the Minister of Health may have said in his presentation, it is indeed about time that the problems affecting minibus operators be resolved by legislation. We have had the spectacle of the minibus operators being imprisoned for persistent breaches of the law and there were two very unsavoury consequences of the operation of judicial function.

The first was that a number of persons supporting the minibus operators gathered at Holetown Court and demonstrated their anger at the decision of the Magistrate. I think we all know that it went to even greater lengths and there were allegations of threats against the Magistrate. The second unsavoury consequence was that a group of people went on Vauxhall Road, in the middle of last year and blocked it. Coming out of these acts of disappointment, even disobedience Government Ministers made a number of promises to the minibus operators. They were promised the standing passengers by July last year, 1989 as a palliative to cure the incipient recklessness that there was in the minibus field. But they have had to wait from July last year until now, the end of November, for the promises to harden into legislation such as we have before us today. In the meantime, as I said earlier, some of their number have been imprisoned and felt the Minister of Transport & Works in the company of the Attorney General...

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ... at Vauxhall last year when the minibus men took it upon themselves to block the road and sent for the newspaper if they wanted to see it. They never resiled from that in the Press.

Hon. M. A. KING: Point of order. The Honourable Member may be inadvertently misleading the House. He is saying the Minister of Transport and Works made some promise to minibus drivers in my presence at Vauxhall. Mr. Speaker, I categorically deny any such promise.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think you could make that a point of order.

Hon. M. A. KING: I know you all have been walking about saying that but it is not the truth.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am saying that it was carried in the newspapers. They were never denied and there was comment made about it. If the Minister is saying

that he was misquoted or I am misrepresenting him, Sir, I have no wish to do that and I am not going to press it any further at this stage but I will reserve the right later on to produce the actual date.

Sir, I am not getting into anything about lights, Sir. Minibuses have to operate on highways. It is a measure of the competence of this Government that for at least seven months now, the lights on the Tom Adams Highway, the Errol Barrow/Cummins Highway have been shutting down in large numbers every night. It is very unsafe and it is worse when there is heavy rain and you are trying to drive through there and this Government has been unable for several months to fix even the lights on the ABC Highway. That's all I say about lights at this time. I will deal with them down Western on Sunday night.

Let me come back to the minibuses specifically. I am proud to be a member of the Barbados Labour Party and to be secure in the knowledge that it was the Barbados Labour Party that gave the minibus men in Barbados a chance to survive, a chance to earn a dollar. You talk about enfranchisement - this is a large group of persons whom we economically enfranchised and for that we got abuse. In January 1988, we got abuse, a lot of scurrilous attacks were made on persons who were not in this House and indeed on a former Senator by the Minister of Transport. The Minister of Transport, the substantive Minister, is not in his place today and I will deal with that later on. He criticised us in early January last year for...

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I just wanted to find out. Did the Honourable Member say that the Honourable Minister of Transport subjected Members of the Opposition to scurrilous abuse in Parliament? It would seem to me, Sir, that you would not allow scurrilous abuse of Members to take place.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not aware that at the time the statement was being made that he was specifically saying that it was made in the Chamber. If the Honourable Member is saying that that kind of behaviour took place in this Chamber, then certainly the Honourable Member would want to modify or adjust that statement to conform with what is more appropriate under the rules of the House.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wouldn't wish to reflect upon the Chair or its competence at all but I am submitting that in a speech in January 1988 the Minister of Transport called the names of Louis Tull, L.B. Brathwaite, Lindsay Bolden, Vic Johnson and Dennis Tull in the most derogatory terms in this Chamber in relation to minibus operations. He vowed that he would deal with the minibus men. Both then, and on November 22, 1988.

So that when the Opposition accuses the Democratic Labour Party of not having good intentions towards the minibus men, the accusations are made from a substrata of

fact expressed publicly or from a display of attitudes to that sector. There were threats to break the minibus men, run them off the road. There were criticisms of their operations on Highway 1, on the Oistins route and on the Pine route on November 22, 1988 and in January. It is all here. These are matters that are going to be photocopied and distributed at the right time. I will wait to help deal with these matters. 3.15 p.m.

The minibus men are aware of the attitude of the Government. Essentially what the minibus men would be feeling was expressed by the Leader of the Opposition when I came in today and heard him saying that it took four and a half years, almost five years now to come and make simple amendments that do not amount to half a page to fulfil a promise to an important interest group in a subsector of this economy.

On page 25 of the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto under "Minibus Operations" item 3, it was promised to permit a limited number of persons to stand in minibuses as they are now permitted to stand in Transport Board buses. Just for the sake of the record, so that when whoever moved this Bill is going to reply must tell us they had promised as item 2 to construct a minibus stand of similar standards as that which now serve the Transport Board at Fairchild Street. That has not come yet. You have the sight of minibus men running about out there in Problyn Street being run off the route by policemen.

When you build up the hopes of people that you are going to do something, you have to deliver. There is a level of expectation in this country that has to be met. Therefore the promises have to be met or forget them. All of this I have spoken in here several times about it. These broken promises are what conduce to the level of cynicism that there is in Barbados and an anti-politician feeling because they do not see us as worthy of their trust because of the number of things we say and then do not do, the number of promises we make. Those are two that the Democratic Labour Party made in 1986 and then pledged on page 28 of the Manifesto that they would continue to carry out the people's business and uphold the law and all of that.

Now, while the Attorney General has taken all this time to make this amendment to the law, perhaps, he will explain what is the Government's position in regard to the Z vans and taxis. I understood the law to be that a taxi was entitled to use the lettering "Z". A number of what I call the Z vans, the Suzukis, which are licensed "Z", some 310, were licensed and have been in operation for some years now plying as taxis. All of a sudden, in September this year, as another irritation to these small businessmen, the Minister launched a campaign to have them come back into MTW complaining about the construction of the seats, how many they should carry and to have them relicensed.

They were said to be operating illegally, yet so far as I am aware - I have missed in this session of Parliament two days. If they came when I was out on those two days, too bad - I have not heard of any amendment to the Road Traffic Act or any amendment of the Regulations since the Z vans were first licensed that changed the law to render them illegal in September whereas for all the years before they were operating legally. *

They were licensed up front and allowed to operate for two, or three years. All of a sudden in September they are told they are operating illegally. How could they be operating illegally? What law was broken? They certainly were operating more legally than the Central Bank in allowing Government's overdraft to be at \$147 million. I want to hear something about that. The Government must explain that to the country.

The position is very clear. Three years you were * licensed under one Act and one set of regulations. Three years later, without any change of the Act or the regulations you are told that you are illegal. A lot of people's livelihoods were threatened! They were put- to great inconvenience.

I do not know what the explanation from the Government is in relation to the Z vans and the taxis that ply. For example, out there by Nelson or down in the lower *» end of Broad Street, or the Lower Green, but it seems to me there will have to be some further amendment to the law. If I go to Nelson and hire a taxi to take me to Neil's, that taxi cannot stop anywhere between Nelson and where I live and pick up anybody. He may charge me \$20, or \$15. The essence of being a taxi surely is that it is a whole hire. I hire the taxi. You license the Z vans the same way but they can stop on their route anywhere and pick up anybody for whom they have space. If that is not an anomaly in the law I do not know one when I see one. That is not a whole hire. I say the thing has to be straightened out because you have conflicts now within the taxi community.

I am not saying that anybody is breaking the law. I do not know. The taximen in town who run the cars...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He cannot set any traps for me. I know him and he knows me. *

He was born one day after me. I am April 28th and he is the 29th. So we know how to operate. He is a lot older than I am. I am saying, Sir, that there is this conflict within the taxi community where everybody is licensed as "Z" but the cars operate differently from the Z-vans. Now it needs j*. to be sorted out.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not know. I am asking for an explanation from the Attorney General. But that like so many things in the transportation system needs to be rationalized. Now the Labour Party's position is quite clear. I do not think that anybody should be in doubt from the way that we allowed the transportation system in this country to function particularly between 1976 and 1986. Between 1976 and 1986 a conscious decision was taken to have a private sector transportation operating alongside the public sector transportation. We recognized, and I think the present Government recognized, too, that transport is a service which has a social cost and a social benefit. The reasons that compelled us to nationalize the transport system were as valid then as they are now.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: CBC. That is what I said. The Party has never spoken about privatizing the Transport Board. There has been no change in the policy. It has been recognized, Sir, that in the interest of the greatest good the Government and the people themselves by way of subsidies should carry some of the costs of ensuring that there is public transportation available to the broad mass of people. But in every country there will be insufficient units of public transport available. In order to fill the gap and satisfy the need, you have to allow private operators through taxis, minibuses, Z-vans, and whatever to run alongside the public transportation system.

What any Government has to aim at in my submission is a proper harmonization of the two systems so that both can operate efficiently and effectively without the one doing financial violence to the other. That is what we have to aim at and there will be interest groups, lobbyists, and so on. We have to listen but we have to come up with a plan. I do not think it is all that difficult to devise a plan. We are talking about 166 square miles and 254,000 people as big as a county in England. We ought to be able to get the system to work. We are complicating it by a number of irrelevancies. I know admittedly there has been a great expansion in the number of privately owned motor vehicles, but we have a good network of roads generally speaking throughout Barbados. I am not talking about tenantry roads but generally main roads. I think it is a challenge for us now in this decade and hopefully within a matter of less than five years to try and work out some methodology where everybody can be satisfied. The public expects that in respect of public transport it will have to bear the cost of a subsidy. The only question there has ever been is the level of that subsidy and we have to make an attempt to bring it down.

I am not going to disclose at this stage the Labour Party's proposals on that. They will be seen shortly. The Minister of Health said that the election is in a matter of weeks away and in those weeks we will see them.

Sir, the Honourable Member for St. George South has drawn to my attention the definition of "maxi taxi". It is a motor vehicle constructed or adapted to carry more than five passengers but not more than ten passengers for hire or reward and kept at a garage. All I am saying is that we have to change the lettering because they all cannot be "Z". For example, (d) Authorize to convey passengers from the point of origin to one or more destinations but which may not pick up additional passengers or set down passengers between the point of origin and the destination along any bus route. This is a very wide definition. All I am saying is, Sir, that we may have to call them ZA, ZB, or something. Because I am telling you from experience that it was drawn to my attention by a gentleman who was here from American Home Insurance Company in Puerto Rico to do some investigation in respect of the Defence Force man, Mr. Lewis, from St. Peter who got killed sometime ago. I met him when he came to my chambers. He came one day and then he came back a second day. He asked me before how to get to me from the Hilton. I said, "Well, from the Hilton you get a taxi marked "Z" and come and he came". He called me the night before he left and said that he took a Z van and it was cheaper for him going back. I said, "True, that is a point". None of us here had thought about it before. The experience of a Puerto Rican drew it to my attention.

Now Mr. Speaker, Sir, I regret that the Minister of Transport and Works was not here today to pilot this Bill. But I predicted that last week and I told (he Minister of Health that he was not going to be here to deal with it. He had a good reason. During the Transport Board's strike last year all of them over there made the Minister of Transport and Works eat humble pie. They treated him badly and now they would want him to come in here to pilot this and use his oratorical skills. I know him too well. I told him last week that he was not coming for that nor the meeting Sunday night.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not going any further today. The Member for St. Lucy and I agreed on something coming into the House today. Timing is important. We agreed on something. I just wish to make it clear, Sir, to the public that we are glad that something has been done to legitimize the carrying of standing passengers in these minibuses. But we regret that it took so long to implement Promise No. 3 on Page 25 of the DLP Manifesto and it took such great human suffering to have these couple of lines introduced by way of amendment. 3.35 p.m.

So that no one misunderstands and misquotes, the policy of the Barbados Labour Party - and I am authorised to say this - is not to privatise, for now or ever, the public Transport Board. There are certain parastatals which are worthy of privatisation, and privatisation involves a number of different methodologies. Some of those which are

worthy of privatisation will be dealt with early next year when we form the Government of this country.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this Bill regarding the Road Traffic Act. Everyone in this country knows that the minibus is a life saver to the travelling public, because if we had to depend on public transport many people would never get their business done.

Sir, I heard earlier today that the private concessionaires of bygone years operated a very poor system. That is not completely true. I lived in both worlds and I am saying that during the time of the private concessionaires who operated in the interest of the travelling public - and I am going to call some routes - there was a far superior system of transport to what we have today.

These are the routes, Sir. Route 13, General bus, Silver Sands. We got one every half hour and we were certain about it. Today if you get a bus on Route 13 every hour and a half or two hours you are lucky. I see every morning crowds of people passing my door going eastward trying to scramble for the minibuses and Z vans. They cannot see a public transport bus. On top of that, Sir, those buses used to start at 5 o'clock in the morning and worked until midnight. Today they are non-existent.

Route 14, General bus, Top Rock, the same thing.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Route 15. I am going to call all of them. I know them better than you, I am older than you and I travelled by all of them. Route 15, Progressive, Golf Club Road. First class service. The Lincoln bus going Bush Hall and Bank Hall. The buses used to criss-cross, one going one way and the other one going the other way and they would meet somewhere around Bush Hall or on Station Hill. I used to travel by that bus every Saturday. The National bus going to Walmer Lodge, passing by you, Sir. The Central, going to Deacons Road, the Liberty going to Brittons Hill, the Yonkers going to Jackson, the General again going to Belleville. Those buses gave good service. The My Lord's Hill bus going to the Ivy and My Lord's Hill; first class service. The Diamond went to Boarded Hall and that was not always reliable. The Leeward going to St. Lucy was a good service. The Rocklyn.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Blades Hill was very poor. St. George was very poor. Route 10 to Bay field was very poor. Route 12 to the Crane and Sam Lord's Castle were more than poor. Today they are still more than poor. I am an

island traveller, \ travel around the Island and you should do a lot of that.

Mr. Speaker, when one will come in here and say that the concessionaires gave very poor service, that was far from true. The Government of the day took over the buses from the concessionaires over a cent. They wanted a fare increase of a cent and the then Premier said not over his dead body will bus fare rise and the concessionaires decided they were not going to run them any more. That is how the Government came to own the transport system. Today you will hear Members trying to give the impression that the best system we have ever had...

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Am I correct in understanding the Honourable Member to say that the late leader of the Barbados Labour Party, the late Sir Grantley Adams, said that he would not grant a cent increase? Over his dead body? And for that reason the concessionaires refused to run the buses?

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, I did not say so, but if he wants an explanation I will give him the explanation. The late leader said the reason he was not giving a cent was that they were making money and it would be unfair to the travelling public, the poor people of this country, to pay an increase in bus fare. He said it all over the country that all of them were making money. On Sunday night in Silver Sands a speaker from the Labour Party said that if you did not go to Silver Sands and put down a good speech you did not bother to go any place in Barbados at all. He said it at Silver Sands too.

Mr. Speaker, I really want to talk not on the minibuses, because I think that a lot has been said already on the minibuses and the Z vans. I want to say a bit on driver's licences and the sticker which goes on the windshield. I think it is high time that we do away with this clumsy book which after a few months in your possession it turns into a pack of cards. 3.45 p.m.

The Ministry of Transport should be looking at something more like an ID card. It's like an NDP card. This is something which would be handier. The disk which goes on the windshield should be done away with and translucent stickers placed at the rear number plates, like is done in Canada.

One, the Police would be able to spot quite early whether the licence has been paid or not. Under their present system, they have to deploy a lot of policemen and they will stop one out of every twelve or twenty-four which passes to check to see whether the licence is paid or not, and chances are that those who did not pay slip through the noose. These things I would like to see addressed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Another problem with the transport system is the persistent overspeeding and underspeeding on our highways. Many people seem to think that it is only the speedster who causes accidents. Many accidents are caused because of underspeeding because many drivers after driving for some considerable time behind a slow poke will decide "Well, it is time that I should overtake him and get on my way". And in trying to overtake, he runs into an oncoming vehicle or runs over the side of the road. I think that it is time that people are fined and fined heavily for driving too slow. There should be a minimum and a maximum limit. I think these are things that the Ministry of Transport should be looking at.

Now, the slow-moving vehicles, I think, Sir, I have spoken on that before and it seems to me that since we have all agreed on that during that debate, I am seeing more on the streets now. Up to this morning, there was a big earth-moving equipment on the ABC Highway, at rush hour, delaying traffic. We definitely have to do something about these things.

Then we have the problems of vendors at roundabouts. I am certain that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central would have seen these vendors like I do - vendors at the roundabouts and irresponsible drivers stopping to buy things from these vendors. This, Sir, is bad and these are things that the Ministry of Transport should be cleaning up. I don't think there is a law to stop anybody from selling at a roundabout or to stop a person from slowing down and buying something at a roundabout. Don't tell me that the police are that indifferent that they would see people breaking the law and would allow them to go by. We should be doing something about these things.

I remember one morning going to work. Luckily for me the driver in front of me ran into the stopped vehicle at a roundabout trying to buy a paper.

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Another thing I would like to talk about, Sir, is pollution, both noise pollution from these vehicles, exhaust noises and noises from the music boxes in these vehicles and air pollution. I think earlier in this session, I spoke about pollution. I even asked a parliamentary question about pollution and the answer I got was that there is legislation to control the air pollution. I think, Sir, that that is not good enough. It is high time that we should be not only teaching people how to protect the environment, how to protect the air we breathe, but we should invest some money in getting testing equipment to be certain that these vehicles meet the required standards for pure air. After all, we are living in a modern world and there is no point talking about the environment and going to these different conferences and yet when we get home we

do nothing about these things because, Sir, we can go without food and water for some time but not for too long without air. If you look around you will see many dying trees, especially the mahoganies, and I will risk to bet that the reason for this, and for the slow growth of these trees, is because of the heavy pollutants in our air, the heavy concentrations of carbon monoxide. These are things the Ministry of Transport should be looking at but yet you will come into the House, you will discuss these things and that's the end of that. Nothing is done.

Now, regarding the certification of driving instructors, I think that this is a good move, long over due and I hope that the inspectors or examiners of these driving instructors really do their job because I am ashamed to say that there are few drivers in Barbados who could really pass the drivers' test. When it comes to turning corners, I don't think two out of every ten Bajans would pass that test. They would all get a ticket for making an improper turn. It is common, Sir, for drivers to be parked on the curb and without even signalling they pull off. They are driving along and they feel like turning left or right, they just turn left or right and this I believe, Sir, is because the instruction given to them was very poor. You can only be a good teacher of a particular subject when you yourself know the subject thoroughly and I would hope that when this is put in place that the examiners are really examiners and worthy of the position which they will hold. I don't believe in passing the buck. I don't believe in favouritism. I believe in giving a man what is rightly his and if he is your friend and he can't drive, tell him: "A motor vehicle doesn't belong to you. Get a donkey cart."

Sir, I think that what has been meted out to the Z van operators was very bad. It is like promising me something if I would do a job for you and after I have finished the job, you just let me know that was all it was, a promise. It was unfair to make these people believe that they could register their vans and get a licence to carry X number of passengers only to find that later on down the road after the money has been paid up they are told that they can only carry three. I think they were shortchanged and this I cannot support.

I think that something should be done in order to help the taximen who are displaced from Trafalgar Square. Looking at those poor fellows in Trafalgar Square, I know it is going to create a lot of hardship on them because up to this time nobody is saying whether there would be adequate parking space provided some place in the city for them. In every country especially in the Caribbean there is adequate provision for taxis. 3.55 p.m.

I remember going to Aruba a few years ago and as small as Aruba is, there were adequate taxi stands. Here we have some trying to hold on, jostling for space around Nelson and others blocking off the lower end of Broad

Street in the Lower Green. It is time that we look at these small black people and treat them the way they deserve.

With these words, Sir, I will crave your indulgence.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of this legislation and to say that this particular piece of legislation is in keeping both with the promises of the Democratic Labour Party and is in fulfillment of its obligations to the people of Barbados particularly those who form the minibus owning class.

Some of the comments that have been made in the debate ranged pretty far and wide. A lot of them relate to people's personal perceptions about conditions of driving on our roads in Barbados. A lot of them relate to niggling concerns about the loopholes in legislation that presently exist. A lot of them relate to people's perceptions of the role of the minibus owning class and the persons who service the transport system in the private sector.

Perhaps the fact that people have such divergent views on this particular subject and on subjects relating to transport as a whole causes us to reflect on the existing arrangements that relate to the planning and execution of policy in relation to transport. Transport, as many Honourable Members have said, particularly the Honourable Leader of the Opposition from time to time, is an area of growth. We have to consider its potential.

It is not always easy for policy-makers to blend the needs of adjusting legislation from time to time as well as taking into consideration the changes that take place in the way people function in the private sector in relation to transport, the conflicts that were raised by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas between taxis that operate as whole hire as distinct from the Suzuki vans.

You look at the points raised by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East and you see that they come from a totally different angle. His perception of the transport system in Barbados is somewhat different to mine because he has had experiences that I have not had in relation to how transport has functioned in terms of its being solely owned by the private sector as distinct from the blend that we currently have.

The point is that perhaps, it is about time that we considered the potential growth of this area. It is important not only in relation to transport *per se*, getting school children to school, but the question of its impact on tourism, its impact on industry in getting workers to their work places, its impact on our morals in the society because of the levels of indiscipline that are presently being experienced in relation to some people who function as drivers of minibuses. I will get to that later. We should perhaps consider as an adjunct to or as a policy-making mechanism to assist the Minister of Transport and the

country as a whole in executing these policies, the establishment of some form of transport commission or some body of persons who will sit down to deal with areas of the development of transport in Barbados in a holistic way, taking into consideration how it impacts on all aspects of our national life. I think that sometimes very often when persons are in positions of policy-making they are not „, necessarily as easily accessible to ideas and views from all sectors as they should be. This is a common problem because of the nature of the work of Ministers of Government.

I believe that the present Minister of Transport shares my view. He is very accessible. The point is we are in a situation here where we are passing what might appear to be, for example, in the words of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central piecemeal legislation that you could bring down two weeks after you get into office. We „* have had experiences with rush legislation where a Minister of Finance went to tax mangoes and bananas in people's backyards because he was rushing and we had to restrain ourselves and restore some sanity to the situation.

You cannot rush on every point. There are occasions when you have to be careful in the manner in which you adjust legislation that it has the desired ripple effect through other pieces of legislation that may impact upon it. The fact » that it might have taken four years to come with legislation that makes certain adjustments that are necessary and nobody has doubted the necessity of the adjustments - In fact, they have said that they are fully in support of these adjustments. That is therefore the test of the efficacy of this legislation and the test of the ability of this Government to provide legislation that meets the needs of the Opposition forces, of the Government forces and of all the people in the country who are interested.

Aside.

*

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: It was only vegetables he was taxing? I thought it was fruit and fish. The point is that it has received widespread acceptance. However long it takes the fact is it is now going to form part of the Laws of Barbados and will be a necessary adjunct to the existing Laws.

Aside.

«(»

»

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is a point I want to come to. I know you are concerned about that and so am I. Everybody will be concerned. You cannot answer a question like that by talking. The present law does not provide for standing passengers. The people who went to Glendairy it did not have 7 passengers in it. There was a man who was just stopped on the road driving a minibus overloading by "98".

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: There were 40 school children in a Z van the other day. The people counted them. So if a man intends to break the law by allowing him to carry seven standing passengers, it is not necessarily going to solve the problem. If the level of conscience of people is such that the almighty dollar causes them to be reckless, they will do it whatever legislation you provide.

The fact that the law did not permit minibus drivers to carry seven persons standing, I suspect is not going to impact significantly anyway in relation to the behaviour of some minibus drivers in this country. All that is going to happen is now you are going to charge him for carrying more than seven. In fact, they might try to stick in "98" plus the seven that they are lawfully permitted to carry. This is the difficulty that I have with some of the positions that Members of the Opposition have come up with. 4.05 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central seems to want to blame us for the fact that some people are languishing at Her Majesty's pleasure because they overloaded minibuses. But if this legislation was on the statute books, I am certain those same people would presently be in Glendairy Prison because they have overloaded even beyond the seven.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The prosecution proved the case and, therefore, I assume there was that number of people. All I am saying is that I understand the concern that perhaps the penalties in the legislation might be excessive or they should be more prescribed in relation to the number of offences you can commit before you are imprisoned. That might be the answer. But this legislation is not going to solve that problem, or it is not going to solve the problem of minibus drivers in this country who are indifferent to legislation, who do not carry their social responsibility no matter what concessions you give them.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central knows that this Government gave them concessions. He credits himself with giving them. But he cannot tell this House that as a result of those concessions that the minibus fraternity in this country responded positively by way of a reduction in their lawlessness in relation to some offences. There was no commensurate reduction and he knows that as well as I do that sometimes when you go out of your way to offer concessions to people particularly in the private sector their response is simply to demand more and never to stop to ask themselves - what is my social obligation in this country? All of us in here know that and I am not saying anything that we do not already know. So that the criticisms that we are receiving are not in my view the kinds of criticisms that answer the problem in relation to the transport system in Barbados today.

Now one of the Honourable Members said that this debate boils down to what is Government's position in relation to small black businessmen. Well, this piece of legislation is not going to answer that question. You have to take the totality of concessions that have been awarded by this Government, the totality of attitudes that have been displayed by this Government in all areas of the private sector, and the totality of responses that the private sector has come up with. It is as simple as that. This legislation cannot be judged or cannot be the basis upon which one is going to judge whether this Government has responded positively to the needs of what he refers to as a small black businessman in Barbados. The cash turnover of persons operating minibuses in Barbados is substantial. Do you know that?

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, you are in business. You should be able to help me. I am asking for your help not your condemnation. You can be gracious sometimes. The cash turnover is substantial. The point is that at the end of the day people who are benefitting that way have to live up to their social responsibility. Successive Governments have permitted them to continue developing their businesses in response to the concessions that have been given.

The minibus drivers, magnets, owners or whatever you wish to call them in this country have therefore to respond positively to the concessions and privileges that have been given to them by being certainly more helpful to the elderly and young people in the community and responding to peoples' views about their attitudes towards the young and by being more helpful to working citizens. I understand that a recent incident took place where a headmaster of a school told the students to avoid travelling on a particular minibus and the minibus driver got out of his bus one evening and went into the headmaster's office to accost him for that. I do not know who he is. I only heard that today. I know nothing else about it. But I understand the person who told me is reliable and I know it to be true because that person has an intimate knowledge of it.

In Barbados you only have to travel in the area of Collymore Rock in the evening and you can see lawlessness exhibited by minibus drivers. The reaction of one of the owners of these minibuses — I have heard one of them on the radio - is that he does not really want his minibus to be driven like that. His response when people were saying, "Look, these minibus drivers are playing the fool" was: "Well, who wants their drivers to be charged? Who wants their minibus to be recklessly driven?" Well, the person goes on to say, "What are you going to do as an owner of a minibus to ensure that your drivers are conforming to the law and that they have positive social attitudes when they are dealing with the public, etcetera?" He could not answer that question. It had not crossed his mind because what he

had basically done was to let loose a minibus on the streets of Barbados with a man who had no idea of his social responsibilities to this country, whose education may not be as great as his, and he had been terrorizing the streets daily. The owner's reaction to that is basically that he does not really want that to happen but that is part of the business scenario in which one functions. That is the kind of thing that privatization and a lawless private sector generate in this country.

Now it is not to say that there is not lawlessness too at times in other areas of the country even in state corporations. Sometimes when I drive behind Transport Board buses I see the way school children are forced inside, but it is not probably the fault of the driver. One evening I was driving behind one going towards Woodbourne and a bus window dropped out because these young people were forced against the window. The bus had to stop and one of the children nearly went through the window.

The other point is that there has been talk about privatization. I am glad that the Barbados Labour Party has indicated firmly that it is against privatization of the Transport Board. The Labour Party believes that constituency represents the rural sector although there is not much evidence to bear that assertion. Therefore, in that respect, they like me would be concerned that persons in my constituency would not come off with a good deal if the transport system in this country was privatized. They may not have the same sincerity of view as I have about my constituency, but I am certain that they probably approach the issue from that angle. The point is as it stands now the Transport Board is providing inadequate transport services in parts of the rural sectors as St. Joseph, St. Andrew, St. John, and St. Philip. As inadequate as it is, there are some people who say that it is better than elsewhere. But that perhaps is not good enough because we expect the best for our people. The point is that I accept that in my constituency...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, that is what I am saying. I am also saying that in relation to my constituents I am concerned that there are times of the year particularly when the school children are out - when school children are not going to school, it is a relief to people living in the rural sector. It is bliss because they can get up at a reasonable hour and get to work comfortably. When they are competing with the school children, it is a different thing. Now that may tell us a story. That may tell us that the transport planning authorities perhaps have to look at another way of getting school children to school so as not to impact adversely on the Transport Board's provision of services. Perhaps if there was some way that getting school children to school could be contracted out, well that might be one of the answers.

Years ago there was a minibus owner from Top Rock - I do not remember his name - who used to transport boys to Lodge School everyday. He owned a couple of minibuses. He had a gas station in Top Rock and they used to meet in Collymore Rock. This bus used to take them straight up to St. John.

Perhaps we should look at ways and means of helping the private sector to be more involved in transporting school children so as not to impact adversely on the working population. But I am still making a call in any event in my constituency for an improved transport system. I still make that call. There are parts of St. John particularly Glenburnie where, if a bus driver at his own whim decides not to go down that hill, the bus simply does not go down the hill and people are dropped at the top of the hill and must walk down. There are other parts of St. John, for example Guinea and Rosegate, where the bus service does not pass. People have to get off at the cross roads in Massiah Street and walk down that road.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, I am very grateful to you for that. Many years ago the previous representative for St. John raised this issue and I am very concerned. Fortunately, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West passes through there and drops a few people to work on mornings so as to save them from having to walk out to the cross roads. That is about the only good turn he has done to St. John for a long time. 4.15p.m.

The point is, however, that the bus service in that area needs to be addressed, and I am concerned that people living in the rural sections of Barbados - St. Joseph, St. Andrew, St. John, parts of St. Philip - have valid complaints about the bus service, the public transport system as it is. What concerns them is that they see Transport Board buses in some of the St. Michael areas travelling with very low capacity. That is a valid concern and it is one that we have to explain to them.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You have to pass through your constituency to get to the Ivy, so I would not attack your constituency. If you want to do that you will have to attack them yourself.

All in all, Sir, I believe, as I said in the beginning, that much of the problems in relation to the transport system in Barbados could be adequately addressed and solved if, for example, a transport commission were established of people from all sectors of the society to see not only how best we can plan the transport system in relation to bus service, but also taxis and all other areas, the question of licensing,

certification and all of the other areas that presently impinge upon the lives of citizens on a daily basis.

With those words, Sir, I am going to give my support, like all Members of the House, to this piece of legislation and I am going to make an appeal today to the owners and drivers of minibuses to accept that this Government has responded in their time of need by providing this legislation, and to accept that in response to the concessions that we have given them, to the support we have given them, even if critical at times, and to accept that with all of those privileges or rights, whatever you want to call them, they have commensurate responsibilities in this society. That this concept of the minibus culture developing, this concept of lawlessness between half an hour every morning going to school and half an hour coming back is not doing our young people and the elderly of this country, and also people who are coming home from work on evenings and have to jostle in this kind of subculture, the world of good and that they have a responsibility as citizens to react to these concessions, to react to the positive nature of Government's attitude towards them by being good citizens and by being responsible socially, and by understanding that the rights that they have carry certain heavy responsibilities which they must discharge. Even though this legislation may not stop more of them from going to Glendairy Prison for infractions of the law, what it means is that we have made it easier for them to ply their trade in an area of very stiff competition.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that one has the opportunity in this House to agree with at least one thing said by the Honourable Member for St. John, but I really would like to add my support to the sensible and constructive suggestion put, that Barbados could benefit from having a national commission on transportation, a commission that would embrace both private and public sector involvement and inputs, and whose broad terms of reference obviously would be to see to the rational development of the transport system of this country and the rationalisation of the relationship between the public sector and the private sector in what we all agree is a very essential public service.

I think, Sir, that this will take some of the rancour out of the debate...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not fair that the Honourable Member cannot be heard in this Chamber, having been given the right to speak. I have already said that Asides should be very low. I do not think I can make any greater plea than that.

Mr. O.S. ARTHUR: ...but I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the country must envision a situation in which there has to be an expansion of the private sector involvement in the transport system. That has to be as much rationalised in the future as the role of the public sector part of the system. It is in that capacity that one welcomes the only constructive contribution by the Honourable Member for St. John since he came into this House in 1987.

He almost succeeded in reducing the force of his contribution this afternoon by criticising the Member for St. Michael South Central for not ensuring that reduction in the licence fees led to a reduction in the level of lawlessness. I do not know how he could have expected the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to ensure that the reduction in the licence fees should lead to a reduction in the level of lawlessness by minibus operators. He said that this legislation does not address the problems of the small businessman, and it was not intended to, and we can agree that the Democratic Labour Party never brings legislation...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member did well up to the point at which he has started to misquote me. All I am saying is that this legislation must not be taken alone as an indication of the Democratic Labour Party's support for the small business sector. I did not say that this legislation itself is not part of that strategy for the small business sector. He should not put words in my mouth. He knows that this is the party that has always been committed to the small business class in this country.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Yes, Sir. His most recent contribution to the debate that the Democratic Labour Party was the only party that is concerned for the small man leaves one necessarily to ask the question, where were the small men when the St. John Development Plan was being prepared? From what one was told, the St. John Development Plan was prepared by a white plantation owner, a white tourist operator, a land valuer and a former Prime Minister. One would think that if the Democratic Labour Party is so concerned about the small black man, if they had the opportunity to prepare a St. John Development Plan, at least the opportunity would have been grasped to involve the small black people in St. John in the preparation of the St. John Development Plan, but 50% of that plan was in fact developed, as we understand it and as they have confessed, by white businessmen.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member may be inadvertently misleading the House. The Labour Party has accused us of being racist, now he is accusing us of having white people write our development plan. We do not know what to do, Sir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am sure, Sir, that one of these days the Member for St. John, on reflection, will feel embarrassed to know that two white men and a land

surveyor were the principal architects of the St. John Development Plan, and he will go back and involve the small black people of St. John in a real development plan in the future.

He also said that there is a very poor transport system in St. John, which is a reflection which I thought... 4.25 p.m.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Point of order. I do not understand why the Honourable Member is putting words in my mouth. I said the system is inadequate. To say that I said it is poor is wrong. It is meeting a need but it is inadequate. It is as simple as that. But that does not mean it is poor. If I used the word 'poor' it would mean that the transport system is not serving any need. I used the word 'inadequate'.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Yes, Sir. He said 'poor' but if we allow 'inadequate', the force of my argument still holds. It is a reflection on the quality and the level of his representation on behalf of the people of St. John. But all that aside, Sir, I think the essential point that we can take is his very valuable and his very constructive contribution that Barbados needs a national transport commission. Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe that this present debate is highlighting...

Mr. SPEAKER: It appears to me as if Members believe I have two sets of Standing Orders. There is only one Order and that is that Members be silent while others are speaking.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Member for St. Lucy, Sir, is leading the racket as usual, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rules of the House clearly say that the House will deal with any Member when invited by me to do so.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate, illustrates the way in which the practice of interest group politics *per se* can lead to unnecessary difficulties in the running of the affairs of a country. The Democratic Labour Party in its last national campaign, in my humble submission, set out to purchase the support of important interest groups in this country by the provision of blandishments, even if those blandishments could not have been put into effect.

In 1986, the Democratic Labour Party set out to purchase the support of the private sector at all costs, even to the extent, Mr. Speaker, of putting together economic proposals which in their heart of hearts the broad mass of the Democratic Labour Party did not support but it was important to them at that time to try to secure the support of the private sector as a whole and we must not be surprised today, Sir, if there is a falling out between the private sector

and the Democratic Labour Party because the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, was not at all intent on honouring the spirit of those proposals. What was important at the time was that the proposals could help to secure an electoral victory.

In a similar sense, Mr. Speaker, it was important to the purposes of the Democratic Labour Party in 1986 to secure the support of the minibuses operators in this country because they understood clearly that the minibus operators had intimate contact with a large mass of Barbadians and that a bad propaganda put against the Barbados Labour Party by minibus operators would be instrumental in bringing about in part a change of government and hence, these kinds of proposals were put. Now, there was never a case substantiated that the minibus operators were facing a financial burden. In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, when the late Prime Minister Tom Adams set the fees on minibuses it was in relation to what the minibus operators themselves were saying that they were earning per day, when the Government asked them to provide a service during Carifesta, and those fees were set objectively by the former Prime Minister in relation to what the minibus operators themselves said. It was on their own assessment; but without any investigation as to whether there was a financial burden or not the Democratic Labour Party said: "Let us try to get the support of the minibus operators of Barbados by promising to cut their fees by 50%". And, in a similar vein, Sir, although there were a lot of technical considerations raised then about the safety involved on the part of the minibus people being able to carry standing passengers, that was one of the considerations raised. The Democratic Labour Party went ahead and promised to allow minibuses to carry a number of standing passengers.

I have to say that the minibus operators of St. Peter, in particular, have had to suffer from taking the Democratic Labour Party at its word. The Member for St. Lucy would have seen that photograph, Sir, of a gentleman whose name I shall not call, on Sunday. But, he knows him well because that gentleman worked very hard in the 1984 bye-elections. He was not driving for me. He was working as a driver and it was as sad a thing to my eyes as I am sure it was to the eyes of the Member for St. Lucy to see that gentleman being escorted on his way to prison after he had done so much hard work in the bye-elections in St. Peter and in 1986.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is sailing into some very dangerous waters, I submit, Sir. The Honourable Member seems to be suggesting that if anyone works for the political party that becomes the Government that that person can break the law with impunity. The Honourable Member is heading down a very strange path and I draw it to your Honour's attention, Sir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, one does not want to condone lawlessness in this society but the DLP seems not to understand what is meant by matters of urgent public importance. For four years, there has been a promise outstanding to the minibuses operators written into a manifesto to which a Caribbean statesman signed his name by way of a pledge that "I am commanded to honour this pledge to you, the minibuses operators, that we as a Government are going to allow you to carry standing passengers." And we say, Sir, that that is the context within which we on the Opposition side must castigate Government in this particular matter, that for four years - and that's the point, Sir - the opportunity was missed in order to redress this problem. You did not have to change a whole Act in order to make the amendment. If the Government was serious about the matter it could have gotten that one amendment alone.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading this House, Sir. Again he is giving the impression that the DLP is committing some kind of crime when in fact we are fulfilling a manifesto promise. The Honourable Member's party promised to deal with the 1974 constitutional amendments and they went for ten years, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: From the point of order, the point of order has been exceeded.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the real point I am trying to make is that we must not let the Government put the false argument, in my view, that it had to bring an entire and vast change in the legislation in order to accommodate one amendment which would have given effect to their manifesto pledge and the argument is, Sir, that 'the amendment that would have given effect to the pledge is so simple that it did not have to take four and one-half years and four and one-half lines to come to this House.

The additional point, Sir, is that while the DLP was tarrying on the point, people were going to prison for taking the Democratic Labour Party at its word.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member cannot make the statement that people went to prison for taking the DLP at its word. That is blatantly...that is not only untrue, it is false.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I may say they did not go to prison and perhaps that is the additional point that I really want to make. I am not about to encourage lawlessness but I believe that we have to find a way of suitably punishing people in Barbados where they do things that in my view do not merit being sent to prison. For example, Sir, the sending of people to prison for not paying child maintenance. This is not to condone but we must stop sending people to prison for that kind of thing. Also, it would be better in my view

rather than to send a person to prison for the non-payment of child maintenance to put that person in a position where he could earn an income and be able to maintain the child. 4.35 p.m.

I also feel that in areas such as this that in sending people to prison...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. The Honourable Member might not be aware that it was a Divisional Court that refused the appeal that caused the man to go to prison. We cannot be criticising it. There are two courts. The weight of the evidence and the circumstances must have warranted some unusual activity. They were two High Court judges.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is I would rather prefer to see very stiff fines and increasing fines being charged for offences like these, making them do community service. I think this kind of offence, in my assessment - I could be wrong - does not merit an imprisonment. We could even earmark some of the fines for victims of traffic accidents caused by this type of person so that in the event the minibuses men themselves cause accidents and they are victims they could at least know that there will be some compensation. Increase the fines and stiffen the fines. Make them do community service, and take the large fines that we should impose and put them into a fund so that the victims of recklessness can have some form of compensation. What is the point of sending some of them to prison? I am not a lawyer and if the continuous defence of the court is that it is an offence which ought to attract imprisonment, then let it be. My own view is that matters like these do not merit sending people to prison.

The essential point still remains. My colleague, the Honourable Member from St. Thomas touched on it that there is really a mood of cynicism that has been inspired precisely by things like this. The Democratic Labour Party may want to tie up itself in all kinds of legalities. It will succeed in tying up itself in all kinds of legalities.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The cynicism in this country started with the callousness of the Barbados Labour Party. Do not put it on the Democratic Labour Party. What cynicism started with whom? Not bring a resolution or a bill can cause cynicism? Deal with the ten years of the wickedness of the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, that has been the most blatant confession ever yet by a member of the Democratic Labour Party that there is cynicism in the country and that there is cynicism of this Government because he just said it started with the Barbados Labour Party.

Hon. B. M. TATTT: On a point of order, Sir. When the Barbados Labour Party politicians do the things they are doing I say they are cynics. That is what I am saying that the Barbados Labour Party politicians are cynics. There is cynicism in the ranks of the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am awaiting your ruling on whether that was a point of order or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Today we had many points that were not points of order. I thought the debate has been going reasonably well so I have no intention to rule on them. What I would like to say is that the simple matter about points of order is that a member simply gets up and points to the Standing Order which has been breached and then makes his submission. I have in some way made it much more liberal by not asking Members to say which Standing Order and then make their submission. It is clear that the submission must be very precise. I think we develop conventions in this Parliament which I myself will be happy to abide with provided they do not go too far outside of those rules.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am very grateful for the sharp stricture you have made of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West of taking advantage of your wide and handsome approach to the running of the affairs of the House.

The point, Sir, is this, that the public of Barbados is increasingly of the view that politicians cannot be taken at their word. It is in matters like these that position has been fostered when a Government says they are going to give the minibus a transport facility similar to that at Fairchild Street and then does not do it. There is also cynicism, Sir, particularly when some politicians take the words of other politicians, completely misrepresent them, and then try to build a whole national campaign of outrage on something that another politician did not say. If I may give a simple example, Sir, a politician said that he had a document in which reference was made to an IMF Report...

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, I have given room. The Honourable Member knows what I am saying.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: It is being very commonly discussed on the minibuses of Barbados that a statement to the effect that a person possesses a document in which reference is made to an IMF Report can be taken to mean that the person...

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already tried to help the Honourable Member from not going down that road. Let us stay with the taxis.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Yes, Sir. I am staying within the contents of the debate and limiting it to what is going on in

the minibuses in Barbados at this present time. That is the essential point.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: It is the truth. We have also in this debate...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has not concluded his speech.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: We have also in this debate, Mr. Speaker, tried to call attention to what is perceived as a substantial difference in policy position of the Democratic Labour Party as regards the role of the minibus men and the ZM operators in the transport system of this country. There seem to be one policy as articulated by the Minister of Transport and Works and another policy that the rest of the Democratic Labour Party would want to convince the rest of the country is their policy.

I want to say to the House that those elements of the transport system that fall outside the Transport Board have never been subject to more harassment and more irritation and have never been exposed to more policy confusion than there has been within the last few weeks.

We have had situations in which draconian measures have been instituted to deal with problems which on the face of it would seem to be small problems. For example, the question of parking on property belonging to the Barbados National Bank. The response of the Bank in some respects is so draconian that one wonders if there is a war *> between the Government and the operators concerned. 4.45 p.m.

Surely, Sir, the Government could find more amicable ways of resolving those kinds of issues. The Government may not want to agree, but it is a matter of fact that the manner in which the licensing and the revoking of peoples' licences have been handled suggests a Government that is at odds with itself and a Government that is prepared to » allow people to do one thing at one minute within the law » and the second minute, Sir, tell them that what they had allowed as being legal a short while ago is no longer. That, Sir, is simply no way by which a country should be run. We are saying that the Democratic Labour Party ought not to be denying that the method in which its policy in relation to those elements of the transport system which fall outside of „ the Transport Board is being executed. It would seem to be a policy that is designed to cause as much irritation as possible, to lead to as much confrontation as possible as if there is indeed within the Democratic Labour Party a wish

to run the small and the private sector part of the transport system out of business entirely.

I think that the Government in this debate has a responsibility and an opportunity to truly say where it stands. Is the Democratic Labour Party as a totality in support of the draconian efforts that have been made in its name to deal with what to all intent and purpose, Sir, are very small problems? People parked on BNB land and all kinds of confrontations had to emerge as a result of it, Sir. That is simply not the way, Sir. You call back in people to revoke their licences after licences had been given under one condition. That simply cannot be the way.

Therefore, we want to hear the Government. We really, Mr. Speaker, want to hear the Government speak to this particular matter because it is leading to tremendous cynicism in the country. The Member for St. Michael South should be aware that the campaign by these people who have been subjected to this harassment and this irritation have in point of fact taken up a campaign in his own constituency complaining against the confusion in Government's operations and relationship with them. We wonder, Sir, if he has a vested interest in seeing that the confusion persist or whether he as the leader of the party and the Prime Minister of the country wants to see the fostering and flowering of an amicable relationship between his Government, Sir, and those small black businessmen who constitute operators in that section of the economy and for whom he would want us to believe that he wants to secure some economic justice. They are operating in his constituency, Sir, and canvassing against him in public and complaining about confusion in Government. They are making him the target, Sir, of their justifiable criticism of Government which is doing one thing after it has led them to believe something else, Sir.

So that as regards to this particular legislation, Sir, my own position is that the amendment to give effect to Government's promise to allow minibuses to carry standing passengers is so simple that it could have been brought as an amendment itself to the existing legislation in a short space of time and that there is no reason that can explain why an amendment that is so simple should have taken a Government four and a half years to give effect to same. That is our point of view. You did not have to bring a large number of different amendments and changes to the law in order to deal with one. The point being that the one that you postponed dealing with was one that was addressed as a policy matter in your Manifesto. If you were truly serious about dealing with what is contained in your Manifesto as a matter of a social contract to which a Caribbean statesman appended his signature, Sir, then the Government would have long ago brought down to the House the four and a half lines, as they have brought so many amending Acts. The four and a half lines, Sir, could have come four years ago. The House would have been happy then to accommodate it, Sir, and the Government could have

thereafter brought other aspects to the change in the Road Traffic legislation as it saw fit.

But surely, Sir, the Government will agree that some of its reasoning on this particular matter is a little bit threadbare as though you had to change the whole world in order to correct a small problem in a village. That is what the Government is telling the House, that in order to deal with one problem you have to solve all others. We are being asked in this House to accept that kind of shallow explanation from Government as to why it found it impossible to bring to this House four and a half lines to give effect to an amendment, Sir, that would have captured the concerns expressed.

I am obliged to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would merely wish to speak very briefly in this debate and I would really like to put what has been said so far into some kind of perspective. There has been some statement that cynicism pervades the political environment. I know at no time, Sir, in the history of politics when cynicism about politics and about politicians has not been the dominant characteristic or feature. The opinion in which certain politicians and some political parties are held from time to time have tended to rate very low, Sir, and that is so even in Barbados where recent polls have indicated that the standing of certain parties and certain politicians is very low indeed. Perhaps nothing highlights the cynicism or strengthens that perception of cynicism than what, Sir, has happened so far during this particular debate.

The argument as I understand it is that this is a very simple matter. It is of something like four and a half lines and it has taken four and a half years and now I suppose we must be approaching almost four and a half hours of debate in this Honourable Chamber on a matter in which there is agreement on all sides. I have not heard anyone who said that they are going to vote against this particular measure so far.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I heard something about bad manners on your part. I did not hear about any voting against anything. But Sir, the minibuses have been with us for a very long time. They did not start during the time of the Democratic Labour Party. The minibuses have been part of the transportation system for many years long before the Democratic Labour Party assumed office for a second time in 1986. No other political party has sought to provide the law whereby a certain number of standing passengers could be accommodated in those buses. It is the Democratic Labour Party that in accordance with a promise made is now fulfilling that promise. It seems, Sir, that the two

Oppositions combined in their dual or composite cynicism seem to be annoyed and vexed because the Democratic Labour Party is bringing this matter and fulfilling its promise. That is all that we are doing here, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I want to make it clear, Sir, that I spoke in this debate. I am the one who spoke about cynicism. I am not at all annoyed or upset, Sir. The public out there is laughing at the Government, as the Honourable Minister of Health said, just weeks before the election coming with this little sop now. They are laughing at them. They do not understand. 4.55 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Minister of Health never said anything about anybody laughing at the Government.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Before lunch, Sir, he said that the election is only a few weeks away. The Honourable Minister of Trade remembered it when I spoke about it in my speech.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, having not recalled at all having said that, I would like the record to be sought in due course so we can see that.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Oh! Some weeks. Do you hear the difference, Sir? When the Honourable Member for Christ Church West says anything these days I have to be very careful, but he seems even in this to be better at it than the Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is a time of free season and free talk, so anybody on either side can talk about election date, whether it is weeks or whatever it is. The important word will come from your humble servant, Sir. That is the important word. Perhaps I will name that date when the Leader of that minority Opposition over there, who has to make himself right with the public of Barbados, who still has to do the honourable thing, as soon as he is ready to say what were the results of the poll in St. Michael South Central...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I will go down another road, Sir. As soon as that Leader over there, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, may be able to name a Deputy Leader of his party, maybe that will be the time to call the elections. I have been giving them time, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not permit shouting across the Chamber.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: There should be no misunderstanding of what is actually happening here today, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. Since you have allowed some freedom to the Prime Minister to inveigh against the Labour Party, I wish to say that the Deputy Leader of the Barbados Labour Party has been speaking at platforms ah¹ across this country for the past year, Sir. The Deputy Prime Minister of Barbados is held in such high esteem by his own party as not to be able to speak at their recent public meeting.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The public of Barbados will be glad to hear that. Sir, there are some simple facts about this matter. Let me indicate them once again, lest in the humour of the debate they may have been missed.

The minibuses have been around for a long time. The Barbados Labour Party never sought to accommodate them by providing a certain number of passengers as standing passengers on those buses. It is the Democratic Labour Party, in the interest of the travelling public- and in the interest of the operators of those minibuses, which has promised to provide a certain number of standing passengers for the minibuses, and we have come to fulfil that promise. That is not political cynicism, Sir, it is faithfulness towards the promises that are made and we are fulfilling that within the framework of the mandate and the time given to the Democratic Labour Party to deal with its Manifesto promises.

I simply wanted to make that point, Sir.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I heard the Member for St Peter, Sir. I found it difficult to distinguish between what was the main speech and what were the Asides, but somewhere during the course of his address he mentioned something about support for a national transport commission. I heard him say that he supported that particular proposal as put forward by the Member for St. John, and the NDP has it in their Manifesto also.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: They all have it in their Manifestoes, they all have it where they want to have it. I would like to say they may have to rewrite those Manifestoes. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must interrupt for the benefit of this Chamber. It is clear to me that some Members seem not either to know the rules or have studied the rules or have not even paid attention to some of the books available for

good parliamentary procedure. I have been trying my best at all times to help Members.

It is certainly unbecoming for a person to be talking and another person shouting across to another person. It is not a good example for Parliament. I will give room to make little interventions but not persistent so as to interrupt another Member. I would just appeal to Members to speak in undertones. The word is "undertones" - stick it in your head. Get a dictionary and see if you don't know what it means and then apply it.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, when we approach matters we try and certainly I try to approach them in a very studied way and I believe that the time has in fact come when there should be an authoritative study of the public transportation sector in this country. We have been discussing for quite some time now with the European Development Fund a proposal of the Government of Barbados for the funding of such a study of the transportation sector and agreement has almost been reached on that particular matter. It is proceeding very satisfactorily and we have sought funding from the European Development Fund for the initiation of a public transport sector study which will include in its terms of reference the entire public transport sector including the role of the Transport Board and its operations, the minibuses, all of those vehicles which provide services for the travelling public of Barbados. I believe that when this study is completed that there will be recommendations and options available which the Democratic Labour Party Government as the Government of the day will be in a position to take some decisions on.

I think this should be noted, Sir, because we believe that the role of the public and private sector in the provision of public transport service is one that is not only worthy of study but it is important that such a study be carried out. I have said on many occasions, Sir, that we run a mixed system in Barbados. Our economy is a mixed economy and there is absolutely no reason why within the framework of public transport services being provided by a government agency such as the Transport Board they cannot and should not be a continuing role for the private sector in transportation as evidenced by the operation of minibuses or other kinds of private transportation but within the framework of understood rules and regulations. I think this is a fair system. We expect that the parameters of this can be studied and that we can have some options as to where the line should be drawn and so on but believe that that broad framework should be it.

For now, Sir, the Democratic Labour Party Government fulfills its promise that there should be a certain number of standing passengers in those minibuses so that their particular operations can be continued within that kind of framework.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is about all that I wish to say. I would merely like to indicate in closing that over here we have not sent anybody to prison. I want to make that clear. That is not the function of a political party or of a government in that particular matter.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said during this debate on this Bill and sometimes I wondered if we were still talking about minibuses but understanding you well, Sir, I knew that we had to be because you wouldn't let people wander too far away from the bus stand. There are certain aspects of the whole question that have not been really addressed and I thought that though a lot was said that I would still put in my two-cents worth as far as these other areas are concerned. We have to recognize something up front though, Sir. No matter how much the Members on that side try to wish away the fact that it took them over four years to come up with something that could have been done within the first year that they were in office, it could have been done if they were really serious about the plight of these small business people. No matter how much they try to wish that away; no matter what weak arguments the Honourable Prime Minister will come up with which sound very similar to the weak argument that the Honourable Member for St. John came up with, we still know that this is a quick-fix situation coming up to election. But if that is so, that is so. The point is that when you keep shouting that the minibus people are happy about it - of course they are happy. They would have been happier if you did it four years ago and they would be happy if you do it today because it is something that you promised.

It is an interesting thing that one Member talks about the level of cynicism *vis-a-vis* politicians and the Honourable Member for St. John in particular and to some extent the Honourable Prime Minister got up and showed exactly why there is such a high level of cynicism abroad with regard to politicians. Sir, the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto in the 1986 elections, at page 25, you had a whole section - agriculture, health, education and you had a section on minibus operators. That is how much seriousness you said you had attached to the minibus operators. You went on to talk about the DLP "recognising that minibuses had developed into an important and essential part of the public transportation services". That was highlighted and then you went on to talk about the fiscal assistance you would give - the licence reduction and so on; which did come to pass and you went on to give the impression... And, I urge you, although, Sir, I know you have thrown away yours. The Honourable Prime Minister has thrown away his manifesto. I can lend him one. I still have a copy. I urge you to read it and tell me if you were a minibus operator if it didn't imply that as soon as possible after attaining office you would provide for the seven standing passengers. For us to come in here today and try to fool ourselves or anybody else that that was not implied, I don't know what you can call that, Sir, except encouraging a rise

in the level of cynicism that the Honourable Prime Minister and the Honourable Member for St Peter spoke of and with which I agree. Let me make it clear...

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I can make it clearer than the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, Sir. I have no problem with that...

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not heard anybody but yourself. So let's get on with it.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Sir, I am just making a point that I am able to make things clearer than the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. That's all I am telling you, Sir, because I heard him on Sunday night.

Mr. SPEAKER: He hasn't spoken yet so you had better wait until he does.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I know he hasn't spoken yet but you and I know him and I know I can make things clearer than he can - stammering and stuttering all Sunday night. Poor fellow. Let me make this clear also, Sir, because the Honourable Prime Minister made the point...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. We heard the two Members at St. Lucy on Sunday night and there was none of what he just said. As a matter of fact he was acclaimed wide and far by the 10,000 people in the square - eleven thousand people, who said that he was good. So don't let him mislead the House, Sir.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Apart from the fact that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West likes to trivialise some very serious matters sometimes we can always depend on him to be like a court jester to inject a little humour into some serious debates sometimes. But the whole Sunday night the Honourable Member for St. Michael West spent a lot of time on garbage dumps, so I wouldn't be surprised that he would come and talk garbage anytime. 5.15 p.m.

I touch on the whole question too of the minibuses allowing passengers to stand. We all know the buses that most of the minibus operators use today - they were using them in 1986 for that matter - are designed to carry standing passengers. If Honourable Members on that side want to claim they do not know, then they are as guilty of what the Honourable Member for St. Michael West accused the Honourable Member for South Central and that is that they do not know anything about the public transportation. They never had to travel on them.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East when he got up and spoke he seemed to have been confused with two things. One was, he spoke about these vehicles not being designed to carry more than a certain amount of passengers. He never said what that amount was. Somewhere along the line he confused me as though the buses were not designed to carry any more passengers standing. The point is he knows as well as I. do that the buses are designed for standing passengers. They have the rails along the top to hold on to. There is enough space along the walkway for standing passengers, as much as the Transport Board buses. We know the Transport Board has minibuses and people stand in them. The buses are of the same design.

The other point that the Honourable Member seemed to be confused about is when he started trying to confuse the question of the fiscal arrangement with the minibus people with any other arrangements. He made it sound as though that was so simple to put in place, a question where one has to look at the implications in terms of Government's revenue and other implications. He made that sound as though that was so simple but it was so difficult to allow seven people to stand up in the bus where it does not interfere with anything else at all and the bus is already designed for that anyhow.

Let us move on, Sir. I am not one of those persons who is going to stand up in here and for cheap political gain allow the minibus operators to believe that the National Democratic Party supports them come what may. That is not true. The Leader of the Opposition did not say otherwise either.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I know you do not hear the asides Sir, but sometimes the Honourable Member for St. Michael West gets a little loud. I have probably better hearing than you.

Sir, to get back to the more serious point. Unlike the Honourable Member for St. Peter I do not agree with much that the Honourable Member for St. John ever says because he never says anything much anyhow. But I have to agree with him that we have to let persons like the minibus operators, like the Z van drivers, like the snow-cone vendors if you want to get ridiculous, like the lawyers, like any particular group understand that they have to work within what is decent.

I would send out a cautionary note. Politicians always remind me of those little stuff dolls at the circus that people throw balls at. They are always up there to be tossed at. We have to let other groups understand that if they are wrong we have to have the political will to tell them they are wrong. Some people get concerned. I know the Honourable Member for St. Lucy was saying earlier *sotto voce* that you

cannot put too much licks in the minibuses because this is the time they are looking for votes. I do not care about that part. I thought I heard him saying that *sotto voce*.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Even if it were said in a *sotto voce* manner, and it was not, I do not think the Honourable Member could bring it into a debate. I categorically deny that I ever made such a statement. The Honourable Member should withdraw the remark.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you will find that while the minibus provides a very valuable...

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am quite serious about this. I know that you are serious also. The Honourable Member is indicating that I have said that one should not put too much licks in the minibuses because it is time for voting. I never said any such thing. I have not spoken in here on the debate. He is misleading this Honourable Chamber. I think that those remarks should be struck from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Member has answered that remark by denying the remark. Therefore it counterbalances the remark in the sense that the Honourable Member is saying he denies it. Persistence with that approach will force me to get the accuracy of the statements.

The Honourable Member said it was an aside. What is more difficult about it is that if he said it was made in an aside I would not have heard it neither would it have been recorded. The only action I can take is to have the Honourable Member deny it

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes very disheartening like today when I heard the Honourable Member for St. John in his contribution talking about something that was in the Manifesto and the fact that now they were bringing in this thing, though it was four and a half years late, that was keeping a promise. The same Honourable Member has often said that he had nothing to do with the Manifesto because he was not around at the time and was not part of it. Now he comes in here today and tells you it is a promise that is being kept. This is the kind of thing that causes people to be as cynical as they are. Yes, it is true. I agree with the Honourable Prime Minister that there is a lot of cynicism around as far as politicians are concerned. I would be the first to agree with him on that.

Let me go on with the negative aspects of the minibuses. Though we agree, Sir, all of us must agree, that they play a very vital role in terms of providing a much needed service for the man on the street, we must also remind them that they must also take into consideration those same people for whom they provide this service, their

safety and the way they interact with the rest of us who have to use the roads.

I saw yesterday evening four people looking like tourists, because you cannot tell very well these days whether they are tourists or not but they looked like tourists because they had on shorts and beads in their hair. They were standing in the middle of an intersection in Eagle Hall in the middle of the lights and the minibus stopped in the middle of the intersection to let them get on. It blocked the whole of Eagle Hall. I blew my horn because those things get me annoyed. The minibus driver threw his hand out of the bus and said "pass or wait".

The point is that they are not helping themselves. They are not helping us to back them or support them by behaving that way. It is a good thing that those of us in this Honourable Chamber have to take a broader view of what has to happen and what ought not to happen. Sometimes you wonder. It is a good thing that it is only a few of them that behave like that

Another thing you have to look at is the kind of messages that are sent out to the young people. I am not talking only about the dub on the buses because there is good dud and bad dud. If you listen to dub, Sir, and I think you do - I think I saw you tapping your foot on some occasion to some dud. I do too. If you listen to dub there are some good messages and there are some bad ones.

I am talking about the signs on the minibuses. Have you ever looked at the negative signs? They have one marked "The Butcher". Another one is marked "The Assassin", "Nightmare On Elm Street With Freddy Kruger", "Pit Bull". These might be all fashionable and nice to the young people. I do not see any marked favourably. I saw one with Barrow's picture, that was nice and one with Tom Adams. That looked alright too. The likeness of the two people was good. The art was good. I am saying that generally speaking they seem to have these negative violent messages on these buses. I wonder about this. What kind of message are you really sending? I say now that I as an individual - I am not speaking for the NDP - I am speaking for myself. I support the Headmaster at St. James Secondary School.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The headmaster is my friend? I do not know him. The point is, it does not matter if the minibus in question is owned by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. 5.25 p.m.

I do not care who owns the minibus. It does not matter. The point is that if the driver of that minibus is behaving in a manner that is contrary to what the

Headmaster thinks is in the best interest of those children then he was right in taking the kind of action he took.

Now Sir, let us move on. As I said, there were a number of very positive things said about the amendment to this Bill but one had to bear in mind that there are some very negative sides of the whole provision. I heard an Honourable Member talk about a minibus owner on the radio. I heard him that evening too saying - "What can I really do about how the driver drives the bus?" Well, there are lots of things you can do. Do you want the fellow to write off the bus for you then because you do not care? There are lots of things you can do.

If you look at the wider transport provision of public transport, it is the Z vans. I would be the first one to stand up and defend them. I will defend the Z van operators all the way down the line because I believe it is something laudible that these young people have gotten themselves employed in a legal operation. They had the choice of going down the illegal road. They could be selling drugs. But they chose to go down a legal road. I am not here to necessarily spend a lot of time of criticising Government for telling them that they could put five and then coming back to say three. We do not even seem to have the full story on that up to now. Suffice it to say that has been talked about all over the place and the point that I really would like to make rather than that is to sound a cautionary note to these new young business people to behave more serious. There are lots of them on the road who are very courteous. They will stop and let children cross and things of that nature. There are others who are pushing to get the next load. There must be five people down at the next bus stop. So what is the rush?

My feeling is, Sir, that at anytime any kind of legislation is brought to regulate this kind of behaviour and to bring them, as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West likes to say to some Christian understanding, I will be in support of it. I again join any other Honourable Member who has said it in here before in asking these ZM van operators, minibus operators, and the Transport Board drivers too to let us bring back some decent behaviour on the roads. Let us start behaving ourselves on the roads. There are lots of silly accidents on the road today because of that kind of behaviour. A man lost his life going to Wanstead in one of those ZM vans because of wild driving. We know that. One did not have to be there to tell you that it was wild. You can look at the damage on the vehicle and see that he had to be travelling at some kind of speed to be damaged in that way.

Now Sir, in the time that I have left I would like to deal with another area which is in this Bill. It is the question of driving instructors. This is an area, Sir, that I have a lot of problems with. This area again like the Z van operators is an area where we can laud persons for having gotten into their own little business - the whole question of teaching

people how to drive. This is why I can easily support this aspect today providing, Sir, that you make sure that you teach the teachers. I am going to tell you what I mean by that just now.

I agree that a lot of those persons who have gone out there and who call themselves driving instructors are just like you and I. We know how to drive or how- to operate a vehicle. We may not drive as fast as the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, but we know how to operate a vehicle.

Laughter.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I tend to see him driving fast very often. But to be able to teach someone how to really drive is another thing altogether. You have to be properly trained to do this and you should pass some kind of test yourself before you can teach people. It is no secret just like in every sphere of human endeavour you will find unscrupulous persons. There are several student drivers, particularly the women, who have complained to me and I am sure to other Honourable Members on both 'sides of this House about the behaviour of some of the instructors.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Sir, if a person complains about your behaviour, I do not think they would complain about good behaviour. I will leave it at that. If the Honourable Member's friend in St. Lucy who teaches people to drive is guilty of any other kind of behaviour, he would have the specific details. Maybe he will tell us when he gets up. But Sir, I believe that teaching one to drive is not just a matter of telling them how to operate a gear shift and press a clutch and so on. It has to do with teaching them about road courtesy. I heard someone say in here before that people who have driving licences already pull off without signalling. People who are being taught to drive are taught to do that. So by the time they get their driving licence they must behave like that. They never were taught otherwise and I am very heartened that the Honourable Attorney General will bring this particular change. I may poke a little fun at him from time to time, Sir, but I know that sometimes he can be a very serious person. That is why I am suggesting to him that he does not bother with this thing next time around and go back to private practice, but I do not know.

Anyhow Sir, moving on to the question of permits. Now Sir, I have to be very careful how I put this because you know that me and the Press are not too friendly. Whenever they print what I say, it has got to be something rough. It's never something nice. There are some serious allegations that there is some kind of "racket" going on in the Licensing Department with regards to - I am sorry the Honourable Minister is not in his place but I am going to tell him whenever I see him again - the issuing of permits

and people being able to pass for a licence. There are some people who will go in for a test and can hardly blow the horn on the car but pass. There are others who go in five and six times over a period of a year and cannot see that red book. I am told by some of these persons that if you make things right you can pass the first time. You do not have to wait for five times.

I am saying, Sir, that this is such a serious allegation that it is something that I would not toy around with or go any further into. It is something that I would suggest that Government looks into. There are some people who would say that they were always very wary of the fact that this whole area of service was taken away from the Police and given to these other persons. I do not think that that is the reason.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Some of them are. There are persons in Immigration that were policemen too. Well, did you know that?

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Address the Chair.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I do not know what he knows, To get back to a more serious matter, Sir. It is a concern of the public. The fact that people come to you and complain about it means that there is a genuine concern. Do you know what is interesting? A lot of these people who are having a problem with the Licensing Department are afraid to speak out because they want the little book. So do you think they are going to speak out and then do not get to pass at all? They will never pass. So I say to the Honourable Minister through you, Sir, that he has got to be very careful about who is going to teach these driving instructors. Make sure you have the right teachers. We already have a problem with some of the unscrupulous driving instructors ripping off some of the public. We do not want a situation where the so-called teachers of these driving instructors start to get into any kind of collusion. I will just leave it at that at this point.

The only other point I want to make just briefly, Sir, because I did promise that I would be brief...

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I am glad you reminded me of that. Of course, Sir, there is no question at all that we will support the National Commission on Transportation. There is no question about that at all. It is something that we have spoken about in other places and I am sure that the Honourable Member for St. John will give me the credit when the time is right for having given him the idea at some point. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy now is very

excited. He told me that he will be letting Mr. Morgan, whoever he is, know that that should be included in the Manifesto of the DLP. So do not be surprised if you see it in the 1991 Manifesto which we have already warned the people of Barbados not to take too seriously anyhow.

The last point I want to make, Sir, less they feel that they were left out is about the ZM vans because we do not seem to understand something. 5.35 p.m.

There are three different categories of these fellows. The ZM vans cannot argue for any standing passengers, because there is nowhere to stand, but they are as guilty, if not more so, as the minibus operators of the way they use the roads and the disregard they have for the rest of us who have to use the roads. Sometimes they want to run over the same passengers they are trying to get into the van. I have observed at the bottom of Broad Street, by C.S. Pharmacy, three and four of them trying to get around that little curve together to get one passenger. I am very conscious when I get there, so I stop early and let them come through. They put a policeman there one evening and the poor fellow almost got run over himself, so that scene has been abandoned, there is no policeman there any more.

Laughter.

It is very serious, Sir. They have to understand that I will fearlessly defend them, as I have defended the vendors and will continue to defend them, although I may have to have words with the Barbados Labour Party about the vendors in Swan Street as we get close to the elections. But I am not going to talk about them now, Sir.

If I can get back to my point, Sir, all of these operators, whether they be on ZM vans, Z vans or minibuses, have to understand that those of us like myself - and I am sure I can speak for the Member for Christ Church East Central, because I have heard him on these kinds of things before - will fearlessly defend them when they are right, but when they are wrong we are not going to let the public suffer as a result of them believing that they are a law unto themselves. They are not above the law and they have to understand that. We have to work together to provide a better transportation system for all of Barbados and I am not going to see one group believing that they can trod on everybody else.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be long in this debate, because the position of the Barbados Labour Party has been clearly put by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and the Honourable Member for St. Peter.

The debate has been conducted on the basis that permission to allow seven standing passengers in the minibus is reasonable. I have not heard from the person who introduced this measure or from any of the persons who have spoken on the Government side why the number seven was chosen. I have not heard whether there is any proper engineering or other reason for such a number. I am advised by experts that the minibuses can carry, without any detriment to the safety of themselves or their passengers, up to a maximum of ten persons and I would wish to suggest at this stage that if that figure is correct - and in this regard I would strongly recommend that the Government should talk to the Acme Manufacturing Company people who did some study of this some time ago - I would wish to know why limit the number of standing passengers in the minibus to seven rather than to allow the ten passengers that can be safely carried in the minibuses.

The debate has proceeded on the basis that the private sector has a contribution to make to public transport, and this is as it should be. They have been making that contribution for several years now. I myself have spoken in this House on several occasions about the contribution made by persons, long before there was nationalisation of the public transport system, after there was partial nationalisation of the transport system. In fact, there are many such as Mrs. Rock of Rocklyn, Mr. Trotman, the Lucases, the Simpsons and the Ifills, who continued to make their contribution despite the fact that they were not allowed to charge at times according to what the market would have carried, and in fact the real cost of service which they were providing.

The position of the Barbados Labour Party on this matter has been extremely clear. We recognise that there is a social cost of transport, and that particularly on the long haul routes it is very difficult to entice or to induce the private sector to provide the necessary service. I now live in the country, Sir, and I can testify to the fact that the service which is provided in the rural areas of Barbados leaves a lot to be desired. I think there is no Member of Parliament in this House representing a constituency in the north, in the east or in the west of our Island who would not decry the lack of an adequate service for transporting persons, particularly at peak hours and during the period when children are going to school, and therefore I make a plea in this House for provision to be made for more than the seven standing passengers, unless the Government has advice, which is reasonable and correct advice, that seven would be the limit that could be allowed for safety reasons. I am advised differently and I would wish an examination done of this.

Sir, I am not going to list the promises in the DLP Manifesto relating to the minibus men that have not been fulfilled, though they have been listed here already, but I wish to talk about things that have been done in the field of transport which were not promised and which are obviously

sending wrong signals to the small businessmen sector, the private sector in transport.

The first is the restriction on ownership. I can find no logical reason why there should be a rule that a minibus owner is only going to be restricted to owning two minibuses. I can find no reason for this, Sir, particularly when we are trying to encourage the small businessman, and particularly the small black businessman, to get into business, and when we are trying to widen the entrepreneurial class in order to achieve economic enfranchisement in this country. I believe very strongly that it is an area in which market forces should be allowed to operate, and to say to a man that you can only grow to two doors, rather than to get into the big league at any time, seems to me that the State is once again taking to itself an unusual restrictive approach to people owning wealth and to growing economic democracy.

I would strongly advise the Government that that part of its policy is wrong and ought to be reversed as soon as possible. There is no point to it, Sir, it is like saying that you are only going to allow people to have, as I said, for example, a small shopkeeper who is providing a good service and who is capable of growing and providing revenue to the Government at the same time as providing an excellent service, you are only going to restrict that person to a limited performance in the economy. I don't see the sense of that provision, Sir, and I will continue to agitate against it as strongly as I can in the House for as long as this House remains and will make the necessary change after the next election. 5.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, the other area that I think the Government is sending the wrong signal as well in transport relates to the Government's policy in revoking permits of drivers who have three convictions. I think the Government must distinguish between the wrongdoing of a driver and the innocence of the owner of that vehicle. By all means if a driver has been blatantly or deliberately or even negligently flouting the law, then he must be dealt with according to the law but I do not see why you must visit on the owner the fault of the wrongdoer which is the driver of the vehicle. Once again, I believe this is a signal that I cannot understand from the Government. It is giving with one hand and taking with the other and at the same time damaging a small and growing business class. That business class is* very vital if we are to keep a cohesive society in this country.

Sir, on the whole area of the ZM vans, other Members on both sides of the House have spoken but it seems to me wrong...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of privilege. I don't like to interrupt the Honourable Member but it seems to me that this legislation is bringing in the concept of visiting. I

want to draw his attention to Section 114 of the Act as it now exists that that is in fact the policy. This Road Traffic Act came in 1981 and so Section 114, I draw to his attention that that principle was embedded in the main Act when it was brought here.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I am going to say that if that is the policy, it ought to change because we must remember that this class has now grown considerably and in my view has the potential for growth and for saving the Government much needed capital whether we are providing that capital by way of a levy or whether we are providing that capital out of the Consolidated Fund.

The third area that I am talking about today is the ZM vans. I am going to be told that existing legislation deals with the problems of the ZM vans whether they should carry three or more passengers. Let me make the point, Sir, I have seen actual letters licensing the small Suzuki vans to carry seven passengers and I have also seen subsequent letters during the currency of the licence asking the same person to come in, to say that they are breaching existing regulations and that therefore they will have to revoke the licence. Now, Sir, obviously, *the* Licensing Authority should be estopped in such circumstances from going back on its own position in having given the licence and the easiest thing to do is to change the regulation if necessary.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, it was drawn to the House's attention Section 114 of the Road Traffic Act appears to be at variance with the point made by the Honourable Member in relation to punishment of the owner of the vehicle. The present Section 114 allows the owner a defence if the act committed was without his consent, not due to any act on his part and if he had taken all reasonable precautions to prevent the commission of it. What the Honourable Member was referring to was the announced policy of MTW three weeks ago that if a driver gets three convictions he goes and the owner goes with no defence. He loses his licence.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It came from the Ministry of Transport and Works.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the point that I am making is the Honourable Member is going to say that it is not the law, but let us put it this way, the policy was announced from the Ministry of Transport and Works.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I clearly don't wish to get into a contention but the Honourable Member more than anybody else would know that no matter what is announced that no one can be punished without a defence in law in Barbados. I drew to the Honourable Member's attention that there is in fact a

defence in the law as it exists. We would have to come to the House of the Assembly to pass legislation to do what you are saying.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I didn't realise that the Honourable Member wanted to say that the Minister of Transport has made an announcement that is contrary to what is in the law. That is what I understand him to be saying.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I don't see how he could understand that. First of all, Section 114 imports the principle that an owner can carry the blame of a driver unless the owner is able to provide a defence. That is the principle and I am sure that the Minister of Transport and Works who made such an announcement could only be making it in the context of the principle that already exists in 114.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Permanent Secretary, I believe, or the Acting Permanent Secretary, in the Ministry of Transport made that announcement. It has not been other than for the Honourable Member for St. Michael West getting up and saying that it is contrary to the provision of the law but I have had up to now no statement saying that the announcement by the Permanent Secretary is not the Government's policy. How the Government was going to implement that policy I do not know.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The former Attorney General must be in some kind of strange mood Sir. Since when can a Permanent Secretary commit the Government in a matter of that kind? If the Permanent Secretary says we propose to do so and now he is coming in here and speaking *ex cathedra* as though there is some law that has been passed or that the Democratic Labour Party pronounced on something. What foolishness is this?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is obviously the self-appointed Prime Minister of that side, Sir, to defend the Government on each matter. But let me say, Sir, that I have known on many occasions that when a Permanent Secretary...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I am no self-appointed Prime Minister of anything. I am a Minister of the Crown and a front bencher and when I hear foolishness, it is my duty to defend it. You are always talking about collective responsibility. You want to attack us and when we defend you now talk about self-appointed prime minister. I have never declared myself a prime minister. When the time comes I will be a prime minister not...

Mr. SPEAKER: And that is going beyond the point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The trouble is that the Honourable Member may be engineering that time faster than the Honourable Member for St. Michael South thinks.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I did not give him any document Sir, so I can't engineer anything.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member protests too much about what he gives me. Let me go on, Sir. Let me answer the point that Permanent Secretaries do not announce policies, Sir. This Permanent Secretary has certainly on many occasions spoken for his Minister and it really is just a glib statement that Permanent Secretaries do not announce Government policy. That is not true, Sir. One assumes that he is acting with the authority of the Government because it would be very unusual for the Permanent Secretary to be speaking in the way that was spoken given the whole understanding and clear indication that it was Government's policy. If the Honourable Member wants to say that it is not Government's policy, I would welcome that statement from him. But the point is that until he has spoken there has been nobody who ever said and I am sure that all Honourable Members were of the impression on this side. 5.55 p.m.

Now, Sir, there is obviously a good deal of room for the private sector to work alongside the state sector in the field of transport. To the extent that the Government has announced that it is trying to find funds for an overall study of the capabilities of the Transport Board and an overall study of the transport needs and the relationship between the various sectors, I would welcome this.

I believe that there have been other studies already available within the department which would assist the Government not in waiting for another two or three years for such a study, but in implementing immediately some of the necessary changes that must be brought to the transport system in this Island.

I would wish Government to discard its plans for restricting ownership to two minibuses. Instead, to provide assistance to the small business sector to help them answer some of the growing problems which they are confronting, diverse problems, Sir. It is not only the problems of management but the problems of relationship with the public itself, problems of their relationship to the balance of the transport system, their understanding of the laws and regulations which govern public transport in the Island, and that the antagonism which has built up between the private transport sector and the public transport sector will be removed once and for all.

I believe that they have given tremendous service. In fact, let me say this that I do not believe the public transport would have survived in Barbados over the last ten years without the role played by the minibus men, the Z taxis and

the ZM vans. In fact, it would have called for greater expenditure on the part of the Government, both on the capital account and the recurrent account. This would have meant heavier taxation on the public of Barbados as a whole. I said that of the five promises made in the Government's Manifesto in relation to the minibus men, only two have so far been honoured. I would wish to know, before I conclude my speech, how soon the Government proposes to honour the other undertakings set out in its Manifesto.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I will be short on this just to say that I think the Government has to be commended for taking the steps to bring these amendments down here to Parliament bearing in mind the many problems which have been outlined by Honourable Members in their contribution here today particularly in relation to the minibuses and the Z vans. I would, however, just want to say that the public ought to be aware of the fact that today also the Government laid regulations relating to the prohibition of the playing of music in a motor omnibus or minibus. I think this is a nuisance which people complain about and which we have brought regulations down to take care of.

At the same time, Sir, the Bill which we are debating here today makes provision for the insertion of a section relating to the establishment of a limousine service. Again, I think that the Government ought to be commended for this because it has taken into consideration the whole question of the development of services particularly in relation to the tourism sector and, at the same time, to the growing sophistication of the travelling public of Barbados.

I was particularly interested in listening to the Honourable Member for the City in his contribution to this debate. I turn to my colleagues and I indicated to them that it was, in my view, one of the best speeches which the Honourable Member has made in this Chamber. It appeared almost to me and to us over here as if it was a swan song. Be that as it may, Sir, in the banter which took place during the time I did hear the Honourable Member for the City indicating that the Leader of the Opposition, that was in a *sotto voce* remark, had talked so much foolishness that he had to get up and speak so as to distance himself from the foolishness of his leader.

You will see that the speech which he made was completely contrary to the speech which the Leader of the Opposition made. For that I would want to commend him because I think it was a speech which was to the point, which addressed the issues and one in which I think we all agree with bearing in mind that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who spoke on this matter really was speaking in complete variation with the Honourable Member for the City.

Mr. E. BOURNE: On a point of order. I cannot recall hearing the Honourable Member for the City saying those words, Sir. I ask that they be struck from the records.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I heard him say them. He was speaking in a *sotto voce* remark.

I think the other section relating to the driving instructors - it has to be taken into consideration that the amendment makes provision for the licensing authority to prepare a code to be known as "The Instructor's Code" containing such directions as appear to the Licensing Authority to be proper for the guidance of driving instructors. I think this is a welcomed development.

A lot has been said about driving instructors. I think the point has to be made that if we are going to attempt to correct some of the very serious problems which obtain on the roads in Barbados we have to ensure that proper instructions are given when people are learning to drive. At the same time drivers must understand that being in possession of a vehicle whether it is a large vehicle or a small vehicle, that they do not have all of the rights. Other drivers also have rights.

The roads are to be used carefully. The mere fact that we are having so many deaths on the roads indicate to us that there is need for proper road appreciation on the part of drivers for the use of the roads and also there must be, at the same time, a proper appreciation of the road users, the pedestrians, for the way in which they use the road. It is a fact that sometimes pedestrians would give the impression that the road, as it were, belong to them and you have to wait on them, 6.05 p.m.

I think there needs to be an understanding amongst all of the users of the road that if we are going to have safe practices on the road that they have to cooperate with each other. I think that these amendments are welcomed and I would hope, Sir, that the regulations and the law will be complied with by all persons concerned.

I thank you, Sir.

Mr. C. R. NP-BLETT: Mr. Speaker, this is just a short intervention. I would like at this stage to register my support for the Bill and I thought that I would lend a bit to clear up one or two points concerning the question of the Z vans. We have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where over 1200 taxis were registered and they were mostly saloon cars. At a later stage certain Z vans such as Suzuki and Daihatsu vans were brought and registered as taxis carrying about three to five passengers. Owners of these taxis then joined the ground transportation system and they have been taking more than the number of passengers for which they have been registered. They have also been charging a fare at the rate of the passenger bus rate. Some confusion has been

caused where these vans like the ones that are being legitimately used as taxis, who for instance if they are doing an airport job will be charging \$20 for a trip from the airport to Bridgetown. Yet some of the passengers can pick up one of these Z vans like the ordinary bus and have been paying a dollar. It has left a rather bad or dirty taste in the mouth of our visitors where they feel at times that they are being ripped off. Some effort has got to be made to draw the line as to those vehicles that are being operated as legitimate taxis and those that are being used like buses. This has caused the Licensing Authority to recall some of those vehicles that have been registered for more than the usual taxi capacity. For example, those who were registered for five and they found that they had increased the seating up to ten. I believe we will have to look at a method whereby we can draw the line between what is really a legitimate taxi and what is functioning as a bus or minibus of some sort.

With these few points, Mr. Speaker, I hope this is taken in the spirit in which it is given as good reasonable advice. Thank you.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, we have spent a long time debating this measure and a lot of issues have been dealt with. But I think before we close debate on this, there are a number of issues which I would like to address. This legislation is part of an overall review which the Ministry of Transport and Works needs to make into the transport system with a view to improving the whole traffic management process in the country.

A number of issues have been raised in relation to maxi taxis and what has been called Z vans and I think a lot of confusing statements have been made. Some have been made for purely political purposes reaching out to get political support in areas. The position which has been taken by two Members of the major Opposition party demonstrates the political confusion into which they have found themselves. The Leader of the Opposition, for instance, takes a position which is more or less a free for all which would tend to suggest, as I understood it, that we were doing the worst thing in the world to the Z vans and the maxi taxis, and that we should allow them to do as they like. The Honourable Member for the City in one of his more sombre moments and in one of the better speeches he has made in the House was quite clear as to the need for properly regulating the vehicles which are doing public service work. He spoke like he belonged over here really.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, for instance, talked about how the minibuses have done so much better than the Transport Board. We do not hear *sotto voce* remarks. But when pressed *sotto voce* as to why have they done better, his response was that they had provided a lot better service.

When pressed further as to naming the areas in which they had provided better service, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was very quick to back off and not commit himself. I am sure the kind of service which he would have classified as some of the better aspects of service would be some of the same types of services which the Honourable Member for the City was condemning, like where minibuses would stop in the street, stop at cross roads, would cause all sorts of problems, break all sorts of laws and do things which are contrary to the law. All of that would be justified in the name of doing things which pleased the public and served the public. The public has to be served, yes, but it has to be served in the context and framework of law and regulation. The moment we are willing to throw law, regulation, and order out of the window in order to satisfy a few political whims here and there, the country would tend to be headed downwards. Let me say this that whether the NDP or whoever it is is willing to support actions by whomsoever which do not necessarily comply with the strict provisions of the law on the basis that you are pleasing certain sections of the public and if that is the way we are going, I say that that is not the way this country ought to go and sooner we bring a stop to it the better.

If we look at the position in relation to the Z vans and maxi taxis, Mr. Speaker, a definition of maxi taxi was read earlier today by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. The significant aspect of that definition and this is the current definition of maxi taxi is that it means: "A motor vehicle which among other things is authorized to convey passengers from the point of origin to one or more destinations but which may not pick up additional passengers or set down passengers between the point of origin and the destination along any bus route."

So the maxi taxis are the ZM vehicles and the ZM vehicles are the ones which do precisely what falls outside of the definition of maxi taxi. Everybody talks about the Z vans. But what are the Z vans? The Z is the registration for a taxi. Now taxis traditionally have been the motor cars in the country. But the position has been that when motor car owners who operated those motor cars as taxis went out of service they replaced them by the Suzuki vans which now are popularly known as the Z vans. So that you had the Z vans coming into existence as a direct replacement for the legitimate taxi. The Z vans are really taxis and nothing more and they are to ply as taxis and not to pick up people on routes. So that in the law they are not authorized to do the work which they are in fact doing.

So that when you hear talk about change in policy and the pressures which Government is putting on people, why do we not look at all aspects of the equation and try to understand what is happening and try to bring some sense into an analysis of the total problem. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that when the Ministry of Transport and Works was assessing this problem and I make the point that the

Minister of Transport and Works has to look at the total framework for regulating the public transport system at all levels. 6.15p.m.

The Ministry found that there were some 47 maxi taxis (ZM vehicles) which were currently being used by individuals to pick up passengers on routes. Approximately * 30 of those 47 vehicles have been operating on those routes - and the routes are largely the Wanstead/Redmans Village route, the Howells + Road/Ivy route and the Oistins/Silver Sands route - over the past ten years, so this is not a new thing which has been happening in relation to those ZM vehicles. They have been there operating in the country for the past ten years, and operating in a context where we as a Government came into office, finding these maxi taxis operating in the way in which they were, in a way in which they were not authorised to do by law. What are they saying we should do? *Do* what they did not do when they were in *** office and throw them off the road straight away?

I think we recognise that they were performing a part of the transport service, and the essential thing is to try to come up with a framework which would regulate and regularise the position as far as these vehicles are concerned. The whole point about all of this is that the Ministry of Transport and Works is presently looking at the total position with a view to bringing a rational judgment •*** and assessment to bear on the total problem and trying to arrive at the solution which would be equitable to' all concerned.

This amendment which we have done today is just but part of the problem.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I do not think the Attorney General, if he was addressing my concern about the Z vans and the Z cars, is answering, or else he is misrepresenting what I said. The point I was ** constrained to make was that the Z Suzuki vans stop all about and pick up passengers. The Z cars are licensed the same way but operate as whole hires and it seems to me that there is a problem. I gave the example of the gentleman from Puerto Rico who drew it to my attention that when he hired a Z van he thought it was going to be he alone, but then he found other people were stopping it on the way back to the Hilton. When he took a car from the Hilton, it was he alone that came to town. I was only suggesting that I -> think that Government should clarify the legislation by perhaps changing the lettering on the Z vans. I understand the ZMs, they are the maxi taxis, the big ones, but there is a little confusion, especially for foreigners who take a taxi. When they take a Z van they are not getting what they expect in respect of a taxi.

«tk

Hon. M. A. KING: The point I was making, Mr. Speaker, is that there has been no change in the law in this regard. A "Z" is a "Z" is a "Z", so it does not matter if it is a

car or a Suzuki. It is a "Z" and it should only be doing the work which a "Z" is authorised to do. What I am saying, in essence, is that the Zs, according to the law as I understand it, are not authorised to stop at bus stops and pick up passengers on the routes, nor are the ZMs. That is what I am saying, but I am saying that that is the situation which the country has been faced with and a lot of emotive arguments are used. If you try to enforce the law you are going to hear all talk about you are trying to stop small, poor, black people from making a living. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition came up with that today. It does not matter that they are breaking the law, you are stopping small, poor, black people from making a living, so I am saying that if that is the way we are going to proceed with the public life of this country and we are going to do nothing about it, something has to be seriously wrong.

Just to conclude that aspect of my presentation, Sir, I am saying that the Ministry of Transport and Works recognises that there is a problem which has to be addressed and is looking at a way of dealing with the problem which will come up with an equitable solution for all who participate in the industry.

Just by way of a point which has been raised, a pure political point, and there is no substance to the argument articulated by the Honourable Member for St. Peter - the point has been addressed by Honourable Members over here - when he would suggest that this Democratic Labour Party Government is responsible for some people who break the law getting locked up. How did he put it? "While the DLP was tarrying on this point, people went to prison for taking the DLP at its word." The point is, Mr. Speaker, if that Honourable Member for St. Peter has a point of view about sentencing, fair enough. He may have his point of view. Magistrates and Judges may have a different point of view. The Honourable Member is free to criticise the sentencing policy of the judges and magistrates. 6.25 p.m.

I have no difficulty with that and I have said that one welcomes criticism of that sort once it is fair and rational and reasonable but at the same time the Honourable Member is being totally unreasonable and unfair when he seeks to criticise the Democratic Labour Party Government, the political agency in the country for what is in essence a judicial decision. The laws of the country are there and don't say to me that..

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, Sir. I have not criticised the judicial system. I have merely criticised the Government and particularly the Attorney General for having tarried in bringing the legislation to the House. Two different points altogether.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the point I am making. I was being generous to the Honourable

Member and suggested that he was validly and properly exercising his constitutional rights in criticising the judiciary if he so felt, but he is saying that he is not criticising the judiciary so it shows how preposterous and ridiculous he is to criticise the...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the language is a bit...

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the words. His argument, Mr. Speaker, is so fallacious if he seeks to criticise the political directorate for a decision of the Court. Nobody in their right mind...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is now misleading the House. What the Honourable Member for St. Peter was truthfully accusing the Government of is causing these people to go to jail because of its vicarious actions. What he is saying is that because the legislation for standing passengers took four and one-half years to come these people built up a series of convictions over the four and a half years carrying standing passengers that when the time came they had a record as long as my arm and the magistrates' hands were tied. If this legislation had come in 1987 I am sure that these persons could not have built up a long list of convictions which then tied the magistrates' hands. That is all we are saying.

Hon. M. A. KING : Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Honourable Member for St. Thomas rose. He is good at defending criminals in the Court, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the essential point is this. How can you legitimately criticise a Government because the courts in the exercise of the judicial function decide to sentence a person to prison for breaking the law and let us face it The courts have before them all the facts and issues. I don't know the number of convictions the man had. I don't know what sort of convictions he had. I don't know how many people may have been overloaded in the minibus from time to time. You saw the situation reported in the Press and I don't know whether it is true or not of a Z van at St. George School overloaded with 48 and he was saying he was trying to get 50 in a little Suzuki van licensed to carry five. Are we not concerned about the safety of the population and about the young people of this country? Those are the sorts of things. Even if it were brought years ago, don't you see how ridiculous your argument is? Even if you brought the seven passengers years ago how would that deal and exculpate a man carrying 48 in a five-passenger van? The whole point is that a lot of these vehicles where the drivers are charged with overloading are loaded not with any six or seven or ten people but there are scores of people more in the minibuses and that is why the police take action and I am sure that policemen are not unreasonable and that where there are a few extra people in the vehicles sometimes enforcement officers tend to go easy on that. For instance, if you exceed the speed limit by five miles an hour the police

don't bother you. That is not unusual. So let us be reasonable.

Now the Honourable Member for Christ Church West raised the question why not ten why is the number limited to seven. I didn't have the answer directly at my fingertips but I got in touch with an official of the Ministry of Transport and Works and I was told that the reason for the seven is because of the configuration of the buses they allowed one standing passenger for every row, more or less. I am not an expert but I am told by the officials that that is the reasoning behind the decision.

Another point on which the Honourable Member for Christ Church West did spend some time was in relation to what he said was the announced policy of the Government that where a driver got three convictions that the owner would be penalized by losing the licence to operate a minibus. One Honourable Member out there quite rightly said that that was a statement made by the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Transport and Works. I believe the policy of this Government is enunciated as a result of decisions made by the Cabinet.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I am very clear in my mind what I want to say. I am saying that the policy of the Government is arrived at as a result of decisions made by Cabinet. Clearly the Permanent Secretary relates to his Minister and must recognize the fact that the Ministry of Transport and Works can only act within the context and within the framework of what the law prescribes so that the Permanent Secretary is not going to make a statement which ignores completely the framework of the law and what has to be done and clearly what the Ministry of Transport and Works is in the process of doing is setting up a regime whereby they can control some of the actions and the activities of the minibus drivers. I know that this is a matter on which the Ministry is actively involved because I have met with the officials of the Ministry of Transport and Works and with the officials of the Office of the Chief Parliamentary Counsel with a view to providing a regime for disciplining and controlling the activities of minibus drivers and operators and owners when they operate outside of the context of the law.

I didn't hear the Permanent Secretary myself. I am not going to respond, Mr. Speaker, like so many people you hear on the call-in programmes who have a variety of interpretations which they put on everything. All I am saying is this. In the context of regulation and regulation that must emanate from the Ministry of Transport and Works, the Permanent Secretary presents a position where clearly the minibus drivers commit offences and clearly if the owners are in any way a party to, accessory to the offences which have been committed by those drivers, what is wrong with disciplining those owners in a context where

they are vicariously as accessories guilty of an offence. If you look at the Permanent Secretary's statement in that context and against that background there is nothing wrong with it but what we in this country are in the habit of doing is making ex cathedra statements and judgments on issues without analysing fully what the statement means and what the full facts of a situation are.

So that all I am saying is that if you take the Permanent Secretary's statement out of the total context you are likely to come up with all sorts of configurations and statements which for political purposes you can distort to suit the ends which you desire. You understand that very well so that...

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: That's a matter on which I think you should get a reply from the substantive Minister. 6.35 p.m.

I heard a lot of things during the course of this debate against the substantive Minister of Transport and Works which I do not hear when he is in his seat. I do not hear those kinds of comments being directed against him. Now that his back is turned and now he is not here, you will hear all sorts of criticisms being made of him. Let them make the criticisms of the Honourable Member when he is in his seat. Why is it that they do not do that? Are they afraid of him? They are afraid of his response? I am saying, Mr. Speaker, the Bill is something which is necessary, which is desirable, which clearly has the support of all the House. It is a pity we have had to spend so long a time on debating something which is the subject of universal approval.

On the motion of Hon. M. A. KING seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT the Bill was read a second time.

On the motion of Hon. M. A. KING seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1-6 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 7 was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, amendments of this Bill have been circulated. Among the circulated amendments they show clause 7 to be deleted.

I beg to move that clause 7 be deleted. Hon.

B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

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

New clauses 7 and 8 were called and passed.

Clause 10 was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I move that the old clause 10 be deleted.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 9 — 16 inclusive, as renumbered, were called and passed.

Clause 17 as renumbered was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in clause 17 as renumbered, there are some consequential amendments to that. I move that the words "7" and "10" and the "comma" appearing after the word "9" be deleted and that the clause as amended stand part.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. A. KING seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour, Mr. SPEAKER, the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendments and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly:

On the separate motions of Hon. M. A. KING seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT the Bill was read a third time and passed. 6.45 p.m.

PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL, 1990

Order No. 3 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the payment of pensions, gratuities and other allowances.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguishing characteristics of this Democratic Labour Party Government is that it is a sharing and caring Government. The Pensions (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill, 1990 which is before us is yet another example of that caring and sharing characteristic. The legislation seeks to provide a retirement income through pension payment to staff employed with Statutory Boards in Barbados. With the passage of the legislation, Sir, those persons who are

employed with the Statutory Boards will be given some comparable pension with those who are in other parts of the Civil Service.

Now Sir, this is an initiative that is being taken by this present Government. It has not been done before. It is a new provision and it seeks to raise the level of the status of employees of Statutory Boards. There are some 50 Statutory Boards including the 24 Boards of Management of the public secondary schools, the tertiary institutions such as Erdiston Teachers Training College, Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, and the Barbados Community College and they employ staff, Sir.

At October 1990 the total staff complement of those Boards was 8 873 at all levels and this number, Sir, may be compared with those in the Civil Service where the numbers are approximately, Sir, 17 430. So 17 430 persons approximately are employed in the Civil Service and in the 50 Statutory Boards there are some 8 873 persons employed. In the Civil Service some form of retiring benefit is guaranteed to an officer or employee on retirement so long as the basic conditions of the relevant pension legislation is adhered to or satisfied. Over the years similar conditions have been extended to personnel employed in some of the Statutory Boards but not all of the Statutory Boards. We have a situation, Sir, in which in the Civil Service there is some form of pension eligibility so long as the requirements of the existing pension legislation are met. In the Statutory Boards the situation is varied. Some but not all of the Boards have some form of pension legislation and their position is as follows, Sir: The 572 non-teaching staff of the secondary schools as well as the tertiary institutions including the Barbados Community College are pensionable under the Public Employees Pensions Act and where appropriate under the Casual Employees Pensions Act.

So those members of non-teaching staff of the secondary schools and tertiary institutions including the Barbados Community College are pensionable under the Public Employees Pensions Act and where appropriate under the Casual Employees Pensions Act. The teaching staff of the schools and the tertiary institutions except the Barbados Community College are civil servants and the teaching staff of the Barbados Community College are pensionable under the Teachers Secondary Schools Pensions Act, Chapter 56. So those persons, Sir, are taken care of under existing legislation.

The staff of the National Housing Corporation from the inception of the predecessor body, Housing Authority, has always been eligible for retiring benefits just as civil servants are under the Pensions Act, Chapter 25, the Public Employees Pensions Act, Chapter 30 or the Casual Employees Pensions Act, Chapter 20. So the employees of the staff of the National Housing Corporation are taken care of as far as pensions are concerned under those pieces of

legislation to which I have made reference. But then, Sir, there are some Boards like the Industrial Development Corporation, Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation, Barbados Development Bank, Barbados National Bank, and the Central Bank of Barbados which have instituted for their staff pension schemes either with insurance companies or under a management committee comprising representatives of the Board and the staff of the Board. In such cases, there is reciprocity which is guaranteed between pensionable service with the Board and pensionable service in the Public Service except in the case of the Development Corporation.

So for those Boards which I have just mentioned arrangements have been made by the management of those Boards for pension schemes either through insurance companies or under a management committee made up of representatives of the Board and the staff of the Board.

Now we go to another category, Sir, and that relates to the staff of the Child Care Board and Sanitation Service Authority. These two have pensionable status. The staff of these two Boards have pensionable status under the Statutory Boards Pension Act, Chapter 384 or the Statutory Boards Casual Employees Pension Act, Chapter 383. These two Boards were established in 1969 to take over services formerly run by the local Government Councils and the staff on transfer carried over certain rights to pension which had to be preserved. So we have, Sir, the staff of the Child Care Board and the Sanitation Service Authority which have pensionable status under those pieces of legislation which I have identified.

Sir, there is the other category of some 15 boards including successor organizations to former Government Departments such as the Barbados Water Authority, Barbados Port Authority, and the National Sports Council which have no formal pension scheme for their staff and on retirement personnel may be granted an ex gratia award. You can see, Sir, there is a variety of provisions here by one means or another where some Boards have made available to their staff some kind of pension rights, but then there are other Boards which do not have such provisions but which may grant ex gratia awards to their employees who may reach the age of retirement.

Since 1971, Sir, the policy of the Government of Barbados and I am referring to both the Democratic Labour Party Government and the Barbados Labour Party Government, it has been the policy of the Governments of Barbados in the matter of pensions to be guided by the principle that wherever possible liability for payments should be taken by the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme. That is the liability for payment in respect of pension. The policy has been that they should be taken over by the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme and as far as possible that there should be no duplication of a service pension or an old age contributory pension under

the National Insurance Scheme. So the other plank of this policy is that we should avoid duplication as far as possible. 6.55 p.m.

This policy is tending towards the realisation of the objective and concept of a national pension plan applicable to all workers in our society. Therefore, successive Governments have sought to avoid duplication in the matter of the payment of pensions. <•*

In giving effect to such a policy, care has to be taken to avoid any conflict with the provisions of section 103 of the Constitution, which contains entrenched provisions relating to public service pensions, so we seek to avoid any constitutional problems relating to the public service pensions. In accordance with this policy, civil service pension schemes have been varied from time to time to reduce duplication with the National Insurance Scheme, including duplication in respect of dependants and *» disablement pensions.

Statutory Boards have also been directed that in formulating pension schemes for their staff, certain measures should apply. These are as follows. In respect of schemes with insurance companies, coverage should only relate to all the service which preceded the National Insurance scheme, and in respect of subsequent service only » for emoluments over and above the maximum insurable earnings, which is \$2,600 per month under the National Insurance scheme. The purpose of this is to ensure that the provisions under the National Insurance scheme, which allows for a pension to be paid to eligible persons, should not be duplicated under any policies with insurance companies. The policies with those insurance companies would therefore apply only to service before the National Insurance scheme came into being, or in respect of service above the level payable by the National Insurance scheme, which is a maximum of \$2,600 per month as insurable * earnings.

Secondly, Sir, the principle exists that there should be no duplication of pensions under the National Insurance scheme and the Board. Therefore the policy aims to avoid all kinds of duplications of pensions payable under the National Insurance scheme.

Many Boards have not been able to develop pension schemes for their staff, for a number of reasons. There may have been an embargo placed on such development, or there might have been difficulty in conceptualising and implementing schemes. What has happened is that the Government has examined this entire situation, and in the case of the 15 Boards which now have no scheme for their staff in terms of comparison with those Boards which may have, and in terms of the policy which I have just outlined, Sir, the Government has come to the following conclusions.

Firstly, that those Boards which are engaged in a commercial or semi-commercial activity should, within their own resources, formulate non-contributory schemes for their staff as a normal operating expense.

Secondly, Sir, those Boards which are dependent largely or entirely on Treasury subventions to finance their operations should be scheduled within the provisions of the Statutory Boards pension legislation in the same way as the Child Care Board and the Sanitation Service Authority are now scheduled.

In respect of the first category which I made reference to, some seven Boards, involving staff complements of 1983 persons, the Insurance Corporation of Barbados has undertaken to institute a pension scheme to apply to the following Boards, namely, the Barbados Water Authority, the Barbados Port Authority, the National Petroleum Corporation, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and the Insurance Corporation of Barbados itself. Those Boards with staff complements of 1983 will therefore have pension schemes instituted under the aegis of the Insurance Corporation of Barbados.

It is expected that this scheme will come into effect retrospectively from 1st January, 1990 and that Boards will contribute to the scheme in proportion to the numbers of their staff and will have the option to buy in past service in respect of persons on their staff before that date. The necessary trust deeds have been drawn up by the Insurance Corporation of Barbados and those are under consideration.

For those Boards which are dependent upon support from the Treasury, namely, the Board of Tourism, the Export Promotion Corporation, the National Conservation Commission, the National Cultural Foundation, the National Sports Council, the National Training Board and the Public Utilities Board, involving a total staff complement of some 1513 persons, this Bill, the Pensions (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill now before us, Sir, is intended to provide pensionable status for the staff of those Boards.

The various posts attached to each of these Boards are set out in the Schedule to the Bill and provision is also made for the scheme to apply to them from 1st September, 1969 when the Statutory Boards Pension legislation came into effect, or from such later date when the respective Board may have been established. Provision is also being made in respect of the service of staff before 1st September 1969 and that provision would principally apply to the Board of Tourism. The opportunity is also being taken to update the schedule as it relates to staff of the Child Care Board and the Sanitation Service Authority in respect of some other provisions. 7.05 p.m.

Sir, the Bill also provides for the extension of reciprocity, of pension arrangements for the staff of the Industrial Development Corporation and the Insurance Corporation of Barbados who may transfer to public service or vice versa in the same way that such provision already exists at the Central Bank, the Barbados National Bank, the Port Authority, the Barbados Water Authority and other organisations. This Bill and the commercially operated pension scheme being undertaken by the ICB represents the finalisation of the programme of extending equal treatment to all employees in the public sector in this matter of pension. We do not believe that there should be these wide variations between what happens in the central Government and what happens in certain agencies under the central government agencies, such as the Statutory Boards. At the same time, the measures before us are compatible with the wider concept which has been canvassed of a national pension plan and all of this within the context of the National Insurance and Social Securities Scheme.

It is our hope, Sir, that through this legislation the Board may be able to attract even better levels of trained staff, reduce staff turnover and enhance staff productivity morale and satisfaction. This measure, Sir, should be a tremendous benefit to the staff of the Statutory Boards and as I indicated, it is part of that sweep of legislation, Sir, which has been introduced and enhanced since 1986 in terms of improving the status of all public employees, the civil servants and those who are employed with the Statutory Boards.

With those words, Sir, I commend this legislation to this Honourable House and I expect that it will get support from all sides of the Chamber. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker I second the motion that this Bill be read a second time and reserve my right to speak.

SUSPENSION

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, since it is now just after 7.00 p.m. I move that this House be suspended until 8.00 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I gave Honourable Members the assurance that I wouldn't be long.

I don't want to hold up the House. There are a couple of points that I want to make about this. First of all, Sir, I am glad to see that the Government has moved to give pension rights to workers in Statutory Boards. I think if the Prime Minister checks his files he will see that it has been the intention of the Barbados Labour Party and indeed work had started to create a national pension plan. I think there needs to be rationalization of pensions both in the public sector and in the private sector in Barbados and this is a step in the right direction although I wonder if the Prime Minister can explain the reason for the omission of the Transport Board workers from the scheme. I do not see in principle any justification for the discrimination. He mentioned that there were two types of Statutory Boards which I think we have all accepted, those which perform a commercial or quasi-commercial role and those which perhaps are developmental and are not expected to function on a commercial basis. He listed seven, I was able to get down four - Caribbean Development Corporation, Tourism Investment Corporation, Barbados Marketing Corporation, The Port Authority and he said that the Boards will contribute to the scheme which would be run and established by the ICB.

In the second category of Statutory Boards, you would have for example, the Board of Tourism, Export Promotion Corporation, National Conservation Commission, National Cultural Foundation and National Training Board, the Public Utilities Board and the National Assistance Board. Now, I don't understand why from either category the Transport Board which employs some I suppose some 1600-1700 people, probably 1800, with the puffing that has to be done for elections, whatever they are - a large number has been excluded. What is the reason for excluding the Transport Board workers from these pension arrangements. I think that I did see that the National Housing Corporation is included in this. If not, they should be. Just give me a minute, Sir, to check. I can't remember the details very well but I remember at the NHC we had been discussing, when I was Chairman, and indeed at CBC and I am glad that the Government has now legislated for CBC.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We had a falling out, so what? Just as the Honourable Minister of Health and the late Prime Minister Mr. Barrow fell out over his presumption in challenging him for the Presidency of the Democratic Labour Party.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I have to put the record straight. First of all I have never challenged anybody for the Presidency. I was President of the Party and I therefore could not have challenged anybody. One, I was challenged and two, I wish for the record to establish that no Mr. Barrow and I, if he is referring to the former, late great representative of St. John, fell out, not in the way in which he and the other Mr. Barrow fell out, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Be that as it may, Sir, I put it badly, Sir, and I accept that. Mr. Barrow challenged - as we would say in Barbados 'challanced' him, dared to challenge him for the presidency. But that's not what Mr. Barrow told me in Colin Mayers' house in Miami, Sir; but he is my friend and I won't write these things into the records. I will tell you privately. 8.10p.m.

Do not force me. I tell you where it was said. He told me all about the organisation for the voting. We will not go into that now. There are some things that should be left out of the record.

The first point, therefore, is why the Transport Board workers have not been included in this scheme to give them pension rights? Secondly, the Prime Minister spoke in terms of all workers being caught by the umbrella of this legislation. Now, I wonder if that was just a loose way of putting it because it seems to me that there are people in the National Conservation Commission who are not included.

The category of worker who does the brunt of the beautification, the ladies and the gentlemen with the hoes and the cleaning equipment, they are not in here. The assistant manager, assistant accountant, deputy maintenance supervisor, draughtsman, what the Jamaicans call the tall people, the high up, they are in here. You also have the tour guide, stenographer and senior superintendent. I am glad that the watchmen have been included at the Sanitation Service Authority although they are excluded in some of the other Boards. I wonder what was the rationale, therefore, for the choice of persons who would qualify?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If you ask the Honourable Member for St. Lucy to desist from talking across to the Honourable Member for St. Peter. We three are contesting seats in the north. I heard him mention the name of a former fast bowler for Barbados whose photograph I saw in the newspaper with another old gentleman also running for St. Lucy for the NDP calling themselves the "northern lights". But, Sir, the bulbs are blown. Ask the Honourable Member for St. Lucy not to let us speak about blown bulbs in here. There is one retired pacer from the northern end and the other retired pacer from the south calling themselves the "northern lights".

His intervention was answered because we are dealing with pensioners. All these northern lights that my friend, the Honourable Member for St. George South is bringing to foist on us, these retired buggies with pensioners I do not see them provided for here, Sir. That is a serious thing, Sir.

At the Export Promotion Corporation similarly ...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir. I saw the ad in the newspaper when the Prime Minister who brought this Bill to Parliament baited the NDP saying that there was going to be elections soon. The ads went wild, shadow boxing. But he has gone down the wicket already. Too sweet.

The Prime Minister was rather short in his introduction on how this scheme is going to be funded. I am not too clear. For example, if you are an employee of the Statutory Board referred to in this Act, you are covered for pension through this Act. What is to happen in relation to a National Insurance pension? Is it going to be absorbed and you get one pension or can you get a National Insurance pension plus this? I do not know.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He made it clear? To provide everything and it comes out of one pension. It is a national pension plan we are working on.

I would also like to hear, Sir, in view of recent events whether there is enough funding in the...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, there are at least two members on the front bench on that side who can speak with more intimate knowledge of that lady than I. Therefore I do not think they should press me on that one.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I feel that any Honourable Member who is bringing information to the House should bring it fully. He should lay it out. If you have northern lights surely in the stellar there should be some additional indigent payments.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am not getting into who switches on the bulb for a northern light, whether anybody can switch on somebody else in that scenario otherwise known as "turn on". I am not saying who turns on whom. I know.

An actuarial study was to have been carried out into the whole business of pensions with an examination into the old age pensions and the National Insurance pensions. I believe there has been a report laid on the Prime Minister's desk. I think the country deserves to know whether over a 20 year period the resources to ensure the continued payment of pensions are secure.

Now Government from time to time borrows heavily from the National Insurance Fund. We know that. This Government has run out of options to borrow. They have burst the Central Bank's overdraft by some \$46 million.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: \$58 million? Well, as at November 22 it was \$48 million then. I hope that all of us are assured that there is a fund whose integrity is secure to cover the arrangements that we are providing for tonight.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I hear of continuous actuarial work because in the debates of 1984 the present Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central had promised to pass a law to jail the Minister of Finance if he printed any money. The then Prime Minister, Mr. Adams in reply in the Budget debate at page 1065 said these words. I commend them to the House because we know that Government has been printing money. That has never been denied. It is clear from the Central Bank's yellow book. I am sorry the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not here because I wish to remind him of his suggestion and commend all of this to him. Mr. Adams said:-

"His bizarre suggestion that when returned to power, the Democratic Labour Party will pass a law to jail the Minister of Finance if he takes any money, would better have come from the Leader of the Opposition, (the Rt. Honourable Mr. Barrow)." 8.20 p.m.

"When the Leader of the Opposition says those things, he says them in the jovial and jocular mood, betraying the generous personality which he has buried for so long, but which is emerging as he enters his later years, has his achievements behind him and is no longer, perhaps, struggling with the same absurdity as twenty years ago. If he had said it, we would laugh. When the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central says it, we can only pity him.

I would really ask him if he understood what he was saying. He should not have left it at the Minister of Finance. He should have offered one year in jail for every Minister who allowed inflation to go over 20 per cent. That would deal with the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Mr. B.M. Taitt). He would still be in Glendairy. He should have said five years in jail for every Minister that allowed unemployment to go over 60 per cent. That would deal with the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P.M. Greaves). He would still be in jail. It would be twenty years for him. He should have said five years in jail for every Minister that signs an agreement to put 10 per cent or more on the water rates. That would take care of the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L.E. Sandiford). He should not have confined it to printing money, which was started by the honourable Member for St. John. He should have said joining the IMF. He should have said ten years in jail for joining the IMF and another ten

for printing money, and he would have got all of his ex-ministerial colleagues out of the way and been able to achieve the ambition after which he lusts so enthusiastically. There is something physical about that man's ambition to sit at the head of that bench. It makes one sick."

Do not mind the last part, Sir, deal with the printing of money.

I just want to say, Sir, that I need some assurance. Indeed the House deserves to have the assurance that the funds to cover these arrangements are in place. The Prime Minister did say, for example, that commercial Boards would be contributing to the scheme, and he mentioned CBC. We know that CBC has been more often broke than in funds, and BMC. I do not know about the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation, I really do not know where they get their funds from or if they have. I would wish to hear from the Prime Minister in respect of each of the Statutory Boards what would be the liability to contribute to the fund, the quantum of each Board's liability to contribute to the fund. In other words, is it going to cost CBC another \$50,000 or \$100,000 a year? Similarly, the BMC, Tourism Investment and so on.

With those few words, Sir, I beg to say on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party that we support the Bill in its intent but I think we need to have some more information before we can go overboard on this one. The intent, the scheme is in harmony with our own articulated position several years before, indeed by Mr. Adams, and now that it has come we wish it well, but our concerns need to be addressed.

I am much obliged, Sir.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like also to join in support of this measure for the reasons advanced by the Prime Minister, since it brings all of these workers in line with other people who benefit from the pension fund, as it were. My only observation, if it is one, has to do with a point I made in a matter having to do with pensions some time before this Parliament and I am worried that over time we will fail under the weight of the whole pension arrangements.

I am concerned that we might need to examine our whole approach to pensions and pension legislation with a view to establishing some fund, as the Member for St. Thomas called it, from which we might be able to invest funds to further enhance the fund. I do not think that we can continue to draw from public funds to pay pensions for as long as they last. I think we have to rethink the position and even though this is a very good measure and it takes care of people who are not similarly positioned, I believe we still have to go a little further and re-examine our whole approach to pensions, not on any partisan basis, but

certainly in a national light with a view to putting it on a firm footing, because people work for all their lives and then they depend on the pensions to take them through the balance of their days and I would want us to be very secure.

Many companies in Barbados have wound up over the last couple of years and pension funds have gone astray, nobody seemed to know where they were. I think the "• Central Foundry and the Barbados Foundry were two companies that went into liquidation and people who had contributed to the pension schemes there had to suffer losses and cannot now benefit from whatever investments were made in that behalf.

I think we need to look not only at pensions legislation in this regard, but also at other areas of legislation that will be touched by the whole concept of pensions. We have to look at pension schemes that are operated by insurance companies, as well as pensions under whatever pensions * legislation we have in Barbados. So even though I support the legislation, I would still add a word of caution that we have to look at the whole concept of pensions again.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support what is really a major piece of legislation, and in giving my support to this legislation I would like to first of all state my regret that my colleague, the Member for St. Michael Central, is not in his place today, because I am sure that he * has worked very assiduously in pressing the call for this kind of legislation. Indeed, I would suggest that the trade union movement, as the representative of workers, would be very, very pleased with the introduction of this legislation and the ethic which it gives to providing pensions for a large number of persons in the public sector.

I think one has to look at this legislation both in terms of what it achieves and also from the point of view that Government is generally an exemplar. Government is expected to set the conditions of employment for people employed therein and give an example to the private sector to follow. I believe that this is therefore in keeping with what we would expect of a responsible administration. As the Prime Minister says, it really follows in line with what other administrations have done before, comprising those Governments that have had the fortune to lead the destinies of the people of this country.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and I hope very much _ •** that the Press will give full coverage, not necessarily to the debate, but to the substance of what this legislation does and what it means for the people who will benefit from it, because I believe that sometimes the Press should perform a special public role in passing information, a very important role. I think the Press should take a responsibility sometimes in educating and informing the public and not * looking for areas only of controversy or areas of conflict. Indeed I would hope that the reporters present with us today would do some research on this one and add it to the

information coming forward and do a good feature for the people of Barbados. I know that they are competent and capable of doing that and therefore I hope that they will adopt that as a public duty. There is nothing in this that speaks of conflict or rancour. In fact, I believe that the three parties in the House will speak as one on this issue and I believe that all sectors in Barbados will agree that this is in fact good legislation and I have no doubt that the Press will do its utmost to give this the kind of coverage that it deserves. 8.30p.m.

All too often, Mr. Speaker, we find there is a certain dualism in the provision for pensions in the private sector where one group of employees, normally what we call the white-collar employees, will have access to pensions, whereas those on the shop floor are bereft of that kind of provision. This is not so generally speaking in the public sector where generally speaking all employees of whatever calibre are exposed to pension arrangements. I think that a pension is a right. I don't think a pension should be considered a privilege for an employee. I believe that a worker enjoys right to a pension because of the contribution which they make to the life of any organisation during the period when they work. Recognize, Sir, that at some times we give 30-35 years or more of our lives to a particular organisation and workers make a significant contribution to the livelihood and the welfare of that organisation. We have heard debates about the pensionable age for parliamentarians, especially by a new party which is causing some concern to the community by wanting to change everything that exists. I cannot really support the position taken by these newcomers in matters of pension. I believe that those persons who make valuable contributions to any institution build up a right to a pension which in a sense is aptly deferred remuneration.

What you are doing is to ensure that those persons who work for you when they were able, when they are no longer able that they are still in a position to cope with life's situations. In fact, I think it is well known that we in the trade unions believe that pensions should even be indexed and we have made this point over and over again that not only should workers as a right have access to a pension but there should also be indexation of pensions so that as the cost of living continues to increase the workers are not put at a disadvantage.

I believe that this is a significant step forward and I hope that it is recognized as a major social development, not to the same scale as the introduction of a national insurance scheme but along the same lines basically. I think it is giving expression to the basic, social, democratic orientations of the DLP and I think the Government is to be complimented for this and the Prime Minister in particular for bringing this into being. Mr. Speaker, I can think of the pioneer work done by the Barbados Workers' Union in this respect. People are not generally aware that long before

there was a national insurance scheme the BWU pioneered the toughest pension scheme where persons who worked at docks are able to get a pension along with their national insurance pension so that when they retire they can live relatively comfortably. We will never forget the attempts by Frank Walcott to introduce a similar scheme in the sugar industry. The gentleman is now the President of the other Chamber, the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union. When he attempted in 1963 to introduce a pension scheme for the sugar workers of this country, and when at that time, through political considerations the then leaders of the Barbados Labour Party sought to prevent this becoming an actuality, it was short-sighted at that time. I think the present leadership of that party will recognise that or the present members, those in the Chamber at this point in time would recognize that that was short-sighted but I believe that workers in the sugar industry to this day do not have a pension scheme in spite of that massive contribution that that industry has made to our economy. The workers in sugar to this day do not enjoy a pension from the companies that employ them and I could bet that that would not be true for the white-collar people in sugar. I would be quite surprised to learn that the white-collar people in sugar do not have their own pension schemes, but there has always been an upstairs-downstairs policy in some of these private sector organizations.

I believe that this example coming from Government should be taken up by the private sector. Government is willing to play the role of exemplar and that is why sometimes when I hear all this talk about privatisation I wonder if people recognise the significant difference between the private sector and the public sector in this country. When we talk about privatising institutions you are also privatising the employment of people. It is alright to privatise the institution but are you going to get the same kind of relationships with the people who are there.

The Prime Minister in his winding up made the point that he hopes that this action will result in those people feeling better about where they are working, giving better productivity, that there will be less turnover etc. I believe that he is on good grounds. I believe that persons who are exposed to a certain level of benefits will be happier where they are employed and will give a better service. After all, if you have access to a pension, good remuneration, secure employment, medicare schemes, all these matters, why would you want to leave where you are and go somewhere else. There is no reasonable and rational person who will leave good and go to worse. Although this is not a law that would appeal to Members over on the other side. It is not a policy that would appeal to the members of the NDP but generally speaking nobody would go from a position that is better to one that is worse. But my friends have done this. Generally speaking, when these conditions exist one does not find that there is an outflow. It is very difficult to find people leaving the public sector to go and work in the private sector except on retirement because generally

speaking the public sector has always been a good employer and what we are doing here is just showing that it is an even better employer which is really augmenting the tremendous provisions that are made to these workers who make a very important contribution to the life of our country.

So, on behalf of the union and speaking also on behalf of my colleague, the Member for St. Michael Central, I would like to compliment the Government on this measure which will bring relief and comfort to several persons in the public sector and which once again underlines the fact that Government that has a democratic socialist orientation is one that will be supportive of the human resources of our country and I therefore have no problem whatsoever in supporting this Resolution.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation for the comments and observations which have been made on both sides of the Chamber. 8.40 p.m.

I would like to thank Honourable Members for the contributions they have made to this particular piece of legislation which has generally been given support although a few queries have been raised. I do not propose on this occasion to go deeply into most of them.

Let me indicate that the Transport Board does have a pension scheme, I am advised. I believe this was raised by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. My understanding is that they do have a pension scheme for employees, that the National Assistance Board is included under these arrangements and that those employees whether of the National Conservation Commission or otherwise should be covered under either the Statutory Boards' casual pensions arrangements or under some other arrangements. In any event, if we find that any category of worker may be omitted, we will make the necessary adjustments or amendments to this piece of legislation. Those amendments will be done by Order so that if there are loopholes or deficiencies identified we will seek to correct them in that particular instance.

As far as commercial operators like the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation may be concerned, and corporations which are also tinged with a heavy dose of public interest activities, we will certainly make provision through grants or subventions to the corporation to assist it in meeting its share of any obligations arising from this particular matter. I think I should make that point clear.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas referred to some actuarial study and the status of the National Pension Plan. I will check on that and in due course, on some other occasion, give the Honourable Member a response to that either privately or on the Floor of the House.

I think those have been the matters raised. Once again I commend this matter to the Honourable Chamber.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in committee.

Clauses 1-5 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour, Mr. SPEAKER, the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER NO. 4: NURSES AND MIDWIVES (REGISTRATION) (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1990

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Nurses and Midwives Registration Act Cap. 372 provides at section 7(1):-

"Any person who after 25th June, 1973 applies to the Council to be registered as a nurse and who satisfies the Council

(a) that she is qualified to be so registered;

(b) that she is a fit and proper person to practise nursing in Barbados; and

(c) that she is of the prescribed age,

is entitled upon compliance with the requirements of this Act and on payment of the first registration fee to be registered as a nurse."

Section 7(2) of that Act makes provision for the registration of a nurse who:-

- (a) has completed the prescribed course of training at a place of training in Barbados recognised by the Council and has passed the prescribed examinations; or
- (b) holds a diploma, certificate or other status or form of recognition granted in a place outside Barbados by duly constituted body empowered by the law of that place to confer authority to practise nursing and which is recognised by the Council as being equivalent to the qualification required by paragraph (a)."

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am seeking here to do is to put the nurses on the same footing as the doctors and the dentists. A doctor coming into Barbados to do a short stint at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or a dentist coming in to do a locum for another dentist can, in fact, be provisionally registered but a nurse cannot be. It works as a disadvantage to Barbados.

It became apparent after I had put in place a policy that is in keeping with policies practised in the more developed countries, where those persons who do not exactly satisfy the requirements for registration as perceived by the Nursing Council would be required to take an examination. What I did was to ask the Nursing Council to fix the examination twice a year so that there is now an examination given in April and September of every year so that everybody knows when the examination can be taken.

Those persons coming from other jurisdictions that do not quite, for reasons which are peculiar to the Nursing Councils, fit the requirement to be registered per se, are required to take examinations. What we discovered though is that persons coming from Guyana who would take an examination in April would come into the country may be two or three months before, if they would work they would have to work as a nursing assistant because they could be so registered. It is demeaning for a person who has worked for 15 years in another jurisdiction as a registered nurse who is coming to take an examination to work in Barbados to be required to work at a station beneath that to which she or he had become accustomed over the last 15 years. 8.50p.m.

I myself am not qualified to pass judgment on the determinations and decisions of the various councils, because as you know, Sir, they have an absolute discretion, but I have been concerned as Minister of Health that a person, for example, who is trained in St. Lucia and who, if anyone of the Honourable Members in this House went to St. Lucia and got into an accident, could assist a surgeon in St. Lucia in the operating theatre in an emergency to save our lives, but if that same person should come to Barbados,

for some peculiar reason that person would only be able to work at the level of nursing assistant.

We have rectified a part of it by arranging for the said examinations I talked about, but the passing of this Bill would help to ensure that such a person, while provisionally registered, could work at the level to which she or he had become accustomed. It provides, of course, an additional pair of hands for us in Barbados for those persons who are coming, for whatever reason, to take the examination to be registered here at the level of nurse rather than at the level of nursing assistant. It is for that reason that we have sought to put this final part of a whole examination of the approach to nurse recruitment.

I should say to the Honourable House that, spearheaded by Barbados, an attempt is being made to have finally a Caricom examination that can be taken by all nurses anywhere in the Caribbean that would be automatically accepted by all other jurisdictions. I feel that that is the only thing that would be equitable, in the final analysis, and with the approval of the Regional Nursing Council, that is a process that is in train. In the meantime, Sir, I believe that the nurses should be put on the same footing as the doctors and the dentists, and hence we bring this amendment.

I want to take this opportunity in passing - I know the hour is getting late - but in recent times the President of the Barbados Registered Nurses' Association has sought to give the impression, according to reports in the newspaper, that the shortage of nurses in Barbados is somehow so acute that we are in danger of closing wards at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There is absolutely no validity in such a statement. Far from our closing wards at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I am pleased to report, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the areas of expansion under the \$40 million project which I reported to this House some time ago have in fact been opened in sequence and most of them are either now on track or will be on track within the next two weeks. I do not intend to detail all of them here, Sir, but the Accident and Emergency Department, the Neo Natal and Ob-Gyn Department, the new wing has been opened, the Out-Patients Clinics have been opened, and the Surgical Intensive Care Unit has been opened and the recovery room is being joined with it for the time being to allow the present recovery room to be refurbished. All of the theatres that are to be refurbished have been refurbished, and generally speaking, Sir, we have been in a position, because of a specific recruitment policy which we have followed in the last three years, to be the only Caribbean country with a surplus. Our net position is that more nurses have been recruited than have left the Service.

I have not bragged about that position in the past, because it is not a position that one wants to brag about so much as to continue, but in the face of the kind of statement alleged to have been made by the President of that

Association, I feel bound to draw to the attention of this House that not only is it not true, the contrary is true. I also wish to give the House the assurance that arising out of policies which we adopted from 1986-87, I can say to the House that by 1993 there will be an additional 400 nursing personnel that would have been trained in Barbados, broken down as follows: Between 1986 and 1990 we have had so far 160 persons registered in the three year general nursing programme, 40 persons in the two year shortened RN programme, 164 persons in the registered mental nurse programme and 150 persons in the midwifery[^] and the enrolled nursing assistant programmes, which will bring a total of 150 + 164 + 160 + 40, which as I said will be in the vicinity of 400.

I say that, Sir, with all due deference and respect for the number of young women and men, not many men, who have found it desirable again to become nurses. We have achieved this without a great deal of fanfare by (a) a policy of reintroducing in 1989 the stipend which had always been available to student nurses from time immemorial and it has made a tremendous difference. It does not seek to pay the student nurses their actual worth, but it allows the third year nurses to get \$500 a month, the second year nurses \$400 and the first year nurses \$300 to allow them to buy certain incidentals which, as you can appreciate, would prove and was proving a hindrance in the past

One of the objectives we have set ourselves is to allow for training of 100 nurses or more per annum, and with the co-operation of the Community College we are going in that direction, so that by 1992 we expect that the enrolment for nurses' training in the general programme will be on average about 100 nurses per year. This will ensure for all time thereafter that we have the capacity to replace outgoing nurses in our own system and allow for a surplus as we used to do in the 1960s for those who wish to go out and discover greener pastures.

The policy of the Government is that we will not, I repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not stand in the way of anyone who feels that he or she wishes to go and discover what lies beyond the mountain. We feel that anyone who goes out will come back, or at least will send back, but in any event we will seek not to deter anyone from going. I am happy to report, nonetheless, that the numbers that have been leaving Barbados show a level no higher than has been the case for the last 25 years in this country. There has been no special attraction, apparently, for Barbadian nurses in any of the capitals that have been trying to woo West Indian nurses. 9.00 p.m.

I believe the reason is that we have taken deliberate, specific steps to improve the quality of the environment within which our nurses work. We have not yet reached the level that this Government considers appropriate but we are going there very fast and I am happy to confirm, Mr.

Deputy Speaker, that the morale across the board is very high.

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

Hon. C. V. WALKER: I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative.

On the motion of Hon. B. M. TAITT seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed. The

Schedule was called.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule be the Schedule to the Bill.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. B. M. TAITT, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. B. M. TAITT, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the House having done a magnificent job of passing some good legislation today, Sir, having some good amendments, some good debate and still not in a position as adumbrated by both Leaders of the Opposition, Sir, I think that the reporters deserve to have a rest, so we are moving the adjournment, Sir, until next week.

Sir, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 4th December, 1990, at twelve o'clock noon.

Hon. M.A. KING: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 9.10p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 20th November, 1990.....	6148
--	------

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD.....	6148
-------------------------------	------

1. The Defence (Rate of Pay, Loans and Allowances) Regulations, 1990.
2. The 21st Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank for the financial year ended 31st March, 1990.

Hon. B. M. TAITT.....	6148
-----------------------	------

1. The Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1990.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. B. M. TAITT	6148
------------------------	------

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bartlett Tenantry, Christ Church for the resiling of residents affected by the Sewerage Treatment Plant.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. B. M. TAITT	6149
------------------------	------

A Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the payment of pensions, gratuities and other allowances.

A Bill to provide for provisional and temporary registration of nurses and the prescription of temporary registration fees.

Hon. M. A. KING.....	6149
----------------------	------

A Bill to provide for the protection of children from exploitation.

NOTICE OF A MOTION FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE ON MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE	6149
--	------

Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6149.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.....	6149
------------------------------------	------

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6149.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BELL TO AMEND THE ROAD TRAFFIC ACT, CAP. 295	6149
---	------

Hon. M. A. King, 6149, 6182; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6151; Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, 6155; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6156; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6160; Mr. E. Bourne, 6163; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 6165; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 6168; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6172; Mr. P. J. M. Miller, 6174; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 6178; Hon. E. E. Greaves, 6181; Mr. C. A. Neblett, 6182.

PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL, 1990	6186
---	------

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6186, 6193; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6188; Mr. R. P. Byer, 6191; Mr. R. L. Morris, 6191.

NURSES AND MIDWIVES (REGISTRATION) (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1990.....	6193
--	------

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6193.

SUSPENSION.....	6159, 6188
-----------------	------------

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6159; Hon. M. A. King, 6188.

ADJOURNMENT	6195
-------------------	------

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6195.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter) BOURNE, Mr. E. (Christ Church East) BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East) BYER, Mr. R. P. (St. George South) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (SL Lucy) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central) MILLER, Mr. P. J. M. (City of Bridgetown) MORRIS, Mr. R. L. (Christ Church East Central) NEBLETT, Mr. C. A. (St. Andrew) SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West) THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John) TROTMAN, Mr. C. LeR. (St. Michael Central) WEEKES, His Hon. L. A. (St. Michael North West)

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986-91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 4, 1990

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P., (Speaker)

His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker)

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), J.P., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs)

Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Health)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of International Transport, Telecommunications and Immigration and Leader of the House)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.), (Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, B.A., M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)

Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General, Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign Affairs)

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc.(Econ.), (Minister of Housing and Lands)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.)

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture)

Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of Education and Culture)

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)

Mr. E. BOURNE

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, M.D.

Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M. (Minister of Tourism and Sports)

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN, M.A.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS, B.A., Cert. Ed.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER

Mr. R. P. BYER, LL.B.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B.

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Ifarewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in Session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, November 27, 1990.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Honourable House held on 27th November 1990 be taken as read and confirmed.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no corrections or observations let those Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of the Accounts and Statements for the month of September 1990 as prepared by the Accountant General.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central - A Resolution of No-Confidence in the Minister responsible for Finance.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: A Resolution of No-Confidence in the Minister responsible for Finance. Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution. Should I read the Resolution? Don't read it? Thank you very much, Sir. I had better rephrase that, Sir, I beg to give notice of a Resolution of No-Confidence in the Minister responsible for Finance.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill to amend the Judges' Remuneration and Pension Act be read a first time.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that this Bill be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary question No. 134 asked by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Sir, that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

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

ORDER NO. 3 - TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BARTLETT'S TENANTRY, CHRIST CHURCH, FOR THE RESITING OF RESIDENTS AFFECTED BY THE SEWERAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this acquisition of land at Bartlett's Tenantry has a long history in that the residents surrounding the Sewerage Plant at Emmerton needed to be removed or it was felt necessary that those people in the immediate environment of the Sewerage Plant should be removed and we did go through a lot of searching and looking for lands where we could move those people. We tried as far as possible to keep them together and that is one of the problems why it has taken fairly long to bring this acquisition here because, as you are aware, most of the available land in St. Michael is not in the quay area; you need or that you would like in order to build houses. We looked at one area but that area was determined even under the Barbados Land Use Act it was to be used for another purpose and that purpose has now gone.

We looked at another area but that area could only accommodate about thirteen houses so then we had to look further. 12.25 p.m.

We came upon this area at Bartlett's Tenantry always bearing in mind that when you are relocating people you tend to relocate them as close as possible to where they have been living before. Bartlett's Tenantry is not as close as one would like but it is the nearest area we could have found to accommodate the number of houses we are going to relocate there. It is in close proximity to the other persons from that area who had been relocated to Clapham. Bartlett's Tenantry is just on the other side of the roundabout.

There are about five parcels of land here. The notices have already been published on this land. The National Housing Corporation has already decided that it will relocate three or four of the persons from Emmerton as quickly as possible because there is one section of the land where infrastructure, water and lights are already in. That one section can accommodate, I believe, about four. Very soon we should move about four persons from Emmerton to Bartlett's Tenantry. As soon as the infrastructure has been put in - we are moving very quickly with that because we realise that this is pretty urgent - we will remove the other houses.

This Resolution seeks parliamentary approval to acquire about five portions of land at Bartlett's Tenantry for the relocation of the residents from around the Sewerage Plant at Emmerton,

With those remarks I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, just a short intervention here. As the Honourable Minister of Housing knows, he and I have had a very difficult period on this whole issue since he became Minister in 1986. It is because I have said on numerous occasions in here and elsewhere that I have found on a lot of occasions poor people who are not necessarily in a position to help themselves are always the ones who tend to be used by politicians as footballs. The Honourable Member for St. James South would know very well what I speak of because he is very good at playing football with them. This is yet another example of that kind of behaviour.

I am saying now that there are politicians and there are politicians. There are different types. There are some of us who come in here with the full knowledge that we have come to serve the people who elected us and there are others who think we can run on them. If the Honourable Member for St. James South has a difficulty in deciding

which type of politician he is, that is his problem. A lot of people know what type he is already. Let me move on because it does not make sense to waste time with him anyhow.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I said St. James South. You did not hear? I mean St. James South. We will get around to that. If he continues to listen to our meetings as well as he is doing, he will hear more that I will say on that.

The point is, Sir, that just prior to 1986 - all the saying that is going to be done as far as that Honourable Member is concerned, the Prime Minister will deal with so I do not have anything to say about that at all.

Let me move on, Sir. Even prior to the 1976 Elections the Democratic Labour Party then who were the ones that came with the Sewerage Plant Project had meetings and informed the people of Emmerton Lane - the Honourable Member who is the Honourable Leader of the House now at that time chaired the meeting at St. Mary's School where they informed the people of that area and a former member Dr. Caddie was present - that once the plant was put in place they would be moved. It would be in their own enlightened self-interest for the plant to go down there because they would have much better conditions.

I am making the point, Sir, about the whole question of being political footballs. At that time the candidate for the Barbados Labour Party informed them "Do not mind them. You do not have to move. You are staying just where you are." Whether they were going to make conditions better for them or not we do not know up to now but they were told they did not have to move. The people were in a state of confusion.

Along came the Barbados Labour Party Administration, erected the Sewerage Plant, moved some of the people to put down the Plant. Get that straight, Sir. They moved enough people just for the plant to be sited. The others were still there. They were told on numerous occasions by various Government agencies that they would still be moved and that a buffer zone would be created, some sort of park around the Sewerage Plant. This did not happen.

Just before the 1986 Elections there was a rush and about half a dozen people were moved so that there would be some indication that something was going to happen, the kind of election gimmicks that we see happening now, that kind of rushing around. It happened then in 1986. I called on the present Minister of Housing at that time to tell the people of that area what was going to happen with them. He did not only tell me. He went down there with his officers - I can see it now - in a jeep, I remember. He got out (the same one that he drives - I am not sure if he still drives it though) of that jeep, walked around and saw the houses that

needed to be moved. He said that was not a problem. They will have to go, shortly too.

There was a front page article in "The Advocate" - this was 1986, I believe it was August - and he was talking to a lady who lives in the area assuring her that they were going to move in the shortest possible time. That was four years ago. He said that his Ministry moves very, very slowly. He said that himself. Do you know that the first thing that happened was - some Honourable Members may find these things funny but if they had to live in the conditions down there at Chapman Lane they would not be laughing and finding it so funny. I am surprised at the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East when he finds things like this funny because he is a man who is always claiming to be champion of the cause of the poor people.

Let me move on, Sir. They went into the area, sent some officer from Housing and the officer went down there and assured the people that they would be moved to Valery. I asked the Honourable Minister of Housing and he said No, they are not going up there - I am going to get to you now. You take it easy - that he had something else in mind.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Whatever you say I am going to handle it. Let me talk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, I think we need at this point in time to make sure that the debate continues according to the Rules of the House. I said last week if you make an aside, it must be of such that would not disturb either the Chair nor the speaker. Now, I am not going to permit anything less than that.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Thank you, Sir. I am glad you are protecting me from the Honourable Member for St. Michael West

This time around - in fact, this is now going back to about a year and a half, I would think - people came down and measured the houses, assuring them and some persons even asked me if the leasehold improvements that were done to their houses if they would get them back when the Government moved the houses. I told them "Of course. They must get them back". They measured the houses and told them they would be moved to Passage Road. Obviously, nobody had any quarrel with Passage Road. Passage Road is close enough to the City. These people who live in the area who tend to work as vendors in the City would have been housed in Passage Road. They were quite happy with that. I too. 12.35p.m.

But along came the Honourable Member for St. Michael West and reminded the Minister of Housing, who

seemed a little afraid of him anyhow, that there was no way that he is going to condone him putting house spots for people who are badly in need of house spots.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to also say this. You are suggesting that the Minister is a coward.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: No, Sir. Not at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are suggesting that.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Some of us are afraid of ghosts but we are not cowards.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are suggesting

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: He may be afraid of his mouth, Sir, not what he can do him. The Honourable Minister of Housing is a strong, strapping looking man. I do not think he would be afraid of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West. He might be afraid of his mouth though, Sir.

But anyhow, let me press on. There are house spots that were promised at Passage Road. Do you know what kind of weak excuse we got from a party who went all over this country lambasting the Barbados Labour Party? The weak excuse we got was that the Barbados Labour Party had already promised the people a playing field and we have to give them a playing field. And I heard it again today in here. The Honourable Minister¹ said in here that it was even promised prior to the DLP taking over, it was promised for a playing field. Sir, it was even promised for the gymnasium. We have not seen any gymnasium there. We do not see any gymnasium there. All we see is a little - what would you call it - stand. A place that hardly anybody uses because all around that area there are at least three or four playing fields in the immediate area which are well used. It is hardly ever used anyhow.

I am saying, Sir

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Well if I am dishonest, all the Honourable Member has to do is to get up and say what I am dishonest about.

What I just told you, Sir, is chapter and verse, exactly as it happened. It is a fact that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Since he says that what he just said is chapter and verse, I am saying he is misleading the House.

He knows, Sir, or ought to know that the decision to put a playing field there was made by the Democratic Labour Party administration before it demitted office in

1976. Therefore for him to get up and give the impression that that decision was made during the Barbados Labour Party time, is absolutely wrong. He is misleading the House.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Yes, Sir. Any misleading would have been done by the Honourable Minister of Housing. He told me that Bradshaw promised to put a playing field there. Those were his words. Okay? Let me press on.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. It is okay for anyone to get up and say this person promised you this and the next person promised you that. I never told the Honourable Member that. Nonsense.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: He said to me that the playing field was promised by the Barbados Labour Party and you cannot go back on it and not give the people the playing field. That is what I am saying, Sir. So if the few votes in Passage Road from one or two fellows who can go and play football is more important to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West than the people to be resided from Emmerton, I have no quarrel with that. That is his problem. He has to live with his own conscience. Not me. That is all I am saying, that to me, it was more important for the people resided than having a playing field. We have a scarcity in the whole of the St. Michael never mind the Cily. The whole of St. Michael has a scarcity of house spols.

He knows that there is a playing field right there at Richmond. There is one at Wesbury School. There is one down in Chapman Lane. All around in a circle, there are playing fields that people can use.

This is the same Government that castigated the Barbados Labour Party for thinking that they could get votes for putting up playing fields and social centres. This same Government This same Democratic Labour Government castigated the Barbados Labour Party for that. And now, they are going to look to get votes for putting up a playing field where they could have housed people.

Maybe this is why you have a difficulty with him, Sir. Maybe that is why the Right Honourable Prime Minister has a difficulty with him and started to express that difficulty Sunday night gone. But we will get more of that.

Laughter.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: You see, the Honourable Member does not know the difference between a Sandi Dem and another Dem. I would explain to him which ones are which.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I should like to make it abundantly clear that I do not have any difficulty with my Minister of Health. I had a difficulty with the Member for the City. That is why he is over there in the Opposition.

Laughter.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. Of course, that was no point of order. But the point is that the difficulty that the Right Honourable Prime Minister may have with this member is the same difficulty that thousands of Barbadians have with that Right Honourable Prime Minister. Next time your votes will not be enough to get you home. Do not worry about that. You are not getting home, next time. Your pensions look pretty so you do not have to worry about any votes.

Sir, as far as the Emmerton Lane situation is concerned one is very concerned that one has not heard the Minister say anything about it. You see, the Democratic Labour Party Government has a way of quick fixing things. They always. They like to accuse people of creating impressions and that is all. But yet, that is the way they live.

I have not heard what is going to happen, after the houses are moved. Are we still going to have that buffer zone in Chapman Lane? Do you know what it is? Have you ever seen a plan? Do you know what the plan was for the Chapman Lane area? If the Honourable Minister does, I should like him to explain to us, what else is going to happen.

Beyond that, Sir, as far as moving these people to Bartlett Tenantry is concerned, I am very happy that the people are going to be resited somewhere where they are not going to have to put up with the conditions like in Emmerton Lane. Of course, Sir, it would be remiss of me not to express the concern that they are moving them so far away. But one has also to wonder if they are going to get proper conditions where they are going because the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central would tell you himself that the area they are looking at to put these people in is in need of a lot of work, infrastructurally. He has already complained, several times, about the infrastructure in that whole area. He knows that the conditions under which they are going to be removed need to be corrected.

One only too well clearly remembers the early days in Clapham. The people of Chapman Lane have proven themselves - those who were moved to Clapham - and have shown you that they have made it a very beautiful area. For all of these people who simply would like to criticize these people have gone up to Clapham and created a beautiful community.

I am hopeful that, in Bartlett's Tenantry, that the infrastructure would be put in properly. I hope that the Minister can assure us today that proper infrastructure would be put in place so that these persons could go up there now and, hopefully, create some kind of nice neighbourhood, as long as the physical attributes are in place.

With those few words, Sir, I should like to support the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one clarification. Since the Honourable Member spoke first, I took it that he was speaking for the Opposition.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. That is one Opposition over there.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was only made in reference to time limit.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He spoke for the whole Opposition, Sir. I do not believe that the Barbados Labour Party wishes to share the view he expressed in its entirety but if he spoke for the whole Opposition, I will have to indict them, as well.

I am very disappointed, Sir, that I have to enjoin in this debate, in terms arising out of a statement made by the Honourable Member who just sat down. I do not know what his problem may be. It may very well be that the polls for his constituency which show that he is running third in a three man race might be causing him a lot of distress. It might very well be that the fact that some of the people who he feels would vote for him, which would be change of heart, would be, as he put it, moving so far away.

I really do not understand how that Honourable Member, in all honesty, could get up in this Honourable House and, first of all, make the statement that there are a lot of playing fields in the area of St. Michael West and then cite two schools.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. I never said there were a lot of playing fields in the constituency or area of St. Michael West. I said in the area of Passage Road. That is what I said. The Honourable Member knows that too.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Well, Sir, Passage Road is in St. James North. I have said in this House of Assembly in the year 1974 that there was not a single solitary playing field in St. Michael West and he has the temerity to come in here and talk about the little "nay-nay" playing field I got in Passage Road for the people of St. Michael West. 12.45 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is true. I saw to it that it is not "nay-nay". I saw to it that they did not put housing, gymnasium, Miller Products, or nothing on it.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Nobody uses it - that is your business. It is there for all time and the pavilion is wonderful. It is dishonest to say nobody is using it, Sir. The children from the Louis Lynch School and other children in the area have already started to use it as a hockey field. So that is dishonest, Sir. For anyone to say that would be purely and completely dishonest or ignorant But that is not the point I am making. I am disappointed that an Honourable Member who is next door to the constituency, who is fully seized of all of the circumstances would say what he said in order to make a point about some people being moved from around the sewerage plant. Perhaps because of this unholy alliance between him and the Barbados Labour Party he is unable forcibly to quarrel with the Barbados Labour Party who for ten years did nothing to move the people in spite of the commitment made by the Government of the day in 1976. If he is unable to deal with the Barbados Labour Party, let him not take....

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know that after Sunday night he has gotten a little excited. But look I said, Sir, that the Barbados Labour Party moved enough people to site the plant and they moved a few more in 1986. How can he now get up and say that I said they never moved anybody when I never said anything. Well, try and write down what I said if you cannot remember it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not saying he did not mention the name. I am saying that he does not have the capacity to take on the Barbados Labour Party because of the unholy alliance between them. That is what I am saying. I am accusing him and his party of an unholy alliance. I am not making any foolish sport with him. I am saying, Sir, that there is something diabolical about a man who walks through a constituency and gives people the impression that he is with them and that he likes poor people.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I wish it to be clearly understood that the Barbados Labour Party has no alliance, holy or unholy, with anybody. They will soon find out.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I can appreciate that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas would want to disown them at this point. I can understand why. I am not dealing with that now, Sir. There is a time coming when we will deal with that. I am dealing with the Honourable Member for the City who ought to be able to understand what representation means. Representation requires that you understand what the people of the constituency who send you to the House want. In 1974, Sir, the records of this

House would show that I made a statement in this House from that end of this House, Sir, in which I then pointed out....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. So far as I am aware, the Honourable Member who is now speaking was not a Member of the House of Assembly in 1974 and he could not have spoken in here. He must not lie, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes Sir, he is perfectly correct. Did I say 1974? He is perfectly correct, Sir. I was not in the House in 1974, Sir. I was in the House from 1976. That is correct, Sir. I was a Minister in the Senate from 1971, Sir, and so I will repeat. I made a statement in Parliament in the Senate and subsequently made another statement in this House when I came into this House sitting on that corner. You can correct me. You will remember better than me. I,» was here in 1976 and brought you in 1978 so you would know.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I appreciate that, Sir. I agree. This Honourable Member, Sir, who must have given it deep and ^ serious thought before uttering the words and, therefore, in my mind stands condemn. He stands condemn in my mind, Sir, because he must have given it very serious and deep thought. He is fully seised of the history of the playing field at Passage Road which at the time he was running for Parliament he told the people on the other side of Passage Road that they would be able to use. Get up and say so.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Oh no, no, do not try that talk.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I want to say is that you must <*. still maintain some dignity in the Chair. You cannot get up saying, "Oh, no, no". You cannot address me like that.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. At no time have I told anyone that they would be playing on a playing field in Passage Road. I did not even know that there was going to be a playing field in Passage Road. The last I heard was that it was going to be a gymnasium. I never knew of any playing field that anybody was going to play on. Ii> fact, I thought that over there would become an extension of Kensington Lodge for houses and not a playing field.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, his memory may be fading but on more than one occasion the Honourable Member himself uttered with his own mouth words to the effect that he was with me 100 per cent in my fight against the wicked **** Barbados Labour Party who was going to be depriving the people who they were jamming together in what he called "Knots Landing". Yes, you, the Honourable Member for the

City called that place "Knots Landing" and he helped me campaign up and down fighting to say that we wanted that playing field for recreation. There are more people who will benefit from the playing field - those who live in the City, part of Passage Road and those who live in New Orleans. That is why the people in the City are going to get rid of him, Sir. The Honourable Member must not interfere with me.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am going to teach him a number of lessons. He must not interfere with me about my constituency. You and anybody else can make fun about me and any other Honourable Member. When it comes to my constituency - let me address you, Sir - I will bite out their throat, Sir, if they interfere with my constituency. They are not to interfere with my constituency and especially the Honourable Member.

The Honourable Member ought to be ashamed of himself, Sir. Never in my life would I have thought that of all the people I know who offered themselves as a representative that that Honourable Member would turn against the people of Passage Road. The people of Passage Road must have given him some indication that they are angry with him and that they are going to reject him. I do not know, Sir. But the playing field is going to remain, Sir, because it was fought for. Senator Dennis Hunte as the parliamentary...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Connell's buddie. You see he remembers, Sir. You see he is remembering, Sir. You see how he is prompting me, Sir. He knows what I am saying is true. Senator Connell and Senator Hunte were buddies. He knows the whole thing, Sir. The only reason I do not bring Your Honour in, Sir, is that the Rules do not allow me to bring Your Honour in, but everybody in here knows, Sir. The Leader of the Opposition knows too - everything.

As I was saying, Sir, Senator Hunte went and did an exchange with Plantations Limited to allow Plantations Limited to have seven acres of land at the new area in Indian Ground which was being built up in exchange for the property at Passage Road. The purposes were convincingly and comprehensively without any other consideration to provide a playing field for the residents of Passage Road, Barbarees Hill, New Orleans and the surrounding areas. When the Barbados Labour Party came into office, the Honourable Member for St. James as he then was, Lionel Craig, after having completed the building at what the Honourable Member for the City calls "Knots Landing" determined that he would like to extend housing to the other side.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He calls it Knots Landing. Ask him why. Let him get up and say why he calls it Knots Landing. I do not know. But that is how he describes it. Ask anybody who lives in the area when they hear Knots Landing if they do not think of the Honourable Member for the City. Ask him, Sir. 12.55 p.m.

Don't you believe he calls it Knots Landing?

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: But he cannot deny it. I challenge him to get up and deny it.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that is so trivial that I.... On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. It is so trivial that I was really trying not to bother to get up, but he kept repeating it. I never called the place Knots Landing. Some of the followers of the former representative for the City called it so, because they said the apartments were so beautiful that it was like the TV show, Knots Landing. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West once said on a platform at the corner of Baxters Road, on the night before the last election, that there would be no swimming pool and they could stop calling it Knots Landing. He is the first one on the DLP side that I ever heard calling it Knots Landing.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, it is so wonderful that he can remember all of those details but he himself never called it. Here is an Honourable Member who got up and told the House that he never called it Knots Landing. Let me try not to put him in more difficulty, except to say this. I leave him to all the people out there who know that he calls it Knots Landing. But that is not the issue, the issue is that when Senator Hunte got the seven acres of the land where the Community High School used to be, which was owned by D'Arcy Scott, and subsequently owned by Plantations Limited, it was always understood that it would be for a playing field.

As I was saying, Sir, Lionel Craig wanted to put housing there and I fought in this House of Assembly. I told him I would lie down in front of the bulldozer and I recall his saying that any Member who feels so strongly about something he would review it. To his everlasting credit, and the Labour Party, they reviewed it. Then came DeLisle Bradshaw who wanted to put the gymnasium there and I had to go through the same process. The Honourable Member got mixed up between the gymnasium and the housing, because when the Labour Party was going out of office in 1986 the talk was not housing, it was a gymnasium. The question of siting people at Passage Road was a matter which came up subsequently and it had to do not only with siting people from Emmerton, it had to do

with the siting of people from Church Village. When the Barbados Labour Party was building the Central Bank, they indicated to the people that they would be able to move from Church Village to Passage Road, and once more I went to work, behaving like a banshee, Sir, because that is how you are supposed to behave for your people.

That is what I would have thought the Honourable Member would be able to do for those people from the City who live in Passage Road. You put people in an apartment building, there is no recreational facility whatsoever for the people who live on the City side of Passage Road and those who live in the apartment buildings. It is well known that no one considers a school ground to be a playing field, and because St. Leonard has been the playing field for Rangers and other people from time immemorial, and the Headmaster of that school has had on more than one occasion to draw attention to the difficulty which they were having administering their own lands because of the use by other persons. The other persons had no choice.

The Honourable Member talks about Westbury School. The Honourable Member knows that the Westbury School ground only became playable in an expanded way in relatively recent times and that it is used under controlled circumstances. Therefore, Sir, I am very mortally disappointed that the Honourable Member would come in here and in a moment of attempting to score a political point try to castigate the people of St. Michael West. The people of St. Michael West do not owe the Honourable Member anything. The Honourable Member should never try to take away anything from the poor people of St. Michael West.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: On a point of order. If the Honourable Member does not have anything to say, he should stop. To say that I come in here castigating the people of St. Michael West is not true. You, Sir, never heard me castigating anybody from St. Michael West in here, and he does not live in St. Michael West, so even if I castigate him I would not be castigating St. Michael West. *

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is nothing short of castigation for anyone to say that we put ____

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Let me make my point, Sir. The Honourable Member said in his speech that for the sake of a few people to kick about a football we put them on a higher priority than moving people to put housing. He is in fact saying that the recreational requirements of the people of St. Michael West and the people of the City are not as important as some other requirement for the same people. That is what the Honourable Member said.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. I do not understand why the Honourable Member is trying to

say what I said, when he has just repeated exactly what I said. Yes, I said that housing people, to me, is a higher priority than providing a playing field. I said so and I stand on that.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member got up to say that I am right and have been right all along. All I am ** saying is that he is castigating my constituents. -When my constituents get a road and you say that yours should get it before them. . . . what foolishness is this I have to put up with? Have you come in here to tell me that the people of St. Michael West are to be second to anybody else anywhere in the world?

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: No shouting across the Chamber.

mr

Hon. B. M. TAITT: They can never be! I will not have anybody coming in here, Sir, trying to give the impression that we politically made some manoeuvre. He tried to give the impression that the Barbados Labour Party had made a decision about the property.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the Honourable Member then castigating the people of the City by saying that the people of St. Michael West should get priority over them?

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot be a point of order now.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: That is the same thing he is saying, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Let the Honourable Member for St. George South get up and speak for himself. He cannot ** guide those who cannot receive guidance, so let him not try to confuse the Member for the City, making him get up on foolish points of order.

Certain remarks made by Mr. R. P. BYER were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I will not resile from my * position that the Honourable Member for the City on this day, the 4th day of December, 1990, wrote in the history books of this country that the people of St. Michael West are somehow inferior to some other principle which he has in his head. That is what he has said, Sir, and I maintain that there are more people from the City ____

**,*

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The more this Honourable Member continues to make this speech, the more any regard or respect I had for him diminishes. I at no time said that anybody was inferior

to anybody else, and I would like that withdrawn from the record, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If he does not understand the English Language, that is his problem. I will repeat in the same language any time what I have said. If he does not understand it, I understand what I said.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Under the Standing Orders of this House, Sir, Members are presumed to be honourable. A Member cannot persistently deliberately misinterpret or distort what another Member has said, particularly when such distortion would tend to diminish that other Member. The Honourable Member for the City has risen on several occasions and pointed out to the Honourable Member that he is misleading the Honourable House by distorting what he has said, and I would urge that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West pay some respect to the Standing Orders of this Honourable House and desist from that line of argument. 1.05p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The interpretation of the Standing Orders rests with the Chair. The Chair is not always guided by what other people interpret whatever they are talking about to mean and therefore in my estimation I will make my decision based on what I consider the fairest interpretation of what is being said.

The second point is this, the purpose for a point of order is to help to adjust any misunderstanding that might have arisen and therefore when a person rises on a point of order it tends to give that balance and the Chair does not have to interpret anything. Continue.

Hon. B. M. -TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not surprised that the Leader of the Opposition would seek in his way to suggest that I am distorting, which in itself is a breach of the rules. To suggest that I am distorting when the Chair...

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already made the ruling that I have not accepted that form of interpretation and therefore the matter rests where it began. That is, the Honourable Member has risen on a point of order. He has said what he considers to be true and the Chair abides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I accept Your Honour's ruling, Sir. I was merely expressing my own view, Sir, about the Leader of the Opposition. But then, I am not surprised that the Leader of the Opposition would seek to protect the fledgling Member for the City who always seems to need protection from somebody on that side after pushing his mouth into a position where he is.... I deem him to be attacking the people of St. Michael West. If he had anything to say about me, let him say it. He is saying that housing has a higher priority than recreation. That is not the argument. That is not the issue. That is what he was saying.

Let him say that he did not say that. He put his argument in a position that suggested that for political purposes and political purposes alone that we refused to house the people of Emmerton so that we could give for political reasons the people of Passage Road as he put it, a playing field to kick about a football. I take fundamental objection to that.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not acting. But I don't worry with the two of them, Sir. I beg your pardon, Sir. I don't worry with him, because when you play act you get serious but I don't have to get into that.

I am saying, Sir, that when it goes abroad that we are playing political football... Those are the words he used, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Neither you nor anybody else can drive any wedge between the Prime Minister and me. What you have to do is know your little places.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would wish that Members keep to the Resolution.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I feel so strongly, Mr. Speaker - please forgive me, Sir. I feel so strongly about this issue...

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no forgiveness in this House when you break the rules.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If anybody else had done it, Sir, I probably would smile and let it go. But, I walked with that Honourable Member through Passage Road. I stood up and helped people to support that Honourable Member, Sir, whereas I never went.... Let him get up and say where else I haven't been. I resent it and I want the Honourable Member to know that I resent it and I want him to be under no doubt and I want no Honourable Member in this House to be in any doubt whatsoever that when it comes to people in St. Michael West there are no holds barred. Let there be no error when you are going to address matters relating to people of St. Michael West, go into the proper posture. Don't come in here trying to give the impression that the people in St. Michael West have dropped down.

He describes a \$400,000 pavilion on the site in disparaging terms. But that is all right. When we went and looked at the pavilion at Emmerton, that was fine. It is fine for the people of Emmerton to get a pavilion but not the people of Passage Road.

Sir, I am going to support the move of these persons to Bartlett's Tenantry. I am going to support the acquisition of this property at Bartlett's Tenantry to house those persons. I am glad that at long last a decision taken by the Democratic

Labour Party to site the Sewerage Plant is coming to full fruition. The Honourable Member suggested that it took four years. Throughout the length and breadth of this country all that you are hearing now is what we haven't done. They are not in a position to say that we haven't done this and that. All you can hear them with now is the preamble that it took four years. In the constituency which I represent, Sir, it took forever to get any of the facilities which we got in the last four years. In those four years, Sir, I have lived to see the people of St. Michael West with facilities commensurate with their station in life.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall yourself that I had to speak in here and on that occasion I didn't condemn a single party. I condemned the hierarchy for the forty years before when in Passage Garden one mile from the City of Bridgetown there were roads that were unfit for a plantation tenantry of 1920. In this House, I said so, Sir, and I said it was a disgrace and I know that the Barbados Labour Party administration especially between 1976 and 1986 determined that nothing would be done in the constituencies of St. Philip and St. Michael West.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. I was a member of the Barbados Labour Party administration in 1976 to 1981 in this House, 1981-85 in the Senate, 1985-86 again in this House and the statement made by the Honourable Member is not true. He ought to know that in relation to St. Philip, Sir, he never said St. Philip South. He said St. Philip. In relation to St. Philip, Sir, people in Padmore Village got roads that they never had even though they voted for the Democratic Labour Party's candidate for about 15 years. The people in Marley Vale and Sealy Hill got a new road.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is when I was representative. From Blades Hill to Three Houses a new road was put in where the public could go up the hill from the spring back over to Supers. Could I go on, Sir, or do you want me to make a separate speech?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you could reserve.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You talk about the playing field at Chapel. You want us to go on, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: One more.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One more, Sir? All of Church Village, the most populous district in St. Philip never had one fire hydrant in their time and I made sure that it was protected and secured. I am going to have to make a speech about all the things I did for St. Philip. I will get my file.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am grateful to the Honourable Member, Sir, because I was trying not to be as partisan as possible but the Honourable Member confirms, because I had pointed to my colleague for St. Philip South and the Honourable Member and everybody in the House knows that they decided not to do a single thing in St. Philip South while they were doing all the things he just articulated, Sir. They were doing them next door in the North when he was the representative and my colleague was in the South where they did nothing, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I believe a rural development scheme was put in at Heddings. The road from Sam Lord's Castle...He said it. They know what we did. A whole industrial park developed at Six Roads to provide work for thousands of young people in this country. What lies am I hearing from that side, now?

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition must remember this. When I drove the tractor as Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce and" started the industrial park, he and a whole host of them, Sir, had a campaign to indicate that we only came up there because elections were coming. So, that was done by the Democratic Labour Party and since then nothing happened in St. Philip South. .

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The truth is that in the St. Philip North bye-election in February 1976 - which shows that February is a good day for elections -1 made a call for an industrial park in St. Philip. As a result of that, the Government then was put under the severest pressure. On one afternoon, I remember about it, the then Minister of Trade, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, came to Six Roads with a Mr. Brown from the IDC with a piece of paper, about three sets of foolscap with a little something drawn out. 1.15p.m.

They did not invite me to the opening but I went. I looked at it. Between then and September 2, 1976 all that the Democratic Labour Party did at Six Roads was for him to get into a JCB and parade with a big hat on his head and push away a little mould. That is all they did from February to September 1976. We built all those buildings up there, Sir. It was like the St. John Development Plan. I will speak later on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, it always gives me an opportunity to remind Members of the Rules of the House. I have allowed some long points of order. In future, make your points a little bit shorter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, they are trying to take me away from the City. I will take him on in St. Philip another

time. We have had that debate before. I want to finish where I began on the City of Bridgetown.

I want the Honourable Member for the City never again, Sir, for the remaining time he has in this House to attack my constituents. I want him to understand that anything which we manage to secure for my constituents would have been the result of hard work. I want him to know that the constituents are very appreciative. I want him to know further that his constituents from the City, New Orleans, King Street, Lightfoot's Lane, Passage Road, all of those persons who now play on the pasture will be happy that it has been put there.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Any time he says something which runs contrary to the interest of the people of the City I will get up. I would rather err on the side of those people. I would like to tell the Honourable Member that I cannot give him an assurance that I will not have to deal with him rough again. Every time he does anything that attacks the people of the City, I will deal with him.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He has taken counsel and he has indicated what he will do. I have no doubt that he will be doing it from a forum in the newspaper or some such thing. I give him the assurance that in the same way I looked after the interest of the City by putting the playing field there, in the same way that every time we have looked for anything in St. Michael West we have sought to help our brethren across the constituency border that I will continue to do so.

We could not ourselves have done more for the people of Emmerton than we did in 1976 when we designed the Sewerage Plant in such a way as to allow for the buffer. Had we been given the opportunity we would have moved the persons to a more salubrious surrounding. Had we been given the opportunity we would have done all of the things we promised to do as we have done since 1986 with the people of Barbados and in particular the people of St. Michael West.

We have been able, in spite of the behaviour of the Honourable Member to give a substantial amount of help to the people of the City. The people of the City are appreciative and that is the problem. The Honourable Member's direction and the direction of the people of the City seem to converge at one point and now they seem to be diverging.

I hope that the Honourable Member will come in due course to understand the error of his ways. I believe that he is not altogether beyond redemption. I do not think he is completely incorrigible. Therefore, I feel I would give him just a little slap on the wrist on this occasion. That is a figure of speech, Sir. Clearly I will not be attempting physically to assault the Honourable Member unless, of course, he came into the constituency and behaved in a manner that required such activity because he is very good

at instigating that kind of activity. I will have to tell you about that a different time, Sir. The Honourable Member really disappointed me, Sir, because he helped me fight for the playing field and now merely to make a political point he is going contrary to his own dictates.

When the Leader of the Opposition was discussing the movement of these people from Emmerton Lane on a number of occasions, he was one of the people who agreed with me that we must fight for the rights of the people of St. Michael West.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I wish to disassociate myself from this half hour assault from the Honourable Member for St. Michael West on the rights of the people of the City to adequate housing.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You see, Sir, what he did was to give his Honourable colleague an indication of how he should have responded. Let the Leader of the Opposition get up and argue that my fighting for the people of St. Michael West is an attack on the people of the City. Let him get up and argue that. He has done worse.

What the Honourable Leader of the Opposition does on this matter is of no import to me. It is the Honourable Member for the City who represents people who use this playing field, who comes in here and tries to give the impression that it was some political gimmick. That is what he said, Sir. Lord give me the strength to perform more political gimmicks for the people of St. Michael West that will result in the kinds of facilities which we now have in a magnificent playing facility at Passage Road, thanks to the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution which is to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bartlett's Tenantry in the parish of Christ Chorch for the purpose of resiling residents affected by the Sewerage Treatment Plant. I regard the bringing of this Resolution to Parliament as in keeping with this Government's commitment to alleviate problems where they exist. From time to time the Honourable Member for Bridgetown has articulated the problems that the people in the City face with regards the Sewerage Plant in the City.

Normally I would not wish to get into the debate because I think it is merely a procedural one in terms of the Government meeting its commitment to the suffering people of the country. I was drawn into the debate by the Honourable Member for the City, taken by surprise because I did not even think it was necessary for the Honourable Member to speak. Since it was a matter dealing with his constituents I gave him the freedom of speaking but, at the same time...

Aside.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWATTE: Yes, I gave him the freedom so I did not even want to listen to him.

The point I am making is that any perception he may have had to my sitting over here has nothing to do with the fact that he was speaking. I was speaking to one of my colleagues. I think that a little laughter at some point is allowed to each and everyone of us at anytime we want to feel a little happier. 1.25p.mi

But I want to say, Sir, that I am somewhat surprised that the Honourable Member would have taken opportunity to deliver the kind of speech that he delivered today. If, in my own situation, Sir, I had the opportunity to have that kind of support, albeit. In his case, coming from the opposite side, Sir, I would be very much happier than he seemed to be, in the Government coming to the aid of his constituents.

I want to say, Sir, that one of the reasons why I feel that I would always be able to support the Democratic Labour Party is because, inside itself, Sir, our basic being is to see after the needs of people. Therefore we should not find at these times, the kind of attacks that the party gets from the Opposition.

The Honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown and myself have on many occasions, earlier on, discussed some of the problems that we face in our constituencies and we have discussed them at the level where we agreed and appreciated that not everything could be done at the same time. We also felt that if you were talking about doing some of the things, there was preparation that has to be made.

Aside.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Everyone knows that you cannot move people from one area to any other area, unless the other area has been prepared. I want to say when the Honourable Member says, sotto voce, that it is fourteen years he is talking about, that it was some time in 1975 or 1976 that the concept of a sewerage treatment plant was designed. The Democratic Labour Party left office in 1976 and therefore a period of 10 years elapsed when the Democratic Labour Party was not in office.

I do not know how the Honourable Member can lay the blame for nothing happening, insofar as resiling the people between 1976 and 1986 at the feet of the Democratic Labour Party. He obviously wishes to do that but I know he is a more honourable person than that. I believe he would be fair enough to say, Sir, that if nothing were done between 1976 and 1986, that at least, the Democratic Labour Party would have had to have time, since 1986 to implement the programme that would bring to his constituents the kind of assistance that I think they deserve.

The tactic, Sir, of trying to offset will not necessarily work. I want to say that if the Honourable Member is serious about representing his constituency, he must be so seen by them and by us because I take the matter of parliamentary representation very seriously. If Honourable Members on this side of the House gave any indication that they were not taking parliamentary representation seriously, then I would have the same opinion of them, as I am having of the Honourable Member on that side now.

I am saying that it does not do this country any good for us to take opposing positions just for the sake of politics. I think that the people of this country must see us as being much more honest in our approach to representation. I just wanted to say, Sir, I took great objection to being drawn into the debate at a point when, I think the Honourable Member was clear in his mind that I was not in any way referring to anything that he had said.

Thank you, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I never thought that I would live to see the day when, on the Floor of this House, I would hear a philosophical position articulated, such as that that was articulated, by the Honourable Member for St Michael West.

I wish to make it clear that I fully support the position of the Honourable Member for the City in according a higher priority to removing persons exposed to all sorts of environmental hazards - persons whose lives have been made miserable, not only by smells, but the general environment of the Sewerage plant - by giving the removal of those persons to an environmentally safer place a higher priority than a playing field.

This party, the NDP is concerned about people and the welfare of people. I must congratulate the Honourable Member for the City in taking a firm stand in signalling to his constituents and to Barbados that he is not afraid to come in here and say that he accords a higher priority to matters affecting their lives and limbs than to a playing field. I go further and say this, Sir, that I also wish to congratulate the Honourable Member for focussing on one of the most serious problems affecting not only the City of Bridgetown but the country as a whole, namely, the question of inadequate housing.

I agree with the Honourable Member that persons in Emmerton are not only entitled to live in a safe environment, that they should be moved as quickly as possible to a more salubrious environment and that there can be no way where such action takes second place to any other consideration. It is a matter of life and limb. It is a matter of the basic right to safe housing. I think that all Honourable Members of this House should congratulate the Honourable Member for the City on the courageous stand which he has taken, in this debate.

But, Sir, it does not surprise. This morning when I looked at my newspapers and I saw what the Right Honourable Prime Minister did to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West when he put him in his place, not in here, Sir, "out there on the platform on Sunday night, I genuinely felt sorry for him. I must confess, Sir, I felt sorry for the Honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member need not feel sorry for me, Sir. Tell him, Sir, I am well.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I felt sorry for him and I asked myself, Sir, what would he do today? Then it suddenly occurred to me that, knowing the Honourable Member, you can expect that he would try to overcome his humiliation by expatiating and expanding on all sorts of matters, in Parliament today.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is talking about humiliation. It is only that he made reference to the Member for St. Michael West. The most humiliation I have ever suffered, Sir, is when I recognized the role I have played in putting this Honourable Member on the backs of the people of this country, Sir. I am humiliated by that.

There is nothing that he or anybody can do to humiliate me. The Honourable Member knows that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If he wishes to defend himself, let him defend himself. All I am saying, Sir, is that, as someone who had fought with him over many years, I felt a sense of human sorrow for the way in which he was publicly humiliated.

But, Sir, I believe that it is very important that we look at this Resolution and see what it is all about. 1.35p.m.

The Resolution, Sir, is about the provision of a location for the resiling of people who should have been protected long ago from the unfortunate environment which was created by an act of the State. The problems which the people in that area of the City had were created by an act of the State and the State was under obligation at a much earlier period to do something about relieving the problems which it had created for the people in Emmerton. But Sir, I am not surprised that this has come before the House now. I am not surprised either that it will only effect a few houses and that all the other people who will still be left behind will have to continue to face the problems for a longer period.

Last night, Sir, I was looking through some debates of the House. It is a hobby of mine from time to time, Sir, to look through some debates of the House and I came across an interesting comment by a former Member of this

Honourable House in 1971. That comment related to the fact that what was being done in 1971 was an interesting invention that the Government had three programmes. It had a current programme. It had a capital programme as approved in the Estimates but it also had a programme of electoral works. So what we are seeing coming into play now is the number three programme of the Government that has absolutely nothing to do with various approvals in this Honourable House. But we all understand and the people in the City understand only too well. Sir, I have had the opportunity over the past two weeks to be doing some house to house in the area of Clapham Park.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well now how have we got from Emmerton to Clapham Park?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Because some of the persons of Emmerton were moved to Clapham Park, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but we are not dealing with those who have been moved already. We are resiling people to another area called Bartlett's. Bartlett's is where we are talking about.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, the point I am making is that those people from Emmerton who were removed elsewhere are missing their brothers, sisters, cousins, and the people whom they grew up with in Emmerton. I am saying, Sir, that I wish to make the point that it is important to keep communities together as far as possible when you undertake the resiling of persons and not to put a few houses here and a few houses there. What I discovered, Sir, is that many of the young people in Emmerton call on their colleagues and friends that they grew up with who are now living elsewhere to get them to come down and play with them and this kind of thing like this. Very often you see on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon many of the persons who once lived in Emmerton but were removed by the State and put elsewhere in their belter interest in terms of their environment and so on have found it very difficult to form not only a firm community, but also they want a continuing relationship with the people whom they have grown up with and so on and lived with for many years.

So I would urge the Minister not to allow this number three programme, the programme of electoral works. We have a capital programme and current programme. We now have a programme of Electoral Works. There are three programmes that the Government has now.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member by sneaking and saying that he saw what somebody else said is, in fact, casting a slur on the Government, I submit it is not permissible. To indicate that the Government has a third programme when in fact the system is set out and the Government comes down to the House of Assembly and ask the House of Assembly for money to carry out both the capital programme and to pay

the cost of current expenditure. The fact that some Member in a debate 20 or 30 years ago was able to get away with that is no indication that the Honourable Member can now say that the Government has an electoral programme. There is an implied suggestion that the Government is doing something improper, Sir. I submit that the Honourable Member should withdraw that

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am going to read from Hansard on Page 2988, Tuesday, March 30, 1971. I am going to read this section, Sir:

"I am very glad, of course, and I am always glad to see money spent on capital works for the good of the people of Barbados. But I sincerely hope that the Minister of Finance will not allow himself to be dragged further down the road to financial misbehaviour which is so frequently suggested that this Government has been indulging by using these borrowings at any stage in this year to carry out any programme not of current, not of capital but of electoral works."

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the Honourable Member is carrying the debate completely out of what it is intended to do. What I am suggesting to Honourable Members at this point that the Resolution does not purport to carry us as far as that. I am suggesting once again that we stick a little closer to the Resolution and let us get on.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir. It is also correct, Sir, that persons living in Emmerton were told by officers in the Ministry of Housing whether it be the NHC or elsewhere that they would be resited at Valery. That is a fact. Not only were they told that they would be resited at Valery but officers from the Ministry of Housing also went into Valery and told the people of Brittons Hill that persons from Emmerton would be resited there. Now if the Minister of Housing does not know what is being done in his Ministry, that is his problem. But I can confirm that it is a fact that the people were told that they would be sited in Valery and that officers in the Ministry of Housing met with several residents in Valery and told them that people from Emmerton would be brought up to Valery.

Sir, that is a fact and I wish to confirm that the Member for the City was telling the truth because I know what happened at the Valery end. I also support the position taken by the Honourable Member for the City that it is wrong to be turning around and around poor people the way in which they have been turned around by this present Government and in particular the people of Emmerton.

Sir, I felt very proud to see the way the Honourable Member for the City got up and defended his constituents against the maltreatment and the negligence of the present administration. Let it be clear that anything affecting the people of Barbados particularly the disadvantaged in this society will attract the eye of this political party which I

have the honour to represent. However much that may upset the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, that is our position in the political spectrum of Barbados.

The Minister of Housing cannot deny that officers in his Ministry went to the people in the City and the people in Brittons Hill and told them that the people in the City would be resited at Valery. 1.45p.m.

All sorts of different plans have been made for Valery from time to time. They have had several meetings up there with the people and virtually nothing has happened in the area.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West makes a big play of his assessment of the electoral chances of the Honourable Member for the City, and he must be responded to. All I can say is this, that I have never seen such love and appreciation demonstrated for any representative as what I see is now pouring out of the people of the City, those who live in the City and those who live outside the City, for the Honourable Member for the City. In fact, those people from the City who are now part of St. Michael South Central tell me "so long as Peter Miller is in your party I will vote for you." That is what they tell me. A record of strong, pertinent, effective representation for the City of a kind which they have never envisioned they would get and a kind they have never had before. So I must reply to that suggestion of any loss of support in the area.

Now, Sir, to the area of Passage Road. Let me say this. The Honourable Member for the City is quite right, that in all physical development plans there has got to be some allocation of priorities. I think it is unfair that if the Honourable Member for the City gets up and defends the rights of his constituents, if the Honourable Member for St. Michael West wishes to defend the rights of his constituents, so be it, but do not try to make the transfer to suggest that when the Honourable Member for the City defends his constituents, that that is a slur on the constituents of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Sir, he said he brought me in here in 1978. What can I say? I was always under the impression that the people of St. Michael South Central brought me in here in 1978. It is a fact that he assisted me with my campaign and I am eternally grateful for it. I would never find myself among the ranks of the ingrates on that side, because if it is one disastrous position taken by the Democratic Labour Party in public life, it is the fact that they are always on the side of gross ingratitude. One of the worst sins that can be committed in the world, I think, is the sin of ingratitude. They are a bunch of ingrates, and I will never be forced into a situation where I could deny publicly the fact that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West assisted me in

my bye-election in 1978. Ingratitude is not one of the sins that I would ever be guilty of. Those ingrates, Sir, will go on platforms tonight and abuse the white people, and the following morning they would call them and apologise and beg them for money, and write them letters. I am going to read one on Sunday night.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to remind the Member that he cannot stray too far away from the Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will not, Sir. I am awfully sorry.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are straying. I think you said somewhere in your remarks that you want to get back to the Resolution and I was very grateful for that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My problem is, Sir, that I could stand lies, I could stand abuse, I may be even able to stand physical assault, but I think the worst thing is ingratitude and that is what is going to defeat the Democratic Labour Party, because they stand out as a bunch of ingrates, with one or two notable exceptions whom I have never heard do it.

If I may continue, Sir. The Honourable Member said that he was mortally disappointed in the Honourable Member for the City. The Honourable Member for St Michael West can never be mortally disappointed in anybody. The term "mortally disappointed" implies some kind of soul, some kind of heart, some kind of commitment, and when one saw the play-acting that went on here this morning, one detected that there was no mortality whatsoever, no opportunity for mortality in a soulless, unemotional presentation that was purely acting.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. It is a tradition of the House that an Honourable Member does not wait until another Honourable Member is not in the Chamber to abuse him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the Honourable Member would want to use a different form ----

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I said that is a tradition, Sir. I am now going on to make my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but the implication is there.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: But, Sir, I submit that to say of an Honourable Member, especially if he identified the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, that he has no soul is the worst form of abuse, especially coming from an Honourable Member who knows no god, who serves no master, who has no relationship with anything ethereal at all, that makes it doubly dangerous for him to say I have no soul. That Honourable Member does not know anything about my soul, Sir, cannot know anything about my soul,

will not know anything about my soul and is in no position to assess who has a soul.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member has confirmed, Sir,....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to confirm anything. I have always allowed discussion to be made in reference to what has been said in the debate, but I am not going to permit that particular reference to be a debate in itself. It must have some relevance to the Resolution and therefore Members ought not to use what they consider a debatable point in a Resolution to which it does not have much relevance. I will allow the Honourable Member to respond to the Honourable Member, but not to debate it in full.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir. I accept your ruling on that point, but I think that where an Honourable Member refers to the bulldozer, which I presume was used in the Emmerton Lane area, I presume when he said that he would lie down in front of a bulldozer on behalf of his constituents....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the Honourable Member has managed not to hear what I said correctly. I said that I said in the various debates that would they try to put housing I would lie down in front of the bulldozer.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: All I want to do, Sir, is to confirm that it would be my assessment of the Honourable Member that he would lie down in front of a bulldozer on behalf of his constituents once he was satisfied that the brakes were on and it could not start. 1.55p.m.

One further point, Sir, the Honourable Member made. For the first time in my life have I heard an argument advanced as was advanced by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West that a school ground is not a playing field. Sir, the Honourable Member for St. George North and I went to the same primary school, St. George's Boys and Sir, there is a big playing field there. That was a playing field and it was a school playing ground. From the time, Sir...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is taking it out of context because I went on to lay the foundation of my statement by indicating I was responding to what the Honourable Member had said about there being playing fields all around and I dealt with the policy that school grounds were not playing fields for the purposes of community activity.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely sure that I have quoted the Honourable Member verbatim. I wrote it down, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Having heard him quote verbatim before and being absolutely right, the fact that he wrote it down does not make it verbatim. Only the reporters can make it verbatim.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not only, Sir, am I satisfied with my notes but as one may observe that having made detailed notes of the substantive points that he made in an half hour speech, I could not cover half a page of a foolscap paper. But the point I am making, Sir, is that the submission by the Honourable Member that a school ground is not a playing field indicates to me that he does not know what a school ground is or what a playing field is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Neither do I want to know, because we are dealing with resiling people. We are resiting people for housing purposes. I have already said I will not permit debates to be carried on a topic that is not so relevant to the Resolution. One can respond but need not carry to a debate.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I feel a great sense of satisfaction that at long last and after persistent urging by the Honourable Member for the City that some small step is being taken to remove a few more of his constituents from the hazardous and unhealthy environment which has been created by the State where they live. I certainly will give my support to this Resolution. I have no difficulty with that whatsoever, but I hope, Sir, that whereas we all accept that in our plans for housing that we have to create adequate opportunities for leisure and so on, that we must recognise that the priority in Barbados today is housing; because I believe that when these persons are moved into a better area free from the assaults and insults on their health, even if that is limited to their olfactory apparatuses because of the constant smells in the area that it will be a better life for them. Therefore I have no problem whatsoever with the Resolution in that regard.

We also recognise, Sir, that it is part of the number three programme of the Government - the electoral works programme. But the people of the City will recognise this. They would know. I am quite sure the people of Emmerton and the people of the City generally would know who was the man who stood by them in all their difficulties down the years. They would know who was the Minister of Housing that came down there and made a promise to them and did not do anything about it until now there is an electoral programme in place.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every single person in the City knows that the man that they can depend on, the man who has stood by them, the man who has fought for their cause is a man called Peter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas caught my eye.

SUSPENSION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am moving that this sitting be suspended until 3 p.m. today. ***-

Hon. B. M. TATTT: I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I had no intention at all of * speaking in this debate until a number of statements were made about my Party which in the rules of debating I have a right to reply to. If I may start with the language of the Honourable Minister of Health at 1.41 p.m. today. He was saying that the Leader of the Opposition had cast a slur on the Government which is not permissible. I would wish to say that the suggestion and innuendos and indeed the outright allegations that the Barbados Labour Party between 1976 and 1986 was motivated by mala fides towards the *• Democratic Labour Party is a slur against that party in the same way as I suppose it would be a slur if I said that for the Ministry of Transport and Works to embark upon a programme for 1988-89, 1989-90 only to repair the roads in St. Michael, all the roads in St. Michael and Christ Church and St. George but at the same time denying rights to proper roads to the persons of the northern part, could be considered a slur against the Government.

During 1976-86, the Barbados Labour Party Government so far as I am aware treated the people of St. *• Philip as a whole with similar kindness. Every Government has priorities. Some types of Government public investment are more suited to more areas than others. I well remember in 1976 asking for a housing area to be brought for St. Philip North and the Honourable Prime Minister at the time, Mr. Barrow went to Blades Hill and said: "I say that no housing area is coming to St. Philip North. People in the country don't want any housing area." He finished his speech by saying: "It is just like if Sparrow say so. I, Errol *• Barrow say so and that is it."

The point I wish to make, Sir, in response to the allegation is that St. Philip South developed at a very rapid rate in terms of private housing between 1976-86 as the Honourable Representative for that constituency must or ought to acknowledge. Union Park Development spread to j* Ruby Park and there is a massive housing development from Union right back up to Long Bay Point. That could not have happened unless the Government of the day had created a climate for that kind of investment. Whether there

is a housing boom or not depends on the economy and how the economy is growing. No one can say that within the last eight months there has been a housing boom in Barbados. There hasn't been because the economy has been tight. People can't have access to credit.

I don't want to stray too far from the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am only saying that to emphasize the point that you can't always look at direct public investment.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: A point of order, Sir. I don't like to interrupt the Honourable Member. He said that you can tell when there is a housing boom that the economy is well, but, Sir, Clearview Heights, Meadowview Heights, Fort George, about five more in the last eight months, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. If he said he is not aware that would be so, but to say that there has been no housing... There have been about twelve housing developments.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I couldn't hear the interjection of the Honourable Member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure you wouldn't because I, myself, was having difficulty in hearing the Honourable Member. I think Members could be a little bit more considerate to the Members speaking.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am only saying that I think all Barbadians recognise, except Members on the front bench, that within the last eight - nine months, private housing development in Barbados has slowed.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I said I would attribute that to the impact of the credit squeeze that has been with us since October last year and I think that that is not anything that is worthy of debate. That is axiomatic. It is a given situation. 3.10p.m.

If they want to talk about the time before that and say there was a housing boom, they have the Government's Economic Report to show that there was an unusual housing boom in the sense that you had more housing completions than housing starts.

Now, Sir, in relation to the transfer of persons is specific of the Resolution. Ever so often a Government must, in the public interest, disrupt the lives of people in certain areas by way of compulsory acquisition and removal of the persons from the area that has been acquired. I say it is a disruption in the lives of individuals but there is a larger

public interest that demands that their own private interest be subordinated to the larger public.

When the Sewerage Plant came in the middle 1970's and had to be located at Emmerton, it had to be located somewhere. Wherever it was located some residents in the immediate vicinity would have been adversely affected. I think it was the Democratic Labour Party Government that negotiated the contract. It was sited at Emmerton. We had to move people.

What I want to counsel this Government to do is to ensure that when people are moved to a new area as a result of a compulsory acquisition that their circumstances are improved.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes. We started it, Sir. I just want the assurance. As the Minister said, we started it. Where persons who were dislocated had no waterborne systems, no fences to their houses, we ensured that they got all those things. I do not believe that this Government would stop these kinds of things. I have no evidence. I am asking the Minister, therefore, to ensure that those basic amenities are provided for the people who have to move.

My recollection about the site at Passage Road, Sir, which was the subject of hot contest between the Minister of Health and the Honourable Member for the City, was that when the Barbados Labour Party secured a firm promise of financing for the indoor gymnasium from the Chinese Government, a number of sites were looked at. The site at the bottom of Passage Road was one. At the same time as that was happening, we also had to give attention to persons who were being dislocated as a result of ongoing acquisitions.

At one time it was thought - I do not want to pin it down to a year - that in so far as you had the Kensington Lodge Housing Development on the left-hand side going to Baxters Road, that you could complement that development by a similar type development on the other side where the playing field is. It was then decided not to go with a housing development on that side.

I think the Minister of Health was right that it was Mr. Bradshaw who certainly led the public to believe that the gymnasium was going on the site where there is now the playing field. Subsequent to that another site had been found for the gymnasium. It freed that site up for the purpose for which it is now being used.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is all right, Sir. Before lunch - do not bother to stop me - the Minister of Health assured the Barbados Labour Party of having an unholy

alliance with the National Democratic Party. You see how they are now very friendly, Sir, the Minister of Health and the Honourable Member for the City? You will also note that the..

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is casting aspersions on the whole House to suggest that two Honourable Members who engage in debate should thereafter become enemies would be an assault on the entire tradition of this Honourable House. To suggest that we are friendly now, Sir, is to suggest something contrary to the rules and the spirit of this House. Your Honour should take note that the Honourable Member is misleading the House.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I should have said, even more friendly because you will note, Sir, that there are three parties in the next General Elections campaign. All of us, including you, Sir, have candidates nominated against you. You have two, one from the NDP and one from the BLP. The only politician in Barbados who does not have a NDP candidate nominated against him is the Honourable Minister of Health. They must ask themselves what is going on.

Mr. R. P. BYER: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas is totally misleading this House and he knows better than that. This party did nominate someone to run against the Honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I was very careful in my language.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I was equally careful in mine, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We know the pressures that the Honourable Minister of Health put on the original nominee's mother.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I put no pressure on anybody who has been nominated to run against me other than the pressure I always put by being what I am.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We have no alliances forged on this side. In the same vein, Sir, you will recall the language of the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke about the Honourable Minister of Health at 1.38 p.m. I will be eternally grateful for the Honourable Member's assistance to me in 1978. When he was talking about ingratiation he was not included. 3.20 p.m.

Sir, I regret that the debate got bogged down into a comparison of the relative merits of housing as against recreational facilities.

I think now that everyone has had lunch and is in a more sober mood and reflective attitude, it must be considered on all sides that the provision of housing is a basic need. The provision of recreational facilities is not in the same order of magnitude or priority as housing. The UN certainly speaks, in its Ways and Means booklets on housing, food, shelter and health. Provision of recreational facilities is essential. They used to form part, of the basic socialist dogma, that the individual must be given enough leisure time to develop his total personality. The state has a responsibility to provide those kinds of facilities and amenities. Though we recognize that they are necessary in the scheme of priorities, I do not think that we can argue about the relative merits or the hierarchical order of things.

It was, however, refreshing.....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That has to be paid into the Central Bank. You cannot keep it.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is amazing, Sir, I was in Barbados for one of the St. Peter by-elections. I was out of the Island for the other.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. The one that was drawn. I was out of the country for that. I would never forget phoning Barbados the next morning and asking what was the result and somebody said to me, "A tie." I asked them what time it was in Barbados because he would have to be dreaming. I was told it was a tie.

But, in the second by-election, I remember hearing the debate then raging that the Barbados Labour Party ought not to have been talking, indeed boasting, about the provision of recreational facilities for the youth of St. Peter, instead it should have been talking about housing and planting of yams, potatoes and eddoes. The persons who articulated those policies were the candidate herself who was managed by the Honourable Minister of Health and, to a lesser extent, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy who is not now in his place.

I am glad that five years have passed because, in the interim, we have had the Report of the Task Force on Unemployment. One of the recommendations of that Committee was that Government should develop at a greater rate, playing and recreational facilities all over Barbados.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes. I think the Honourable Senator, Senator Alleyne in the Other Place had a lot to do with that. So if he was behaving like Poonka, as the Honourable Minister of Health is suggesting, it is a matter for them, Sir.

But it is there, as a matter of recommendation of the Task Force Committee. They even went so far as to say that Government should involve the private sector in advertising on billboards and that the private sector should take over certain playing fields. A company should take over a playing field and look after it. All of that is in the Task Force Report.

So that today....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member made reference to the Member for St. Michael West. That is the only reason I rise, Sir. When I said *sotto voce* to the Honourable Member - the reason you did not hear when I was speaking to this Honourable Member - that he was all over the place, I did not mean any Honourable Senator. I meant the Honourable Member. In his speech today, he is like Poonka, all over the place. That is what I meant, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I assure the Honourable Member that before the day is out, I am going to come right home. I am not going to go down in St. Peter and St. Lucy and so on. I am coming to St. Michael West before the day is out. I did not say anything about elections. You know about that. We are friends. I have always been your friend. I do not think that my comment, with respect, Sir, is out of place.

I began by saying that I was responding to points made in the debate and I was claiming the right to debate points made on the other side, provided I have some relevance to the Resolution. I set my parameters early. The relevance to the Resolution is that the Honourable Member and the Member for the City had an argument as to what impression was being conveyed about the priorities between recreational facilities and houses. I was suggesting that I sat back and listened to the debate between the two honourable gentlemen and just smiled that we could have this debate six years after the St. Peter by-elections when the Democratic Labour Party, at that time, was not singing the song of praise for recreational facilities, as the Honourable Minister of Health today regaled us, Sir. He would die virtually to ensure that the people in his constituency got the playing facility at Passage Road. I do not blame him for his enthusiasm, his conviction, his commitment or his dedication to the cause of his people. That is what he is here for. He could not be in here for so many years if all of those attributes were not recognised by the people of that constituency. I applaud him for fighting for them. But I am saying that four years ago we would not have - not in respect of that particular location but in

respect of the general, we would not have heard him speak with such conviction.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, so that the record would be complete, Sir. The Honourable Member may, inadvertently, have been misleading the House when he spoke about the debate, six years ago, in another place.

The truth is that a Minister of Floods having been appointed and the distribution of the largesse going in a particular way, we felt constrained to draw to the attention of the populace, as a whole, the disproportionate dispensation of largesse, in a certain direction, as opposed to another. That was really the context in which the debate took place, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I understand the point he has made. I do not think there would be any other person better able to make the point than the Honourable Minister of Health. In the month of May, 1976 when he was a Senator, he walked hand in hand with leading Members of the Democratic Labour Party when the then Minister of Transport and Works, Communications and Works at the time, Dr. Caddie was trying desperately to pave all the roads in the Orleans for the Billie Miller by-election trying desperately to do what they call today "electoral work".

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It did not help. I hope we have now arrived at a consensus. The Prime Minister likes consensus government. He has not had any great success in achieving his desired goals of attaining consensus for all or any of his policies among the electorate of Barbados. They shall shortly find out that that is the truth rather than any opinion. That will be proven to be true when the people have a chance to record, by X, their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the Government.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Nothing goes right with this Government. I hope though that we have arrived at a consensus that as far as possible we have to ensure in these acquisitions that disruption of peoples' environment, culture, association, family ties, or whatever should be kept to a minimum. Secondly, in moving and relocating persons, we expect provision to be made for the upgrading of their amenities. Thirdly, recreational development is essential to the development of the total personality of the human being, Sir, but it cannot have in the scheme of things a greater priority than housing. I am obliged to you, Sir. 3.30p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question...

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments I wish to make on this Resolution. The Honourable Member

for SL Michael South Central made the point that the Honourable Minister of Health seems to be placing a higher priority on providing recreational facilities than on housing. I thought that that was the direction in which the Honourable Member for St. Thomas was going as well. But I wish to make the point that they are not alternatives. It is not either housing or recreational facilities. It is not even a question of priorities for that matter. They are both equally important aspects of the programme which have to be done and there is no point providing housing especially in densely populated areas without providing the ancillary recreational facilities even with lights. Because I think any sociological analysis of the kind of problems which you see develop out of situations where housing becomes so compact that there are no recreational facilities that all kinds of sociological problems tend to arise out of very densely populated areas where adequate recreational facilities are not provided.

It seems that the ideal situation in the Passage Road area which is densely populated would be to have a recreational area available so the people will have adequate recreation. It seems to me that this should be the norm wherever housing developments are taking place that adequate and sufficient recreational facilities should always be provided as a necessary and essential adjunct to serious housing development. So they are not alternatives. They are not even competing interests. They are essential conjunctive interests which need to be established. They need to go side by side.

Now the area where these residents are being located is in Bartlett's Tenantry which is part of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that the movement of these residents to this area will be complemented by all the adequate facilities which are necessary to make the area amenable not only to the residents who come in but also to those who are already there so that we will have adequate things like appropriate hard courts and lights too for that matter to utilize.

I, Mr. Speaker, have great pleasure in supporting the Resolution. Thank you, Sir.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, about two weeks ago we heard about a simple Resolution and that it should not have taken that long. One tends to get the same feeling today where a matter of acquisition of lands could take two, three, or four hours. Now Mr. Speaker, I have heard...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. Now the Honourable Minister does not realize what he is doing. When this House was opened in June 1986, you claimed for all of us certain ancient privileges and freedom.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not wasting time. I resent that too for him to be saying so. We have rights in here to speak, Sir. You claim them on our behalf. If I am wrong, I stand corrected by you, Sir. It is really an insult to the intelligence of the total membership and it is also indicative of the kind of contempt that the Minister has for people, Sir, and the peoples' business in Parliament for him * to make that kind of statement. I think it should be withdrawn, Sir. It is a reflection.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to assure all Honourable Members that freedom of speech and freedom to express one's opinion in this Chamber will always be upheld by myself. As far as I can remember, I have always allowed that to the pattern of our debates. I am not always clear in my mind as to some of the comments that are made in respect of that kind of approach, but nonetheless I am sure that all Honourable Members agree that the sole purpose is * to allow that freedom of expression in a debate from which we all should benefit.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against the freedom of expression and freedom of debate. That is not what I am getting at at all. The point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the fact a resolution that calls for the acquisition of land to relocate persons to another area could take three hours to debate in *» my opinion smacks of a plan by certain persons to extend debate on anything that is brought to this Honourable House. That is what it smacks of.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, the Member is still continuing in the same vein and the Member for St. Thomas got up and objected to it just now and you reaffirm what the Member said. Nobody here has planned anything. I am the representative for the people of St. George and all of the other Members on this side are representatives for the people of the various constituencies. There is no conspiracy to do anything. As to the debate that ensued in here today, some people may think that it was useless debate. But when you can have the Member for the City and the Member for St. Michael West in my opinion bringing out two essential points in the whole debate, to my mind they were competing interests. That was what the debate was about, a philosophical position; one holding one position and another holding another position. That, to my mind, was important in terms of what was done today, so I do not * know what foolishness the Honourable Member is talking about. 3.40p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the Honourable Member does not intend to create or to give the impression that such is the way he made the statement that one should get so * light under the skin in respect of what he has said. My feeling is that he is probably just making a comment in a general way without any specific reason for it. I am sure the Honourable Member is clear on that.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the same thing that the Honourable Member for St. George South is accusing me of he is trying to do. He is trying to limit my freedom of speech and I am defending mine as well.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: No shouting across the Chamber.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I have my opinion and you have yours. Mr. Speaker, I have listened today to speeches from the other side and speeches from this side. I sympathise with the Honourable Member for the City, because I believe he is honest, I believe that he meant what he was saying, but some of what he said was misguided.

I will turn now to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one moment. It is not fair that Members should ignore the pleas of the Chair. I have repeatedly asked that Members should say whatever they have to say in very, very low tones, but to shout across the Chamber in my view is not a fair thing to the Chamber, to the Member, and most of all to myself, who has always given Members the opportunity to speak when they want to speak. Continue.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I was saying, the Leader of the Opposition who believes that he should get into every single debate, which is his right, but there are certain things he said which I could not believe he would have made.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael West in his contribution said that you cannot in all honesty believe that a school ground can take the place of a playing field. All of us, except the Leader of the Opposition, know what the Honourable Member for St. Michael West meant. If you believe that Combermere School grounds or Harrison College grounds or Lodge School grounds in the normal run of things can be termed playing fields, as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was trying to say, go at Combermere or Harrison College or Lodge School at 1 o'clock or 11 o'clock in the day and play cricket there. But you can go on the playing field at Passage Road any time of the day, and that is the point he was making. Only the NDP would not understand that point.

One other statement made by the Leader of the Opposition, and this sums up the Opposition totally, was that people in the City said that they will vote for him, the Leader of the Opposition, because of the representative. Have you ever heard that? That is what he said. I wrote it down. Even if he did not mean that, that is what he said. I wrote it down because we have always heard people saying "I am going to vote for the Democratic Labour Party because of Barrow," "I am going to vote for the Barbados

Labour Party because of Tom," but now you have people who will vote for the NDP because of a member in the NDP.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member, Sir,....

Mr. SPEAKER: Make the point.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am making the point, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: No long points of order, straight to the point.

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have said, Sir, that those persons who once lived in the City but who now reside in St. Michael South Central and are voters in St. Michael South Central, who once voted for the Honourable Member for the City, have assured me that they will vote for me because of their knowledge and relationship with the Honourable Member for the City. That is what I said.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for the City said today that those persons from the City were moved to Clapham before he was the representative for the City. Nobody has moved from the City to Clapham since 1986.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: You said that today. Is it wrong?

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members.....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will move that some Members leave the Chamber too. I am going to ask Honourable Members to be silent while another Member is speaking. Is the Honourable Member for the City tired? If you are, do not wait on me. I am going to ask Members to be silent. Will the Honourable Member continue?

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, they are not going to divert me from what I am saying, and I am going to make it clear. The area that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is now representing was represented by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East. No persons at all were moved from the City of Bridgetown to Clapham. Not since 1986. 3.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. Let me just clarify.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can't be on a point of order and clarification.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I believe the Honourable Member is inadvertently misleading the House, Sir, because *sotto voce* I said to him there were people who were moved just before the 1986 elections to Clapham. It had nothing to do with what the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was speaking about at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: You need not add any thing more.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: That is precisely the point I made that you said just before the last elections they were moved.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: The same point I was trying to make and he got up and confirmed it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will Honourable Members keep quiet.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, let me continue. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that officers of the Ministry of Housing met with many persons in Valery to tell them (this is what he said, and I copied it down) that people from Emmerton are coming to Valery. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say whether he is telling the whole truth and nothing but the truth or not. I find it strange, Mr. Speaker, that officers from the Ministry of Housing should meet with people in Valery to tell them that people from Emmerton are coming to Valery. Housing is not the Welfare Department. Why would people from the Ministry of Housing meet with people from Valery to tell them that people from Emmerton are coming up there? To beg them to agree with them and to live nicely with them? Why? I am asking him.

I will go further, Mr. Speaker. Let me go further. You are not going to divert me today. Let me say this, Valery is a World Bank Project - Valery, Rices, and Thomas Gap. Those are World Bank Projects, so you just can't take people from any area and put them there. Those are special projects where the Housing Planning Unit in the Ministry of Housing and Lands under the Barbados Labour Party decided that they were going to go into a joint venture with the World Bank in order to upgrade the houses in certain tenancies. It was a project which provided for cost benefit

analysis. Valery was not an area and is not an area where you can relocate people. So, I would like to know how it is that officers from the Ministry of Housing and Lands could have gone to Valery, when it is a World Bank project and tell people up there that people from Emmerton are coming there. You will have to explain how and everybody will know whether you are telling the truth or anything else.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am convinced that the Honourable Minister hasn't a clue what is going on in his Ministry. For several years, there have been several projects which have been canvassed for the Valery area and what he is talking about is the last of the projects that have been canvassed for that area. I have been invited by your Ministry...

Mr. SPEAKER: No. No.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:... to attend meetings in that area. So, don't come and tell me foolishness. You don't know what is going on...

Mr. SPEAKER: That's the end of the point of order.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central knows nothing about his constituency. He knows absolutely nothing about any part of his constituency. Let me tell you this. In fact, we only came to this Honourable House of Assembly about six weeks ago, it could be eight weeks, to vest Valery in the National Housing Corporation.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not permit Members to shout across the Floor.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will continue. You keep hearing, Mr. Speaker, in here that certain projects...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Point of order, Sir. Before the Honourable Minister finishes, I just wish the Honourable Minister to explain to the House whether the Government got finance for that World Bank project at Valery. I am a little confused in the family quarrel.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can't be any family quarrel in the House.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: This Government has nothing to hide and I will answer because it concerns my Ministry. The preliminary discussion on the World Bank Project was entered into by the Barbados Labour Party administration - the low income housing project.

I have said it already that you all started the preliminary discussions but let me explain to you why the World Bank is no longer in it but this Government has decided to carry it on because it was a special project. Let me tell you why the World Bank funding did not materialise. The World Bank decided to tell us in the Ministry of Housing and Lands by how much we should carry up the rental rates at National Housing and by what time and we told them this is an independent country and we are going to make that decision ourselves. Nobody will tell us how much to carry up the rates nor by what time. They did not agree and we proceeded with the project on our own. It was the same project except for the World Bank fund. We took out the name World Bank and called it the National Low Income Housing Project. There is no mystery toil.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already asked Members not to shout across the Chamber.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, from time to time and today you heard it again. The first statement you heard was that this belongs to Phase 3 of the Government's programme - the electoral part, they call it. There is no electoral part. You also hear that the Ministry of Housing takes long to do certain things. That statement was made in here. It isn't that the Ministry of Housing takes its time to do anything. The Ministry of Housing *per se* necessarily has to do things over a period of time. Let me explain to you, Mr. Speaker, about this project that you heard is now coming on stream because of the elections. This started on November 24, 1989. This is not something that the Government decided yesterday morning to do. This project to move the people to Bartlett's Tenantry...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not hearing any asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we are today debating the acquisition of land at Bartlett's Tenantry, Christ Church. 4.00 p.m.

That is what we are debating. This Resolution seeks permission to acquire the land at Bartlett's Tenantry. This was said today to be something happening because of the electoral atmosphere prevailing in the country. That is what was said by the Leader of the Opposition. I am trying to demonstrate to him the fact that we came today for the acquisition of this land at Bartlett's Tenantry has nothing to do with any electoral atmosphere prevailing today.

This project started on November 24, 1989 when certain officers from the Ministry of Housing and Lands and myself paid a visit to three different areas to look at

sites to relocate the people from Emmerton. We went to about three different sites, St. Barnabas, Bartlett's Tenantry and I do not remember exactly the other one. Mr. Speaker, let me explain to all and sundry because they keep claiming that the Ministry of Housing takes time to do things.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. How can we take a Minister seriously who cannot even remember where he went?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order. I am coming directly to the point. I have exhausted my patience. According to Rule 40 (2)(a) "The Speaker shall order any Member whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House during the remainder of that day's sitting." I am very happy that I can do that this evening.

I am going to ask Members to confine themselves to the Rules from henceforth with no further interruptions. Asides must be at the lowest tone possible, no shouting across the Chamber. When I call the Member's constituency's name I intend to ask that Member to withdraw. Continue.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to explain. Now, a lot of persons, especially those persons writing on behalf of the NDP, have never been in any government. They do not know anything about how government functions. The Leader of the NDP, his stint was too short. Those persons over there would know the sort of procedures that have to be gone through in the Ministry of Housing. I am trying to tell this Honourable House that you cannot just get up one morning and say you are going to do something there and do it the next morning.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, On November 24, officials from the Ministry of Housing and myself paid visits to look at certain areas in order to find some land to relocate the persons from Emmerton. On November 29, 1989 the Chief Surveyor was advised to provide information relating to the approximate size, description, the name and addresses of the owners. You know that will take time.

On December 8, 1989, the Town Planner advised the Ministry of Housing that the proposed development at Bartlett's Tenantry was supported but that full details must be submitted at the appropriate time in order to ensure proper site planning. You cannot send anything to the Town Planner until you have received certain information from the Chief Surveyor.

On January 21, 1990, the Chief Surveyor provided the Ministry with certain information, not all. On May 17, 1990 Cabinet agreed to the acquisition. On June 25 the section 3 notice was published. These are things you have to go through. You cannot circumvent them. When people are writing in the newspapers that this takes long and that takes

long, those people who are writing do not know how the Ministry of Housing has to function.

On August 31, 1990 the Ministry of Housing and Lands was authorised to enter into the land to do certain preliminary work. There is very little work you can do because by then you have only published sections 3, 4 and 5. On September 10, 1990 four copies of the plan that we had asked the Chief Surveyor for arrived. On October 19, the Resolution was sent to the Attorney General's Chambers for vetting. You can see all of this process had to be gone through before you could just move into people's land. It is not like what used to take place every now and then before, where you would just move in and say you wanted this and take it up which caused a lot of trouble in Barbados and which has caused this administration real trouble.

You would recall that only last week or the week before we had to come to this House of Assembly to legalise the acquisition of 82 parcels of land because it was not done in the way it should have been done. When you see people writing and stating certain things, they do not know what they are saying.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central should know there are certain processes that must be gone through. It is not a question of the Ministry of Housing being tardy, or being recalcitrant or anything like that in what they are doing. They have to go through certain procedures and we are not going to break the law in order to satisfy those people who believe you can get up one morning and say they want that and go and put a house there and it is done. We are not going to do that. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this question of playing fields has to be looked at seriously because a lot of persons believe that a recreational area is nothing. A recreational area is a very important part of any development as was stated by the Honourable Attorney General.

Let me give you one example of the problem of putting a development without any sort of recreational facility. West Terrace was a development that was done by the administration before us, nearly about 300 or 400 houses without a single recreational area in it. I have had complaints for the past four years. Every single year people complain about not having a recreational area in West Terrace.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. In that whole development plan which started as the Cave Hill Development Plan and then was sectionalised, there were areas left out on the Plan for recreational facilities to be

created. They may not have been created but they are still there. The green areas are left out and you cannot build on them.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am not criticising it. I am only talking about the problems if you have a development area with no recreational facilities.

»

Mr. Speaker, I really did not want to extend this debate but let me say again. In the Husbands Development conceptualised by the Barbados Labour Party - you want me to say so - you all were going to put 496 houses there. This administration had to take the decision that to put 496 houses any place without a recreational area was madness. 4.10p.m.

We cut it down, we reduced the number of houses at Husbands to 394 in order to provide recreational areas in that Husbands area. That is why the other 112 houses have gone out to Cane Garden.

This administration has taken a decision that every single development must have some recreational area in it. That is the point I am trying to make. You cannot say that this thing is more important than that. It all depends on the development at the time you are doing it.

Today, what we had in here, Mr. Speaker, is that you had a second argument of comparing the provision of housing with a recreational area. This Resolution is not really about the provision of housing per se, at all. This Resolution is a Resolution that states that houses are already existing, but that you are looking for alternative areas to put them. It is a re-allocation, a re-thinking. It is not the provision of housing, per se.

So to come in here and to say that you are having a priority between the provision of housing and the provision of a recreational area is not what this Resolution is all about at all. This Resolution is about relocating people.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I thought that I should just get certain things on the record because there are things we keep hearing over and over. What amazes me is that everything that the Government comes forward with, you hear it is because of elections. You know, Mr. Speaker, that if the predictions are right, we would have had the elections already. Everything the Government does now is elections, elections, elections. You had better get elections off your mind. By the time the elections come around we would go crazy.

Mr. Speaker, with those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. *•

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN BILL, £
1990

Order No. 1 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the protection of children from exploitation by preventing the making of indecent photographs of them and matters related thereto.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to provide a regime for protecting children from those who would seek to exploit them, by using them in the production of indecent photographs. It, of course, seeks to penalize the distribution, the showing and advertising of such photographs.

The Bill is not a terribly long one but it does make the taking, distributing and showing of indecent photographs of a child, as well as the possession of indecent photographs of a child an offence. Publication of an advertisement that is likely to be understood as saying that the advertiser distributes or shows or intends to distribute or show indecent photographs is also an offence under the Act.

The Act also explains what distributing an indecent photograph is. What it sets out to show is that any person who parts with possession of an indecent photograph or who exposes or offers it for acquisition by any other person is regarded as distributing it. The defences to distributing or showing indecent photographs, Mr. Speaker, are outlined in the Act. It provides that it is a defence if a person charged can prove that he had a legitimate reason for having the photographs in his possession or for distributing them or that he had not seen the photographs or did not know or have any cause to suspect that the photographs were indecent.

Another significance about the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it makes that where a person is charged with taking or permitting the taking of an indecent photograph of a child, the wife or the husband, if the wife or husband is the person charged, then the other spouse is a compellable witness, and may be compelled to come before the court to give evidence in that regard, if they are in a position to give evidence that may be useful.

Another of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it provides that where a corporation is party to an offence, under the Act, and it is proved that the offence occurred with the connivance or with the consent or was due to any neglect of any director or officer of the corporation, that officer also is deemed guilty of an offence and is liable to be proceeded against under the legislation.

Another clause of the Bill provides for the forfeiture of photographs which are regarded as indecent. That forfeiture is done by an Order of the court.

One of the other clauses sets out the maximum term of imprisonment to which a person charged is liable, that term being five years where the conviction is on indictment and two years where the conviction is before a magistrate.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the main provisions of the Bill. The major purpose of the Bill is to provide protection of children from exploitation and to prevent indecent photographs being taken of them. I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful that this Bill has come, even though it has obviously been prompted by the events which are sub judice and about which I make no further comment.

In 1986, at page 31 of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, it was written that:

"A re-elected BLP Government will enact the following new Acts to update the CRIMINAL LAW."

Among a whole list was:

"A Protection of Children Act."

This Bill before us deals with one aspect of protection of children from lewd, immoral and obscene conduct on the part of others who take advantage of the frailties of youth. Although it does not cover every situation in which children need to be protected; it is a start in the direction against the worst forms of child abuse that there can be, where, for example, children are subjected to filming and photography by persons of twisted and distorted mentality. 4.20 p.m.

Now how long are we locking them up? I do not think that we are locking them up long enough, Sir. For indictment, it is five years and summary conviction is two years. There can be no excuse for adult persons who abuse children and the rights of children as they are destroying in a way the future of a country. But even though this Bill only goes part of the way, I think it is timely because there has been a significant amount of the kinds of abuse provided for in this legislation within the last five or six years. The English had A Protection of Children Act I think in 1978 which is far more comprehensive than this. But children today can go into these video shops and purchase "blue movies" and see all kinds of nude acts which could

have a very deleterious effect on those children's personality. I am no moralist and I am not being sanctimonious. But I think that we must set our faces against a number of practices in this society which are harmful to young people and destructive of the youth.

Now Sir, I believe that all Barbadians are deeply concerned and most Barbadians are exhibiting a fear about anti-social conduct, lawlessness, restlessness, criminal activity, and deviance that is pervading Barbados at this time, Sir. Everyday you can read of some violent crime committed. A young girl not even 18 years was found dead. Two 13 year olds were shooting like "Bill Buckeroo" in a housing area. One in my constituency was killed, brutally murdered, and the man who killed her drank "garden wine" and wrote himself off. Well, that saved the State some funds. Taxi drivers who try to make a dollar in a very competitive field and in a field starved of a steady supply of patrons are afraid to ply for hire at night because they have lost about four who were cut down in very brutal circumstances. Only last night one was beaten up and cut up. There is a trend that is worrying the whole society, Sir. The Commissioner of Police had warned earlier this year that crime was going to get worse. Well, violent crime has indeed gotten worse.

I think the time has come, Sir, when the Government must take some drastic action to curb the trends that we are seeing. I want to make it very, very clear and let nobody doubt me. If I get the chance to be over there where the present Attorney General is within the next four months, it is going to be rough and tough. I am not making fun. The Prime Minister has said and I accept what he has said that there is a small minority element that is playing the fool in this country that has to be dealt with drastically.

I have explained, Sir, in an article which I have written, one aspect of dealing with the criminal situation. That will take a little time because that comes at the end of the day. That comes after conviction and that is a change in the penal system. I am grateful to the Advocate Newspaper for writing in support of what I had published. But before you get to the stage of conviction, we have to do something to halt the trend of crimes. It seems to me that we have to ensure first of all that we have an adequate number of policemen. I am with the Government on this and I do not believe that we need an exceptional number. What we need is a better deployment of the existing numbers you have and we have discussed in here a methodology of freeing up more policemen and having them on duty and on the beat by civilianization. The Government has started to move in that direction. You have to make sure that the Police Force is contented, otherwise you can give them 1200, 1400, or 1500 - The Leader of the Opposition was offering another 300 - if they are not contented, they are not going to produce.

Productivity in the Force means working and stopping crime. It is therefore unfortunate, indeed unhealthy, for Barbados in 1990 to be witnessing the kind of strain that there is on the relationship between the Attorney General and the Police Force. Similar strains exist between the Attorney General and the Firemen. But I am dealing with the Police Force. Government must do something very early and urgently to restore a balanced relationship between the policy-makers in the Ministry and the Police Force. Part of the problem lies in the broken promises, but we have become accustomed to those under the Democratic Labour Party for the last four and a half years. It is nothing new. They do not believe that it is any big thing to say something in their Manifesto and to stick to what you say. They have even written it...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is making a statement which I submit casts aspersions on the integrity on every Honourable Member on this side of the House, indicating in language which I need not repeat that we do not believe that when we make a promise that we should keep it. I think the language is inflammatory. I am sure he can make the point using different language, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is true, Sir, that it is not I who spoke of a Prime Minister as an abortionist in a political context in 1988. It is not I who said, "What social contract what". It is not I who wrote in the capacity of Press Officer to the Prime Minister, "Do not mine what Errol Barrow may have said before the elections. Look at what he did after." It is not I who wrote that. 4.30 p.m.

It was a member of the Democratic Labour Party close to the Prime Minister who wrote that, and that statement has never been withdrawn. If you are talking about Members of Parliament, it is not I who said that the fiscal arrangements on page 5 of the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto in 1986 were mistakes, were errors thrust on the Democratic Labour Party at the last minute to which the public should pay no attention. It was not I, it was the Member for St. John who said it in here.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, I never made that statement in this Chamber. The Honourable Member is misleading the House and should issue an immediate correction.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, Sir, he has admitted saying it. That shows the extent of the bond that they feel between....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He did not say it in here, he said it outside. Do you want me to sit down to say where you said it? Was it at a Branch meeting? I want to say that

part of the problem lies in the breakdown in the relationship between the Attorney General and the police. He is not going to admit that there is a breakdown, but there is a breakdown. The police do not care anything about him. Do you want me to say that?

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member likes to mislead the House. The Honourable Member must remember how in 1987 three Attorneys General of the former administration - Mr. Henry Forde, Mr. David Simmons and Mr. Louis Tull - not only asked Durant to resign, but made serious comments about his inability and about the inability of the police to maintain harmonious relations with any Minister for Legal Affairs, including the three of them. Do you remember that? So do not put it out of context, he has had problems with everybody.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I want to make it clear, Sir. I was not in here talking about the Commissioner of Police at all today. You cannot say that anything I said today related to the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. SPEAKER: Because you know how the rules work with a public officer, so you would not have said it at all. I am sure you would not have said it.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: When we took that decision to call for the Commissioner's resignation, it was in relation to his report in 1986, and they have not laid one since. It was precisely because of a paragraph in that report where it appeared to us in our deliberate judgment that he was playing politics in language that he used in his own report in 1986 and the fact that a Commissioner of Police should not appear partisan. That is why he may have had problems. He had no problems with me when I was Attorney General, because I only had a year, but I am not dealing with that. I am not talking about the Commissioner of Police today, I am talking about the police, the rank and file, those of the rank of Sergeant who accused the Attorney General to his face of letting his promises miscarry.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is again misleading the House. What the Honourable Member must do is not to distort the position, he must put a true presentation on it. The position is that the Labour Party administration never had cordial relations with the Police Force. I think the Honourable Member will remember the former Attorney General going into a police station and making a big song and dance, right there in Headquarters, and telling the police "you are behaving this way, not one blind cent you are getting from me. I am not giving you anything." Do you forget all of that? Have you forgotten how Louis Tull would not even go and address the graduation class? Do you forget the bitter relations which existed? Do you forget how Mr. St. John cursed the police in this House? Do you forget how Tom Adams

cursed the police openly in the House of Assembly? Are you forgetting all of that?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already said that points of order should be brief, but what I want to draw to Honourable Members' attention is that the Bill before the House is very clear, and I am sure Honourable Members understand the Bill. Even though there might be excursions into other areas, I am asking Members not to be irrelevant.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am grateful to you, Sir. With respect, I cannot be irrelevant in talking about the police and their operations and offences committed against this Bill, because the police can, under this Bill, use their powers to go by warrant and use force if necessary to break into a place to find evidence which would lead to a conviction under this Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said to be relevant, and some of the names I have heard in the debate, one has to be very careful with the relevancy of those matters, but it does not mean that one should speak extensively beyond the scope of this Bill.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am very grateful, Sir, that you put the Honourable Attorney General so firmly in his place, as it was he that was calling names in here without asking permission, not me.

Sir, it is well accepted among the general public of Barbados that the relationship between the Attorney General and the broad mass of the Police Force is not a happy one. I am not talking about the Commissioner, I am dealing with the rank and file. Indeed, the relationship between the DLP Government and the Police Force is such as not to make for a contented Police Force now, and that is one of the problems I am talking about, the need to have a contented Force. 4.40 p.m.

The regrading exercise has caused greater dissatisfaction in the Police Force than anything else in the last four years. You think it is fun - I am not speaking literally, metaphorically - that some of the police officers at the top got as much money out of the then exercise that they had to hire a "Z" van to carry it home. Little fellows from constable to sergeant got \$54 a month. After you take out tax, National Insurance levies, not even enough to buy a coke, or to buy what Little Rick would call a brown mint. Those are the ones who have to go out there and do all the hard work. They are the ones who have to expose themselves to the criminal element that is armed in this country with guns and knives.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I do not like interrupting the Honourable Member. I wish to submit that the Honourable Member's debate so far would more properly fall in a matter dealing with the Police Force.

While this Bill has elements of policing, as is almost every regulatory piece of legislation, I think the Honourable Member is stretching the Rules, I submit, Sir, to be taking the discussion into the area of the regrading exercise.

The Democratic Labour Party did not do the regrading exercise. They had an independent commission that did the regrading exercise. If that matter is to be debated it should be debated properly and substantively, not as part of this, I submit, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: In response to the Honourable Member I already raised the question of relevancy and the scope of the Bill. I am sure the Honourable Member is capable of dealing with the Bill within the context in which it is set out. I do not think I have to read and spell for Members.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was dealing with broad principles on the second reading because they relate to the management of this Bill. How are you going to manage to protect children from indecent photographs by disallowing people to take photographs of children?

Some time ago, about two years ago, a shop on Baxters Road was raided and a lot of what the lay person would call indecent or obscene matter was taken away. They had no legislation such as we are now enacting today to deal with the situation at the time. But the police are the ones who raided the place and took away all the fancy literature, implements....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...accessories, which my friend for the City is far greater acquainted with these wrappings than I. He calls them accessories. I am grateful.

Sir, I am not going to make an excursion into all the problems of the Police Force. I accept your strictures on that. All I am saying is that one of the first things we must, do in order to, as it were, arrest the trend in crime is to create some contentment within the Police Force. I am not going to embarrass the Attorney General anymore. It is up to him to work out a methodology to restore the relations between himself and the broad membership of the Force.

Secondly, Sir, I think the time has come when we must now sit down and do an analytical study into the causes of this deviance that we have in Barbados. Even today's newspaper, I think it is the "Advocate's" editorial is guessing. What they are doing is setting a set of theories that one group holds to the view that the crime we are seeing is caused by economic deprivation. Another group thinks it is a cultural, sub-cultural problem. A third group thinks it is something to do with the personality, must be the Eysenck principle. They do not go on to say that.

Everybody is guessing when it is accepted that there is no one single explanation for the cause of crime.

There are a number of factors which can predispose to that deviance but you cannot scientifically pull out of any of the literature to say that crime is caused by economic deprivation, by broken homes or by single parent family. The evidence is not there. The best explanation is now a multi-factor theory explaining the causes of crime.

We are guessing in Barbados. It is a field that is rich and fertile for scholarship and original work to be done. I am asking Government - the Barbados Labour Party is committed to it as part of our Manifesto, I have the authority to say it. I have said it on platforms. We are committed to two things, namely, a national task force on crime and at the same time a proper commission of enquiry into the causes of crime.

I do not mean a commission of enquiry that is going to sit in any ivory tower. I can envision people from Cave Hill in the socio sciences sitting on the commission and making inputs. But it is time that there be dialogue with the youth to try and find out what is happening to them inside that is causing them to react this way. We cannot shunt them aside and say "well, we cannot make a hand of today's young people. Let us forget them". We cannot do that. We have to try and save them. Before you can save them you have to try and find out what is making them tick in the way that they are ticking. I think Government must approach this in a studied way but with some degree of urgency.

I remember when Winston Hall and his fellows Oliver and another guy had Barbados terrorised for about two weeks, the Prime Minister then, Tom Adams, thought it necessary to go on television and reassure the country that something was being done. I have been astonished that with all the crime that we have been seeing, and the Attorney General must know of it, his own constituents must be telling him that they are concerned, you know the Attorney General has not even been on a Democratic Labour Party platform or spoken at a public meeting? They have held three or four recently.

The biggest issue in Barbados today is crime, law and order. Let us understand that. We do not need the polls to tell us that, the polls say so. From our own experiences we must know that the biggest issue in Barbados today is this restlessness and crime. The Attorney General is under a duty in those circumstances to take the country into his confidence and let them know what is happening and what they are trying to do about it. Instead, as I say, I am personally disappointed that they have started a round of public meetings going to tell the truth. I make no comment on the slogan.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I really find it difficult to understand. If the Honourable Member is not

discussing what the Attorney General has said in here, he is now attacking the Attorney General for not speaking on political platforms after three meetings! Do you think it could be reasonable that the Honourable Member could be making a speech and casting aspersions on another Honourable Member for not appearing on a political platform? This is unbelievable. The Attorney General has spoken at least seven times in the last two years on some aspect of crime in this country at a public forum. 4.50p.m.

If the Honourable Member, either via the newspaper or the television was unable to hear the Attorney-General he cannot come and castigate the Attorney-General. I think it is unfair, Sir, and I submit that the Honourable Member is casting aspersions on another Member, contrary to the Rules.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I plead guilty to casting aspersions. Yes, Sir. I am deliberately saying that the Attorney-General, in my opinion - You do not have to agree with it. It is mine, I am entitled to hold it - having regard to the recent escalation and relentless upsurge of crime in the last six weeks

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: - As the Member for the City is saying violent crime - was in those narrow circumstances, under a duty to take the people of the country into his confidence. It is my opinion. If I am wrong, I do not mind being wrong. I cannot be right all the time. I have to be wrong sometimes, I am a human being.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member again is misleading the House. He keeps going down that road. I saw in the press somewhere, where at some public meeting he made that point. I have spoken on the issue of crime at important meetings. The Police Force conference takes place once a year.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: You are misleading the House. You said I have not spoken to the public on it. I have spoken publicly on it. That is the whole point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am listening to you.

Hon. M. A. KING: I have spoken publicly on the issue at important Police Force conferences. The Labour Party takes the view, of course, that public meetings are where you have to make the statements of policy.

The Police Force conferences are the conferences where you deal with important policy issues relating to the Force and to crime. If the press does not report the

important policy statements that are made at Force conferences and at police meetings and I have addressed at least two or three of them within the past months and will be addressing another police meeting within the next two days - if they do not take those important public occasions on which I make important pronouncements on crime, I do not know what the Honourable Member wants.

Do you want me to speak at a public meeting?

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order made.

Hon. M. A. KING: I will be speaking at one. But I speak at public meetings which....

Mr. SPEAKER: You need not carry on on that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I understand. The Attorney-General has a cold, Sir. I am not going to press him. He is no better than the Deputy Prime Minister. All kinds of meetings going. You have not heard him. He cannot have anything to tell the public. I will leave that. That was only by the way. I will steer now back to the point.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I heard that, Sir, about disturbing the public. I really do not want it to be said....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I believe that this Honourable House and Your Honour has a right to know.

The Honourable Member is - as he said just by the way - attacking the Leader of the House. I think it needs to be said for the record that the Leader of the House, in recent times, went to represent this country at the highest level in Japan at the inauguration of the Emperor. On another occasion the Honourable Member was in another country representing the country.

I think it is very unreasonable and unfair for the Honourable Member to be giving this House information of which he assumes to be authoritative when, in fact, that information is not accurate.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas were ordered, by Mr. SPEAKER, to be expunged from the record.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, coming back to the debate. In order to ensure that we catch some of these people who are preying, as I said earlier, on the frailty of young people, the Force must be properly equipped and indeed, it must be contented and some methodology would have to be worked out by which the country can get better

police coverage than it presently has. I am not going into the details. I am too responsible to say in here what I know. Honourable Members know. I just say that I think we need a better spread of police surveillance. I do not condescend upon any other particulars because it is a very sensitive thing we are talking about.

The Attorney-General has to get a plan going to ensure, especially at night, that this country is better policed than it presently is. He knows what I am talking about, Sir.

If we can do some of these things, address the results of the analysis that we carry out with the young people, in trying to programme our policies towards a solution of the problems that are thrown up by scientific study, we can get more men in the Force in operation during the night, especially when there is the highest proportion of violent crime. If we can detect and catch more criminals, then the next step in the process is a system under which we deal with those convicted.

I am going to start at the top. I have made it clear in here. Thankfully, the Barbados Labour Party at its Annual Conference in October 1990 voted massively in favour of the retention of the death penalty and its use, as we have come to expect it some years ago. That is to say that we reserve it for the worst type of crime. I want it clearly understood. I am no softy softy on this. I believe that if you commit violent crime, a violent murder and you exhaust your right of appeal, you go down. 5.00 p.m.

I have sympathy for crime of passion situations and each one has to be looked at individually. But nobody is going to convince me that if somebody sets out with a gun to go in somebody's house and cuts them up or shoots them and robs and rapes a woman of 72 years old and that kind of thing that I should have any sympathy to the extent that the taxpayers of this country should pay to keep him fed to grow thick and fat in prison for ten years. I am sorry but that is my personal belief. I am not in it. Thankfully, the broad mass of the Labour Party is with me on that stance. It is an area where people can have their own personal views influenced by moral considerations. I grant them that. They are entitled to those views. This is my personal view. I am not going to quarrel with anybody who is an abolitionist and holds that view.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will start at the top, Sir. We must retain capital punishment for the worst type. We must enforce it by ever so often giving the hangman a salary. The fellow has not had any bread for a long time. If he was relying on a few necks, he would have died from starvation a long time ago. Use it and let it be known that we cannot have this type of fellow around the society. I am not going to be ridiculous and say that we do it publicly.

That is a throw-back to more barbarous days. I am not in that. I am saying to use it and let it be known that yesterday at 5 o'clock "X" was executed and he was the man who was involved in such and such a terrible murder. It may have an effect

Sir, I am sure you have been doing some canvassing. Do not shake your head. Well, if you have not, Sir, it is * time to start. Take that little advice from me. If you start -1 am addressing you, Sir - you would be amazed at some of the things you hear from some of the young people. You hear, "Man, I am going to lick you up. I am going to shoot you. You only want killing." All of that you hear. Now added to those threats they are armed. Well, we came along hearing that as boys and growing up in this society. How many of us have not heard as youngsters growing up the saying, "Man, I am going to beat you and then go and pay the magistrate for you"? This is an attitude of mind. But we had those attitudes of mind for as long as we can remember. ••• It is different today. You have the attitude of mind plus arms, guns, knives or bottles. They are using them freely.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: My friend is reminding me that it is dangerous to have a street fair. The police have had to clamp down on the holding of street fairs because there are no longer places that you can resort to for safety. What •• do we do, Sir?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, the Hometown Festival is a national event and I would expect special security. We have to do something, Sir. But when you are dealing with the penal side of it when you catch them, I am all for retaining the death penalty and using it by way of example ever so often.

"»

Lower down I think that we have to examine alternatives to imprisonment for certain types of offences. I do not want to be misquoted. The Honourable Minister of Labour, Youth, and Unemployment said - What did I say wrong?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Right. Unemployment, Labour Relations, and Youth. He went to Haynesville and I do not think it was inadvertently or unwittingly. I think it was consciously deliberate - my solution to the problem is to build more jails. I am going to bring the tape and let you hear yourself. He said that he never said it and we have it on tape. Poor fellow but I understand though. No wonder the Honourable Member for St. Joseph when she finished her speech that night she said, "Ladies and gentlemen of St.

James South I implore you, I beseech you to replace Keith Simmons.", and she got down. I am correcting an abridged version of the truth. Sir, I got that on tape too.

I want to make it clear, Sir, that I am not talking in terms of more jails. Jail must be reserved for the worst type of offender from whom society needs to be protected and who is persistent or residivist. I am talking about sex offenders, child abusers, druggies, violent people who cut you up short of murder or shoot at you and that sort of thing. Jail has to be for that type. But there is another type of offender for whom jail is not in my submission the ideal punishment. The fellow that they bring in to Court on a Saturday morning with one marijuana cigarette which they caught him smoking or that type of petty criminal should not be sent to prison. Those who abuse and use indecent language in public places and on the highway need discipline and order to pull them up sharp. They should be made to work in this country. They should be punished within the community by making proper use of Community Service Orders. I do not mean like one magistrate who tacked on a Community Service Order to some youngsters from St. Thomas to write 100 lines. That is just a play-play thing. Your leisure time should be docked where you feel it. When you want to go to the Globe is the time under the supervision of people in the Probation Department your time should be docked and you should be made to go and repair some old peoples' homes, paint them, and do some debushing and get rid of some of the mosquitoes in this country, and so on in an atmosphere where when your peers pass and see you carrying out your punishment you will feel shame. But to send that type of fellow who is misguided to prison for six months has the potentiality of creating in him so many criminal learning processes that he could be forever after twisted and tainted. We need to try and save these people. Punish them by making them do things in the community by attending centres or something like that. 5.10p.m.

Now, Sir, I am submitting therefore that there is a variety of punishment that can be used to ensure that people are punished and at the same time their punishment is in a productive way beneficial to the community, and the community is saved from having to pay for their keep in prison. That is something else we can deal with in detail, I am not dealing with it now, I am just giving the broad parameters.

If what the Honourable Minister said at Haynesville meant that he was referring to my view, shared by every Chief Justice we have had, that there should be a borstal, to that extent he is right, because the only other custodial institution we need in Barbados to deal with persons, for example, convicted under this Protection of Children Bill, is an institution which will deal with persons between ages 17 to 25 in a tough but humane regime. I used to think that Cable and Wireless buildings at Carringtons in St. Philip would have been ideal for a borstal. I do not know to what

use they are currently put, but I used to think that those buildings could have been used for that purpose.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am told that I might be in Zone 1, but an area like that, set apart from the road with good structurally sound buildings and a lot of land, where they could remain and involve themselves in agriculture, while at the same time being taught a range of trades and skills such as carpentry, masonry, joinery, steel bending, wire bending, auto body repairs and so on. An idyllic dilution like that where the bell would be rung at 4.30 in the morning, especially like now it is cold, you would be ordered to take a cold shower and come out on parade, at attention, get some breakfast and go to work under strict supervision, under people who understand the importance of discipline. I am not talking about beating, I am not in that, I am not talking about brutalising people, I am talking about a disciplined regime. You do not brutalise people in the Defence Force or in the Police Force, but you understand and you are expected to inculcate precepts of discipline. If you can learn discipline in the Defence Force and in the Police Force, you can learn discipline in a borstal and you do not have to be beaten for it. It depends on your catchment area for your instructors and the people who are going to supervise and maintain discipline, but the borstal I envisage would be a place where, as I say, the regime would be tough and strict, or as I said in here before, Sir, you would not be sentenced to two, three or five years, you would be sentenced to an order for training and discipline of indeterminate length. When you come out depends on how you respond to the instruction and treatment inside.

I have seen boys at Dodds who, if you ask one of them how long he had been in there, he would not say he had three years, he would say "I have one year and days". He is counting in his mind how many more days he has before he walks out, he is not interested in the training aspect of his incarceration.

These are some of the thoughts I have, Sir. I could be wide of the mark, but I feel that we have to make a try to rethink and look at again the whole system that we have in Barbados from the police in terms of complete re-organisation of the Force, look at its management procedures, its day to day operations and make adjustments. I believe that there is a little too much specialisation and compartmentalisation in the Force.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member for St. James South said that is right. They are getting like the Telephone Company. My phone went out of order Thursday before last. I called and the fellow came to check the instrument. He picked up the instrument, opened it and said there was nothing wrong with the instrument. But the

phone was still not working. So he said he would send somebody else the next day. Another fellow came and said he had come to check the line, so he checked the line, there was no problem there and he said he had to go back and send another fellow to check the cable. For a week I could not get through to people from St. Thomas and they could not get through to me. Three different people had to come to fix one little problem with a telephone.

I find that in the Police Force there is a little too much specialisation and compartmentalisation. You go to certain people about a problem with somebody giving you a bounced cheque and they say they cannot take a statement on that, you have to go to town to find somebody in the fraud squad and if you cannot find that person on that day you are in trouble. You have to go back two days later. That cannot be right. If you have a problem, you should be able to go to a police station and, as they said in the old days, lay a complaint and a policeman should be there to take your statement rather than shunting you off because it is not his territory. There is a lot of struggle for territory.

This is one of the things, Sir, if the Attorney General knows of it, he needs to discuss with the Force in an effort to get some of this bureaucracy that is coming into the Force and impacting negatively on the proper performance of the Force.

Sir, I have had a long discourse with Honourable Members and I wish to just say that the Labour Party is going to support this legislation, and we hope that the Minister will take some of the things we have said to heart. I wish to assure him, Sir, that when we say that we want him to take the country into his confidence, we do not mean that he must go on a political meeting, he can make a statement on TV or something and talk to the country. He is relying on the Press. He said he had spoken at the Police Annual Conference. They wrote that much. He may have said something very fundamental, but to the Press it is not fundamental because they missed the point, so it never gets publicity, and I am saying when you know that a situation is escalating and appearing to get out of hand, and certainly appearing to worry people in the country, I think as a leader you have a duty to say "I think it is time for me to interpose myself in this. Let me just let the country know they must not worry, we are doing our best to police the country and so on." Say something to them. 5.20 p.m.

You would know what is going on. I do not know what is going on within the Force, what moves you are making. One does not expect you to talk secrets either. I think it would be a responsible thing to do. I am not saying go to a public meeting and then say I made a statement of fact Sunday night. They have had a number of public meetings. They do not think very much of the Attorney General so they did not invite him to speak. We have not heard from him.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. I cannot let the records show that, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I said "they".

Hon. B. M. TAITT: But it is not "they" from the Barbados Labour Party under a breadfruit tree. "They" could only mean the Democratic Labour Party. It is simply not true what the Honourable Member has said. It is simply not true. Let the records so show.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this Bill I do not intend to get into the criminology or the penal system which may be a by-product of this Bill. However, Sir, I would like to state that although I am, in fact, supporting the Bill, I believe the Bill only goes part way.

Dealing as it does with basically photography, we have to realise that it is not dealing with the whole area of viewing. We will have to look in the future to see how this can be tied in with the whole Act which we also have as the law, the whole question of censureship because in this Bill we have a definition of "child" under 18. We have a definition of "film" which includes any form of video recording. Of course, we have the other aspect of indecent photography.

There are three areas in the Bill where it says "indecent photograph" I know there may be within the legal system some other consideration but that will have to be argued if and when the time comes. The second one deals with the protection of children. I think this is very relevant to the Bill. As we know in most instances we will expect by experience that the children of whom we are speaking more often than not are female.

Thirdly, the whole Act as it states is to provide for protection. When we speak of protection, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, this does not venture into the area of the Film Censure Board. We must be aware that even the Film Censureship Board does not have the authority under the Act to deal with theatres, CBC or, indeed, to deal with the video clubs to which reference was made earlier because as we know the people who either man, maintain, manage or own the video clubs are people in Barbados who we know have satellites and spend whatever time is necessary to do what they call taping and editing in order to produce many of these films which are sold or rented at these clubs.

Now, there may be other illegalities involved here in terms of pirating etc. We know that is a fact. That does not relate directly to the Bill in terms of what we are saying about photographing of children. We may have to follow up and we will follow up on this Bill because we may find that

having dealt with the first area of filming or photographing of children, some individual or individuals may choose to make a business out of that film which might have been produced of that child, therefore moving it into the realm of commercial business.

Now, Sir, we also have to look at the whole question of the districts and the reporting. I do not intend to get into the whole area of the Police and their methodology in terms of investigation. I think the Honourable Member for St. Thomas did a specialty in that area. He ranged quite wide in the area of the police and what they may have to do. We know and we have been hearing of reports of children being found in districts. We have heard reports of some type of filming, photographing or something which at that point was deemed illegal although not under this particular Bill. It says that the police can follow up. What I would like to know is that when the police have heard of these reports they will be able to follow up and identify the person or persons responsible because of the identity of that photography. We have only heard of reports of some of this, I am saying it is only a report so far because under the present laws, to the best of my knowledge, no-one was actually convicted. I am not even sure if anyone was actually charged for performing such a function. I know that there is a situation which is now *sub judice* and we have heard accusation of that occurring in a public place. I will say no more than that.

When we deal with this problem of the children being photographed I, like the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, would hope that if at such time any individual is caught, apprehended and found guilty of staging any viewing or indeed photographing of any individual child, that individual, should be punished. When one reads certain aspects of the Bill, which to me, as a layman, it seems to be a little lenient in terms of what I believe should happen to an individual who is guilty; but what I am saying is that when the photograph is found and if you can pursue and identify an individual who is responsible, or if, given the proper information, we can get to the location where such an act is being perpetrated that we should not spare that individual who is involved.

Now, I think when the Honourable Member for St. Thomas mentioned that we should consider and ask what is making people tick, I believe that we may have to ask, who is making them tick? Not necessarily what is making them tick. Because I should like to submit to this Honourable House that part and parcel of who is making them tick has some direct relationship, if not to the photographing but may to this whole question of this type of photography and drugs. What else? We may never know.... 5.30p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that I am happy to support this Bill. I believe that this, along with some of the other positive steps that we have seen, following up on

what we had only yesterday, Sir, in the banning of the music on the buses which impacts on the school children on the buses; if we can follow up and see that the children can again get some direction, in terms of their protection, we still may be able to save the society.

I am much obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the debate did range a bit wide, as the contribution by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas did range a bit wide and venture into areas of the police.

But I should like to confine my remarks to things specifically for which the very Bill itself touches. There is an organization in the United States of America called the North American Man Boy Love Association, NAMBLA. It is an organization that promotes sexual relationships between man and boy. That is essentially what it is about. The law in America permits this kind of association because of the wide freedoms that that country practices and enjoys.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Yes. It is a fact. Actually, one night while watching television, the Koppel Show on ABC that comes on at midnight there was an interview by the President of that Association.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I happened to be in America at the time. He was conducting an interview with the President of that organization. It was an actual call-in programme being conducted on TV. Happily the situation in Barbados and the Laws of Barbados will not condone such a situation.

I think we have made a step in the right direction today. This legislation is not comprehensive in dealing with all the aspects of child abuse which to my mind is one of the worst forms of man's inhumanity to man. I believe personally and I am speaking for myself that any person caught abusing a child in a sexual way ought to be castrated, if that person is a man. That is my own personal belief. I believe there are certain forms of punishment that ought to be reserved for persons like that.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Ought to lose their member. If it is a female, other considerations maybe. Some of the forms that are practised in some countries where, I would not like to say it in here, Sir, a similar thing can be done to a female as well to deprive her of any sexual capacity. That is how I feel about it.

The Act talks about the protection of children. It is an Act that complements other forms of the legislation dealing with cruelty to children and even some of the principles that are laid down in the Child Care Board Act.

But, as I was saying before, I believe that the penalties in the Act are a bit moderate, too light. Contrary to what the Minister of Education was saying not too long ago, the Act does touch on the point of pirating. It is not mentioned there but it talks about distributing photographs. If anyone in Barbados uses a dish to pirate this kind of material that is broadcasted and then distributes it, the offence is not so much in the pirating itself, the interception of it, but in the distribution of it. Once the person distributes the material, then to my mind, under Section 3 (1) of the Act that person is also guilty of an offence. At section 3 (1) it says:

"Any person who distributes or shows an indecent photograph of a child is guilty of an offence."

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Of a child. Any child at all. It does not have to be a Barbadian child. Child means a person under the age of 18 years. The difficulty in that aspect of that offence is to prove that the child we are seeing on the screen is a child under 18 years. It is just a question of proof. This is merely evidential.

Sir, I am glad that this community of Barbados is making a step in, at least, addressing one form of child abuse. Many children in Barbados are abused in this way. You have had cases in the courts of this country where step fathers have been brought before the courts for committing offences upon their step children. There was one that was tried last year which, unfortunately, the case went to appeal and the step father was found not guilty, by the Appeal Court.

But in a lot of the cases -I know I had the unfortunate experience of dealing with a situation where a client of mine her husband fathered one of her children's children. Her first child, a female was not his child and he had not only one but two or three children from that girl. It caused her tremendous psychological problems and she had to be treated.

There are many cases in Barbados that have to be kept under wraps by the Child Care Board for fear of not wanting to hurt the children who are involved.

I had another case that I dealt with which eventually was withdrawn from the courts, where a hard man of about 28 years old fathered a child from a girl who was 14 years old and the matter did not come before the law court. This is back in the time when we were a little more lenient. This was probably around 1981, 1982 when we were a little more lenient in our approach to dealing with problems of

this nature and when people caught in those circumstances were not brought before the courts. The view was taken, at that time, that the father of the child ought not to be brought before the courts because then there was the whole question then of maintenance that came into it. Who would maintain the child when the father was jailed because there was no doubt about it that he would have been jailed. I have no doubt about it at all, because the evidence was there clearly. *

I welcome this kind of legislation, Sir. As I said before, it is limited to a particular aspect of child abuse but I am certain that we will explore other areas and we will introduce legislation to deal with other areas of the abuse of our children. Our children are precious and they ought to be protected. They are the next generation of Barbadians and we cannot allow psychological damage to be done to them too early in their lives.

Sir, my own view about it is that child pornography, as it is called, is in some respects born out of or is an extension of the whole area of the drug culture. Most of the child pornography or if you want to call it an illegal industry most of the profits from the illegal drug industry are put into that and further profits are made because there are a lot of sick people amongst us, Sir, a lot of sick people who crave for this kind of entertainment. A very base kind of entertainment. There is a market for it out there. There are all kinds of photographs of children that are distributed. You only have to follow CNN on mornings and you get an example of what I mean and what I am talking about. The MacMartin pre-school case in California that went on for so many years. So far, no one was proven guilty but at the same time there is no denying it.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: One person was. I think he was retried. ^,

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Appealed. Anyhow he was recently found guilty. One person was. 5.40 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Anyhow the point I am making is that there is evidence that there were severe elements and aspects of child abuse in that case. Then there was a recent case about three weeks ago where a man pleaded guilty to perpetrating acts against children going back for about two generations. A father said that the same man perpetrated an indecent act against him as he was perpetrating an act against his very child. He pleaded guilty and was sent to jail.

These are things that we should seek to guard against. We have to be very, very watchful to preserve the kind of democracy that we have. I am only hopeful that our laws will not be interpreted so liberally by our judges as to allow for the creation of the kind of society that exists in America at this moment.

In this same connection, we also have to deal with the whole aspect of cultural penetration in so far as television is concerned. I am hopeful that this whole idea of cultural penetration will not take root in Barbados and that we will not allow our society to be debased by what we are seeing coming from America. It is true that American television has a lot of good aspects about it. I agree to that, but at the same time there are some things that we ought to guard against. I am not saying, Sir, that we ought to prevent people from buying and installing dishes because I like to watch television. The point I am making is that our society has got to be educated to the point where the adults in society know exactly what they should allow their children to watch and what they should not allow them to watch. That is the point that I am making.

Sir, I would want to see the promise made at Page 21 of the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto carried out. That was a promise, Sir, that had a grounding in law and order and it had to do with drug pushers, drug importers and highly placed people like that. If I may just briefly refer to this Manifesto, Sir, which is a document of the House. At Page 21, the third from the last paragraph states: "Many serious crimes now have their origins among highly placed drug importers and drug distributors. These people have vast resources of illegally acquired money which they use to buy politicians and some policemen in all countries. In Barbados our Police spokesman has continually lamented that their search for drug pushers has frequently been thwarted by "people in high places" whose influence is strong enough to shield the guilty." It goes on to say: "The Democratic Labour Party will fight this evil with every resource which the law allows and in the face of every danger which the struggle brings. The total available resources of the state will be used to protect patriotic citizens. A Democratic Labour Party will with the help of all citizens who care for this country and young people wipe this loathsome scourge from the lives of all Barbadians." That is their solemn pledge.

Now Sir, so far I cannot say that I have seen that this pledge is being carried out. They do go on at Page 22 in terms of sexual offences against women and minors and this is what this Bill today is dealing with. It is said further: "A DLP Government, after consultation with the Judges will seek parliamentary approval for the establishment of appropriate legal arrangements to have these cases conducted in Court opened only to those concerned in these trials. We think it is neither proper to the dignity of women nor to the feelings of children, to handle these matters in

open Courts. Parents and teachers in the case of minors would be deemed to have legitimate concern in such cases."

Now Sir, the whole idea of conducting certain trials in camera is an idea that I like. For example, one of the policies of the National Democratic Party is to have rape trials conducted in camera. Now I would have thought that the first attempt more or less an experiment to see how conducting trials in camera would work in the case of young children would have been attempted by this Act here. Sir, I am certain that at some time an offence might be brought against an adult person for an offence committed under this Act where a young person would have to lead evidence. Now I am certain, Sir, that all the evidentiary concerns and considerations which now employ ordinary trials would be brought to bear against that child. In normal trials children are tested as to their understanding of right and wrong and so on. The only point of evidence that I see in the Bill is dealt with at Section 5 where it says, "On a charge of an offence under Paragraph (a) of Section 3(1), the wife or husband of the accused may be called as a witness for the prosecution or defence and if so called notwithstanding any other laws is a compellable witness."

Now I can see evidentiary problems for offences committed under this Act where you have got to call young children in evidence. I do not know if the Attorney General agrees with me, but I would like to hear him on that when he is replying to the comments made during this debate. I can see problems developing in terms of evidence. There are some areas where you would hardly have evidentiary problems. The age of a child might very well be disputed if a child is identified in a photograph the age of the child. How are you going to receive evidence of the age of that child? You may receive it from the parents and so on. But I believe that there are other considerations of an evidentiary nature that would still touch on any offence that is committed under this Act. But apart from that, Sir, I can see no serious drawback although that may very well be a serious one. I can see no serious drawback from this Bill once it starts to operate.

Now Sir, my view is that things are going at such a rapid pace in Barbados and we are developing so rapidly that some of the negative attributes of development are attending our development. I believe that this Bill is a reflection of that as well. The problem of child abuse, Sir, is not something that is recent. Child abuse was with us from the very beginning. That is why from very early in Barbados we had the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Law, but there were shortcomings of that law. Some of these shortcomings are identified in this Bill before us. But I would hope, Sir, that at a later stage that more comprehensive legislation dealing with other aspects of child abuse will be brought to this Parliament. I would hope that that is done in the not too distant future.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to give my support to this legislation with a couple of reservations relating to the actual provisions. I want to start by saying that I do not think that anybody will be in any doubt that the children of Barbados and their existence in this country are comparably much better than in many other countries of the world. Recently, as a result of efforts by UNICEF to have certain treaties or resolutions passed, at the United Nations relating to the rights of children, the information about the plight of children throughout continents in the world has become more widespread and Members of this Parliament have had a chance I believe in participating in those debates. The Honourable Members for St. George South and St. James North have participated and Barbados has been acknowledged even when our Prime Minister recently visited the United Nations to participate in what I believe was the World Summit on Children. It was acknowledged that Barbados is one of those countries in the world that rates the role of its children and provides an environment for them that is meaningful and one in which they can grow up reasonably well. 5.50 p.m.

There are countries in the world, for example, where children at the age of four are working in coal mines, there are countries in the world where children are living on large rubbish dumps, there are countries in the world where children are still being sold as slaves, and yet we in Barbados are able to provide for each one of our citizens guaranteed rights and privileges and also a certain amount of welfare to ensure their social well-being. Nobody should doubt that the reason for this has been the concerted effort by the State to intervene where necessary to provide that minimum standard of living and so on for all of our citizens and to carry out the necessary programmes to ensure that each and every one of the children born in Barbados at least attain certain basic needs and is not below the poverty line.

There are countries, like the United States of America, where a large number of persons exist below the poverty line. I believe right now it is over 30 million, and these are people who on a daily basis have nowhere to live, nothing to eat and are suffering from malnutrition. When we therefore compare Barbados we are somewhat better off. That is not to say that there are not occasions when the State has to involve itself further in improving the environment in which children live. This legislation, which is to provide for the protection of children from exploitation by preventing the making of indecent photographs of them, seeks to address a problem that is perceived to exist in our society today and is also seeking to extend protection to children in an area which hitherto it did not seem necessary to provide that protection.

However, this legislation brings the State into the debate on issues of morality and issues that traditionally the State has not always had a comfortable role. For example, in this legislation the definition of everything else is pretty

clear, but the legislation itself does not provide for an adequate definition of the word "indecent". It therefore says 'indecent photograph' includes an indecent film, a copy of an indecent photograph or film, and an indecent photograph that is part of a film that shows children." If somebody were charged under one of these sections, there would be a valid debate during the course of the trial as to what is the meaning of the word "indecent" and I suppose that the » suggestion would be that we should apply contemporary definitions to words like "indecent", but contemporary definitions of the word "indecent" refer to things like propriety. I am looking at a 1968 dictionary which, for example, defines indecent as "unbecoming; in extremely bad taste; unseemly; offending against propriety or delicacy; immodest", and that does not deal with obscenity.

What is an indecent photograph of a child? A photograph that shows the upper half of a child's body? At what point do we cross the line in relation to indecency? ** This is one of the problems that we are going to have with this legislation.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. George South has done some comparisons to American law. The Americans have had a very long debate on all issues like this - obscenity, indecency, censorship - *» and they tend to categorise these debates as the battle between the literati and the philistines, the philistines being people of average intelligence, who believe that art should be basic, there should be nothing extravagant about it on either side, so for example average American citizens are offended by the exhibition that Maplethorpe, I think his name is, has recently put on, because it shows pictures of men in poses together, it shows pictures of men and children, naked children, it shows pictures of men in outfits that are used in sexual encounters and that kind of thing.

Now, these are just photographs, and the American Supreme Court in due course will have to rule on these matters, but I suspect that at the end of the day they are going to rule that they are not obscene, even though they may be depicting children. There is a problem with this, because I suspect that legislation of this sort must also go further. In its definition of "indecent" it must also speak about the intent of the person in taking the photographs, •» because if I wish to take false - and I am not being extravagant - but let us assume that we were having an intellectual debate and I was a photographer and wished to take a photograph of a young girl who was naked because of some particular artistic attribute that she had, would that qualify for a prosecution under legislation of this sort? The philistines would say yes and the literati would perhaps say .^ that the society needs these kinds of things to stimulate its artistic and creative responses, and the fact is that these things exist anyway, so that by stopping somebody from

taking your photograph like that offends against creativity and so on.

All I am saying is that in the definition of "indecent" in this legislation, I suspect that the intent of the person in taking the photograph is really what the legislation is interested in. The legislation is interested in stopping the exploitation of young children by characters who go around filming them for the purpose of selling blue movies, or filming them for the purpose of selling the photographs or for using them in advertisements or in other forms of fare for public consumption.

At the end of the day when this legislation comes to be interpreted, I suspect that the persons who have the responsibility for it are going to have difficulty in coming to some conclusion as to what "indecent" means, and those who are philistine in outlook would certainly accept that any photograph of a naked or half naked child, or whatever, may fall within that category, and yet there will be others on the other side who may not feel that tests that are that restrictive should be applied.

Where the State intervenes in matters of this sort, they have to be careful that there is not an attempt, while trying to deal with a situation that may come to hand or may arise in a pragmatic way or deal with it in an expedient way, that it does not in fact militate against other forms of creative expression that are wise.

I am saying I support this legislation, that I have no difficulty with it at all, except to the extent that the lack of definition of the word "indecent" is something that I have my own reservation about. As I say, when the State intervenes in issues like this of morality and of questions relating to responding to public pressure, in relation to legislating matters that the public feels strongly about at a particular time, one has to be careful, because legislation should not reflect only contemporary views but it should be the kind of legislation that can stand the test of time throughout the ages. I still believe that the State has a duty to set the tone and to protect and I believe in this regard the State's duty extends in relation to children to several areas of activity.

The Minister of Education mentioned the recent banning of music on minibuses. This is one of the areas, like many others, in which the State at times has to intervene and set a common standard for a number of reasons, not so much relating to issues of morality because dub music may, in fact, be wholesome in some respects and some good has come out of it, but because it may have a duty in relation to several other aspects of the relationships between people in the society and the protection of citizens travelling on public transport is the major pre-occupation of the State. 6.00 p.m.

When the Government takes a decision or this Parliament to ban the playing of music in minibuses, it is not making a statement about the quality of the music. It is not making a statement about the morality of the kind of music that is being played. It is not making a statement about the lyrics. It is essentially responding to the needs, as I understand it, of public safety in relation to the conduct of public service vehicles on the roads. People, however, as I said, will always get carried away in debates of this sort. Just as the minibus drivers are now responding to their perception of Government's motive for banning the playing of music on minibuses, there will be some people who would respond to legislation of this sort on the same basis that they feel we are making a statement about morality and about standards that should, in fact, be involved.

The point is that at the end of the day the courts have to interpret this legislation so we may very well pass legislation and wish to apply particular standards but the courts may not conform or respond in the way that we anticipate at the end of the day so we are only part of the process and people should not believe that passing legislation in here immediately sends out some signal to the community about levels of morality that should be pursued. The State's duty in matters of this sort then is not to respond simply as a matter of expedience, or fragmentism or populism.

The speech by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas - I am sorry he is not in his seat - was in a sense, a tragic one. The Honourable Member for St. George South has treated us, on many occasions, to his concept of legislation of this sort. He did so briefly on this occasion but, nevertheless, wisely and could have used the time that was allotted to the Honourable Member for St. Thomas to enlighten us on his visions for the young people and the extent to which legislation of this sort protects young people. Instead of that, we were treated to a speech which, if ten years from now, historians or persons involved in social inquiry were to read any of these debates, they would have no idea why legislation of this sort was being passed in a Parliament in 1990 if they were to read the speech of Members of the Opposition. Of course we were told some time ago that the Manifesto proposals were locked up in a safe. I daresay somebody has lost the key and the combination and we are not going to be treated to anything better.

In essence, I am disappointed that the debate has not responded to some of the issues that legislation of this sort because we may feel that we are doing something progressive or that we are intervening when necessary as legislators and that we are causing the State to come down in a particular area and make decisions that are necessary to preserve public order or to bring into being a new range of criminal penalties and offences so as to stop a particular development in the society. At the end of the day when the law courts have to interpret the legislation we may not find

that their response to the legislation is in the way in which we intended because they may apply any variety of tests to determine what the word "indecent" means in legislation of this sort.

I want, therefore, to support this legislation and to say that I believe it to be a positive development in promoting a safe and comfortable environment for our children and to say that it comes at a particularly important time in relation to the rights of children in the world today and to say that this Government should be commended for its response to their needs.

Thank you.

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this bit of legislation which I think is long overdue. The exploitation of our young people is a subject of grave concern to us. This is just another indication of the priority that this Government attaches to the safety of our young people. I am sure that mothers and parents who care for their children would be very happy to see this legislation. We know, Mr. Speaker, that legislation in itself does not change people but, at least, it will send a message to all of those persons out there who would want to exploit our young people.

Whilst I am on this, Mr. Speaker, I think in some ways some parts of our media are guilty of exploiting some of our young people. They just barely miss the crease, so to speak, because a lot of the young persons who watch these photographs and other manifestations of the sort feel that this is the way to go. I am speaking specifically of those semi-nude, near nude photographs which adorn pages of certain publications. I would like to think that this Bill would go some way in making people understand how we feel about those manifestations.

Mr. Speaker, along with this Bill I would hope that the parents and guardians of young people in Barbados would pay some more attention to the supervision of their children, also help them in many ways to understand what real values are all about because in putting forward some of these other pictures which we see, a lot of young people get the idea that these are the norm so they will not think that they are being exploited when people want to photograph them in all sorts of positions.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, am very happy that we are having this Bill now. I am not a lawyer so I really do not go into the fine points of what "indecent" means. I think most of us in this country have a very good idea of what "indecent" means.

Once again I am supporting this Bill which, as I said, is another manifestation of how the Democratic Labour Party Government is thinking about the young people whose responsibility it is to look after.

After all, Mr. Speaker, there was a very important conference here in Barbados all to do with young people. We, the Barbados Government, signed the Convention on the Rights of the Child. I think that this Bill is part of that securing the rights of the children. Thank you.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I also rise to support this Bill. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the adults of the country have a very very great responsibility in terms of protecting those rights of children just alluded to by the Honourable Member for St. Joseph. Just as parents, we have that micro responsibility of looking after our household and our children, the way how they grow and setting standards for them, as a nation we cannot leave the development of our children to chance. We have to plan. We have to assess and examine the culture that we establish in which they will grow. 6.10p.m.

Sir, it seems to me that, briefly, we are having changes in the overall culture to which our children are exposed. I should like to suggest that we need to recognize that we have a strong external impact on that local culture. I would like to pose that perhaps, in a country like Barbados, we are talking about a superordinate culture or a dominant culture and a subordinate culture. In Barbados, the superordinate or dominant culture is the one that, generally, will set the tone and the pace of where this country will go. But that subordinate culture can interfere with the overall tenor of the society and the image that is projected in the society-.

I would venture to say that the superordinate culture in Barbados is one that is fairly conservative, fairly quiet, fairly orderly, religious and intellectual. The subordinate culture is, in many ways, the opposite to what I have established before. It is a small sub-culture but it can, to a large extent, determine the perception of the entire country because it is normally a very virulent sub-culture. I think that, quite frankly, at this point in time, we are seeing its most virulent expression. I can only go by my own experience but it seems to me that if I did look at Barbados, coming through the fifties, when I first was exposed to culture, in a wider sense, the popular culture in Barbados was determined, largely, by inputs from America and so on.

I recall the music was the music of people like Pat Boone and Ricky Nelson, the young crowd. You still had inputs from, let us say, Bing Crosby, Nat King Cole and so on. As a boy coming up in the fifties, that was the music we had.

If you put that, along with what is happening in the cinema, when you went to the cinema, what did you see? You saw Bud and Lou, you saw Jerry Lewis, you saw people like Dean Martin and so on. It was a humorous culture, along with some romantic singing. The worst that

people would do is smoke a cigarette or pet somebody in the front seat of a car. That was the kind of culture that was portrayed. That affected our generation coming up.

That took a swing then into the sixties when you had the Beatles and Elvis Presley, as the musical expression.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The Temptations and that group. Beautiful singing, fairly simple, easy to listen to thing. You had movies that were, basically, based on the same groups and so on. It was the soft romanticism. Not even soft porn yet. It was easy for a family to go together to see that kind of thing. But then you heard that, perhaps, Presley was moving into popping some pills or something like that. I do not remember that affecting Barbados. It only came out years after that Elvis Presley was a victim of that kind of thing. But we down here were seeing the pictures and we did not know what he was into. We were not affected by it.

Then you moved into the seventies and you are talking there about people like Bob Marley and reggae music. Then as an offshoot of that, you got the marijuana coming. You started to get from the cinema point of view, the visual side, you were getting - Do you remember? - the movies. They used to be Westerns. A whole lot of Westerns, Django and Kung Fu started coming in. But it was Django and Kung Fu. The beginning of a very, very militant, aggressive kind of media coming at you.

Then we moved into the eighties. If we thought that the Beatles and Bob Marley were bad then you had hard rock and funk.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: And acid rock. That was LSD and all the other things they were experimenting with. Bruce Lee. I remember every day, day in and day out, every cinema in Barbados was into Bruce Lee and that sort of thing. For the first time you saw somebody pushing their finger at somebody and blood gushing out. When we saw blood in the 1950s and 1960s, we knew it was play, play blood. Violence was play, play violence. But, for the first time when you watched these things in a cinema, you saw real violence, people being shot and their heads blown away, that kind of thing. There was a whole change of the culture, in terms of what was being presented to us.

Now you are into the nineties and what are you into? You are into Rambo, Chuck Norris, the Mutants and that sort of thing. All sorts of weird things with violence always. There is blood and so on. Then, even when you have so-called humour, it is who? You are getting Richard Prior and you are getting Eddie Murphy, where pornography is the norm. Fellows curse and they do anything at all. That is the culture we are talking about. The dub music and the

dancing where people are "wucking" up and rubbing up and the zoom lens zooming in on you. That is part of the whole culture to see who is doing it worse.

But, quite frankly, if you look through these decades of change, you have had to me - it is only my perception - a worsening kind of popular culture. That is my perception of it looking at it as a man in my forties. It seems to me that my children are getting a worse break, in terms of the culture to which they are being exposed to than I was. I had a moderate moving through but they seem to be getting the tail end of a kind of culture that has corroded. To me it is becoming a very, very poor kind of environment to expose anybody to.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Yes, "Yellow Submarine" and so on.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: But to tell you the truth, when I heard the contents of the "Yellow Submarine" I did not know what was included in that.

What I am saying is that you have the playing out of this popular culture really levelling out and exposed to everybody. Crack and everything is part of that. Crack cocaine, it seems to me that we have got now to the nadir of this cultural deterioration. It has imposed itself on Barbados, lock, stock and barrel, into part of the sub-culture that is now our own.

You can see it out there. You can see it in the haircuts. You can see it in the ear rings. You can see it in the nose rings. You can see it in the dibby dibby dress. The behaviour that has no respect for anybody. It is a virulent sub-culture that tends to be interfering with your subordinate culture. It will continue to interfere with the subordinate culture, once it gets support from those persons who can use their voices and their positions against it. Because there is no way that a sub-culture should take over a dominant culture.

Those of us who have an interest in making sure that our cultural nationalism remains in tact and that our culture should grow and strengthen, rather than be weakened, will speak out against these things without fear of any repercussions, because we have a responsibility to our children to come up in the environment that we enjoyed, or an improved environment, not a worsened environment.

It is vitally important that we need to send messages to the dibby dibby crowd and all those other virulent sub-cultures that can eat out the very body of a nation and reduce its level. We have to be very clear that we will not stand for that. There are some people who believe that

because things are popular that they must therefore be given full support. There is no writer that says that popular means good. There is nothing to suggest that because the majority of young people will follow that culture that it is necessarily the culture that we should support.

I was listening to a radio programme yesterday on my way, driving somewhere, and somebody called in, on behalf of a little girl four years old, who is having a birthday. They asked the little girl what song she wanted. The girl said "dub". Who is going to tell me that any four year old child has the intelligence to make decisions. All that is happening is that that girl is hearing dub in her home from morning until night. She will come up believing that dub is the only music there is. By the time she gets 16 or 18, she would be a dub fanatic. Well, that child has no intelligence. It is the parent that must be blamed. Any parent that exposes the child to a diet of the counter culture is a parent that has no responsibility. You can imagine a parent that would impose on their children dub, blue movies, and pornography, dibby-dibby clothes and then they think that they are giving their children a chance in life. But unfortunately that will happen because the subordinate culture might be a very popular culture in some areas. Therefore, some children start out with the disadvantage of their lives being determined by too narrow a circle. That will be no help whatsoever to the children. 6.20 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas said that he wants to see a study of what is happening in Barbados in terms of this type of culture. I agree with him. It is time that we put our sociologists to work and go and examine these groups who are calling themselves gangs or whatever. Do a good sociological examination. Look at the places where this is taking place in the housing areas, etcetera. Look at the people who are part of it.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Well, those are housing areas too in areas of whatever kind - the upper class and the other class ones. I call them housing areas whether they are terraces, fairways, heights or whatever. Those are areas where a certain group of people are living together with their concomitant problems which we need to examine and then come up with some results. Tell us what is happening. At least describe scientifically the phenomenon. Even if you are not able to give us the reasons why, at least describe as carefully as possible what is happening. Let us know where it is happening and who are the participants in it. Give us the facts because we are just exposed once in a while to a newspaper article where somebody does something somewhere. We are getting these kinds of bits of information coming to us. But let us get a scientific analysis soon so that we can at least look at it and try to get a better perspective of what is happening.

Now the Honourable Member for St. Joseph again related to the Press and their role in this matter. I have been looking at our national Press and again it is only through the Press that we get some information about school children's behaviour. Occasionally, I will read in the Press about some girls who leave home apparently with another set of clothes and do not get back to their home or to their school. I understand from people that this is happening. We learn from the Press about girls who are lost. Every now and again we read that somebody is lost and then we hear that they are found somewhere else at somebody's home. It is the Press that brings us into the picture of what is happening. Without that Press we would not know what is happening. But it gives us a picture that in fact our young people are really going astray. They are giving us the information. We need to find out the "why" and the "wherefore". But that is part of the information that the Press is giving and performing a useful service.

Mi

At the other end, I sometimes wonder if the Press is not going in for "soft porn". If you see True Confessions and Sach Moore's article, I look at them in passing. But they are not anything other than "soft porn" quite frankly. It is popularized "soft porn". I understand there is something on the radio at night called "Heartbreak" where people are allowed to talk all this dribble and a lot of munderings, sentimental stuff, and so on. Barbados is a country that believes in its freedom but sometimes we can allow too much freedom to go overboard quite frankly. Even though I respect the Press and what it represents, we have to caution the Press. I am not saying that the Press is worse than anybody else because the people can go and buy their Mills and Boon and whatever else. I understand that that is getting progressively more "soft porn" too. Where Mills and Boon used to be probably just romance stories, I understand that recognizing how peoples' tastes are changing they are changing too. But then you have the television. You have "Days Of Our Lives" and all the other things that people watch. I do not think that Barbadian parents say that we will watch and send in the children to sleep. I believe they all watch these things together.

What you are seeing is an environment developing quite frankly around us partly imposed from outside and partly with our own complicity. They might call it that because once you do not reject the things and, in fact, we are actually taking them and accepting them as part of our norm. If we do not say that we do not want "Days Of Our Lives" or "Santa Barbara" - I do not even know them. I really do not get a chance to watch them - and exclude them, in fact it is saying that we welcome them. Once we welcome them, gradually and insidiously you know that you will pay the penalty of a culture that will develop and grow. As you say, it might be a political decision to make. If the people want it, that is usually the dilemma facing policy-makers. If the majority of people say that they want it and another group of people believe that it is not best for the society, how do you act? Where do you act? That is the

dilemma that faces all policy-makers. But I doubt that the subordinate culture in Barbados believes that "Days Of Our Lives" *et cetera* are really very good for the country. I doubt that very much. I doubt the church and all the others who make subordinate culture would accept that. But at the same time there is a mass of people out there who would say, "Touch it and you will see".

In fact, I think the whole dilemma with the minibuses is part of that and we recognize that "dub" music on the minibuses is not good for the culture. You take a decision but there is a virulent counter-culture that would threaten the policy-makers and would say, "Well, you touch the dub and see what will happen". Sometimes you have to take a position. I think the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works was in the Press at any rate. Some of them were saying, "Let the Minister do anything with dub, he will pay". I think that I remember reading that in one of the local newspapers. So apparently he has to pay now. But some people have to take decisions. As I have said, if there is one thing that we cannot afford to do is to sacrifice the future of our children and the future of our country because of fears we might have about short term discomfort that we might suffer. Quite frankly, I feel that the quality of life that we enjoy is very important and most important of all is the children. I have talked for a very long time but all of us know that Basically, a child is really the product of what it is exposed to. A child does not come with superior intelligence. If you give a child dub all the time, there are few who will resist it. But mostly children will just spout what they get pushed at them. If children come up in a culture where they do not see where it is anything wrong to be bearing their bodies, they will pose willingly before any camera. Then we will have to try to convince them that something is wrong. Children will tell you - what is wrong with me taking a picture when everyday I can look in the newspaper and see some people winning a beauty contest? So why can I not be beautiful too? What do you want to stop me for? If children look at television, they see every ad is a sexual ad. If you advertise cigarettes, there is sex in that. If you advertise a car, the car is going to purr in a sexy purr. Everything that is being advertised has something to do with sex either subtly or out front and these are things that we have to notice. We have to set directions for the country.

I think we as policy-makers have a very important responsibility in that direction and to me that is what this piece of legislation is all about. It might appear as a small piece of legislation. It might appear as a piece of legislation that is really only providing a remedy for something that was not there before. But to me, it is in line with the kind of legislation that sends a signal to the public that we are concerned about the negatives and we want to turn around the situation that we recognize to be deteriorating.

I want to make it very clear that those persons who would want to blame any political party for things like

crime in a country and drugs, *et cetera* are only whistling in the wind. It is wider than that, much wider. I am trying to suggest to you that a lot of the culture that we are now having in this country had their genesis not in Barbados but what we are consuming from the United States of America. We consume some of the worst ghetto culture from the United States of America lock, stock, and barrel. Families in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and other places have more in relation to Barbados - I am talking about dominant main stream Barbadian culture - than anything in the Bronx, Brooklyn, and so on. But still the worst elements of the Bronx then will infiltrate Barbados because you are not going to find that in certain families in the United States of America. Those are the worst elements, but they will come over here and want to take over this culture and have no respect for any of us - politicians, priests, teachers, or anyone. You go around that crowd if you have them in your constituency, when they dress up in all their earrings and all sorts of things they do not have any respect for anybody in Barbados. They do not have respect for life. We are watching a situation in Barbados where men are taking knives and cutting up women like they are cloth or something like that. You have that situation developing where when you open your newspapers you read that men are stabbing up women. 6.30 p.m.

This is not a matter for fun, this is a very serious matter in our country, that males could feel that there is something heroic in taking knives and cutting up people, or that young men could be walking about with guns, having a quarrel and going back in saying "I am coming back now" and coming with a gun and start peppering all about the place. That is serious. We need to recognise that. We need to recognise that that has nothing to do with Barbadian culture, that is strange to Barbadian culture and we have to root it out. There is no question in my mind about that. We have to use all of the powers available to us to root out that before it gets any further.

Barbadians must not be threatened by these unruly elements, whether it is pornography, violence or whatever, and our innocent children must not be afraid of these unruly elements. This is nothing on which political parties should divide. The whole question of the police that is becoming such a political matter, that is terrible for a country. The police are not anti any DLP, the police are not anti any BLP, and they are not pro any NDP. If you poll the police you will see the police have their own personal voting powers, they know how they are going to vote when the time comes and all efforts to make it seem as though the police en bloc belong to or support any political party is nonsense. It is arrant nonsense. The police are intelligent, educated Barbadians and they know what they will do when the time comes. That is their business, but any effort by any group to suggest that they are anti DLP, why would the police be anti DLP or anti the Attorney General? That is foolishness! Arrant nonsense! For any politicians to be

going out giving this suggestion, trying to politicise the Police Force, does not speak well of a country like Barbados. We should try and keep the police out of politics as much as possible, the police have a job to perform. In the same way politicians should keep out of policing. Keep the police out of politics and the politicians out of policing. That is how it should be. They will have to interface at some point, that is inevitable in the system that we run, but that is how I feel it should be and I do not think we should try to look at the police performing their functions from any political point of view.

Nobody can tell me that the police will not try their best to get to the root of the problems that we have. Nobody can give me the impression that the police are running away from their problems. I am saying that the problems which the police today are facing are extremely complex cultural and social problems which they might not have faced before. I believe that the police are coming up against elements different from what the elements were in this country before. The elements of drugs and so on, and the wilfulness of the people involved, I think are different from anything that the police ever met in this country before 1990. This drug element is a serious element. It has money, it has professionalism, it has will and the police are facing that like anybody else and I do not believe it is easy for them. I believe the police are trying their best under very strange circumstances. I really believe so. I think they would like to break the whole cycle of crime that is existing in this country. Can you blame the police when every time some fellow gets angry with his girlfriend and he takes up a knife and kills? Can you blame anybody for what is happening in that particular context? Somebody who wants to kill a woman and then takes gramoxone and so on? What is the police going to do with that? It is a very difficult and complex situation facing us, but I believe fundamentally that a society has to have answers to its problems. I do not believe that problems are insoluble, I believe that we need to examine the situation facing us more carefully and we have to take measures, like the banning of music, that dub music, we have to take measures like the one we are taking now and there are other measures that we have to take in order to send signals that we understand that there is a superordinate culture in Barbados and that we support that superordinate culture. We understand there is a subordinate culture, and if that subordinate culture is giving problems, then we will have to deal with that subordinate culture. When I am talking about superordinate and subordinate cultures, I am talking in terms of behaviours, especially those that relate to matters like order, crime and so on, I am not talking about all superordinate and subordinate in all terms. I am talking about this particular area where the superordinate is one that believes in order and the subordinate one believes in disorder.

I believe that we have to bring all forces that we have to strike out pornography, the ill treatment of young people,

the ill treatment of women and all of this murder that is going on. In most cases it is men killing women. These are things that we have to deal with at the root and at the source. A lot of education, a lot of time, a lot of censorship are necessary. We do not have to feel that we have to take everything that is imposed on us, we have to be able to set up our own standards, our own codes of behaviour, our own codes of discipline and get Barbadians to follow that. We do not ask Americans when they come here to this country to acknowledge our code of behaviour, but we want Bajans to acknowledge it, and we have to set very clearly in our minds what we want for Barbados. What do I want for my children now and in the future? Then we have to do some social engineering to ensure that what we want we get or as approximate to it as we can.

It is not something we will leave to chance. We cannot be haphazard about it, and legislation is one of the major * tools to get what we want in place. Of course, after the legislation is passed we must police it and enforce it, to make sure that exactly what we want must be done. We will not pass the law and then allow people to flout the law and get away with it.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support this legislation and to compliment the Attorney General for bringing it to this Honourable House.
*

-

Thank you.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, this debate has been used for a full fledged examination of the issue of crime. It is really a debate relating to the protection of children, but there are one or two points which I think I need to respond to, particularly some points made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. I will fully address the issue of crime and the police at a more appropriate time, but I certainly am not going to have sufficient time to deal with *** the matter in its fullness.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas began his presentation with a talk tough stance, and this is to be expected around election time, because the point which political scientists, political analysts and social scientists make quite effectively is that one way of trying to get the public's support for a position is to talk tough on crime. A tough law and order stance is one which social scientists » and political analysts believe is one which appeals to the public, so the Honourable Member goes down the road of talking tough. It might involve building more gaols, hanging people, whipping people, and you can go the whole gamut of talking tough, of passing some of the most draconian legislation, enforcing the most draconian penalties, being as oppressive as you can to your society. ^ This is one way of looking at it, but the point which some social scientists and social analysts make with equal force is that tough talk and tough legislation do not necessarily deal with the problem of reducing crime. They look at the

society which is the United States and say that if tough legislation and if building gaols and if the most draconian method of dealing with criminals was the answer to dealing with the problems of crime, then you should really have a United States where crime was considerably reduced. 6.40 p.m.

Yet in the United States of America and in most of the major democracies of the western world, where you have some of the toughest laws in force, where you have an abundance of prisons, you find that crime has not reduced. Crime is progressively getting worse throughout the western world. It seems to be a part of the process of the development which is taking place in the western world.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas goes on to make the point that it is not, perhaps, the easiest thing in the world to determine what are the root causes of crime in Barbados. He goes on to say that an analytical study needs to be done as to the causes of crime. He says that the evidence is not clear and he is going to suggest setting up a commission of enquiry to look into the causes of crime. He is in one breath talking tough and in the same breath saying we really do not know what are the causes of crime in Barbados so we really need to look at it. I do not think any of us really know what are the genuine causes of crime.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central talked about a number of concerns in the community which could be the genesis of some of the crimes. We know that drugs are a serious problem. Crime develops over time.

What surprises me about the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is that a couple of weeks ago he made a speech in this Honourable House where he began by saying that the level of crime which exists in Barbados today is not out of sync with the rise in crime as normally expected. In other words he was making the point that the rise in crime which we are facing in Barbados today is not out of the normal in relation to the rise in crime. You found the same pattern in so many other parts of the world. Now, I am of the view, as I have said before, that the level of crime which we have in Barbados is too high today. I do not resile from that. I would like to see a considerable reduction in the level of crime which is taking place in this society.

Mr. Speaker, you have to forgive me for going into the realm of crime. I am like everybody else departing from the strict confines of the Bill which deal with the protection of the children. It was a point which has been raised and a point which needs to be addressed. I am myself concerned about the level of crime which we are seeing in this country today. One of the things which we have to recognise is that perhaps we are reaping the whirlwind of crime which developed in the country over a period of time. These issues I am going to address very fully.

When you listen to the psychiatrists and the psychologists in relation to the drug culture, they will tell you that those who are the paros today and those who are spaced out on drugs would have started with marijuana years back. They would have gradually got worse and that over a period of 4, 5, 6 years, we are reaping today the whirlwind of what was an incipient drug culture years back.

It is pointless in dealing with any debate on crime trying to point fingers one way or the other because you sow the wind today and you reap the whirlwind tomorrow. What you find happening today one can legitimately argue, Mr. Speaker, is the result of incipient crime which would have started years back. Let us not start to get into that argument because the psychiatrists, the psychologists and those who are involved in the issue and who examine the issue can tell you that these are the concerns which we have to look at. As I have said, I am going to address this issue more fully when it is convenient to do so. But I wish to address one or two specific points in relation to this Bill itself which have been made by one or two Honourable Members.

The Honourable Member for St. George South raised the point in relation to the evidence of children in proceedings brought under this Bill. I think the point he was suggesting was that evidence of children in these cases should, perhaps, be permissible in camera and that children who are called to appear before the courts in hearings under this Bill should not be asked to give their evidence in the full glare of publicity. The Bill does not provide for in camera hearings on this point but the point made by the Honourable Member for St. George South is a valid point and is one which we will address in due course.

The Honourable Member for St John made a number of points in relation to the definition of 'indecenty'. He thought that the Bill would have been better if the term "indecenty" were defined. He made the point that the way how the legislation is drafted it would be left to the judicial officers to determine what circumstance might constitute indecenty. He looked at what he called the approach of the Philistines and the approach of the Literati, the Philistine adopting the narrow approach, the Literati the approach which would be more permissive.

When the legislation first came to me, Mr. Speaker, I myself did raise within my own mind the very point raised by the Honourable Member for St. John. I thought that, perhaps, it would be useful if we knew precisely what indecenty was and what actions constituted indecenty. When I discussed it with the lawyers in the Chambers the response which I got and which, after discussion, I was prepared to go along with was that indecenty was a question of fact which a judicial officer hearing the case would determine and obviously would bear in mind all relevant factors and determine in given circumstances what was or was not indecent. That places, of course, a heavy

burden on the judicial officer. Where you have sound judicial officers really you have no problem. I believe that on balance it may be better, in the absence of having any better way to deal with the problem at this time, it might be in order to leave it as it is.

One remembers the obscenity trials which took place in Britain in relation to books like *Lady Chatterly's Lover*, for instance, where the question was whether the publication was obscene or not. A judge in one particular set of circumstances would hold that the publication was obscene, the opinion of another was that it might not

Just for the records I would just like to refer to Stroude's Judicial Dictionary which deals with the term "indecent". This legislation, let me say, was taken from an English draft on the same subject where the term "indecent" again was not defined. Indecency in this judicial dictionary because this is the type of dictionary to which the judges look at interpreting words - "The words 'indecent' and 'obscene' - this is reading from Stroude's Judicial Dictionary, Mr. Speaker, Vol. 3, Fourth Edition - 'convey the idea of offending against propriety, indecency being at the lower and obscenity at the upper end of the scale. An indecent article is not necessarily obscene but an obscene article is almost certainly indecent.'"

This is a little funny, Mr. Speaker. The word "indecently" has no definite legal meaning and with respect to the word "presence" I remember that in our older courts of justice the judge retired to a corner of the court for a necessary purpose even in the presence of ladies. That, perhaps, would be considered indecent today. The judge retiring for a necessary purpose in the presence of ladies and the judge saying that today would be considered indecent, yesterday in those times it was not considered indecent. So that a judge or magistrate reflecting on whether a publication or photograph is today indecent obviously would have to take into account what contemporary perceptions of what decency and indecency amount to and would, accordingly, make a decision, in that context. 6.50 p.m.

The advantage, of course, in all these issues is that a decision of a magistrate himself might not be final and a person has a right of appeal, if a magistrate finds that a publication or photograph is indecent and that the other side may find not.

So that, on balance then, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Bill is a worthwhile addition to the law and move that it be now read a second time.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. A. KING, seconded by Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. A. KING, seconded by Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. M. A. KING, seconded by Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

JUDGES REMUNERATION AND PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990

Order No. 4 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act, Cap. USA.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session, this Honourable House passed two Bills, one to amend the Constitution and one to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act to provide for the coming into being of a restructured Court of Appeal. This Bill which is now before this Honourable House, Mr. Speaker, is to amend the Judges Remuneration and Pensions Act, principally to provide for the office of Justice of Appeal, because in the restructured Court of Appeal, there will be separate Justices of Appeal who will not form part of the High Court panel of judges.

The Bill, essentially, is to provide for the Justice of Appeal and to provide for the appropriate salary applicable to the office of Justice of Appeal. If one looks at the Schedule, one will see that the offices provided for are the offices of the Chief Justice, Justice of Appeal and Judge of the High Court.

The opportunity has been taken in the course of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, to provide expressly that a gratuity be made to a judge where the judge dies while holding judicial office. I say that the matter is being provided for expressly because it has not been so stated in the Act. But a judge, it appears, may be able to receive gratuity where he dies in office, by an application of the existing pensions legislation *** for the office of judge. But, on representation to the Chief Justice, it was thought that it would be better to make express provision for that and we have done so.

The provision which exists here is comparable to provision which exists, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the Governor-General, certainly the Prime Minister and Ministers, persons holding legislative office and persons in the public service, such as the public servants. It is a provision which is usual in relation to public officers.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be now read....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, just to ask one question, Sir. I do not want to detain the House. Does the Attorney-General have any date planned for the opening of the Court of Appeal? I know that there have been some delays. I wonder if the Government is now fixed on a date for the opening of the Court of Appeal. 7.00p.m.

Hon. M. A. KING: The date, Mr. Speaker, to some extent is dependent on the ability to complete certain physical alterations which are necessary for providing adequate Chambers for the judges of the Court of Appeal. The appropriate drawings have been completed by the architects who have been looking at it and I will be anxious to get the Court of Appeal started if I can within a month or so.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. A. KING, seconded by Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE Mr.

CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 through 6 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. A. KING, seconded by Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour, Mr. SPEAKER, the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. A. KING, seconded by Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BRIDGETOWN, ST. MICHAEL FOR EXTENSION OF THE SWAN STREET; MALL

Order No. 5 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bridgetown, St. Michael for the extension of the Swan Street Mall.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Resolution seeks parliamentary approval for the compulsory acquisition of two parcels of land for the extension of the Swan Street Mall. We are having some problems settling the compensation and so forth. In order that we can acquire this land and to start working on it, we have decided that we will acquire the land compulsorily. In the meantime, we are still speaking with the owners and hoping to come to an agreement as to the price.

With those remarks, I beg that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I do not regard this as a simple Resolution at all and I do not have any intention of keeping anyone in here for another hour and a half as the Honourable Attorney General suggested that I should.

Laughter.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: He did say to me sotto voce, Sir, that I have an hour and a half to speak if I want to and that he had nowhere to go so I could continue if I wanted to. However, in all seriousness, Sir, I know that there are some Honourable Members in here who believe that when one has to deal with this Swan Street Mall issue that one should not get caught up apportioning credit or blame, as the case may be, but get on with the whole matter of getting the problem resolved.

I think it is very important, Sir, that we deal with the apportionment of blame and credit because there have been several other persons outside of this Chamber and outside of the vendors themselves who have made several comments and who have completely misunderstood what was intended when the Swan Street Mall was put together. Sir, bear with me while I explain to you a few of the facts.

Back in 1986 just before Christmas a group of about 25 angry young and not so young men and women - let me clear it up right now. There were very few Rastas in the crowd. People seem to think that it was a bunch of Rastas that I encouraged to go on Swan Street That is not true. It was not as simple as that - came to me very angry and

indicated that every year or so, it would have seemed to them as it draws nearer to Christmas, that they would be pushed off the streets at the most lucrative time. They also indicated that the Administration of this one used to allow them to have the mall on Saturdays. If you will recall, Sir, half of Swan Street used to be closed on Saturdays and it was turned into a pedestrian mall before 1986. People behave as though this is some kind of new phenomenon. At the time I recall that I could not get much support even from my colleagues on the other side who I was with at the time. Before the Honourable Member for St. James South gets excited, I will give him-the credit in saying that the only one at that time who supported me was the Honourable Member for St. James South. That is true. 7.10p.m.

The late Prime Minister, Mr. Errol Barrow, to whom I finally went and put the case, told me what to do and I believe he indicated to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, whose portfolio it fell under, because Swan Street is regarded as a part of the markets. The whole of Bridgetown is in fact a market under the Act as it relates to public markets, and so a hawker's or vendor's permit to sell on the streets came under the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, so he got into the act in helping to determine what would happen. If people would choose to remember, it was decided then that the Swan Street Mall would be set up temporarily while the administration looked at it and decided what was best in the interest of all, but that we would not want to see these people pushed around and ill-treated and not allowed to earn a living honestly, either because of a couple of misguided police sergeants or because of some of the merchants who for their own reasons did not want these people on the street

I believe, Sir, that Honourable Members would appreciate that I am the only one in here with any authority to speak on the matter, because I know about it from the beginning to the end. Members will also recall that the Honourable Minister of Labour Relations, who was then the Minister of Health, held a meeting shortly after with the vendors at the hall of the old Tercentenary School of¹ Nursing and pointed out several things. He indicated that he would encourage his Ministry to get involved in providing sanitation services, et cetera, for the vendors on the street. He suggested to them that he would get the Community College involved in drafting some mobile structure which would be tasteful and that instead of taking away or detracting from the beauty of Bridgetown would probably add to it.

I do not know what happened that a lot of these plans did not fall into place - or maybe I do know - but I will say this. Coming out of the whole problem, or what was envisaged then as a problem, was an organisation called the Vendors' Association of Bridgetown, an organisation which I suggested that they should form, because I know that if you can keep people separated and pick them off one by

one they will never get up off the ground, especially poor, struggling, black business people, so I suggested to them that they should form an association where they would have some strength in, that unity. At the time I suggested to the attorney-at-law, Mr. David Comissiong, that he should assist them and he did. He should be credited with having assisted them in forming an association and getting some hearing.

I might also add that it prompted the merchants in Swan Street to form their own association - the first time in the history of Barbados that all the merchants in Swan Street ever came together for any reason at all - short lived as it was, because we know that there are at least three competing ethnic groups in Swan Street and I am sure that some of my colleagues on that side, who share a similar philosophy with me, would agree that it is almost amazing that we could get those groups to come together to form an ^ association, but if you look at it a little deeper you would see why. They had a common enemy.

Sir, one of the things I think none of us in here should want to encourage is to have our people - Barbadians, that is - who are trying to improve themselves, their standard of living, who are trying to steer away from the illegal path -and, you know, a lot of these people who are vendors out there come from the same districts where there are drug pushers, but they choose not to do that - so we would want to help them to improve their condition. One of the things that was suggested at the time by a group which involved three Ministries - the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Transport and Works and the Ministry of Health - was that certain amenities would be put in place in Swan Street, which at the time I did not think physically could work, quite honestly. It was agreed that there would be some demarcations in the road where only a limited number of vendors would be put in Swan Street, which would make sense, but that did not work because there was not the level ^ of co-operation that was expected, and so when this was supposed to take place in a matter of two days or so after, here we are, three years down the road, and it has not happened.

All during this time I continued to have dialogue with the vendors and I continued to impress on them that one of the things we need to do is to look for somewhere to put them where facilities can be put in. It is difficult to put in those kinds of facilities in Swan Street. So when I heard social commentators like Elombe and others on radio, as they like to call themselves, talking about putting them this place and that place, I take what they say with a grain of salt, because sometimes they like to give the impression that they are so concerned about these small people and then they would push them in the back somewhere and hope that they keep quiet and do not bother anybody again. •* It is just like at Temple Yard, where there is the same problem. I am not here to say that they should have stayed in Broad Street, because that is an argument we could go on

with all night. The problem that occurred in Broad Street, in the so-called Rockers Alley, did not happen overnight, it was allowed to grow and fester. Where it might have started with one or two honest persons, it was allowed to develop into the monster that it became and then the powers that be of that day decided to use a sledge hammer to kill an ant, in my opinion, but I am not getting into the whole argument of that sort of thing.

One of the things we may have wanted to look at is not necessarily to retain the Swan Street Mall as it was, because we wanted to improve, and I am saying it is difficult to improve that situation. So where this Resolution says "for the extension of the Swan Street Mall" I would have thought it would have said "for the replacement of the Swan Street Mall". Let me go on record as having said that my position is that I am looking at a replacement and not an extension.

When I saw the burnt out site on High Street, I suggested to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that it might well be a beautiful site to develop a nice mall, where you can start from scratch, put in nice booths, toilet facilities, running water where persons can wash their fruit and have proper garbage disposal. I must say to his credit that on the day I came in here and mentioned it to him, he said "come and show me this place now" and we walked from here over there on Palmetto Street and I pointed out the burnt out former Basix building, with a car park behind it where another building had been burnt also, and I suggested to the Honourable Minister then that maybe we could look at the possibility of Government acquiring those lands and putting in nice facilities. The Honourable Minister then said to me, "could you find out who these places belong to?" Mr. Speaker, within 24 hours I had found out to whom they belonged and I had given him in writing the names of the owners of that land. One was a gentleman, now deceased, who operated what I think was called General Agencies and the other one was B.E. Naime and Sons, as is laid out in the First and Second Schedules to the Resolution.

That was in October of 1988. So that when I hear all this noise and furore about Government creating this fantastic facility and then they went all over - because everybody seems to be very confused as to where the vendors are going. Some people think they are going under Nelson, now Nelson has been moved, so we are not even too sure which part of Nelson they are going next to now. 7.20p.m.

Some people think they are going all around the wharf, some people think they are going over by the Waterfront and everybody is confused. The Honourable Minister of Transport is probably the only one who is not confused because he clearly pointed, out to me about two years ago where it was envisaged that the vendors would go. When I heard the complaints over the radio that they are

going over to Trafalgar Square I was not concerned because I knew, like some people did, that was not true.

To move on from that, Sir, I was very happy in my own mind then that the facility properly done in that area between High Street and Palmetto Street would be a step in the right direction. The vendors themselves in Swan Street, except for one or two who just want to be a little troublesome, are very happy to go there. I asked them if they would not prefer nice conditions where they would have some little kiosks like what is in the Fairchild Street bus stand, for instance, something they can lock up at night where there are facilities that the public can come with maybe one or two benches where they can sit.

Those of us who do not feel like eating a heavy meal can eat fruits, like my good friend from Christ Church East Central who is now on a very strict diet. You may just want to go and have an apple or two in nice surroundings. I am sure the Honourable Member for St. James South with his good crew from the NCC will do a good job of landscaping the area.

First of all let me say I have no hesitation at all in supporting the Resolution. As I have said, I do not like to see it as an extension of the Swan Street Mall because if you put such nice - to use my good friend's favourite word, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West - salubrious conditions for the vendors in that area between High Street and Palmetto Street, who are you going to put in Swan Street then? What conditions are going to obtain in Swan Street?

I would suggest, Sir, that you take another look. I agree that they are too many for Swan Street and they are too many probably for Palmetto Street. You may want to look at, and I know it is going to be very difficult - I am not pretending that it is not going to be difficult for you to decide who are the long-standing ones, as I like to call them, and who are the ones that just come around on weekends. The point is, if you let them stay on Swan Street the question then arises, are you going to use the old suggestion made by the Honourable Member for St. James South and provide them with facilities in Swan Street whether they are mobile or otherwise because the conditions that obtained in their own enlightened self-interest cannot go on.

This was a temporary situation for the last four years. I know you do not like to hear me talking about this year thing all the time. You have to provide the same kind of comfortable surroundings for the ones who are going to be in Swan Street, if you say you are going to keep some there, as in Palmetto Street or else I will be talking on that again.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr, Speaker, sometimes there are some Honourable Members over there who still have their philosophical moorings and they can understand these things. There are others who see everything in very narrow terms. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North is sometimes in that category or most times. I recognise that he is a little tired.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir. I do not know why the Honourable Member should bring me into this. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central made some sotto voce remarks to which I added. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central is right. This document is a five year programme, not a one year programme and the Honourable Member does not seem to understand that but he is new in politics. One of these days he will learn, too late though.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I am not too concerned with his intervention, Sir, because his five year programme is coming to an end in St. Michael North. I live in St. Michael North and the people out there tell me that his five year programme is over too. You and I will be outside together. Do not worry.

Sir, to get back to a more serious point. I must emphasise that I am very concerned about the whole question of the extension. I would like the Honourable Minister of Housing, if he is in a position to inform us today, whether or not there is, in fact, going to be an extension. If there is going to be one, what will happen with the existing situation in Swan Street? He says that there are too many people to fit into that other area. I do not know how they have decided that so fast because I have not seen the design. I know that they have been able to fit several people along the parameter of the Fairchild Street bus terminal. You could explain to me then how many vendors there are you have to house and why you cannot fit all in the new area?

I just feel, Sir, that regardless of whether we put the vendors in Swan Street, whether we put the vendors in the new facility that will be constructed on High Street, whether we put the vendors in the new Cheapside Market that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has promised us, or wherever we put them I think one thing we must have very clear in our minds is that we are trying to improve conditions for these persons who choose to be self-employed and that the kinds of things that the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central said a little earlier today about the kind of messages we want to send to our people, there must be something tangible too.

We cannot say to our people, do not do all of these wrong things and then every time they try to lift themselves up and get themselves on the right track we put a lot of barriers in their way. We put a lot of disincentives. I fear, Sir, that if this is not handled right, if the whole of

Bridgetown which is seen in the eyes of the law as a market is not looked at in its entirety - in other words, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North says this is part of a five year plan. I do not know what the rest of the five year plan is.

The point is, we have to look at it in conjunction with the whole development of the Cheapside area and the * downtown area around St. Mary's Church which we have heard about. There have been some changes recently. I saw something written up about it and the Jubilee Garden area. Are we going back on the old plan and removing the bus terminal from there and putting it beyond the Post Office as was envisaged? Are we going to remove the old City Council Building? Is it not structurally sound that we have to remove it or are we going to renovate and provide, again, some more facilities for other types of craftsmen or vendors?

*

What we need to do is look at the global picture as far as the whole of Bridgetown is concerned. No, we will never be able to fit all of the vendors in Swan Street. No, we will not be able to fit all in the new facility. You will not be able to fit all in the Fairchild Street market either. You will not fit all along the perimeter of the Inner Basin either. The question is, do we know how large the challenge is? I do not call it a problem. I call it a challenge. Do we know how many vendors we need to house? Do we know what type of ** vendors?

I have heard the Honourable Minister of Trade who is not now in his place speak of the whole development coming from the Pelican Village area right down to the Deep Water Harbour. Are we conscious of what type of vendors we would want to put down there? This is the sort of thing I speak of. I am not just talking about a quick fix situation where we do not want to displease those fellows out there because at any rate it is too near election. At any rate if it was not too near election we might be looking at ** interfering with votes.

This is not a situation either where it is a decision you may have to make that may be unpopular. But it is. best for Barbados so you do not have to worry about that aspect either. All persons in Barbados except a few unscrupulous businessmen in Bridgetown are happy when fellows go out there and try to make an honest living so do not be afraid to make any decisions as far as the vendors are concerned. ** You will have one or two commentators on the radio talking nonsense about interfering with the view of Bridgetown if you put vendors certain places. There is nothing wrong with that. If it is done properly it will enhance it. It will not interfere with it.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my point. I have • always been very clear as far as these small business people are concerned. I am always very clear in my own mind as to what I feel is the right way to encourage our people towards

self-employment I have always been very clear in my mind as to what I think is unnecessary political interference when it occurs by whatever party. 7.30 p.m.

I would only like to - in lending my support to this Resolution, because there is no question in my mind, Sir, that I am supporting it - caution or suggest to the Minister of Housing and Lands or the Minister of Transport, that we may need to take a critical look at the Swan Street area and, in the interest of the vendors that we are trying to assist look at whether we could really site them somewhere else.

I am obliged to you, Sir. ^

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this matter with the location and relocation of the Swan Street vendors and others in the environs of this House is a matter which has received the painstaking attention of the Ministry of Transport and Works.

The plans took at least two years in their making and the Ministry put together a team involving expertise, not only from the public sector, but also hired engineering consultants, architects and landscaping consultants, in order to present the final proposals to the Cabinet of Barbados. In all of these discussions, as the Honourable Member for the City can attest, he was a participant of all of the important meetings. Businessmen in the City of Bridgetown were involved, as well as, the Barbados National Trust. Yes, the Barbados National Trust. That organization which has taken upon itself to purvey untruths, deliberate untruths about the location of vendors' mall on the perimeter of the Careenage.

At the time these gentlemen were busily propagating the fiction that a market would be located in juxtaposition to the statue of Nelson, they were in possession of the actual plans. I have never seen such criminal dishonesty in my life, from an organization that dared to describe itself as patriotic. They were in possession of the plan. They were consulted extensively. They knew what the final proposals were. And yet had people in this country believing that the location was going to be right next to Nelson. I was so flabbergasted I could not even break my silence.

The plan therefore for the allocation of places in Bridgetown to vendors, arising out of the specific problem of the Swan Street vendors, therefore was very carefully and painstakingly constructed. It was carefully gone into, with consultation, in the light of the problems which the persons who were removed from Rockers Alley, in the confusion, together with club wielding police officers, in the light of the problems that they experienced when they were put into a location in Temple Yard, where there was no proper plan. Everybody who goes to Temple Yard can

see the eyesore that it is because of the haste in which the relocation was done. That is why we were very careful to take our time about it and to consult, as widely as possible.

At the time of our discussions, the participants became aware of the fact that, if they had solved the problem of the Swan Street vendors, in isolation from other vendors in the centre of Bridgetown, such as those who sell right on this street to the east of this building, that as soon as they finished with that problem, they would have to address the problem in Rickett Street vendors and those that were encroaching on the premises of the Central Bank. And therefore, it was decided to incorporate all of the vendors within this central Bridgetown area.

There were plans to beautify Parliament and it was felt that it would be an intolerable situation to have rickety stalls lining the street right next to this building. That is why the numbers were greater than those initially thought to be provided for. That is why there is an extension, not only of Swan Street, but also the establishment of malls on the northern edge of the Careenage. Here again, I must advert to the comments of the politicians from the Barbados National Trust. The political organization known as the Barbados National Trust had no objections to locating vendors' booths on the periphery of the Careenage basin but they would prefer it to be on the southern edge of the Careenage basin rather than the northern edge. It is interesting to observe that these gentlemen have used, among the many other arguments, the fact that Trafalgar Square has a certain historicity. I conceded. But I also recognize that it is a colonial historicity.

Their proposal would have the vendors' mall in Independence Square which also has another kind of historicity. If, as they describe it, an act of vandalization by locating booths on the northern perimeter takes place, if there is any vandalization, I would prefer Trafalgar Square to be vandalized than Independence Square. Independence Square has a particular significance for the people of this country. In my view, it is an unpardonable insult to those people who fought for Independence and cherished Independence to say that a vendors' booth should be put in Independence Square.

When one balances the two historical circumstances, I would sooner have one in a colonial location than in a location of Independence. The location of the booths, Mr. Speaker, were not arbitrarily decided upon. Extensive discussions took place with the vendors themselves and it was agreed that there is no point moving people to other locations where they could not make a living. The whole purpose of vending is for people to make a living.

We discussed, at great length, the merits of a location on the northern periphery of the Careenage basin, as distinct from the southern periphery. Most of the vendors unanimously agreed that the stream of passenger traffic was

such that they would be better off, if they were located on the northern periphery of the Careenage basin. That was the major consideration in locating a number of the vendors there. 7.40 p.m.

There will be a permanent mall created in Swan Street, limited to 40 vendors. When the whole problem is settled and all of the vendors are properly located, if the 41st vendor moves into Swan Street he will find himself charged. The number will be strictly limited to 40 and not another person will be permitted to go there/All of the sanitary and other facilities which will enable the vendors to keep the area clean will be installed.

I myself have proposed, and most people within the Ministry of Transport and Works agree, that if a huge fun fair like Disney World, for example, where tens of thousands of people go every day, and such large areas with far more people can be kept spotlessly clean, there is no reason why we cannot keep the Swan Street Mall spotlessly clean, the Mall on Palmetto Street spotlessly clean as well as the perimeters.

I reject categorically the notion that because working class black people are involved in selling that the area is going to be filthy. It seems to me that people have a very strange and negative view of poor black people to assume that automatically, because they are working in a particular area, it will be immediately converted into a shim, and we have black men writing and walking about this country talking in a way that is pejorative of themselves, when they represent to the world implicitly that because these people are black working class people, then it will follow, as night follows day, that where they are working it will be dirty.

The same people from the National Trust live in immaculately clean homes. Who cleans these homes? The same black working class people clean these homes. Cave Shepherd and all these stores are immaculately clean. Who keeps them that way? Not the owners and persons of that ilk, it is persons like the vendors, their sisters, brothers, mothers and fathers, that keep these business places in Broad Street, of which their owners are so proud, and their homes immaculately clean. I therefore do not understand why automatically if they are working in their own areas that it will become a slum. I think we have to do certain things to ensure that this does not take place. We have to ensure that people clean constantly. If we do not clean on a full time basis, then garbage and other dirt will accumulate. We must use the mechanisms that big organisations use, by having people cleaning eight hours a day, every minute of the day, and we have to pay these people properly and pay them at such a level that they will want to keep their jobs. If they want to keep their jobs, they will be productive. I have no doubt whatsoever that the mechanisms that will be put in place will be such as to make Barbadians proud of these areas.

I reject as racist and class riddled foolishness the notion that street vendors will automatically create slum conditions. That does not happen with proper planning and if proper waste disposal systems are put in place. So we are not merely addressing ourselves to the problems of persons in Swan Street, but persons in Swan Street and others whose numbers have increased substantially since 1986, " and it is hoped that when these three locations are well established we can then put regulatory procedures in place to ensure that the random setting up of trays anywhere in that area is discontinued.

It is still continuing, to a large extent, due to the fact that the Fairchild Street market is no longer a magnate that it was before the completion of the Fairchild Street bus stand. When the Fairchild Street bus terminal was an open area, where passengers could move without obstruction between the terminal itself and the market, good business ** used to be done. Once we had our modern terminal, which segregates passengers from the market itself, there has been a considerable reduction of visitors and many vendors have left the market and are crowding the sides of the streets. Only last week I am told the police removed many of them that had been encroaching upon the site where there was a fire recently. In any event, the Fairchild Street market is going to be demolished. As soon as proper facilities can be made available in the Cheapside market, the vendors in the ** Fairchild Street market will be relocated there and the site will be used for the third phase of the Fairchild Street bus terminal.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is the response to all the points that have been made. The fact that it is an extension is due entirely to the fact that the numbers in Swan Street have grown, and are growing, and that the Ministry of Transport and Works also took into consideration additional vendors in the central Bridgetown area.

Thank you.

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas, Question No. 134. *

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Question No. 134 reads as follows, Sir:

"To ask the Minister of Housing and Lands: Will the Minister please state if it is the policy of Government to establish rental units and service lots at Church *» Village and Gibson Land, St. Philip and to erect a Community Centre at Church Village, St. Philip? If the answers are in the affirmative, will the Minister please state: (a) how many rental units and service lots

have been established at the aforesaid districts; (b) where, precisely, it is proposed to build the Community Centre in Church Village and when?" 7.50p.m.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the answer to Question No. 134 is as follows:-

"It is Government's policy to establish rental units and serviced lots as well as to erect a Community Centre at Church Village, St. Philip. There are no immediate proposals to establish rental units or serviced lots at Gibson Land, St. Philip.

- (a) Fifty (50) terraced units for rental and twenty-nine (29) serviced lots will be provided at Church Village, St. Philip; and
- (b) the proposed Community Centre at Church Village, St. Philip, will be located on a site to be determined during the financial year 1991/92."

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One supplementary, Sir. Is the Minister aware that the Manifesto of the Democratic

Labour Party promised rental units and serviced lots at Gibson Land?

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Yes, the Minister is aware of that. That was and is in the Manifesto. The review that we made showed that they were needed more at Church Village than at Gibson Land.

Mr. SPEAKER: End of Question Time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, now that we have concluded business for the day, I move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, December 11, 1990 at 12:00 o'clock noon.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday December 11, 1990 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 7.55 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of
Tuesday, 27th November 1990. .6197

Hon.P.M. Greaves,6197.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER:----- 6197

Receipt of Accounts and Statements for the
month of September, 1990 as prepared by the
Accountant General.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Dr. R. C. HAYNES 6198

A Resolution of No Confidence in the Minister
responsible for Finance.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. M. A. KING 6198

Bill to amend the Judges' Remuneration and
Pensions Act.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 6198

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPUL
SORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
BARTLETT'S TENANTRY, CHRIST
CHURCH FOR THE RESITING OF
RESIDENTS AFFECTED BY THE
SEWERAGE TREATMENT PLANT 6198

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 6198, 6216; Mr. P. J. M.
Miller, 6198; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6201;
Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6201; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons,
6206, 6212; Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, 6207; Dr. R.
C. Haynes, 6208; Hon. M. A. King, 6215; Mr.
R. P. Byer, 6216.

PROTECTION OF CHILDREN BILL, 1990..... 6221

Hon. M. A.' King, 6221, 6223, 6238; Mr. D. A.
C. Simmons, 6221; Hon. C. V. Walker, 6228;
Mr. R. P. Byer, 6229; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson,
6232; Mrs. M. Barker-Welch, 6234; Mr. R. L.
Morris, 6234.

JUDGES REMUNERATION AND PENSIONS
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1990..... 6240

Hon. M. A. King, 6240; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons,
6241.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPUL
SORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
BRIDGETOWN, ST. MICHAEL FOR
EXTENSION OF THE SWAN STREET
MALL 6241

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 6241; Mr. P. J. M.
Miller, 6241; Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 6245.

QUESTION TIME

QUESTION NO. 134 ASKED BY Mr. D. A. C.

SIMMONS 6246

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 6247.

SUSPENSION 6212

ADJOURNMENT..... 6247

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BARKER-WELCH, Mrs. M. (St. Joseph)
BLACKMAN, Hon. Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East)
BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South)
BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East)
BYER, Mr. R. P. (St George South) HAYNES, Dr. R.
C. (St. Michael South Central) KING, Hon. M. A.
(Christ Church West Central) MILLER, Mr. P. J. M.
(City of Bridgetown) MORRIS, Mr. R. L. (Christ
Church East Central) SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St.
Michael South) SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. Thomas)
TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West) THOMPSON,
Hon. D. J. H. (St. John) WALKER, Hon. C. V. (St.
George North)