

THE
House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1971 - 76

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971-76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 11th July, 1973.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMDND; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); and Mr. A. MORRISON.

Prayers were read.

Mr. GREAVES and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I should' like to remind all hon. members that this is a Special Meeting summoned pursuant to Standing Order 6(9) of the Standing Orders of this Honourable House. Consequently we are only going to deal today with the Orders of the Day which have been circulated specially for this meeting.

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I had completed my Second Reading speech which was duly seconded and a division was called for by the Leader of the Opposition. It was at that stage that there was no quorum. It may well be that those members who were sitting when the division was called could lawfully vote on this particular motion at this stage That is only a suggestion which I throw out.

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, from what I heard the Leader of the House say, only those who were in their seats when the House was adjourned could lawfully vote. This to my mind does not seem correct since when the House was adjourned.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I did not say that. I seem to be very easily misunderstood. I said when the division was called.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The matter is going to be easily settled. I shall have the division bell rung and all those who answer the division bell immediately after one minute will be allowed to vote.

The Leader of the House is quite correct that when the House was counted out a division was about to be taken but for the lack of a quorum.

I shall now have the division bell rung The bell was rung.

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. GREAVES and Mr. LOWE - 11.

NOES:

Mr. CRAIG; Mr. ADAMS and Mr. HINDS - 3.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. GREAVES - 9.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. HINDS - 4.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND and

Mr. GREAVES - 9.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. HINDS - 4. 12.10 p.m.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

I AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G.

FERGUSON, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mrs. EASTMOND, Messrs MORRISON and GREAVES - 9.

NOES:

Messrs. ADAMS, MOTTLEY, CRAIG and HINDS - 4.

Clause 4 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mrs. EASTMOND, Messrs. MORRISON, GREAVES and LOWE - 10.

NOES:

Messrs. ADAMS, MOTTLEY, CRAIG and HINDS - 4.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mrs. EASTMOND, Messrs. MORRISON, GREAVES and LOWE - 10.

NOES:

Messrs. ADAMS, MOTTLEY, CRAIG and HINDS - 4.

Mr. SPRINGER and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, Item No. 2 on the Agenda stands in the name of the Prime Minister, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act, 1962. This follows as a result of the Bill which we have just passed.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Sir, am I hearing the Prime Minister or the Leader of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER:

As I recall, leave was granted in the absence of the Prime Minister for the Hon. Leader of the House to deal with this.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Sir, that was for yesterday's sitting, but this is another meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point made.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am asking for leave to deal with this in the absence of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is no objection leave will be granted.

Mr. ADAMS:

There is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORDE entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my motion asking for leave. I beg to move that I take charge of Item No. 2 which stands in the name of the Prime Minister and for which leave was granted yesterday. 12.20 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

I object to that; the Prime Minister should have been here.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not regard the terms of that motion as proper, and, inasmuch as leave was granted yesterday, I am going to grant permission to the Hon. Leader of the House to take charge of Item No. 2 on the Order Paper, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act, 1962.

CONSUMPTION (AMENDMENT) TAX ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Consumption Tax Act, 1962 (Act 1962-22) in order to provide for uniformity with the Customs Act, 1962 (Act 1962-18), which has just been passed, in the introduction of the Brussels Definition of Value. The object of this amendment to the Consumption. Tax Act is to avoid anomalies, since the Consumption Tax Act 1962-22 contains a Definition of Value for imported goods very similar to that applicable for customs duty

purposes by virtue of Section 117 of the Customs Act, 1962. It will also be necessary to remove from the Act the concession for buying commission up to 5% and for parts air-free and introduce a fee for the form.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. LOWE; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. SPRINGER; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. MORRISON - 12.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS; Mr. FORDE and Mr. MOTTLEY - 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA. Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. SPRINGER; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. MORRISON - 11.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 5.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. SPRINGER; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. MORRISON -12.

NOES:

Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. ADAMS; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 5. 12.30 p.m.

Clause 3 was catted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. GREAVES - 12.

NOES:

Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. ADAMS; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 5.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported

accordingly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs EASTMOND; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. GREAVES and Mr. LOVE - 13.

NOES:

Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. ADAMS; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B.

CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. SPRINGER; Mr. GREAVES and Mr. LOVE -13.

NOES:

Mr. CRAIG; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. ADAMS; Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 5.

THE FINAL APPROPRIATION (1972-73) ACT, 1973.

Hon. C. E. TALMA. Mr. Speaker, the next item on the Agenda, No. 3 stands in the name of the Minister of Finance, and I am asking leave to deal with this in his absence.

I beg to move that in the absence of the Minister of Finance, I be given leave to deal with this item.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, I object to no notice being given of that motion such as required by Standing Order No. 21.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What sub-clause of Standing Order No. 21?

Mr. ADAMS:

The whole Standing Order No. 21. I do not think that it is an exempted motion.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am assisted by May's Parliamentary Procedure, the Eighteenth Edition, page 367

"A motion standing in the name of a Minister may be moved by any other Minister in accordance with the constitutional practice which permits Ministers to act for each other."

I think this is of great assistance to me in over-ruling the objection of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ADAMS:

With respect, I am objecting to the motion; I am not objecting to anything else. I am saying that the motion is out of order because there is no notice.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let us not trifle.

Mr. ADAMS:

That is not trifling; I am going by the Rules. This is the first time that I know that May has been followed in this Parliament, and I have no objection whatsoever to following the precepts of Erskine May, and I trust we can now freely refer to it when it comes to such things as to what constitutes financial Resolutions and so on. I am glad to refer to May, but I still object to the motion because if a Minister can take charge of another Minister's business on the basis of fundamental constitutional practice, you do not need a motion to do so; so I object that the motion is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is the other point I was about to make. In those circumstances the Leader of the House would be quite in place to withdraw his motion and seek leave to deal with the item standing in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I just thought I would mention that I have been in here for a long time. The Leader of the House automatically takes charge of all the business of the Prime Minister, Minister of Finance, Minister of External Affairs and whatever Ministry he holds, and he automatically takes charge of any Minister's

business who is not sitting in this Chamber. That has been the practice al these years.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would like to grant permission to the Hon. Leader of the House to deal with item No. 3. Let the Hon. Leader of the House begin to deal with item No. 3. 12.40 p.m.

THE FINAL APPROPRIATION (1972-73) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out this Bill is the Final Appropriation Bill in respect of the Financial Year which ended on the 31st March 1973 and would provide for the grant out of the Consolidated Fund of the sum of \$8,159,865 and for the appropriation of such sums for the services and purposes specified in the Schedule. This is the usual thing under the Constitution where we come with the Appropriation Bill from time to time, and the constitutional lawyers across there would know that the Constitution provides for this under Section 109(5).

One supplementary Appropriation Bill was introduced into the House of Assembly for the financial year which ended on 31st March, 1973 in respect of money Resolutions which were passed by the House during the period April to August, 1972. This is the final Appropriation Bill for that financial year, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

The Preamble to the Bill was called.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

The Preamble was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Preamble stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Transport Board Act, 1955.

THE TRANSPORT BOARD (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long on this. Since I became responsible for the Transport Board I have been particularly worried about the fact that at the Board there is no pension scheme for drivers and conductors. After all these years, in spite of negotiations for increases in salaries, it hurts me when drivers and conductors have to come to me in this regard and I realise that there was no pension provided for them prior to the establishment of National Insurance. National Insurance will take care of the younger members in the Board but I have been worried, and the Government has been worried, about the fact that drivers and conductors after years of faithful service get no old age benefits.

Part of this amendment is to enable the Minister, provided the Board is viable, to make provision for giving to these persons in their old age some meaningful token of our appreciation of their services. I think the entire House is aware of the financial position of the Board, but still it is absolutely necessary that some provision be made for these people in their old age.

The other aspect of the amendment to the Bill is that the Board is now in a position to retread tyres, and we have also just installed at the Board a fuel injection machine in an endeavour to cut down the black smoke of which there are frequent and constant complaints. We have a very competent and trained mechanic who is responsible for repairing and dealing with this particular piece of apparatus in order to deal with the complaints of the persons who complain of black smoke. I myself have seen it, and as I have said before, the Transport Board vehicles are not the only offenders, but in the Act as it stands there is no provision or authority for the Board

to take in work if the Board finds that the capacity either of the retreading machinery or the fuel injection pumps can be done at the Transport Board. This amendment is to enable the Government or the Transport Board, which is a Statutory Board and must therefore operate within the confines of the Act, to carry out repairs to vehicles operated by Government Departments and other Statutory Boards. I have confined it to this because this is a new venture and I did not want to give the Board power to take in work from all and every public person.

This is an attempt at the same time to accommodate such firms as deal in this type of operation, but the Government as at M.C.W. has other Departments which have a considerable amount of diesel vehicles. Other Statutory Boards do have their own diesel vehicles, and this amendment is to enable the Board, if and when it finds that the work of the Board does not demand its full operation, to take in work from other Statutory Boards or Corporations and other Government Departments like M.C.W. which use a lot of vehicles that give off black smoke or have tyres that need retreading, and this is another attempt to increase the revenue of the Board itself in order to stop having to come to Parliament for subsidies from time to time. 12.50 p.m.

If the House approves these amendments, especially the amendment (a) as set out in the Objects and Reasons, this will not solve the Board's financial problems but it will go a long way towards increasing the revenue of the Board by giving the Board power to retread tyres for M.C.W., any Government Department, or the Ministry of Agriculture. It will also enable us to fix the diesel fuel injection pumps for such vehicles as are owned by statutory boards or by government corporations. I think the House will agree that it is a very good idea now that the equipment is there to allow the Board to increase its revenue by being able to do work for government departments and statutory boards. As I have said before, I have refrained from making it a free-for-all because I want to see the efficiency of the Board in carrying out the work of government departments and statutory boards. There are other firms who are engaged in the retreading of tyres and in fixing fuel injection pumps. They will have no complaints, because I think it is agreed that the vehicles of Government and of the Board are just the minimum amount of vehicles that need this type of service.

Without going into the operation of the Board, or the financial implications of the Board, which I have no intention of doing or even answering because that has been done already, I think the entire House will agree with this amendment to broaden the activities of the Board to increase its revenue and to keep the subventions in Parliament within a limit. I think the House will also agree to subsection (3) to appoint and employ at such remuneration and on such terms and conditions as it thinks fit such officers as it deems necessary. The main purpose of this is to enable gratuities and other pensionable benefits to be paid to those who have given long service to the Board.

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

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some attention to what the Hon. Minister who has just sat down had to say on this matter. All that he has said is indicative of the attitude and lack of policy of the Government. It is as clear as a pipe's staff that here you have a Statutory Board; it was established to manage the affairs relating to buses and to provide transportation, and at no time has any Minister been able to come to this Honourable House and to give a Report that the Board's performances with respect to providing transportation have been satisfactory on any route. This has been going on year after year. The Minister has been bold enough to say that they are now hoping to venture further with a view to helping the Board to find revenue to liquidate some of its indebtedness of previous years. That is what some of what he has said amounts to.

I wonder if the Government's intention to venture into this scheme is the result of one of the recommendations of the King Commission of Inquiry? All we have learnt up to the present is that the Report of the King Commission has been handed in to the Minister and it is under study. I should hope that the Minister would never be so unmindful of this Honourable House and its members as to come here with any sort of recommendation from that Report without giving members on this side of the House an opportunity to read the Report.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister began by saying how worried he is and how concerned the Government has been over the fact that there has been no pension scheme for drivers and conductors. I have made every possible attempt that could have been made on the Floor of this House from the time I have been in here

to draw this state of affairs to the attention of the Government. I said that there were conductors and drivers who had given as much as 16 years' service and had resigned for some reason or other without receiving a gratuity or pension. Some of them have been hounded down, tortured, persecuted, and they had to run and leave their jobs with no pension scheme or gratuity to rely on.

Now, there was an Inspector or Supervisor about two years ago who was given a gratuity. I think his name is Mr. Alleyne, and I think he is getting a small pension. I want to say here and now that what the Board considered at that time and used as a basis on which to give this man a pension is something that I had drawn up and filtered through to the Board long before Mr. Alleyne was about to retire. That is all they had to use, but you will find that, before these workers draw their pay through the check-off system the Union gets its share. What has the Trade Union been doing for these people over the years apart from drawing their money and not demanding that a pension scheme is necessary to be provided for them? You will find some of them today who have been medically discharged still shuttling between the National Insurance Department and the Transport Board. The Board is telling them that it is waiting to see what the National Insurance Department is going to do, and the National Insurance Department is saying that it is waiting to hear what the Transport Board is going to say. 1.00 p.m.

I think it was in 1955 that they were taken over by the Transport Board. In other words, they had given service prior to this with the Leeward Bus Company and other employers and it is after this kind of service that these people gave to the public that they are now in their old age. You must remember that after they have given 20, 30 or 35 years' service it is not easy for them to go and find another job somewhere. I remember there was the same Minister of Communications and Works who had the effrontery, the shameless boldness to tell us that in his Ministry you will find some of the people along the highways who have to draw up under the trees in the cool at 8.45 in the morning are people who are suffering from this or that. In other words he is giving you to understand that his Ministry is prepared to employ even the decrepit when there are so many other thousands.....

Hon. F. G. SMTH:

On a point of order, I did not want to interrupt, but I have never in this Honourable House given that impression. I have said that because my Ministry is a Works Ministry and because of the medical examinations which these people undergo, when a man has worked for 30 and 40 years on fish and bread for lunch, very often some of them are working and do not know the ailments from which they are suffering, not that we are employing decrepits. I know human beings, and all I have said and I maintain is that unless these people fall down dead they very often do not know if they are suffering from diabetes, whether their heart is weak or what ailment they are suffering from. So do not say that I said that because it is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point of explanation.

Mr. HINDS:

That is a very good point the Minister had made because he is now telling us that his Government has been employing these people and apparently giving them just enough that they could get a bread and fish, and he is satisfied to go along with this so that when they get a bad stomach or a bad heart.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of explanation, I know what people eat for lunch today. Until we gave children hot meals they were eating cutters too. These are the hard facts of life but I am not saying that the Government gave them this. But what can they do? Eat three square meals a day with steak?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No valid point of explanation. Let me remind the Hon. Minister that he has the right of reply.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister is saying that this amendment will now enable the Board to provide for these drivers and conductors and inspectors and staff generally.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are happy to find that the Government is now willing to adopt suggestions that have been made from this side of the House years ago. It is something that is long overdue and anything that will benefit any working persons in this community we are ready and willing to support, but I am saying that we have found that the Transport Board does not have a good record at management, at staff employment or doing anything. It has not managed its affairs in any commendable manner over the years, but they now want to engage in the retreading of tyres, they have installed this fuel injection machinery and what not, and all of us are ever so pleased to find that we will get rid of some of this black smoke that is emitted from these vehicles. I think that is what the Minister has given us to understand, but I wonder then if it is a case where the Government is setting itself up to control the emission of black smoke from its own vehicles, and then to take the opportunity of setting the police on the users of other vehicles. I wonder this because whilst we do not have any estimate as to the cost of the installation of this equipment - nothing like this has been put before us - we appreciate the fact that it must be possible in some respects, and we do hope that the Transport Board, if it is going to use its engineers or mechanics or however the officers will be styled in such an exercise, will also make their services available in some measure to the other concessionaires who are employed in a similar exercise of providing transport for our population.

The Minister has said that there is no provision or authority for the Board to take in work from other Government Departments or from the private sector. The Minister cannot produce and for a long time will not be able to produce any evidence that the functioning of this Department with respect to its own vehicles is of so satisfactory a nature that they can take in work from any other Department. We have already under the control of the same Minister a situation at the Ministry of Communications and Works where they have set up this elaborate workshop. At the Ministry of Communications and Works loss has been terrific. The Transport Board's losses have been brought to the attention of this Honourable Chamber. We admit that the Minister is not a policeman, but we are also told that tyres, batteries and whole engines belonging to buses have been disappearing from the yard of the Transport Board. We are not suggesting that because the incidence of stealing has been high in the past that it must of necessity be higher when there is more for people to steal, take and carry away; but what we would urge upon the Minister is that if he is embarking on these new schemes to embark upon a greater method of efficiency, and a greater measure of security and protection of the taxpayers' money. We do not want you merely to come here to get authority to start to retread tyres to find that when you retread 100 tyres, for the Transport Board, only one dozen out of that 100 will really be used for the Transport Board buses, and the others will find themselves elsewhere as things have been happening in the past because of the attitude of our people, an attitude developed in the very recent past in dealing with Government property where people just feel that things are there and if they take a bus engine or wheel, their money helped to pay for it. That is the attitude of some of these people and we are saying it is wrong. 1.10 p.m.

We are saying it is wrong, and we are not trying here to encourage the Minister to go along blindly because recommendations might have been made to the Transport Board to embark upon this scheme to retread tyres to merely adopt them for the sake of doing something and giving the appearance that they are expanding. Whenever any of these grandiose schemes fail the Minister has to come here and look to the taxpayers for money to back up all the losses year after year, and we are saying that the milch cows, the taxpayers of this country, are tired. They are the people who are asking how long is too long for this kind of thing to go on. They are tired with all of this, and if they are going to set up a scheme for retreading these tyres, if they are going to take in the work from other Government Departments we do not want to know they are taking in work from other Government Departments and nobody caring about it. We have had examples of this where you take in work from here and there but nobody is particularly concerned with what those particular items really mean to another Department of Government, and the attitude of the workmen is that if they are working on one item all the others have to wait. If you can find the type of workers, the foremen, who really know how Government must work and what the use of the vehicles means to the Departments things will run much more smoothly, but that kind of workman is disappearing from the scene.

The Transport Board wants permission to employ officers under certain conditions resulting from this amendment.. Mr. Speaker, we are not happy in giving the Transport Board any sort of authority to employ anybody because they do not have a good employment record, and only fools who cannot be of service to any other Department in Bridgetown would leave where they are and work with the Transport

Board, apart from the fact that as soon as they get their names on the Government payroll they do not have to work. That is the only attraction. Now the labourer's task is o'er, but, Mr. Speaker, any officer who really has the drive, the initiative or anything to contribute is not going to sacrifice his future in the hands of the type of Manager that we have been having over the years at the Transport Board. There are drivers who are being tortured - and this is something the Barbados Workers' Union should look into - because when they finish driving those buses they have to wash cars for the same money, if not they lose their jobs. This is the kind of nonsense that you find people having to stand up under at the Transport Board. There are workers at the Transport Board who have to leave Boscobelle, St. Peter and Pie Corner, St. Lucy and drive into the Transport Board yard to know if they are going to get jobs that day, and this goes on day after day. If their names are not on the board they have to leave and go back the next day. What kind of management is this? You are just taking advantage of the labour situation as it is today, and we are calling on the Minister to call on the management of the Transport Board to desist from taking advantage of the drivers, conductors and other people who, have because of circumstances to be trotting up there each morning to be subjected to this inhumane and subhuman type of treatment.

We have not urged the bringing about of a strike because it will disrupt the good work of the community and interfere with the business operations generally, but the people are very dissatisfied with the management. The management does not seem to think they are human beings any longer, if one of the workers who has been working for 15 or 16 years wants to go to the United States on a vacation and he applies for a letter he is given all the fatigue in the world, no cooperation or assistance, and these things are not fair. Why should we under these circumstances agree to give the Transport Board authority to employ people, to torture Barbadians and make them more miserable day after day? We are asking the Minister to look into things generally and see what can be done and we wish his undertaking well. We firmly believe that he will not be long in office to see it functioning, but nevertheless, if he were to see it get off the ground we hope that the complaints we have had cause to bring to his attention today and to the attention of the House will be given some sort of consideration, and that they will be reported to the Board and some remedial action taken. We would like to know that every worker at the Transport Board, however lowly, is allowed to work under conditions suitable for any other human being under the Queen's peace, and we are urging on the Minister to give urgent consideration to these matters.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly glad that your eye caught the member for St. Peter before it caught me, because at least it gave me an opportunity to sit and listen to what he had to say on this matter, and I am in a position now to make a contribution on a number of points which have been raised. I think it would be important for me first to deal with what the Hon. Minister has said in introducing this Bill. 1.20 p.m.

It is important because I think that it has revealed a number of things which are of fundamental importance to us. The Minister in introducing the Bill made reference to the fact that in spite of negotiations there is still no pension scheme at the Transport Board. It is true that at present there is no

pension scheme at the Transport Board. It is equally true, Mr. Speaker, that the Barbados Workers' Union in the last negotiations conducted with the Transport Board made a proposal for the implementation of a pension scheme for the workers at the Transport Board. It is also equally true that the Board adopted in principle the idea of a pension; however, it has not as yet been implemented because the Board has been saying that it is hamstrung by the fact that there is no money. We have been trying to get the Board to finalise this matter.

I think that it is important, when one hears what the Minister has said in introducing this Bill, to know all the facts. He expresses his worry and concern. If one heard him talking one would think that he is the only person concerned about the matter and it was the first time the idea of a pension scheme had ever been talked about. Of course, the Minister has his way of getting over any point that he wants to get over. The point which I want to make is that it is a point I cannot lose sight of because it is going to be a very important factor in determining my not voting on this amendment. I made a careful note and the Minister said something about a pension and, in parenthesis, he went on to say a token would be given to these workers provided the Board is viable. These are very important words.

Now, this seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be an attempt one way or another to interfere with or to frustrate the collective bargaining process which is in operation between the Transport Board and the Barbados Workers' Union. Since the whole question of a pension is something which we have been negotiating and we are hoping to have concluded in the not too distant future, we cannot see why the Minister is going to come here and, as it were, attempt to feed people out of his hands. This is what we are seeing here today, and I am not going to be a party to it. I feel that any attempt which is made to frustrate the collective bargaining process has to be stamped out. I deem this as one such method and, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, I will not be voting for this amendment.

Now, if one were to look at the amendment, Clause 14(1) says that subject to subsection (3) the Board may appoint and employ at such remuneration and such terms and conditions as it thinks fit such officers as it deems necessary.

Again, Mr. Speaker, because of the experience which we have had recently with some of the Boards, the Union has to be extremely suspicious of the kind of Board or the manner in which some of these Boards are being set up and the manner in which the Ministers are attempting to pull these Boards around like puppets. We feel that in any situation where it has been established that the Union and a Board or Corporation, or any employer, or group of employers are negotiating, they should have the right to sit down and negotiate wages, salaries and conditions of employment for employees. This is something for the two parties to determine between themselves. Of course, one knows that the Minister will, from time to time, have certain reserve powers as far as the operation of the Board are concerned. I am not going to vote for this Bill on the basis that the amendment as it stands is such that when it comes

into operation the Board or the Minister can say that when this was agreed to in the House the trade union representative was there and, therefore, this is the position. One has to be very careful about these things.

Now, the hon. member for St. Peter made reference to or asked the question: What has the union been doing for the workers at the Transport Board apart from collecting their money on the check-off system? This is an interesting question. It is interesting because I think it reveals either his lack of understanding, his pretended lack of knowledge, or his complete ignorance of what the Union has been able to achieve for the workers at the Transport Board over the years. I think he would be the first to admit that when the Transport Board came under the operation of the Government the wages paid were low, and that over the years the wage levels have risen. I would not be surprised if the same hon. member, now that a bus driver, for example, is drawing basically in the region of \$70 or \$75 a week, had objected to it when it was first introduced. Neither would I be surprised if he had objected to the shorter hours which the workers are now working.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have established that the Union has been fighting to get a pension scheme established for the workers, because the Union has been conscious of the fact that the worker should get a pension after he has put in so many years of service in any organisation. This is one of the things the Union is fighting to get established. The Union has been able to get better wages and improved working conditions at the Transport Board. I am sure the hon. member for St. Peter is aware that working conditions at the Transport Board have been improved. I do not believe that working conditions in any organisation can be ideal. We always strive after an ideal, but whether or not we achieve that is a matter of opinion.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely important that I draw these things to the attention of the House. The hon. member for St. Peter also made mention of the fact that after the workers have got on the Government's payroll that it is their licence to sit back and do nothing. That is the usual criticism which we have been hearing on the whole question of the attitude of people who work with the Government. I do not think that one can say there may not be some people who have this outlook in life. I think it is equally true to say, Mr. Speaker, that a tremendous amount depends upon the kind of supervision which there is in any operation where people are employed. 1.30 p.m.

I think it is equally true to state that a tremendous amount depends on the kind of organisation and supervision which there is at any operation or at any place where people are employed, and if the supervision is lacking or if the organisation is bad, then opportunities will be created for people to slack and to behave in a manner like the hon. member for St. Peter has spoken of.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of my objection to the two areas in the Bill which I mentioned, I am glad to see that the Minister has seen fit to do something about controlling the emission of black smoke from the vehicles owned and operated by the Transport Board. I think I have raised this matter on a number of occasions in this House, and I am really glad that some effort is being made to correct this and sincerely hope that the kind of experience and expertise which can be built up at the Transport Board from this kind of operation will be made available to other people and to other garages for that matter so that we could have complete control not only of the vehicles operated by the Transport Board but also of all vehicles in the Island. Whether we will be able to have complete control or not is another matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated my general feelings on this Bill and as I have said there are certain aspects of it following on the explanations which the Hon. Minister gave in his introduction that will prevent me from voting for certain aspects of the Bill, because I just cannot accept the methods which are being employed, in my submission, to circumvent the process of collective bargaining.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think in spite of what has been said by hon. members, most members of this Chamber will welcome the amendments being proposed to this particular Act specifically as it relates to the business of the recapping of the tyres and so on as well as to payment of pensions and gratuities. I wish to direct my attention to the proposal of the Board to undertake the repair and adjustment of diesel pumps, because I think this can deal with one of the main problems confronting the quality of life in this country. From time to time most users of the roads and indeed the residents of this country have been worried about the emission of smoke from vehicles, and we are very pleased to note that the Transport Board has taken steps in order to deal with the problem arising in this connection from their vehicles as well as from vehicles of other Government departments and Statutory Boards.

I wish to make the point that this action is further buttressed and underlined by the fact that at the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic which is responsible for the training of operatives and craftsmen in this country, that those students in that institution who undergo training in the field of auto mechanics themselves are now being given training in respect of the adjustment of the diesel pumps. The Polytechnic has acquired equipment for adjusting and calibrating and otherwise phasing the equipment, the diesel pumps and other aspects of the engines in order to control the emission of smoke, and I think that in time we will be producing from that institution students who are qualified to deal with this particular matter, because if we look at what has happened in other countries we realise that the smoke can affect the atmosphere and in turn can affect the quality of life in a country, and when once these matters are put into train it is not at all an easy matter to correct them and this would definitely have an adverse effect on the quality of life in this country.

The Transport Board is doing its part as far as the Government vehicles are concerned and the vehicles of other Statutory Boards and Government Departments are concerned, and this is buttressed by the training being given within the Polytechnic to ensure that the auto mechanics who come out of that institution would have training in the adjustment of the engines to deal with this particular matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I am amazed at the omnipotence and omniscience of the representatives of the Trade Union and the claim of infallibility. Firstly I will deal with the remarks' of the hon. member for St. Lucy. In the Act of 1955 there is a provision as follows "The Board shall appoint such officers, agents and servants as the Board may from time to time determine and there shall be paid to them such salaries, remunerations and allowances as the Board may determine with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee." Today we have a similar provision and today it is frustrating the collective bargaining. The Board has a Manager. We are appointing now a Personnel Officer, and the point made by the hon. member for St. Peter is met because the Manager cannot do a lot of things like looking after public relations and looking after letters for people to go to the States and doing other jobs that a Personnel Officer should do, and I have got the approval and recommendation has just been made to me to appoint a Personnel Officer who will take these burdens from the Manager so that the efficiency of the Corporation will go up.

We have also looked and instead of having a foreman who is a gloried mechanic, I am getting permission to appoint a proper qualified mechanic-engineer. This is operating a system where 50% of the buses are between 15 and 20 years old; so I do not know how you expect me to come into the House and give a report that the buses are making money.

But let me get back to the hon. member for St. Lucy. There is a Casual Employees Pensions Act on the Statute Book. The Union represents casual employees; is this frustrating collective bargaining? This is absolute nonsense. If he does not know what he is talking about, he should not come in and accuse the Minister who is asking to do something that has been done since 1955 of frustrating the aspirations of the Union. When I was running for President of the Barbados Workers' Union, where was he? I have always been on the workers' side and I have come in here just to give the Board authority. All I am asking is to give the Board authority for the Minister to approve what the Board has agreed to. I just had to approve under the Act the wages for the Natural Gas Corporation; it was done by collective bargaining, but the Act must give the Minister some sort of protection of public money. So what is the hon. member talking about frustration? What happened to the Cemeteries Board? Did the Minister not approve increases for the Cemeteries Board? Is it because the hon. member knows the word "frustration" that he is going to use it and accuse me of frustrating his legitimate aspirations? This section is only giving the Minister, on the advice of the Parliamentary Counsel, authority to approve certain things, because there must be in any organisation a certain area of employees that the Union does not represent. Does the Union represent the General Manager or the Personnel Officer? Would the Minister have some

say in what salaries should be paid to them? I am not talking about bus drivers and conductors.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker...

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what is the hon. member rising?

Mr. GREAVES:

On a point of elucidation. Just for the benefit of the House I would like to get an interpretation from the Minister of the term "officer".

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of elucidation. 1.40 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the Act of 1955 had in the word, why did he not get the interpretation before? If after representing them since 1955 he does not know what category is represented by the Union, what is he asking me?

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the categories which the Union represents, this is why I have taken this position,

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of elucidation, it must arise out of what the hon. member has said.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, to move on now, whether he supports it or not does not matter to me, if he is a Party within a Party he can vote for it or not, I could not care less/All I am saying is that I have come to the

House with two measures; one is, we have the equipment which has been working and I have been advised - and I am not buying equipment, the equipment is there - but I have been advised that it is not working to capacity, and in my desire to try to increase the revenue I got my Permanent Secretary to write the Board to ask them if they were geared to do any extra work to try to bring in some money and they replied saying they could. I then said they should limit this work to Statutory Boards and Government Departments. I am not buying equipment, I may have to take on somebody, but I have been advised that they are working far below the capacity of the plant and that they can do more work to earn more money instead of spending money with other companies. Do you know we had contracts with Joseph Retreading Company for doing this work? It is a big operation, and I honestly feel that if they can do it - and that is why I am limiting it, not to take away money from the private people, but just as the Government buys food from the Marketing Corporation to keep the money circulating I am trying to save money going out that can be better used - and if they can do it they should be allowed to do it.

Similarly, the fuel injection pump. I have only started with Government because I have got to be satisfied that they can do this properly, and I want to assure you that the Police can now prosecute the Transport Board. I will say this boldly, that even with the fuel injection pump you will still get black smoke because you cannot stop a bus 15 or 20 years old from giving off black smoke, so do not think that this is a cure-for-all, I am facing facts as I always do. It will cut down some of it, but with the age of some of those buses, especially the Mercedes Benz which are probably older than the hon. member for the City, you are facing an uphill task. I am trying to bring the fleet up to date, every year I am bringing in 12 new buses and trying my best to increase the revenue. I have brought these two measures to the House, not to frustrate the work of the Union, but the Board must have power for the Minister, who is the guardian of the public purse, to approve any collective bargaining, and I can cite for the member for St. Lucy about 40 Statutory Boards which they represent where the Minister has the right to approve. They just got through with the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, did the Minister's approval frustrate them? They represent casual employees in Government and there is a Casual Employees Pension Act, why do you not ask the Government to remove it from the Statute Book if it is frustrating you? What is wrong with this provision here? I am not coming down and sitting down at any bargaining table, the Board will submit recommendations to me and if they are reasonable I will sign them, so how does frustration come in? How did we get into Parliament other than representing the same people that he is now claiming omnipotence, omniscience and infallibility for?

I do not want to say any more, the hon. member for St. Lucy has to realise that we are working with human material, we are working with Barbadians who are people like the member for St. Peter and myself who must be honest and upright, who must give a fair day's work for a fair day's wage, I cannot cut open their heads and put it in, and I want to let the public know what section 10 says. Section 10 of the old Act says: "The Minister may, after consultation with the Board, give to the Board directions of a general character to the exercise and performance by the Board of their functions in relation to matters which appear to him to affect the public interest, and the Board will give effect to any such directions." This means simply that I am a policy maker, I am not responsible for the day to day worker in the Transport Board. People come to me about jobs and about being fired and I fire them out of my office because that is not my function. I tell them to make their peace with the Manager of the Board because I

am not going down into the arena. There may be a lot of reasons, there may be a lot of stealing as you say, there may be a lot of stealing of wages and fares, but what can a Minister do if the people working with him are not honest and are not motivated by the desire to help their country improve? The Minister gets the blame because he is the political animal and when I come here on behalf of the Board I get my head cut off, but it is the people I am working with whom I cannot fire, I cannot dismiss or do anything with. I am the political victim subject to the criticisms of the House, but I cannot fire a worker at the Transport Board, I cannot make any deductions from his salary, and this is the system in which we are working. I do not quarrel with it, but the public must understand that if people are stealing engines or tyres, I can only work with the material which Barbados produces by its educational system who are motivated by whatever motives urge them to go on, who probably have no patriotism who are out to get as much as they want as quickly as they want, which is a modern day syndrome because everybody wants to get rich quickly, but what am I to do as a Minister who is honestly trying to make an operation that we took over from the Labour Party viable? They should never have taken over those buses, but I agree a lot of time has passed and that old argument should stop, but I am hamstrung by money and I cannot bring the fleet up to date all at once. I am bringing in 12 per year, so that when 12 come in 12 more have to go out and this goes on and on, and those are the circumstances in which I am working. I have not got the money to start working an up to date fleet, I have inherited all the weaknesses and the faults of a system which I have found, so I am not arguing with anybody, but when I feel strongly and sincerely that I am doing something which I think is in the interest of a Statutory Board I speak strongly.

Mr. Speaker, you will forgive me, I am not quarrelling, but these two measures I have brought to the House today are efforts to try to maximise the money we have. It hurts my heart when I have to come in here and ask for approximately \$200,000, but if the tyre retreading venture is going to bring in about \$70,000 and the fuel injection pump another \$30,000 I will only have to ask for \$100,000 instead of \$200,000, and the milch cow taxpayers the hon. member spoke about will be thereby burdened. It is only an attempt by me to increase the revenue. I have the equipment, I have been advised on technical grounds that we can do the job, and all I am asking you is to give the Board power to enable me to do the job and to run a better system. I cannot sit down without referring to the hon. member for St. Lucy who has known my attitude towards workers almost from the time of my birth, and if he studies the history of the Workers' Union he will see my name written in the book that was commissioned for the 25th year. I do not see his, but I know mine is there and I can tell him the page too.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What has that got to do with the Bill?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am only telling him that I have always been in the workers' interest, and far from frustrating it I am recorded in a document which was commissioned by the Workers' Union, that is all I am saying. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed. 1.50 p.m.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, in the reply by the Minister of Communications and Works, he referred to Section 14 of the 1955 Act in which it is set out that the Officers of the Transport Board may be employed on such conditions, etc., and that the remuneration and allowances fixed shall be approved by the Cabinet. We find that in 1964 and, again, under this Act that the principle here is quite different from that set out in the 1955 Act. Under the 1955 Act all that was required for the approval of the Executive Committee as it then was, was the remuneration and allowances, whereas in this legislation no person shall be appointed without the prior approval of the Minister if the job has a salary in excess of \$7,200 a year. This is something completely different, and it is not the same thing. What is being said in this Section, as it was passed in 1964 when the amount was \$6,000, is that you cannot appoint anyone to a job unless you had the prior approval of the Minister, and in that respect, Sir, I would certainly suggest to the House that this lends itself to what one would call a good pimp-relationship.

Now, here is a person who has a job in excess of \$6,000. If the Minister does not approve of that particular individual, then that individual cannot get the job. This is not what is contained in the 1955 Act. The 1955 Act sets out that the remuneration and the salary shall be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. What it was sought to do is to control the amount of funds that the Transport Board may spend in order to prevent the Board from creating a job where a person is paid too much money thereby creating a hardship on the Board as a whole. However, this is not the purpose and intention of the legislation that we have before us today. If it were so, then subsection (2) would read: "Notwithstanding subsection 1(A) no salary in excess of \$7,200 per annum may be assigned to any post except with the prior approval of the Minister." When you go on to add that "no appointment whether temporary or permanent may be made to any post to which a salary in excess of \$7,200 is assigned without the prior approval of the Minister" it is in effect giving the Minister the right to say who should be employed and in what particular job. I think that is wrong and I do not think it is right for the Minister to have this power.

Sir, from time to time, people are going to accuse the Government of appointing the "yard fowls", as they are called, to certain jobs in excess of \$600. On the other hand, a criticism may be made of the Minister that he refused to give a man a job in excess of \$600 a month because he belongs to another political party, or because he is known to be a political opponent of the Government. I should like the Minister to consider whether (b) should not be deleted, because it is not right for the Minister to demand that a person cannot be appointed without his prior approval. Why has this been done? From time to time we hear the Ministers of Government say that they have no control over the appointments and promotions in the Civil Service. This is so not only in respect of the Transport Board, but it is also so in relation to the Marketing Corporation and most of the Statutory Boards in this country. That is one of the reasons why the Statutory Boards are not operating efficiently. No commercial enterprise would sit down and wait for the approval of the Minister and the Cabinet when an appointment is to be made if it is to be operated efficiently. In a private concern either the Managing Director or the Board of Directors will look after appointments.

Even if they want to control the amount of money attached to a post and state that no post in excess of \$7,200 without the prior approval of the Minister that would be acceptable in order to give the Minister and the Cabinet control over the finances of the Statutory Board. It should not be said that no appointment to the post should be made without the prior approval of the Minister. I think that is wrong, and I ask the Minister to look at it. As I have said, I think there will be a sort of pimp-relationship between the person appointed to the post and the Minister. He will know that you cannot get a job on the Board unless you do certain things. That is why in this country you will find some people running to get their "D.L.P. Passport" in order to get jobs. In order to hold a job in excess of \$7,200, you will have to obtain a passport. If a man wants to get that type of job rather than relying on his qualifications, he would go and get the passport. He may well feel that if the appointment cannot be made without the prior approval of the Minister and he is not a member of the D.L.P. that the only way to obtain a job is by

way of a D.L.P. passport. When the Minister calls up the General Secretary and asks whether Mr. So and So is a member of the Party...

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, Sir. I do not operate on that low-down basis. I operate on a fair basis, and I am objecting to that. I operate on the basis that a Barbadian is entitled to work in his own country...

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Sir. On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I really want to find out on what the hon. member has risen.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with a situation that could arise.

Hon. C. E . TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order Mr. Chairman. The Hon. Leader of the House cannot rise on a point of order at this stage. A point of order must relate to something which is being exercised in the House at a given time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am well aware of that. The time now being two o'clock, I am

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. Chairman, the Standing Orders were not suspended today.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am reporting progress. 2 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING Mr. SPEAKER? This sitting is now suspended until 2.45 p.m.

On Resumption:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee, and to that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

THE TRANSPORT BOARD (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, at the time of the suspension I was dealing with the question of subsection 2(b) which reads "No appointment whether temporary or permanent may be made to any post to which a salary in excess of \$7,200 is assigned.", and I was seeking to relate it to the previous provision of the Transport Act as originally passed in 1955. Under that Act the Transport Board had the power to appoint officers, but the remuneration and allowances would be granted with the approval of the Executive Committee as it then was. This we find is repeated in subsection 2(a) of this Act which says that no salary in excess of

\$7,200 per annum may be assigned to any post.

What we find indeed reprehensible is the fact that written in this Act as is written in the 1964 Amendment - and this was a feature which was introduced into the legislation dealing with Statutory Boards of this country by this Government - is that no appointment whethet permanent or temporary shall be made to any post to which a salary in excess of \$6,000 per annum is assigned without the prior approval of the Cabinet. Sir, this even goes a little further in its reprehensible nature in the sense that it provides that no appointment whether temporary or permanent may be made to any post for which a salary in excess of \$7,200 is assigned.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side feel that this creates a situation in which you will find that if a person desires to get a job which he knows comes under this provision and which he can only get with the prior approval of the Minister, this would lend itself to a situation where people would of necessity and merely for the purpose of ensuring that they get that particular job, seek to get what is regarded as the passport of the Democratic Labour Party. We have heard already on the floor of this House a Minister of Government state quite categorically that if the situation arose where a person who was a member of the Democratic Labour Party and a person who was not a member applied for a job, he would grant the job to the person who was a card bearing member of the Democratic Labour Party. This is the very situation to which I earlier adverted that Ministers given this sort of power could refuse people jobs purely because of their political complexion and purely because of the fact that they do not support the political party in power, and I think this is a reprehensible situation. It is a situation which not only applies to the Transport Board, but to most of the Statutory Boards in this country, and I think it is wrong. It is a situation that should be removed entirely from the Statute Book. If you appoint people to Statutory Boards, you either have faith in them that they would carry out the work assigned to them, arid if you do not have faith in them you should remove them; but you cannot appoint a man to a Statutory Board and at the same time tell him that if any job which carries a salary in excess of \$600 a month comes up he has to refer to the Minister before he can appoint the man. It is a bad situation because you will find that some unscrupulous Minister will deliberately use this power to refuse a job being given to a person who is not a member of the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, this situation lends itself to pure pimp-relationships, and it is wrong. I urge upon the Government that even if it wants to keep in subsection (a) which says that no salary in excess of \$600 a month may be assigned to any post on the grounds that you want to have control of the finances of the Statutory Board, that is fair enough; but once you agree that the post can be created, I can see no necessity for saying that the Minister must give his prior approval to the person who is going to be appointed to that post.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, if ever there was a Government that is totally unaware of its responsibilities and the situation where it is becoming difficult for not only members of the Opposition but members of the general public to understand what is happening, it is becoming more and more evident month after month. I have heard the Prime Minister and the Minister of Communications and Works say in here that a Minister's responsibility for his department only goes to a certain point. The Prime Minister himself was at pains to say that he is not going to represent any Civil Servant who does something wrong and he quoted from historical facts about where ministerial responsibility lies. Today you have in this very Act a provision in which the Minister of Communications and Works is saying he wants to have the responsibility to hire and fire Civil Servants. That is what it amounts to. You cannot say on the one hand that you are not going to be responsible for Civil Servants, and then on the other hand say you want this authority because it leaves the general public at a loss as to who represents whom and who is responsible for whom. All this amounts to is that you send a friend to the Minister with the instructions that he is a friend of yours, he knows something about mechanics, give him a job down the road, and when the Minister sends him you have to employ him whether or not you like it, and if you fire the man next week because he does not know the job and the Minister says to keep him there, you cannot get rid of him. I am not saying the Minister will do this, but it is dangerous legislation.

Mr. Chairman, if a Minister is going to hold this power unto himself that notwithstanding subsection (1) (c) no person may be dismissed from a post specified in paragraph (b) without prior approval of the Minister, what in effect does that mean? It means that no matter how bad a man is, if the Board feels that they want to dismiss him and he can carry a tale to the Minister, he is there for good.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, is going to create a situation where you are going to have employees walking around Government Departments doing nothing and they cannot be fired, because this puts the responsibility for hiring and firing straight in the hands of the Minister, and once you get a Minister who is willing to accept a news bringer he is going to put that man in a job. You have been in here long enough, Mr. Chairman, and you have heard that at the Barbados Marketing Corporation there were allegations of people walking around who could not be fired, and I would entreat the Government to look carefully at this legislation again. The problem in Barbados is that we make too many bits of ad hoc legislation and change them to suit the circumstances. Under the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act there are so many amendments that not even the Minister himself can tell you where you can find the law for any particular subject. Only last week I communicated with the Prime Minister about a regulation which is supposed to be operative in Barbados and nobody can tell me when the regulation was passed or where to find it, and here you are creating similar legislation.

I think the time has come when this country is struggling under old legislation, you cannot get the old legislation revised, and I think that it is but right that little time and thought shall be given to the type of legislation you are going to create so that it is lasting legislation and not legislation that will be altered. This is putting into legislation the maxim about equity. 2.55 p.m.

Equity is as long as the Chancellor's foot. It means that whichever Chancellor is in power that is how the law will swing, that is all it means. Whichever Minister now goes to the Ministry of Communications and Works it is whose job is permanent at the Ministry of Communications and Works, and this is what it will amount to, that if the present Minister is changed tomorrow and there is a man there to whom somebody carries news and he does not like him he will be out of a job. I would urge the Hon. Minister to look carefully at this legislation again. He is a lawyer, he knows the maxim about equity and he can understand what I am saying, that any man's position of being hired or fired now depends on the Minister who is responsible for the Transport Board.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, some day I would like to give the Opposition a lecture on ministerial government, because they are still operating at a stage where they do not understand what government is all about. I have been criticised all day long, they like to come in and bull-rag a Minister, saying that the Minister knows about stealing and everything else.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is this not what I have been saying? Now he is saying we are bull-ragging the Minister. That shows you what I have been saying all along, this is a confused Government.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Now, you see, you are running a Statutory Board. The Minister is to lay down policy but he is not to have any say at all in approving the quality of the staff that must carry out the policy which the law states he must lay down. This is what you are saying, because the salaries of the persons mentioned in the Act are obviously the top salaries, not the bus driver or conductor, but the Manager, the Personnel Officer or the Mechanical Engineer who are to carry out the policy of the Minister. 1955 was not after Independence, in 1955 your Government grabbed up the buses hot and sweaty, drafted some monkey thing to fool people they had taken over some of the buses. That is all that happened.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir, the Minister must not say that it was some monkey thing when there has been only one amendment to it since 1961. Do you mean you were operating under the same monkey thing for 12 years? You are just as stupid then.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

They had no plan but they grabbed up the buses because they did not want to give the people an increase in bus fares, so they took over the buses, some of them old, broken down, and of no use, and this is what we have inherited. Read the Act and see what happened; that is why I got saddled with a lot of labourites at the Transport Board. Read section 14 which is being repealed "The Board shall appoint such officers, agents and servants as the Board from time to time determine, and there shall be paid to them such salaries, remuneration and allowances as the Board may determine with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee." So what are you telling me now? That you had a Labour Party Government in power, the man who is paying the piper calls the tune, so if they appointed a man you did not like you would say his remuneration should be a farthing and the man would say he does not want the job, but if they appointed a yard fowl of yours the salary could be \$1,000. That is all you are saying in short. They could appoint John Brown as Manager, but if you did not like him all you had to do would be to say that his salary should be a farthing. This is what the Act says

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

What is the point of order?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, a point of explanation then, the Hon. Minister is misquoting legislation, because he knows the salary is fixed according to certain scales, you do not move salaries up and down, so what is he talking about making a salary a farthing? It just shows how he intends to use the Act.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Point made.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I hope the hon. member for Christ Church West does not interpret it that way. The Act simply says ".....and there shall be paid to them such salaries, remuneration and allowances as the Board may determine with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee." So if the Governor-in-Executive Committee did not approve how would they pay them? I am the Minister, I come in here and you criticise me, you. talk everything that comes to your mouth, so what am I to do now? You see, you do not understand what ministerial government is all about. You will have confidence in the Board appointing a friend to a tenth cousin, but you do not have that confidence in the integrity of the Minister. You would pick up somebody who owes no allegiance to the people, who never ran for a seat, who

cannot be kicked out by the people, and give them the power to appoint their cousins, their aunts, their brothers and sisters, but not a Minister who has to face the elections. I can see your thinking, you know you are not going to get into power for all these years because these Acts are not made for us, you are not a Minister in perpetuity, you are a Minister when the people want you. You criticise me now, but would you repeal it if you get into power? Give me an undertaking now, even if you have to do it in 1999. You get on as if being a Minister is a permanent state, you are going to be there for ever and we are passing laws which we will administer till eternity.

I say that ministerial government demands that if a Minister is going to be criticised in Parliament he should have some say in the appointment of the top administrators of any Board established by Government, because the people are the final arbiters, not you, and if the people find that you are appointing an incompetent Board, that you are practising nepotism or dishonesty, putting square pegs in round holes, it is the people - and I am a democrat and I believe in the people's choice and their right to kick me out - but it is the people who should kick me out if they find that I am using my position as a Minister or my appointment as a member of the Government to appoint people to certain positions. You are talking about ministerial government, not of 1955 when you were still under the Colonial Office. Bahamas got independence yesterday, and if you look at the Bahamas Constitution you will see that the Prime Minister of the Bahamas has more powers than our Prime Minister has, but we have approached independence in a niggardly, cannot-trust-my-brother, afraid-he-does-something attitude, and as long as you continue with this idea of feeling that Ministers can do what they like it will continue this way. Ministers can be kicked out, they can be fired if the people feel strongly about anything a Minister does, being a Minister is not a permanent status, so you must start waking up to what ministerial responsibility involves.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is talking.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of explanation. Mr. CHAIRMAN To explain what?

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of information then.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There is no such point under these Standing Orders, you will take your seat.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You will take your seat

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of elucidation to elucidate what the Minister has said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You cannot elucidate the Minister's speech, you can elucidate your own.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Can I ask that he explains something he had just said, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You will take your seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I feel that on Statutory Boards there should not be any square pegs in round holes, I am against putting square pegs in round holes. The hon. member spoke about putting DLP supporters on Boards, but Nixon, Johnson, Kennedy, Heath, Wilson, Manley, Williams, Lee Kwan Yu, Kaunda, Mobutu and Nyereee did it. Name anyone who does not put his Party supporters if he gets into power.
3.05 p.m.

I say that all things being equal, competence, integrity and ability being there, a D.L.P. man who

sweats to get you in power if he is a Barbadian, is the man who deserves to get the job. (Asides.) You are now coming here to play that you are pious and high-minded. If you have a D.L.P. man who has the same degree, the same integrity and ability, and you know that John Brown is B.L.P. you are going to put him in power. Politics is no Sunday School game. I can go on record as saying that I will give the man who supports me the first choice, all things being equal. I am not putting square pegs in round holes. I am not putting an incompetent D.L.P. man in a job which he cannot hold. Charity begins at home.

Sir, Wilson was the Chairman of the B.B.C., Chairman of the C.B.C., and what did he do as soon as he got into power? He kicked out the nominees of the Labour Party and brought in his own. When Nixon came into power all 6f the people who were appointed by Kennedy went. (Asides.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The next time I speak to the hon. member for St. Joseph, I will use the necessary Standing Order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

We are suffering from the fact that we have too many of your supporters as hangovers, and they are trying to sabotage us from too many levels, I do not want to go any further, but we are going to work the system. Do not tell me that you would put D.L.P. supporters in jobs if you came into power. I do not believe it, and I would say that you are not telling the truth. You never operated on that basis. When you were not in power, the Housing Authority, the Transport Board and several places were left with your supporters in them and we have never victimised them. When you were in power who were on the Boards? Did you have D.L.P. members on the Board? Let us start getting politically minded.

Mr. Chairman, I make no apoldgy for this. They can come in here and take off my head, but as Minister I must see the qualifications and the ability of the man who will be appointed to the top post on any Board for which I am responsible. I, as the Minister under Ministerial Status in 1973, demand that as of right and concomitant with Independence, I must not only be criticised in public and in here, but my top administrator must have my approval.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, we have now come to the point where we must decide whether or not the Minister is the person who must fire and hire. That is the point before us. What we are saying is quite contrary to what the Minister, who has just sat down, has tried to make us believe. There is at present in the Transport Board people who are known supporters of the Barbados Labour Party. These people are known to the Manager and the Administrative machinery of the Transport Board. Some of these workers

are Supervisors and they live in Boscobelle, St. Peter, Mile-and-Quarter and so on, and they are put to work at the nearest point to Sam Lord's Castle, Long Bay, St. Philip, and they are never given an opportunity to work near their homes. In the circumstances, when they leave work at eleven o'clock at night in addition to finding transportation they have to travel from Sam Lord's Castle to Boscobelle or provide another home in order to be on the job on time next morning. That is the position. Some of those people have complained to me about this matter, and I have suggested to them that they should get a Democratic Labour Party Passport, pin it on their breast pockets, and let people see that they have changed their colours. I tell them to show the passport to their friends in order to ease the pressure. I am trying to show the Minister the political pressure that is being put on these people, and it is the type of thing that is ruining the smooth running of the Transport Department.

Sir, we have seen the attitude of the Minister in here. We have heard that he is not going to put a square peg in a round hole and so on, but we know what we have experienced already and we do not trust the Minister any longer when he says these things. Now, at subsection (3) it is stated that no pension, gratuity or other benefit may be granted to an officer or servant or to any person by reference to his service. I should like to hear from the Minister what he means by this. In other words, one must take it to mean that in determining whether or not a person is entitled to a gratuity or pension, it is not going to be based in future on X having completed 15 years service with the Transport Board. It will not be a question of reference to his service. It is a question of whether or not, as the Minister has just told us, it is a supporter of the Minister's Political Party who has just completed three or four years or less who will get a gratuity as against somebody who does not support his Party but has given 15 years service to the Department who will be left at the mercy of the Minister to determine what gratuity or pension he is going to get. Could this be fair and reasonable?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member quoted Clause 3(3), but he took the whole thing out of context. Let him read the entire subsection and he will see exactly what is intended. (Asides.) The hon. member stopped at a comma and he did not stop at a full stop.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, it goes on to say

"No pension, gratuity or other benefit may be granted to an officer or servant or to any other person by reference to his service, or to dependants or estates of such persons except in accordance with such conditions as the Board, with the approval of the Minister, determines."

In other words, what is meant by "no pension, gratuity or other benefit may be granted to an officer or servant or to any other person by reference to his service....."?

What can anybody interpret that to mean, Mr.

Chairman?

3.15

Mr. Chairman, the words are here and it means that no worker at the Transport Board can say that he has completed 33 years of service with the Transport Board and as such he will be entitled to two-thirds pension or something like that. It is not like the case of a policeman or any other public servant who knows he has completed so many years' service and is entitled to so and so, because it goes on to tell you that regardless of how many years of service you may have put in, it all depends on what the Board feels like doing and it must be with the approval of the Minister. I do not know if either of the Ministers would like me to employ any other sort of interpretation to this paragraph. If as the hon. member on my left is suggesting it has been badly drafted, I cannot account for this. I am not a draughtsman. It is perhaps regrettable that the hon. member for St. Lucy took to his wings and fled after the assault by the Minister of Communications during the day, because he is not now in his place. This is the time that one would have welcomed his contribution in defence of the interest of the workers and in the absence of his mentor.

However, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister to himself is feeling somewhat happy over the situation because it relates specifically to him in that power so to speak is going to be in his hands and he will have the right to choose finally who should fill this particular post and who should not, and there rests with him.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, the power does not rest with me; the power rests with the Cabinet.

Mr. HINDS:

Whatever officers these amendments refer to, you will find that they are not going to be bound by

discipline to any manager or anybody else because they are going to feel that the Minister employed them, and talk as you like or threaten to dismiss him as you like, they are going to see the Minister and everything will be all right. That is going to be the attitude of these people because you have seen it in the past and it will continue. This amendment is going to make provision for this type of behaviour. It will do the Department no good whatsoever and I am sure the Minister would not like to know he is placed in that position where a person is at fault with respect to his duty or conduct to the administrator of the Corporation and then finds himself relying on the Minister whose interest must be political interest in keeping that person in office and backing up that person's actions however distasteful the might have been or however unruly he might have been to the Manager or Chairman of the Board at times. He would know that he has the Minister to back him up, so we have got to guard ourselves against these things.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, there are just one or two points I want to clear up and put on the records. The first is that at present in every Board certain salaries whether they be \$4,000 which were changed to \$6,000 since the revision and now \$7,200 for certain officers can only be paid with the approval of Cabinet. The Minister himself has not got that power; so whether it is "Cabinet" or "Minister" it is the same thing.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, this is really turning the sublime to the ridiculous. We are discussing specific provisions in an Act which does not say anything about a Minister carrying anything to Cabinet, and we are really making mock sport of this Parliament now because the Act deals with the Minister's responsibility and what he can or cannot do. For the Leader of the House to get up and tell us that where Statutory Boards are concerned you have to go to Cabinet has nothing to do with the Act. If they want it so, let it be in the legislation so that the world at large can see that the Minister has to do certain things, but I resent this sort of foolishness which is going on in here Tuesday after Tuesday and now Wednesday after Wednesday. You come in here with an Act and realise that the Minister is in trouble and that the Act is bad and you get up in an aside and talk about policy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

No point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Sir, this deals with the Orders of the House and what we are debating He is telling us about something else which does not fall under this debate.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with Clause 3 and I thought I would enlighten certain members who are not aware of the Cabinet system or how it functions.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, this is saying that we are all ignorant if he is saying that he is enlightening certain people who do not know about the Cabinet system. I am not asking him to withdraw the statement. We are debating an amendment to an Act entitled The Transport Board Act, 1955, and it says nothing about any Minister taking anything to the Cabinet for approval.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. member apparently does not want to be assisted. However the second point is that people employed by Statutory Boards are not Civil Servants, and on that too the hon. member fell down.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, sometimes Government in newly independent countries, like the people, take a very long time to determine standards which they will set in their country. This is not surprising because self-Government has been long in coming to these territories, and I am unduly patient with the sort of arguments I heard advanced here today by the Minister in defence of the principle involved in this section of the Bill, but I think since we are not ignorant people, and since we are intelligent enough, we should want to set the standards in our country early rather than late. It is an undoubted fact that Ministers sometimes try to control Boards right down to the point of the day-to-day running of the Board, giving directives to them, not on matters of policy, but on matters of administration, and even dealing with the day to day appointments with these Boards. 3.25 p.m.

This dichotomy has presented itself to Governments who deal in mixed enterprise, in the running, for instance, of Marketing Corporations, in the commercial running of transport, and they must decide quite early in their minds whether they want to set a high or low standard. It is surprising, to say the least, that I should hear from a Minister the argument that given all things are equal if he has the power of appointment he would appoint the person who supported him rather than someone who did not. If the ballot is secret there must be certain applicants for posts who are not card bearing members of either Party, and those persons may not have supported either Party, but they will be discriminated against. I believe, and I say very firmly, that that is a wrong principle, and if this is the way this Government is operating it is bringing political considerations to outride decency in public affairs. That is what I say very strongly, because the Minister knows that in this issue we are not dealing with people who are placed on Boards, we are dealing with the method of appointment of people who depend for their livelihood on their work. In the Workers' Union there are people who voted against the Government, yet they are defended by people who are part of the Government, and it will be a great tragedy if one

undermines the integrity of those persons by importing this type of policy as the policy for Barbados.

One of the reasons why we strongly object to the continuation of this policy in legislation is the very reason which the Minister advanced. He read the Act of 1955 (1955-37) and has sought to compare the wording of that Act with this Bill before the Committee. Under that Act the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and subsequently the Cabinet, could lay down as a matter of policy the terms of appointment of people, including their salary scales. Nowhere in the old section 14 could any Minister of the Government in 1955 have any say in the day to day appointment of a member of the staff and looking at his references to see whether he was a Government supporter or not. Read the legislation. It was in 1964 for the first time that this present Government, not as presently constituted but belonging to the same political party, introduced this principle that if the post carried a salary over \$500 it had to go back to the Cabinet for the Cabinet to say whether that particular man could be appointed, not whether the salary was the type of salary that should be paid for that job having regard to the criteria for the responsibility of payment and the nature of the job. That was introduced, and you will see that with most of the Statutory Boards since then the Government finds it necessary to have a word in the day to day appointment of members of the staff of the Corporations, and we are seeing the result all around us. People believe that they are depending on particular Ministers or a particular political party for their bread, they cannot stand up, they are losing their decency, some of them are losing their manhood and they say they are card bearing members of a party.

It is most unfortunate when you cannot have your own political or other convictions because of the fear of this sort of provision. We are not saying that the Government will not appoint to Boards as distinct from staff people who they believe are of their political persuasion, we are not talking about Boards, the point is made that they will be stupid not to appoint, people to these Boards, but if you are controlling the members of your Boards, all things being equal, do you mean you find it necessary to go behind them and control the appointment of the staff? That is what we are raising. You do not feel that their loyalty is in question even to that extent? Why should this be so? Does the Minister need that control? Mr. Chairman, I suggest that one of the difficulties is that despite their claim that we on this side do not understand the ministerial system of Government, the truth is that the Ministers themselves do not understand the ministerial system of Government, because there is a distinction between policy directions and day to day administration, and very frequently one would want to see policy directions being given and once it is not on matters within the ambit of the Official Secrets Act these being published and made known. This should be so not only with this Board but with town planning and other aspects of Government policy. The policy should be there, the Board must conform with the policy, otherwise the Minister has the right with the approval of Cabinet to remove the Board, but the day to day administration should be left to be done properly. Do not tell me that there is no control over the staff, there is, most of them have not got the security of tenure which you find in the Civil Service so there is no cumbersome procedure of dismissing them if they are not performing properly, so it is not true for the Minister to try to argue that he is to take the blows in here and has no say as to what happens. There are all the provisions there if the system is working properly. There are all the provisions there if the system is working properly for controlling inefficiency in administration, if that inefficiency exists, and I think it is unfortunate that we should perpetuate the system.

On one matter to the Leader of the House, the hon. member for St. Joseph is right. Regardless of what the Leader is saying maybe the policy Government wants to pursue, this particular section does not talk about having the appointment subject to the Cabinet's control, it is the Minister's, and it is significant in varying section 14 of the 1964 Act the words "Cabinet approval" were used. I will read for the benefit of members the section that now exists as introduced by the Act of 1964 (1964-42). It was that no appointment whether permanent or temporary shall be made to any post to which a salary in excess of \$6,000 per annum is assigned without the prior approval of the Cabinet." This one speaks in similar terms except changing the top grade of the salary, the figure \$7,200, without prior approval of the Minister. Now Cabinet can delegate to a Minister. This is a specific delegation which is given in the terms of the legislation as it stands. That is the point I am making.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

On what has the hon. member risen?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I am speaking. The hon. member has completed his address, hasn't he? I thought that having spoken for over fifteen minutes he was finished.

Mr. FORDE:

I have not spoken for over fifteen minutes. It would seem like that to hon. members because unfortunately they never listen, and when they listen sometimes they do not appreciate, but that is not my fault, Sir. The point I am making, however, is this, that it is unnecessary to have this type of power, and it is no point saying that legislation is not made for all time because we know that Governments change, but why not set our standards now?

I want to go on to one other point, and that is on the other subsection. I believe that the hon. member for St. Peter again has a point. Although this section says that no pension, etc. may be granted by reference to his service except in accordance with such conditions that the Board with the approval of the Minister determine, it would seem that it is only if the pension or gratuity is being granted by reference to his service you must conform with the conditions, but if it is not by reference to his service

you may not conform with such conditions. 3.35 p.m.

Now, I believe, the drafting here is a bit faulty. What you should have done is to set out the two sections in this Act, or to make by way of Regulations, as the principle Bill has the power to make by way of Regulations, the conditions and lay them down so that they are well known. This gives a classic example of what I have said is a distinction between policy and the day-to-day running. The Minister should have the right by policy direction to lay down in the legislation, or even by direction to the Board, the general criteria governing the awards of the gratuities and pensions. What he should not have is the right to go when John Jones' pension is being considered to be able to say that he is not in the political party, forget his service and do something else.

There is a fine distinction which people do not appreciate, but it must be appreciated. The sooner it is appreciated the better it will be for this small country for the reason that we are all known to each other. If your political persuasions are known in this country we know what can happen. I am not choosing any particular Minister of doing anything, but the position is that you are exposed to the probability and likelihood of certain things happening to you. It is not necessary at Ministerial level or top level that it will happen to you, but certain people who believe that they are in their positions due to the Minister might believe they are doing the Minister a favour by using the political weapon against others. That is the danger in small countries. We must be aware of those dangers, and there is no point in saying that this is idealistic thinking. Idealism sometimes sets the standard.

There is one further point, Sir. In the United States, despite its Watergate, the point remains that the terms of employment in a lot of these public employees are more stringent than they are in this country, and the United States' Constitution permits by way of discovery the method of getting behind the Minister and finding out what he has done and upsetting it on the basis of bias. I am amazed at the protection given to public employees in the United States, because it is much more than we have. If we had that protection here some of the things that happened at C.B.C. would never have happened, because they would have gone before the Federal Communications Commission testing how you could control journalists by directions of that nature. That is the danger of our Statutory Boards.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I just rise to explain to the hon. member for Christ Church West that before the existence of the Cabinet system of the Government it was the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and this was replaced by the Cabinet. In 1955 when the Act was passed it referred to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. That power in Section 14 was passed on to the Cabinet, and by Legal Notice No. 32/1967 wherever the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" appeared in Statutory Boards or the word "Cabinet" appeared in Statutory Boards, the Minister was replaced.

With regard to this bit of legislation here, if a Legal Notice was issued in 1967 the hon. member would look and see that since 1967 there was an amendment to the effect that in any of these Statutory Acts the Minister's name appears. In the Public Health legislation the Minister's name appears, but it does not mean that the Minister does not have to go back to the Cabinet. It is a question of collective responsibility.

Mr. FORDE:

Sir, I am grateful to the hon. member for his lecture. I will save him his time. by telling him that I know of the Legal Instrument. There is also the concept of individual responsibility. The only thing the Prime Minister could do is to sack the Minister if he issued directions contrary to what Cabinet said, because he would be within his legal right. I want the Minister to say that in this particular instance when the change was made it was not regularising from the former Executive Committee form of Government to the Cabinet status of Government, but in actual fact the substantive change was to give the Cabinet the control over appointments which was not in the 1955 Act.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, now that we have got the record straight, I do not think I need say much more. People could be misled by the statements made when hon. members on the other side who knew that by Legal Notice No. 32 of 1967 the word "Minister" in any Bill replaces the Governor-in-Executive Committee or the Cabinet.

With regard to Clause 3(3), this is merely what authority was given to the Governor-in-Executive Committee by the Act. In other words, if there was not that Legal Notice No. 32 you would have had in this amendment the Governor-in-Executive Committee or the Cabinet, but because of the issuance of the Legal Notice you now have the term "Minister". (Asides.) The Board makes the appointments; it makes its recommendations for the ratification of the Minister who does not...

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister obviously has not read the Bill, because he says that the Board makes the appointments. The Board cannot make the appointments, because (b) says that no appointment whether temporary or permanent may be made to any post without the prior approval of the Minister. The Board can only make a recommendation to the Minister.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Board makes the appointment with the prior approval of the Minister, and this was the provision which was in the 1955 Act made by the Labour Party.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir. The Minister reads law but does not understand it. The only approval that was required under the 1955 Act was in relation to remuneration and salary as well as allowances. The Minister should read the Act and see the position.

Mr. FORDE:

Sir, we are not going to argue about interpretation and so on. The position is that in 1955 the only thing that the Governor-in-Executive Committee could legally do under that legislation was to lay down the level of salary. It could not appoint a particular man under any circumstances. It lays down that Post A would be allotted \$600 per month and it would be non-pensionable. That is all it could do.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister does not appoint. The Board appoints with the prior approval of the Minister, and that is all I want to say.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir. The Ministry must not bandy words. It is quite clear that if the Minister says that a man cannot be appointed the Board cannot appoint him, and that is what we are complaining about.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows: 3.45 p.m.

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON and Mrs. EASTMOND - 11.

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. FORDE; Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN - 6.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. SPRINGER; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. LOWE -12

NOES:

Mr. ADAMS; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. FORDE; Mr. HINDS; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. MOTTLEY - 6.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was passed.

THE PESTICIDES CONTROL ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, Order No. 5 is the next Order of the Day and stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 5 is the instant Order of the Day and is to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the control of the importation, sale, storage and use of pesticides.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, ever since 1969 there has been great concern over the use of pesticides in the area and action was initiated by the British Government on the increased use of pesticides in the Commonwealth Caribbean area. Late in that year a memorandum was written to Governments in the area and the British Government suggested the establishment of a pesticides unit at the University of the West Indies at St. Augustine. The British Government went further and sent to the area the Director of the Pesticides Control Unit in the United Kingdom, Dr. Feuell, who was to advise the Governments in the area in collaboration with Dr. Gibbs on the question of the implementation of a common type of legislation for the area. These gentlemen looked at the area, drafted memoranda and suggested legislation partly along the line of legislation which had already been in existence in Jamaica and in Antigua.

We are all aware of the facts that the overuse of pesticides can be dangerous. There are some pesticides with high toxicity; there are pesticides which if over-used can be very risky to the persons who are actually using the pesticides and to the food crops for which the pesticides are applied. Barbados has to pay more serious consideration to the over-use of pesticides because of the fact that we have got to depend on underground water for our drinking supply. We are very concerned over the use of certain pesticides. For example in one enterprise in this country it was discovered that 40% of the cost of production two years ago - and I refer to Farmer Bim - was spent in weedicides and pesticides. Spraying was done every week. What was more dangerous about this exercise was that the pesticides which were used were some of the most toxic pesticides. There are two types. You get the contact pesticide and you get the stomach pesticide. Now the stomach pesticide is less dangerous to the human being than the contact pesticide, and because of the fact that contact pesticide gets rid of the pests more quickly than the stomach pesticide, this is the one most liked by farmers in the area, but is the most dangerous to human health whether it is to the people dealing with it, whether as a result of the residue of the pesticides remaining in the food crop, or whether as a result of over-use of pesticide over the years passing through the coral and reaching the underground supply of water. 3.55 p.m.

It is most dangerous to human health, whether it is to the people dealing with it, whether it is as a result of the residue of the pesticide remaining in food crops or whether it is as a result of the over-use of pesticides over the years passing through the coral and reaching the underground supply. I do not think I have to convince hon. members here that there is need for the type of legislation which I am now

introducing in this Chamber. It compares favourably with the legislation which is already enacted in Antigua, it compares favourably with the Jamaica legislation, and I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that it is the type of legislation which is recommended for the Commonwealth Caribbean area as a whole. Before the functioning of the pesticide unit of St. Augustine which is operated by the Regional Research Council, the advisers have been sent to the area to advise Governments on what form the legislation should take. Here in Barbados we did not only depend on the advice of those technicians who were sent to us, Dr. Feuall and Dr. Gibbs, we have established a local committee comprising representatives from the Ministries of Agriculture, Health, Finance and Communications, and also representatives from the British Development Division, the Barbados Agricultural Society, the Sugar Producers' Association and the University of the West Indies. This committee was chaired by the Deputy Chief I Agricultural Officer responsible for research. They looked at the Jamaica and the Antigua legislation and they have come up with recommendations based on these two types of legislation. The result of the work of this committee established to examine the type of pesticides used and to advise the Government on this legislation is the Bill before us today.

Without any further ado, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, it is all well and good for the English, the Americans, the French

and whoever they may be to come into the Caribbean and talk about the use of insecticides, weedicides and all those other things. No one can deny that extensive use of chemicals can be dangerous to human health, but there is an underlying problem which I have constantly said nobody is looking at. I am going to be the first to say this, until the Government of Barbados tells the expatriates to stay where they are and mind their own business, stop telling us what to do down here, all this legislation is going to do us no good. We are going to find ourselves in the position of the United States of America where one day you will hear that if you drink something it will give you a bad heart and the next day they will say they have tested it and it is something else, or on the other hand they will tell you that if you eat something else it will give you cancer. I have not yet heard the Minister say that the two doctors who gave this advice told us or the other countries in the Caribbean what assistance the British Government or any other Government is going to give the University of the West Indies to help them to carry out specific research into the specific problems we have with all the weeds and pests we have in the fields.

We have a problem here where every Bridgetown merchant is peddling a British pesticide or weedicide, or an American one, and day after day you get salesmen running you down trying to persuade you that their product is the best one to use. I have not yet seen the University of the West Indies or anywhere else recommend a specific chemical to cure our problems in the West Indies. We are all living on what the British have developed to suit British conditions, and this is the reason why you have to pour on gallons and still not get results. I have seen experts in the United States, and I go so far as to say that I have asked one man at the New York State University what we can do with our rice grass problem and he said they did not carry out experiments in these things and that we would have to do that kind of research here ourselves.

It surprised me a few months ago to see two people from the University of the West Indies on television talking about producing distilled water by a new method, but distilled water is used in batteries and you need the food to keep you going. We have a problem with growing carrots and nut grass, and I have not heard the University of the West Indies with any solution as to how to destroy the nut grass, but I hear you must not use kerosene oil, and we are caught in two positions now. I do not mind what the Minister says about me, I think at this time in our history we should try to grow as much food as possible. I think we have been following the line too long of letting the Americans and the English come down here and tell us what to do, and this the problem throughout the Caribbean. The expatriates live in a country where they carry out experiments with their grasses, insects and pests and they come down here and tell us how to legislate to suit their chemicals, and the Government should tell them to stop showing us how to legislate and show us how to grow food. You have these expatriates in the Ministry of Agriculture too. 4.05 p.m.

You bring in expatriates and they want to cover you down with all the legislation they know of from outside, but they have not yet given you the remedy to the problems with which we are faced. It is going to be a serious matter how you apply the legislation over these Boards. Are you going to tell a farmer that he must not do so and so? This is going to be a serious problem. It is no use passing legislation without some alternative, and I think that the Government should be very careful in dealing with this matter. I am not one of those who will do certain things because an expatriate comes here and says that I must do it.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I only want to take up very slightly the point made by the last hon. member. Ever since the publication of the book *Silent Spring*, many persons have looked around for a reason to assign blame for the decline of faunal life, especially birds, over much of the North American prairies and areas where agricultural development has occurred on a large scale, and they think they found in pesticides much of the reason for this decline. For the same reason which the hon. member, who has just sat down, has urged on the House, I would also urge the Minister to look more closely at his expert advice. The D.D.T's and the other pesticides that caused damage to faunal life, that killed the birds that occasioned the *Silent Spring* and had run off into the sea to get into the livers of fish where they survive and can be

found for many generations afterwards, since bigger fish eat smaller fish and so on. These are pesticides that occasion problems that are not the problems of Barbados.

Now, I am not saying that we do not need pesticide control of some sort. I must confess that for a long time I have been concerned about the effect of possible pollution of the water supply by filtration, and I have spoken in the House during the last session on this same point. I would hope that the Government do not think that they have dealt with the water supply pollution problem totally by the passage of this Bill. I do not believe that the pesticides, in any case in Barbados, have been responsible for any large-scale reduction in bird life. There is no doubt that much of the fauna of Barbados which used to live in the country districts is being driven to Bridgetown. You see mongoose and monkeys living more in St. Michael and Christ Church now than they can live in the country. You do not see blackbirds congregating in the Plantation Yards since the Plantations do not keep the amount of cows and horses that they used to. You will now have to look in populated areas to see blackbirds. I would not like the Minister of Agriculture to think that the reason why you do not find so many birds in the country is due to the sprayings that have been going on. Equally I do not believe that in Barbados you have a problem of run-off of surface water poisoning the in-shore fish. If the Minister of Home Affairs were present, perhaps, he could give us the benefit of his expert advice. I do not believe that there is a sufficient run-off of surface water to carry pesticides into the sea around Barbados in any event, but I am no expert on that.

Where the water supply is concerned, the real danger comes from chemicals used in households: detergents and so on. There was a circular recently on pollution in parts of Long Island in the State of New York where much of the water is obtained from the relatively shallowly-placed underground lakes. This survey showed that a good number of the chemicals used in ordinary household detergents were making their way into the underground water supply, and indeed a ban was put on throughout Nassau County and other Counties of New York on the sale of certain detergents because they could not breakdown before they reached the water supply of the people, and they are not allowed to be sold in the whole eastern part of Long Island. I think that this is something at which the Government should look. Sir, the Ministry of Agriculture should do its best to persuade other Departments of Government that the pollution problem cannot be solved merely by imposing control of pesticides.

Now, there is another point with which I would be glad if the Minister would deal. It is part of the ordinary law that no man can carry on anything on his land that is a nuisance to his neighbours, but it would seem that many peasants and residents in the country side are unaware of the fact that they can seek legal redress when a neighbour or perhaps a large plantation so sprays the crops that a drift of the herbicide or the pesticide goes on their land. Letters have appeared in the newspapers from time to time in which people have asked the Government to do something to stop a plantation spraying crops. Well, I am a lawyer and I know better than anybody else that it is not always easy to persuade people that they have a legal remedy, and it is not everybody who cares to go and invest the money necessary to seek a remedy at law.

I would suggest that at the same time as the Ministry of Agriculture is giving people advice on how to go their crops, it should also be giving them advice on how to spray their crops and warn them that they can incur serious, legal penalties. It should not be thought that these cases never come before the court. I have certainly seen them taking place by so spraying pesticides and herbicides as to cause damage to their neighbour's crops or even private gardens. This is something which I cannot recall seeing in the Act during the cursory study as I made of it, and I very much hope that the Minister, if he has not adverted his mind to this problem, will take a note of it to be dealt with at some stage during the future.

I am sure that the hon. member for St. Joseph as well as I and other hon. members who are interested in these matters, would be very glad to hear if Regulations are already in draft in order to get some indication as to the scope of the Regulations which will be made under the Act. Upon reading the Act, it is obvious that its main bite will come in due course when the Regulations are made. I would like to join once again with the plea of my colleague in saying that it is not enough just to put down draft legislation just to pass the same law with a comma altered or a word taken out to make it a little tighter as law, but not to give proper and full consideration to the practical problems which will arise as a result of the Act.

Sir, when the Minister replies, I have every expectation that he will tell us that he very early expects to lay the Regulations. We know that this Minister is always ready to reassure the House with a promise of early action, but we would like a date from him when he anticipates that the Regulations will be ready. What is the point of passing the Act unless you are prepared to give it teeth at the earliest possible stage?

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I have read this Act very quickly, and I cannot find anywhere in this Act where there is any obligation on the Minister to lay these Regulations on the Table of the House and the Regulations to be subject to either negative or, if you like, affirmation, if you like, or confirmation. He is being given by the Act authority to create offences in the legislation and, no doubt, the legislation may well affect the freedom of the subject.

I believe that, in this instance if we are delegating in this type of Clause that Parliament should have some say over the legislation as far as it goes and the manner in which it can affect the average citizen, then the matter should be given serious consideration. 4.15 p.m.

I am not doubting that the legislation will be in the interest of the country as a whole, but I think it is

only fair that there should be some provision where that legislation, before it comes into being, and have the force of law, should be subjected to the scrutiny of Parliament, if it is only subjected to that scrutiny by way of negative Resolution because in this Act there are provisions that, if I may say so, bother me considerably in the manner in which they affect individual freedom and liberty. I refer in particular, Mr. Speaker, to the casual way in which samples are treated in section 8. For instance although Section 8(2) lays on the inspector an obligation to deliver one part of the sample to the owner, he only does it if the owner so requests.

Now under the Food and Drug legislation, I believe we have seen this type of provision, but not exactly in this wording, and I would have thought that this is the sort of legislation which should make it obligatory on the inspector to deliver one part of any sample to the owner himself. In sub-section 4 again the owner is allowed to object to the procedure whereby no sample is taken, but nowhere in this section is there any provision saying how he should object, whether he should be given any reasonable time in which to object, or if there is an obligation on the inspector to draw to his attention in these circumstances that he can object, and although I know that everyone is presumed to know the law, yet it is an undoubted fact that in the heat of the moment when a person is being possibly charged for an offence, that person is at the advantage or disadvantage of not knowing his rights completely. It seems to me that although the powers are necessary to give to an inspector if the control must be properly exercised, I think we should also have proper protection in this legislation for the people whose fundamental rights are being entrenched. For instance you will see in another section that the inspector may enter a household and to various things provided he gives 24 hours' notice to the occupier of the House, but the occupier can be liable in such circumstances for assaulting him in the execution of his duty. One would hope that the conditions of his entry would be better specified.

Mr. Speaker, I am really afraid of general legislation of this nature which seems to be haphazard in some respects. Perhaps the Minister might consider that by sending this legislation to a Select Committee he may be better off in getting his draft improved, certainly in putting in some protection by way of laying the legislation on the Table of this House, and secondly by improving those areas I have spoken of.

I do not particularly want to go into the principle of the Bill. All I would say is that in my experience what I have discovered is that for several years now we have been getting problems in this country from this use and sometimes misuse of insecticides and weedicides and also of detergents, and there is need for adequate control. Indeed I believe that in the survey carried out for the Ministry of Home Affairs on land development policy, one of the strong recommendations made was that specific legislation should be brought down, and I believe that this has not yet been laid on the Table of the House. It has been stuffed away in the Ministry of Home Affairs for some time, but I am glad to see that the Ministry of Agriculture is looking after its side of the matter.

I would appeal to the Minister however to send this Bill to Select Committee to take the points which have been raised, assuming that he agrees with me that there is nothing in the legislation, I cannot find it and maybe today I am shortsighted, which provides for the necessity that the regulations should be laid on the Table of the House. The Act must so provide otherwise there is no legal obligation to lay them on the Table, and I believe that this type of legislation where the Minister can create offences by way of legislation should be introduced in this House. We have long since passed the Henry the Eighth Clause. Henry the Eighth was a gentleman who arrogated to himself the system as you very well know of not only having eight wives, but also of passing the laws he wanted and having the legislation he wanted, and this clause is called the Henry the Eighth type of legislation where Parliament is shut out from having a look in at substantive offences which affect the citizen. I do not know which aspect of Henry the Eighth's character the hon. member would like to adopt, but I should hope that it would not be this aspect of it that he would adopt.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems facing mankind today is brought by pollution and pollution comes in many ways. One of the ways in which it comes to us is by the use of chemicals which are being used in agriculture or in the household. One has to bear in mind that here in the West Indies we are not yet financially or otherwise able to carry out that amount of research which is necessary for ordinary developments, and due to this lack, we have to depend very heavily on what obtains in many other countries. For example, in medicine we depend upon the results of research done in other countries and then we use and apply these results to cure our people, and if you were to sit back and depend upon research in the West Indies being developed and being in a position to produce cures for the illnesses that beset the people of the West Indies, then I think by the time we had got around to producing these results and these substances, more than half the people of the West Indies may be dead. Therefore to me it does not seem to be a valid argument to put forward that we cannot apply what has been done in Britain or some other country when it comes to the question of pesticides or detergents.

I have to point out that there are many ways of classifying pesticides. One may classify them on the basis of their chemical composition or one may classify them in the manner in which they are applied, or one may classify them in the manner in which the action of the pesticide is brought about, but many of the pesticides today are being used to affect certain enzyme systems either within the animal or within the plant, and these enzyme systems usually are the same in certain order of plant or animal. For example to take the human being, certain anti-biotics are produced because they affect certain enzyme systems in the bacteria and these bacteria have these enzyme systems whether they are inhabiting the Barbadian or the Englishman, and therefore if it has been shown that they affect the enzyme systems when applied in the Englishman, it is reasonable to conclude that when applied in Barbadians they would affect the same enzyme systems. I believe this is the rationale on which people produce pesticides and other detergents in one country and then seek to distribute them throughout the world, because the principle on which they operate is held to be the same not only in Britain or Europe, but throughout other parts of the world.

When one thinks in terms of the pesticides one has to bear in mind that they are very strong agents nowadays. One can think in terms of the chlorinated hydro-carbon of which DDT is the best example, or in terms of the organic phosphates which are far more effective and far more deadly. It is interesting to point out that the organic phosphates were developed by the Germans during World War II, but fortunately the Germans did not get the opportunity to use these organic phosphates. They act by way of paralysing the transmission mechanism between the nerve and your muscular junction and as a result they paralyse the individual. They have a curare-like action and they act by contact or they may act by inhalation, and they are very powerful.

Now, the interesting thing about many of these organic phosphates is that it takes a very long time before they are broken down or deteriorate, and this is one of the problems posed by pesticides 4.25 p.m.

The interesting thing about many of these organic phosphates is that it takes a very long time before they are broken down, in other words, before they deteriorate, and this is one of the problems posed by pesticides. One has to be concerned in Barbados about the use of pesticides, and I think the Minister of Agriculture in presenting this Bill to this House is concerned about the use of pesticides in Barbados, because the way in which they have been used in the past has given no protection to anyone, neither the user nor the people affected by the drift of these sprays, and as a practitioner in Barbados in the past I have been a bit annoyed to see the type of dermatitis, the type of skin conditions which the poor people of this country have developed as a result of being unduly exposed to pesticides, and they have not been able to get adequate attention one way or the other. I have to point out, much to my regret, that at the moment there is no system of industrial medical service in the country, but given time and with the co-operation of my colleagues, I hope to remedy this in the very near future.

One has to be aware of the fact that many substances, not only pesticides, are being introduced into Barbados and nobody- the manufacturer, the importer, the agent-nobody sets about to warn the public of the dangers nor to protect them from these dangers which some of these chemicals carry, and pesticides are one such group of chemicals which can carry very grave dangers to the users. Another group which I could at this stage point out, for example, is the biological detergents which are being advertised left, right and centre on the radio, on television and in the Press and everybody seems to be taking to them because they work very nicely, but the biological detergents can produce very severe dermatitis which can tax the dermatologist to his extreme limit to cure, and some people prove incurable over many, many years. While we may very well get carried away by this type of advertisement we are not warned of the inherent dangers posed by some of these things.

When you look at the question of these pesticides it may be well to point out that they can kill the

animal for which they have been prepared, but many of the side effects of the pesticides may not be told to the user. It reminds me of some of the insurance contracts where you are told how wonderful the benefits are which you get from them but some of the fine print is not read or explained to you and very often you find yourself later on with dire problems. While people may talk about non-toxicity and the speed with which it kills, the pleasant smell and all that type of thing, there are other side effects and one of the side effects I would like to point out about the use of pesticides is the defoliatory action on trees and other plants. When pesticides are sprayed they may drift with the wind and affect nearby trees, and days later the leaves of the trees turn brown or yellow and eventually drop off. This is a defoliatory action, it may not be as strong as the other agents which are used for defoliation but they can have side effects such as that.

A very important effect which one has to bear in mind is the over-use of pesticides on any area of land, especially in a zone one area. You can find later on that these pesticides by infiltration get to the underground water, and when they get into the water they remain for a very long time before they become neutralised or detoxified, and worse still, in the process of degradation they may produce even more dangerous substances. Nowadays, especially in North America, we have to be concerned about the occurrence of methyl mercuride in the water, which is a degradating product of some of the chemicals being used in certain industries, and in the waste from these factories going into the Great Lakes and the different rivers in the United States and Canada, and one of the degradating products which has shown to be methyl mercuride which will kill fish and other living things in the water. Not only in the water, but sometimes even in passing one may be able to point out that you may get fish feeding in certain areas where you get a lot of waste material and then these chemicals accumulate within the flesh of the fish and when human beings eat the fish they get toxic reactions. We have to bear this in mind with regard to our water.

The continual excessive use of pesticides in Barbados, especially in zone one areas, where they will infiltrate the water can lead to the accumulation of these pesticides or the degradation process of pesticides to such a level as would cause toxic reaction within the human being, and therefore it is reasonable to expect that any responsible Minister should seek to regulate the importation, use and distribution of pesticides within this country. There are many other arguments one may advance about what we should be doing in Barbados which I do not disagree with, but when we look at the expertise, the financial resources and many other things that are available in Barbados we have to admit that for a very long time we are going to have to depend upon research, whether industrial, medical or otherwise, occurring in other countries to be applied in Barbados and help to develop this country. It may be a very long time before the University of the West Indies may be able to give the answers to all the problems of the West Indies. I share the view that this should be the primary objective for the University, but at the same time being aware of the severe quandaries under which the University of the West Indies is now operating I see that it will be a very long time before the university can effectively provide the answers to all the problems confronting the various people of the West Indies.

I would like to stress that in introducing this Bill I feel the Minister of Agriculture has realised his responsibility to the people of Barbados and has sought to put it as it should be. I am not for one moment saying that this is going to solve all the problems, because we know in Barbados as well as in other countries you pass laws but this does not automatically remove the defect. It takes a lot more than the mere passage of a law in Parliament to remove the defect which the law sets out to eradicate, and it will call for the assiduous application of this law and the regulations which will accompany it to contain the problems which are likely to arise by the indiscriminate use of pesticides.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to the statements made by the hon. members. I must thank my colleague on my right for such an able lecture which he has given to the members on the other side. I must say that we all enjoyed it and it was very enlightening.

Mr. FORDE rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

On what did the hon. member rise?

Mr. FORDE:

Just on a point of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What are you explaining, something arising out of your speech?

Mr. FORDE:

I was just explaining that the lecture was for everybody, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of explanation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I said we all enjoyed it because it was very enlightening. I am amazed at hearing the utterances of the shadow Minister for Agriculture, the hon. member for St. Joseph, who talked about expatriates coming into the area to advise us. Let the hon. member be advised that the expatriates are people who are qualified. Dr. Feuell was the head of the Pesticide Division of the Tropical Products Institute in the United Kingdom. To tell us that this particular gentleman was not competent to advise us on the question of pesticides is to tell the hon. member for St. Joseph that he should not have gone to the United Kingdom to read law. 4.35 p.m.

Dr. Feuell is an expert on Tropical Pesticides, and he is the head of the Division of Tropical Products Institute of the United Kingdom. Dr. Gibbs is the head of the Pesticides Unit of the University of the West Indies. What are you talking about expatriates coming to advise us? They were people who knew about what they were talking and they knew what their jobs were. If we could have found Barbadians who were competent to advise us on the establishment or the implementation of this legislation, we would have asked them to do it. If the hon. member could have advised us on it, we would have asked him. The point is that we have asked people who were competent to advise us and they have done so. Let us thank them for the advice they have given us. Our Committee is established; the Board is to be established and from there on the Board takes over. They advised us on the legislation.

I want to counsel the hon. member that the mere fact that salesmen are going around the country pushing the sale of herbicide or weedicide is what occasioned the introduction of this legislation. We, in agriculture, are not satisfied that all of the products which are pushed upon us are used in the best interest of Barbados and of the region. I also want to advise the hon. member that Farmer Bim closed because they did not take the advice of the Ministry of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, if you are dealing in food crops, because of the type of soil we have in Barbados especially in the St. Philip area, it will be necessary to alternate the crops. The hon. member knows the St. Philip area very well. In that area you have a nut grass problem as well as a rice grass problem. In order to minimise the problem of nut grass and rice grass, you must have a cover crop. No producer of food crops in this country could expect to keep land year after year in vegetables without having a cover crop.

Now, nut grass has just been worldwide acclaimed as the worst grass the world has ever seen. It is equivalent to cancer, and there has not yet been any cure found for nut grass in the West Indies or in any other part of the world. There are certain chemicals that will dry the top of the nut grass when it is sprayed on it and they do not kill the nut. If the nut grass is exposed to sunlight it thrives better; therefore, what has been aggravating the control of nut grass in this country is the burning of sugar cane. Where there is mulch on the land the sunlight is limited and, therefore, the nut grass does not thrive as well as if it were exposed. In areas where we are doing food-crop development in agriculture, we must every two years carry a cover crop. The mistake that Farmer Bim made is that they did not accept the advice of the Ministry of Agriculture. We advised them that they should not keep the food crops in the land year after year and that they should carry a cover crop. They should have planted a portion of the

land in food crops and another portion in cover crops and alternate the crops from time to time. If that had been done Farmer Bim would still have been operating in this Island. If people fail to accept expert advice given to them, then I do not see how anyone can blame the Government,

Mr. Speaker, the Government employed the people to give advice to the farmers. If a particular farmer feels that he is too qualified to accept the advice of the Ministry of Agriculture, then he will pay for it. We have in the Ministry Entomologists who advise us on chemical control and biological control. We have been carrying out a series of trials and experiments, and we are still carrying them out on the various pests and weeds. We have found that certain chemicals are suitable for the weeds which we have in the country and other chemicals are adequate to destroy most of the pests which we have in the country. We have been able to bring the moth borer under control because of the fact that we have been well equipped in the biological section and the entomological section of the Ministry. Entomology is divided into three sections in the Ministry: Plant Pathology, Chemical control and Biological control. We have officers who do a yeoman service to this country in that Department. They do the tests, and after we have applied the chemicals and bred parasites we then introduce biological control.

I would like to invite the hon. member for St. Joseph to come and see what is happening in the Ministry of Agriculture. When he sees what is taking place there, he will not come here uniformed to make sweeping statements which are not accurate. We have been fairly successful with the rice grass problem. I can confess that we have not been as successful with the nut grass problem as we should have been because no part of the world has been successful in dealing with it. Now carrots are susceptible to the residual effects of certain chemicals. For example you can taste kerosene in your carrots more readily than in other root crops, and we are giving consideration to this matter. We have been advising the farmers what to do. The whole idea behind this is to advise the farmer when he should apply his chemical control, how much he should apply, when he should stop, and how soon after the application of the chemical control is the food good for human consumption. This is the rationale behind the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why there should be a long debate on this matter with hon. members making sweeping statements. If you look at this legislation you will find that it is one of the most advanced pieces of legislation that has ever been passed in relation to agriculture in this country. The hon. member speaks about passing legislation for legislation's sake. If I did not think this was important, then I would not have brought it in here.

I would now like to reply to the hon. member for St. Thomas. 4.45 p.m.

On the question of spraying, we in the Ministry are concerned, and we are concerned about spray drift.

People are complaining about their tomatoes, pawpaws, carrots and beans suffering as a result of spray drift. Two years ago this complaint came to the Ministry and immediately I took positive action. I called a meeting of the Agricultural Society and of the Sugar Producers' Association and we went and visited certain areas in the country where there was evidence of spray drift, and we traced it to the fact that the wrong type of spraying apparatus was being used. We came back and gave farmers in the country incentives, and even in this year's Capital Estimates we have provision under the incentives scheme for farmers, and we do not allow them to purchase under the incentives scheme the type of spraying equipment which will lend itself to spray drift. It is true that there are some plantations which still have that type of equipment which we have been trying to dissuade them from using, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been having fairly good cooperation. I know it is hard to tell a farmer who has just spent \$2,000 on a piece of equipment not to use it because it is not in the interest of the agricultural development of the country, and it is equally hard for him to stop using it, but I must say that we have been having fairly good cooperation and the incident of spray drift in this country is not as great as it has been before.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make an exposure now. Spray drift is not the dangerous thing in this country. It has just been proven that the smoke from sugar cane burning coupled with the salt air has been producing a sort of sulphur which has been destroying the onion crops in this country, resulting in what is known as blast in the onions. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the sulphurous chemicals are dangerous to other food crops, and that is why I stand so firmly on the question of burning sugar canes, and I serve warning and notice now.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is that to do with pesticides?

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, is the Hon. Minister condemning his own Government for allowing the sugar industry to burn canes for three years?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, you do something and you see it is a mistake; so the hon. member should be congratulating me in doing something to correct the mistake which was made. What I am saying is that these are serious problems. You brought in the mangoose to get rid of the rat and they turned around and

ate chickens.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let us come back to pesticides.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that you have tried one thing to enable yourself to achieve something else and you find that it does not work; so the argument introduced by the hon. member does not bear any weight.

I think the Minister of Health has answered the question about detergents and so on, but I want the hon. member for Christ Church West to note that Clause 3 of the Bill fully sets out what are going to be the contents of the Regulations. If the hon. member would look at Clause 3 he would see that the Minister has a right to make regulations which contain about five pages of the various aspects of carrying out the provisions of the Act. This is not the only Bill which has been brought to this Chamber where the Regulations do not have to come to the House, and this is one of the few Bills which sets out so fully in detail what provisions will be made in the regulations, and therefore I hope that the hon. member will read the Official Gazette when the regulations are made.

I have no intention of agreeing to send this Bill to Select Committee. If the hon. member wants to vote against it, if he is against something for the good of the country, let him vote against it. I am satisfied that this Bill makes provision for what we want in this country and I promise them the regulations as soon as humanly possible.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed. Clause 3 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to Parliament being apprised of the regulations, and I am prepared to accept an amendment.

Mr. FORDE:

If the Hon. Minister would give way.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I understand that the hon. member wants to make an amendment, and, as I stated, I would be willing to accept such an amendment.

I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:

The amendment I would like to propose is similar to that contained in section 10 of the Health Services Act, 1969-38 after the word "may" to insert in line 1 a comma and the words "subject to negative resolution".

I beg to move that Clause 3 be amended in that way.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that, and in seconding it I would hope that the Ministry of Agriculture really would now get down to what I call serious application of the rules. The problem as I have said recently is that there are too many pesticides, weedicides, etc., being sold in Barbados and there is not in my opinion sufficient data available to the farmer who would want to use these weedicides or pesticides. 4.55 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, after consulting with my colleagues.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

He does not understand what is going on, so you have to shout about this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Who does not understand what is going on, the Chairman?

Mr. BOLDEN:

With all due respect to you, Sir, I am surprised that you would think I would say such a thing to you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The only person you should be addressing is the person in the Chair.

Mr. BOLDEN:

That was a loud aside, I would never say that to you, Sir. I move that the amendment stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is perfectly in order and I think the Government should accept it. All it is saying is that you are giving the Minister power to make regulations which affect the liberty and the operation of private property which is protected by the Constitution and the people's representatives should be able to review the subsidiary legislation following. We will accept the amendment which is in keeping with good parliamentary and democratic practices.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the Minister really put the Act into operation, because I think there are too many pesticides and weedicides in use in Barbados. I would like to see the Ministry adopt a policy or the regulations which are made now, made in such a way that before any importer or salesman can go around and sell pesticides or weedicides they must first be submitted to the Ministry which would carry out certain tests and then give a certificate stating that they can be used in a specific manner and in

specific quantities. In this way I believe you will be able to control the various weedicides and pesticides which are being used in this country, and I would hope that this would make for better understanding between the farmer, the Ministry of Agriculture, the importers and the salesmen of the various chemicals which have to be used in agriculture today.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, there is nobody in this country who is more concerned about the indiscriminate use of pesticides than I am and the mere fact that I accepted the amendment suggested by the hon. member is because I am anxious to get the legislation on the Statute Book, and I promise the hon. member that as soon as perhaps the Acting Attorney General can let me get the regulations the Act will be proclaimed.

The question that the words to be inserted stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that Clause 3 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 8 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest a few amendments to this clause but I will only proceed with one. Clause 8(5) reads "A document purporting to be a certificate by an approved analyst as to the result

of an analysis of a sample, shall, in proceedings under this Act, be admissable....." I would like to insert the words "prima facie" here. The reason is that although under subsection (6) an informant must produce certain things, under subsection (7) you can ask the analyst to come and give further information. If there is no challenge under subsection (6) it is prima facie evidence of the matters stated therein, there is no rebutting evidence and automatically it is satisfactory evidence, but I think we should clarify it to make certain that it is only as prima facie evidence, which is subject to be rebutted, of the matters stated therein.

The other thing is, perhaps the hon. member for St. Michael South will take the point, but it looks to me as if "admissable" here should be spelt with an "i" and not an "a". I believe it is a typographical error in the draft.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to accept that amendment at this stage. I beg to move that clause 8 stand part, subject to the correction of the typographical error.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 9 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule to the Bill was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Sechedule to the Bill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 5.05 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill, as amended, do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

SOIL CONSERVATION (SCOTLAND DISTRICT) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1973

Hon. C. E TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I propose dealing with the Item standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Soil Conservation (Scotland) District) Act, 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Item standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is now the Order of the Day.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very short amendment, and it calls for little or no debate. The position is that the Chief Agricultural Officer has been a member of some 20 odd Boards, and we have found that the sort of advice that we expect to get from him in the Ministry we were not getting because of the time he has to spend on these Boards. We have decided that the Chief Agricultural Officer, who is the Chief Technical Adviser to the Minister, should take his place in the Ministry and not on Boards.

Now, the Soil Conservation Act is one of those Acts which specifically stated that the Chief Agricultural Officer would be the Chairman of the Board. This short Bill is to amend this Act in order to relieve the Chief Agricultural Officer of the onerous task of going to Board meetings so that he may be able to spend more time in advising us directly and co-ordinating the work of the Ministry.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed strange to hear, after eleven or twelve years in office, Government is now saying that the Chief Agricultural Officer is not supplying the Government with the information which he should supply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not say so. I like to play the game straight.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order; that is a point of elucidation.

Mr. BOLDEN:

It is said that he is too busy sitting on Boards, and they are going to change that to allow him to remain in the Ministry to give more advice to the Government. I wonder whether this is the reason why the Government has persisted with the burning of sugar cane. Was it done because the Chief Agricultural Officer was not in the Ministry to advise the Government that it was wrong? If you are going to put him in the Ministry and he is going to say that you cannot burn sugar cane in Barbados any more, and that when you burn sugar cane, particularly in the St. Andrew area, that you bake the top soil to pottery, then I hope that this Bill goes through as fast as possible.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, when I first read this Bill, I thought that all was not well in the Ministry and that the disagreement between the Chief Agricultural Officer and the Minister was such that he was relieving him of certain of his responsibilities so that he could have him around for the exercises in mutual torment which rumour has it has been so marked a feature of the Ministry of Agriculture for some time. I hope that I will be permitted a little indulgence just to say something about soil conservation in the constituency of which the Minister is the representative, not so much from the agricultural point of view but from the environmental point of view.

Now, the Soil Conservation Scheme was started by the Barbados Labour Party in order to rehabilitate one-seventh of the land area of this Island, and with very many fewer resources a large and very promising programme of flood control, soil preservation and general environmental - although that was not the word used at that time - improvement was instituted. It is our view that, particularly from the social and environmental point of view, this Government has been marking time in a dangerous way in the parishes of St. Andrew, St. Thomas and St. Joseph. I believe even a portion of St. John might need it, but I am not sure of the exact boundaries as to what is statutorily defined as the Scotland District, and we are not getting the results that we should expect from a programme which has been in action for 14 years. If you go through St. Andrew it is still an agriculturally depressed area. Belleplaine has never developed to the extent that the planners of 1958 and 1959 and 1960 envisaged. After all Belleplaine is a place with a secondary school, Court Room, Police Station, many roads, a flat area and ample water. At different times we have been promised industrial development for Belleplaine. We have been promised residential development for Belleplaine, but none of this has seriously materialised. I do not even believe that Belleplaine is the biggest district in St. Andrew. I believe that Hillaby is; I believe that there are more dwelling houses in Hillaby. There are 360 dwelling houses in Hillaby and 312 in Belleplaine. (Asides.) If the Minister does not know his own constituency, then I know it and he needs not shake his

head at me. Hillaby is, as far as I know on those figures which are the most recent figures I have ever seen published, a larger district than Belleplaine.

Now, Sir, Belleplaine is the natural centre of the area which should be affected by the Soil Conservation Scheme. The Soil Conservation Scheme should by now have turned St. Andrew into an area of vegetable gardens, fruit groves, proper drainage schemes, tourist area and into an area where persons can go for recreation. Many years ago the Government built an East Coast Road and they had to depend on Barclays Bank to give them a park and upon the National Trust to put down a few trees along it. We have depended upon the initiative of Mr. Foster to develop the north eastern portion of Boscobel with the Foster Fun Land. We have depended upon the ideas of the hon. member for St. Peter to deal with the wooded ridges which overlook the north western portion of St. Andrew. We have got nothing from the Government or from the Parliamentary representative of the area. Even from his Technical Advisers all we have got are old and worn-out ideas.

The flood control system instituted many years ago proved inadequate to deal with the floods of 1967. I am speaking of the time when Sedge Pond burst, and no subsequent damming programme was then instituted. Sir, I think this is a serious mistake. In talking to some of the Technical Advisers I have been unable to get them to even comprehend the meaning of a proper damming system. It seems that the first dams proved inadequate because the foundation of the dams were themselves not sufficiently excavated to stand up to the pressure of water that might be expected in major floods. There is an obvious answer for that and it answers two things: it answers the problems of locating the springs, and it answers the problems of flood water control at the same time. 5.15 p.m.

The depth of soil there runs down at some stage to rock. Deeper and more considerable excavation in my view might have provided an answer to particularly the Sedge Pond area and surrounding areas where water gathered in large enough masses to require containing walls. Instead the Government has aimed at spring controls, searching for springs in 30 and 40 feet of soil, and the Government very bravely says when it has found these springs out and put in the very primitive pipes which are at present installed that it has achieved some measure of flood control. Now I am suggesting that superior excavations would have permitted the rebuilding of dams. I am one who happens to think that especially in a tropical island a body of inland water is a good thing for the ecology generally. Bodies of inland water assist rainfall just as much as trees do - I believe I am correct in saying; I am not a technical man, I only hear some technical advisers saying these things. They assist rainfall, and large enough inland waters themselves provide recreational facilities and people like looking out over water especially in a place like Barbados that does not have any such bodies, and a really deep dam can provide reservoir capacities for the water that flows, and I am speaking of Sedge Pond which is close to the ridge, and becomes flood water lower down in St. Andrew, and becomes spring water on seeping out the hill-sides further away in St. Andrew.

If you control the water at the point where it seeps out of the ridge by a large enough dam with a spill-way with adequate run-off to the sea, it is my opinion that you are providing a better system of flood control than trying to catch springs from rivers that are running 40 feet underground. My view is that you must excavate 40 feet and in that way you will find the river, and find somewhere to put the soil afterwards. I am putting this forward as an amateur. I expect these ideas, to come from the technical officers of the Government and the Minister himself. These are ideas which you must put to them and I do not expect when an idea like that is put to the technical officers as I have put it and as I have heard it put that they should just reject it out of hand. This is what I would like to see the Soil Conservation Scheme doing. At the moment I believe it is doing no more than marking time between Morgan Lewis and Boscobelle. Recently we were taken on a tour by the kindness of the Minister and we saw efforts to no more than control the erosion that has taken place, and it has taken place in historical times. It has taken place with the cutting down of the trees by mankind when mankind first went to St. Andrew 200 or 250 years ago to try to plant sugar. You are shown a mahogany tree and told it is fourteen years old and it is ten or twelve feet tall, and the soil has slipped away on either side of it. You are shown crops and told that from time to time you get cherries or something bearing there; but can anybody who goes and looks at that part of the Scotland District between Morgan Lewis and Boscobelle say he is seeing other than a desert? You are seeing a little hilly, seaside desert with the soil slipping away, and the measures that are being taken are totally inadequate to rehabilitate the area.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the original planners in the Barbados Labour Party who conceived the whole conservation scheme did not think of it just as being a saving operation; they thought of it as being a rehabilitating operation; they thought of it as an area which would restore St. Andrew to the general prosperity of Barbados. St. Andrew is a parish which is losing population; it is losing population from the villages which slip away. The Minister cannot possibly deny that over the last ten years very many persons have been moved out of St. Andrew because the Government finds itself unable to provide proper conditions and proper accommodation for them within the parish.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Now come closer back to the Bill; I have given you sufficient latitude.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I don't want to cut into my time because I only have a limited time to speak, but I am speaking of villages which have been washed away because of inadequacies of the conservation scheme. St. Philip is flat and would be glad for the water. When you have a high rainfall in St. Andrew the little hill villagers have to think about evacuation. I talked about tourist facilities. The Soil Conservation Board should be seeking actively to provide tourist facilities for other Barbadians to visit St. Andrew. Forty years ago there was a road through Turners Hall Woods. That road can be repaired and in many parts of Turners Hall Wood it is in perfectly good condition, but the soil has slipped away from the bridge at the South Western end, because I think the woods run from South-West to North-East. Sir, I am a little confused;

the hon. member for St. Andrew I hope will know better than me. That bridge is perfectly easy to repair and Turners Hall Woods would be a great area for excursions for Barbadians and for the other visitors to the country in so small an island as ours as Barbadians delight in; but the Soil Conservation Board and the Ministry of Agriculture is doing nothing whatsoever to bring a positive integrated programme of rehabilitation to the whole area. All that can be done is that the Minister can come and say that soil conservation is not important enough for the Chief Agricultural Officer, so he can be taken off this Board to do other things. That is the purpose of this Bill. This Bill is an implicit abdication of the Government's responsibility that one-seventh of Barbados' land area is not a sufficiently important enough problem to warrant the constant attention of the Chief Agricultural Officer.

I know that the Chief Agricultural Officer has a high interest in sugar. I believe that the Chief Agricultural Officer is only waiting for Mr. Erskine Ward to resign to obtain his job at the Sugar Producers' Association, and I know that all the advice he is giving to the Government is in the direction of increased sugar production and increased profits for the plantations for whom he soon hopes to work; and I say this in no insulting sense to the gentleman concerned. I hope that the Minister is as aware of the considerations which I am suggesting as general rumour is. I believe it is more than rumour, but I have to doubt and question the Minister's awareness of many agricultural matters because it seems to me that the Minister comes very late to certain things. We talk in here and years after we have talked the Minister knows something. We talked of increasing fruit' production at Belleplaine and the Minister is now planting a few mango trees on what I would call a water meadow by the Belleplaine river, and, I would say this in his favour, having a lot of trouble with his advisers in trying to get his ideas through. But his ideas were not even particularly original at the time when he first put them to his advisers. The Minister has at long last come to an awareness, now that the plantations in which he is interested have obtained permission to cut up, of what we in the House have argued about - that you cannot sacrifice any more arable land in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would enjoin the hon. member to deal with the Bill before us.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am trying to deal with the Bill, but the hon. member has said in the House that he has an interest in Caribbean Estates, the same Estates that own Sandford Plantation - a matter of record. He laid a letter in the House indicating that he owed the Bank \$200,000 odd in respect of a plantation which having been arable? was being cut up into lots which apparently have now come under his lash.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I want the hon. member to come back to the subject.

Mr. ADAMS:

We must understand that I have no intention of using an offensive word when I am not saying something that is not true. And there is no good the Minister challenging me downstairs because I will bring the Cayman Islands records. Don't let the Minister think he can get away. He can put me in court any time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is being irrelevant. I am not going to sit here and listen to irrelevancies. You must take your seat. 5.25 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

The hon. member has said in the House that he has such an interest in Caribbean Estates and some estates that own Sanford Plantation, which is a matter of record. He laid a letter in the House indicating that he owed the bank approximately \$200,000 in respect of a plantation which, having been arable, was being cut up into lots which apparently have now come under his lash.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I warn the hon. member to come back to the subject.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I have withdrawn the word "speculate" but we must understand that I do not intend to use an offensive word, but I am not saying something that is not true, and there is no question of challenging me downstairs because I would bring the Cayman Island records. Do not let the Minister think he will get away, he can put me in court any time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is being irrelevant and if he continues with these irrelevancies he will have to take his seat.

Mr. ADAMS:

But, Sir, this matter of being challenged downstairs.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That matter is now at an end, whether he challenges you anywhere or you challenge him. The relevant matter before this House now is the Soil Conservation (Scotland District) (Amendment) Act, 1973.

Mr. ADAMS; Yes, Sir, the Minister has come very late to an awareness of certain things. I still stand by that statement and I will make it outside the House if he wants me to, and I will defend what I have said in here outside the House. He does not even now seem to be really aware of the necessity to do something about the Scotland District.

If there is one project in Barbados which can attract international aid it is the rehabilitation of the Scotland District. There is one thing international agencies like, and that is to be able to build dams, landscape by the square mile, especially where electricity is involved, but we cannot get electricity out of it so I am a little fanciful in saying that, but if that was in it, think of how well we could do. International aid is fundamentally directed towards this sort of problem which countries have, the preservation of the environment, the preservation of the soil, the restoration of the soil to useful purposes where the hand of man or the hand of nature is running it down. Instead of devaluing the Soil Conservation Board to this extent the Minister should be trying to make it more important to be instructing the Chief Agricultural Officer to put up a scheme to Government for the proper operation of the Soil Conservation Board and the proper rehabilitation of his own constituency, St. Andrew, instead of making jokes about the Chief Agricultural Officer being so busy that he has no time to deal with this. As far as I am concerned, this is one of the major land problems in Barbados today, it is the major land problem as a land problem. It may not be the major agricultural problem, but it is the major land problem and something must be done about it. The Board must be given more teeth, not have some teeth taken out,

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how the removal of the Chief Agricultural Officer from the Soil Conservation Board can take any teeth from the Board. The position is that this Act was passed at a time when there was no Deputy Chief, no person responsible for extension and development in the Department of Science and Agriculture as it was at the time. Today there is a Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer responsible for extension and development, under whom the soil conservation falls, and there is a Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer responsible for research. We feel that this subject properly falls under the Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer responsible for extension and development, and that the function of the Chief Agricultural Officer is to collate and correlate the work of the divisions of the Ministry and advise the Minister of Agriculture on agricultural matters, and that his place is at a desk in the Ministry of Agriculture and not at desks on Boards or on the twenty committees he was on. When he is on these various Boards and Committees what time does he have for advising the Ministry or correlating and collating the work of the Ministry ?

It is a question of getting reports from the various Divisions of the Ministry on the progress made, whether it is the research section, whether it is the entomological section, whether it is the pathological section, whether it is the extension section or whatever section it is, it is a question of his being the liaison between the work done in the Ministry and the Minister, and he has direct access to the Minister. The days are over when there was just one officer doing everything, this is a day of specialisation, and when the Food Crops Officer has made a breakthrough in onions or tomatoes it is for him to advise me or whoever is Minister on what action is to be taken, so his position is at a desk in the Ministry and not out at Board meetings. You have somebody just as qualified to do the job, who specialises in the field of extension and development, quite a competent man, the Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer (Extension and Development), so I do not understand what the hon. member is trying to say.

Coming to the question of Morgan Lewis, he spoke about the condition of Morgan Lewis, but I want to tell this House that the work done by Soil Conservation in the last 10 years under this Government is the work that is standing up. The initial work of soil conservation started at Morgan Lewis and it was done in the time of the Barbados Labour Party. The hon. member is talking about digging up the soil, but they went and dug up the soil without preserving the top soil and when they were finished putting in the dam, etc. the subsoil was on top, you had an outcrop of salt and oil, therefore nothing, not even a bush, would grow. As a matter of fact, the only thing that would grow on that land was the cactus. Mr. Speaker, this is not the case with the work done by this Government.

Take Sedge Pond. Sedge Pond had its problems because of the initial work done by them, but since we have done the repair work there, we are having no trouble. I am talking about the dams.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, cannot the Minister see that the road slippage.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

What point of order is this?

Mr. ADAMS:

A point of explanation, Sir. Cannot the Minister see that the road slippage between Sedge Pond and the sea is due to the inadequate control of the springs at Sedge Pond? There is no dam to burst any more, but you are getting it with roads which slip further down.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No valid point of explanation either, that is a point of argument.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The position is that the work done by this Government at Sedge Pond has stood up. The point is that the capital work done by this Government in St. Andrew has stood up. We have done work at Sedge Pond, we have done a little work on the other side of Morgan Lewis, but the work done by the Barbados Labour Party has fallen through because it was badly done it was a question of trial and error at the time. The work done by us at Bawden is now producing more than it was producing before, because what we did was to take precautionary measures to preserve the top soil, put into the land the underground pipes, and added to this we have done away with the dam system.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of explanation, Sir, you must have a greater production if you do away with a dam.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is a very fraudulent point of explanation. 5.35 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I said on the soil. I did not say that there is greater production on Sedge Pond. I said that work was done on Bawden and that there was greater production from the land for the peasants of Bawden than they got before we did work there. Sedge Pond is now standing up. The work on Sedge Pond which was done by the Labour Party fell down and the dam is silted up. We found another method of dealing with the problem by using gabions. The hon. member knows what I am speaking is the truth because I invited him to the Soil Conservation District and I took him along. I had the courtesy to drive with him and to give him a lecture on soil conservation.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is your point of order?

Mr. ADAMS:

I had no lecture from the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Mr. ADAMS:

He gave me his views on soil conservation, and I gave him mine. He gave us a very nice talk.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is out of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, he is now trying to use the same lecture as his own. The hon. member knows that there are problems in that area. The main problem is that in order to do a comprehensive job on soil conservation in that area will cost us hundreds of millions of dollars. Seven years ago it was estimated at \$100 million (US) to do a comprehensive job on soil conservation in the Scotland District. We have had to change our approach to soil conservation in that area, and we are now doing maintenance work on the good work which we have done at Sedge Pond and other areas in St. Andrew and in the Scotland District . Secondly, we are trying to preserve the area by establishing some sort of vegetation which would tend to stabilise the soil.

The position is that the problem in the Scotland District is a question of slippage, and we have approached the problem in a different manner. Where we had serious erosion we have attended to it. There is a big difference between capital work and maintenance work. When I come to the House for \$1 million per annum to spend on soil conservation it can only do the maintenance work in the area. If the hon. member had accepted my invitation, he would have seen what was being done. The only person on the other side who accepted my invitation to visit the Soil Conservation District was the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and he saw what was going on there. The point I am making is that he saw where we were propagating trees. We were carrying out various research work in the Haggatts area. He saw that we were trying with coconut trees at Sedge Pond; he saw that we were trying to establish grass at Sedge Pond* The ultimate use to which the Scotland District will be put is to provide protein diets in the

country, that is to say, the planting of grass for the keeping of animals and the planting of trees to assist in keeping the land stable. The hon. member knows that all of these things are taking place, and it is not fair for him to say that positive action is not being taken.

Mr. Speaker, we have one of the keenest officers now in the Ministry who is responsible for soil conservation. (Asides.) I refer to Mr. Peter Webster. The hon. member knows that he is doing a good job. He has an assistant, Mr. Lucas, who is looking after plant propagation. We have just asked the Establishment to give us another officer to assist us with the work in the Scotland District. This year we are propagating over one hundred thousand fruit trees. I refer to citrus and all types of fruit trees.

During the regime of the Barbados Labour Party they were producing forestry. They were producing teak and so on. Let us produce food. The hon. member will tell you that we had an argument in the area in respect of whether we should grow teak or fruit trees. I directed, in his presence, that we wanted fruit trees grown. He knows about that. Why should we not produce in that area all of the vitamin "C" which we are so sadly lacking in the country?

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to be as truthful as I think he ought to be, he is in a position to state in this House that the work of the Soil Conservation Department is producing encouraging results. He has visited the propagation work; he has seen trees which were planted under my instructions two years ago, and we are still carrying out experiments. This year I propose to have a tree-planting week. I will encourage the people in the area and throughout the Island, with special reference to the Scotland District, to plant more fruit trees. I also propose that the cost of the fruit trees which we are going to offer to the people will be reduced to a mere pittance. We are particularly interested in getting the 4-H Clubs interested in this matter. We would like to involve co-operatives, farmers in the area and farmers outside the area because we want to carry out this programme. Only yesterday I spoke with the officer responsible for Soil Conservation when he was here, and he informed me that he would have the trees ready within a few weeks to have the tree-planting week in this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to say that the Soil Conservation Programme is not making its presence felt, when we realise that it would cost so much money to stabilise the area, we decided to put vegetation on the land in order to reduce the loss of top soil. I am sure that hon. members are satisfied with my explanation. I must thank the hon. member for his suggestions, but we have certain policies in mind for the area. It is a question of making do with what we have. It will cost too much to do certain things and the returns would be pointless. We have decided to do maintenance work and at the same time endeavour to preserve as much of the soil in the area as we possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should remember my telling an officer that he should not go up in the hills to put in avocados; therefore, he cannot say that there is no policy on soil conservation and that it is treated as a secondary arm. It is one of the most important arms, and I do not say so because Scotland is in the St. Andrew district. A part of St. Joseph, a part of St. Peter, a part of St. John, and a part of St. Thomas is in the Scotland District. I am concerned about soil conservation not only in the Scotland District, and I propose making an Order to take care of soil conservation of all the agricultural land in the Island. 5.45 p.m.

Where farmers put their furrows downhill, they should cut them across the slopes instead as the hon. member for St. Joseph will point out, and this will preserve the soil. What is happening throughout the island today? You have the burning of sugar cane and you have the land left open and the rain comes and washes all the top soil into the wells, and that is why we are not getting the yield today that we got previously. Soil conservation is foremost in my mind not only for the Scotland District, but for the entire Island, and therefore I want the hon. member to note that it is not fair to make the statement he made about soil conservation being a secondary part of the Ministry.

On the question of Hillaby, the hon. member said there are 312 houses there, but he did not say that there is Hillaby, St. Thomas and Hillaby St. Andrew.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What has this got to do with the Bill? You should reply to the points of substance relative to the Bill, if I may suggest.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned these points and it is my duty to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER:

A completely peripheral point, with great respect to the hon. member.

Mr. ADAMS:

Can I help the hon. member?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member must sit, It is entirely out of order. Let us get to the point of the Bill before us.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

There is one other point I would like to take up the hon. member on and it is the question of Turners Hall as a tourist resort. I would like to see Turners Hall as a tourist resort, and I have discussed the matter with the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks and the Soil Conservation experts. Three weeks ago I spoke with the Chief Engineer of Waterworks about the possibility of putting water in that area, and I had discussions with the Ministry of Communications and Works who advised against the construction of that road because it would be a waste of public funds. However they are considering a secondary road out of St. Simons. What we can do is to carry the road to the woods, and then you would have to walk into the woods at a certain part. As far as I am concerned, I want an extra road for my constituents out of St. Simons, and the tourists can also go to the wood; but it is not necessary to carry a road through Turners Hall because it would be too expensive to do that. It is easier to build a road for the people of St. Simons either down through King Street or across to butt out with Isolation Road. All these things have been gone through, and the hon. member tried to give the impression that I am not concerned about it.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I will have to ask for a very small amount of latitude very briefly. It relates to what the Minister was saying in his reply in respect of Turners Hall. This is one of the soil conservation areas with which the Chief Agricultural Officer will have to deal, and I wonder if the Minister can tell us exactly what policy he will be instructing the Chief Agricultural Officer to carry out, because my impression of Turners Hall Woods is that the areas of danger are the low area at the Turners Hall end where there is a water course which washed out the road and has washed it out since 1938, and the higher area at the St. Simons end where you get subsidence and where the road has been broken since I believe 1948, because you can walk from St. Simons and see the broken road. You then get on to a good road that goes through the woods and if the Minister has not travelled on it recently - I have not travelled on it for a few years, but the last time I was on it, in my opinion although a car could not get to it, if you could get a car there you could drive through the woods themselves; but it is its entrance and exit which are damaged.

I wonder if the Minister can say what is intended when he says they will build a new road through from St. Simons, because the existing road always ran from St. Simons to Turners Hall. There was always a road by which you could turn at Turners Hall Plantation, drive pass where they pumped the gas from, cross the bridge and then you had a long ascent through the wood for nearly a mile, and then you came out on top of the hill at St. Simons by, I think, King Street. So I wonder what the Minister means when he says they are going to bring in a new road from St. Simons. There was always a road there but it broke and then slipped.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

The point I was making is that it would be too costly to replace that road. The road from St. Simons is broken and has gone back into Turners Hall; then there is another break when you come from Turners Hall and there is a hard road coming from Turners Hall. The only vehicular access to Turners Hall Woods is to come down through the tenantry which has a macadamised surface, but it does not go directly down to the wood because there is a break in between that and the wood. Now it is possible that access can be made to the wood from this end, but to build a road to join up with St. Simons would be too expensive. There is not a road to join up with Turners Hall Woods from St. Simons. The whole point is that the houses that were at the corner of St. Simons had to be removed as a result of the land slide in the area. There is only a walking track. Even the pipelines were broken, and I was suggesting to the Chief Engineer of Waterworks when St. Simons had a problem that he could bring water through that area by using plastic or galvanise pipes instead of cast iron pipes, so that if there were any land slides the pipes could easily be repaired. I know the problems in Turners Hall Woods; you cannot have vehicular access except at a very high cost through St. Simons to Turners Hall. It is possible however to have vehicular access from the Turners Hall side of the wood, and this is what I was trying to suggest to the powers that be. After all I must know my constituency.

The question that Clause 2 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 5.55 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Agenda stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Health Services Act, 1969.

THE HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, section 11 of the Health Services Act, 1969 (1969-38) stipulates that the Minister may serve or cause to be served on the owner or occupier of any premises a notice in writing requiring the execution of any work necessary for the protection or in the interest of public health. It has been pointed out that a typographical error has been discovered in that by referring to the appropriate clause dealing with civil proceedings subsection (10) rather than subsection (11) has been printed, and in order to correct this irregularity the Attorney General has prepared the necessary amendment which is now being presented to this Hon. Chamber.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition I would like to congratulate the Acting Attorney General on

his very great achievement in drafting this Bill changing a 10 a 11

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, this matter of health, I think coming at a time like this, gives us an occasion to bring one or two things to the attention not necessarily of the Minister but to this Hon. Chamber. We believe that the Minister is well aware of the immense suffering that is caused to numerous residents in several areas, and that the suffering is caused for the most part through the activities of the Board which functions within the Minister's portfolio. I speak with reference to the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. I am sure that whether it is a typographical error or not.....

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, that has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. HINDS:

Are we to understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Health does not want to hear that there are thousands of people who are likely to suffer as a result of an epidemic that might be caused by the

scavengers dumping refuse indiscriminately all over the country? Does he not want me to talk about the rats and flies breeding? Is this what the Minister of Health does not want to hear about? The Minister must know about these things and he must take active steps right now; he is a medically trained man.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, surely the right time will come to discuss these things, but it is not now.

Mr. HINDS:

The Minister himself ought to know and he ought to be glad to hear somebody bringing these things to his attention.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, we are discussing the amendment to the Health Services Act. If the hon. member wants to discuss sanitation let him wait until that Act is before the House.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, what I am discussing are the health conditions of the people which can be occasioned and are likely to be occasioned by the indiscriminate, stupid and foolish attitude of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, that is not before this Hon. Chamber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Will both hon. members please sit.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I said that both hon. members must sit. I must decide as Chairman at what stage to interrupt any hon. member in this House on any Bill, and the fact remains that Clause 2 refers to the Health Services Act of 1969, and in my opinion since the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board came under that Act in 1969 I must give certain latitude. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. HINDS:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe you do not want an hon. member to go miles away from what is under discussion, but I also believe it might be a pill a bit too bitter for the Minister to have to swallow on this occasion. There is no denying the fact that we have an uneasy nation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir, there have been three separate and distinct Acts passed in here; the Health Services Act, the National Assistance Act and the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board Act of 1969, and they were all done at the same time. This matter, although it is related to health, he can deal with at a more appropriate time under the appropriate Act. At the meeting next Tuesday he can bring it up, but in a slight amendment to this Act it is entirely out of place. 6.05 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, this is a challenge to your ruling by the Leader of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member must also realise that I must decide when my ruling is challenged. No hon. member in here can tell me that it is challenged. You will proceed.

Mr. HINDS:

It is within my competence to draw to Your Honour's attention what, in my opinion, is a glaring challenge to Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Your opinion is your opinion and not the Chair's opinion.

Mr. HINDS:

All right, Sir. What we are concerned with is that the health of the people of this country is very much before the minds of everybody at this particular time because, amongst other things, over the fact that the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board seem not to be able, for one reason or another, to grapple with the problem of refuse disposal in this country.

Only about two nights ago there were two Doctors on television on the Government Information Service Programme telling us about diphtheria and so on. We must be concerned with the health of the nation. The question of refuse disposal is something of very grave concern to every one of us. We have to pay very strict attention to it, and we are calling the Minister's attention to the fact that there can be found today, scattered in some Districts in this Island, heaps of refuse that have not been touched by any worker for more than three months.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

On a point of order,

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Hon. Minister will take his seat.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I got up on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

You cannot decide that until you hear what I have to say.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am about to speak and I ask you to take your seat. I have given a lot of latitude on this matter. Let us deal with Sections 10 and 12 of the Health Services Act.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I understand you to say that I can deal now only with figures. Is that the case?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Under this.

Mr. HINDS:

I do not know, Sir, if there are ten or ten thousand people who can be affected or who will suffer as a result of the activities or the mismanagement of maybe eleven or twelve members of a Board who do not know what they are doing. I do not know to what

extent.....(Asides) Mr. Chairman, we are dealing

with public health, and I am drawing the attention of this Honourable House to the state of public health as it bears some relation to the inactivity or the incompetence of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. I need not make mention of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board any more.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you are as worried as I have been over the past months as a result of the insanitary condition that exists in your area. We are hoping that the Hon. Minister will take what has been said.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Under Standing Order 48 when in Committee on a Bill a member can only deal with the particular clause of that Bill and the pros and cons of that particular clause, and he cannot generalise. If the hon. member wants to speak on public health he will have to do so on the second reading of the Bill. In Committee we will deal with clauses, and you can say what are the merits of a particular clause.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I would like a ruling on my observations. I would like to know whether the hon. member can speak on public health in Committee Stage or whether he has to deal with the matter clause by clause. He must deal with the merits of a particular clause.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I will not speak on public health, but I will speak on the health of the nation. Public health seems to be worrying a lot of people. We are concerned with the rats.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think it is discourteous for an hon. member to get up to speak before you give your ruling.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member cannot rise on a point of order and ask you to make a ruling on a point of order. That is well known and he is only trying to mislead you, Sir. He is an embryonic lawyer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Nobody is going to mislead the Chair. Under Standing Order 48(1) a Committee to which a Bill is committed shall not discuss the principles of the Bill but only its details. Now, what are the details of the Bill?

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Minister does not understand what it is all about. The Hon. Minister of Health told us that it is the intention of his Ministry to be able to send or serve a notice on the owners of buildings.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, that is what we have got to concern ourselves with in passing this Clause. It is not merely a question of the Minister serving a notice on the occupier or whoever it may be on the premises. The responsibility of the Ministry goes beyond this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, Section 2 of the Bill reads

"Section 11 of the Health Services Act, 1969, in this Act referred to as the principal Act, is amended by deleting the words "subsection (10)" appearing in line 1 of subsection (12) and substituting the words "subsection (11)"

What the hon. member should tell us is whether we are substituting subsection (11) for subsection (10).

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, until the hon. member takes the Chair, you will rule. What the Hon. Minister should be telling us is that every hon. member on this side should have been served with a copy of the Act they intend to amend. That is what the Clerk of the House should be sending out to us. You ask hon. members to come here and substitute subsection (11) for subsection (10), when some of us have never had an opportunity to see what it is about, and that is why I am grateful to the Minister of Health for having read to us what the relevant section of the Act has to say. I am sure that you will now be able to familiarise yourself, Mr. Chairman, and we are saying that when your papers were sent to you on Friday as to all hon. members, you should have had everything which relates to this matter in your possession since then so that you would be aware of what is before you. We want to see the Ministry of Health in a position to carry out some sort of activity in some of these buildings to which this particular section relates, and not merely sending a notice here or there for a particular purpose. This is a question affecting the health of the nation, and that is what we are trying to bring home to hon. members. I do not know why it is that whenever I get up to speak some hon. members on that side get cold feet. I do not know what kind of sickness they are suffering from. I am glad this is a health matter we are discussing, because having a medical doctor on their side he can render assistance there and then. We on this side are not opposing the amendment. However, Sir, I am sure there are other hon. members on this side who will speak on the matter.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment and I do not intend to be long on the particular section. The section empowers the Minister to serve notice on any person whose premises are being

used for any work that is deleterious to public health, and this particular section seeks to rectify a typographical error that occurred in the main Bill. I think it is significant that almost four years have elapsed without the legal people or indeed the Ministry or Parliament noticing the error, or indeed the Attorney General Acting or otherwise recognising the error that has occurred, that means that section 11 would probably not have been properly effective and carried into effect, and of course you can see the result of that dumps in Culloden Road smoking out people and the Minister could not serve adequate notice; no proper collection of refuse and the Minister could not serve notice under that section; setting up dumps in Club Morgan which are to the detriment of my constituents. If this would enable the Minister to serve adequate notice even on the Crown to prevent them, I would hasten the passing of this Bill, because it is in the interest of public health that we should stop this very bad practice of dumping stuff in the midst of residential areas, in particular a good area like Forde's Road, Clapham and Club Morgan, and Bonnets, and saying that the reason for so dumping is to create a playing field. I am appealing to the Minister to look to see if there are any more errors in this section so that he would have adequate powers to stop the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board from creating that dump in my area.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was passed.

THE INFANTS VACCINATION (REPEAL) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item is No. 7 which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to repeal the Infants Vaccination Act, 1907.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, this Infants Vaccination Act of 1907 was introduced when conditions at that time made it necessary for such an Act. In practice nowadays you will find that very few of the provisions of the Act are complied with, and indeed vaccination is not now offered to children under the age of twelve months. A number of affidavits are received from persons claiming to be conscientious objectors, but many of the children involved, when taken to the Health Centre, are permitted by their parents to take the full course of immunisation including small pox vaccination.

The Ministry is satisfied that as a result of the developed health services over the years that the Infants Vaccination Act no longer serves any useful purpose and is now obsolete, therefore the repeal of this Act is now brought before this Hon. Chamber.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, from 1970 when I came to this Chamber I have been asking the Government to repeal this Act. It presented a strange situation in modern times where a mother on registering the birth of a baby was presented with numerous blue forms, and then in the midst of Court proceedings a mother would take an oath that she did not want to have her child vaccinated. I believe that in 1971 you had people swearing oaths that they did not want to have their babies vaccinated, and the Ministry of Health on the radio, on television and by every available means advised parents to carry their children to be vaccinated against the disease which was then rampant in the country. 6.25 p.m.

I would hope that there are several other bits of legislation like this which we will get around to tidying up, and I am glad that the hon. member has seen fit to abolish this one today. It takes long for them to hear, but at least they are hearing gradually, like the Minister of Agriculture who admitted today that after hearing words in 1970 or 1971 they are hearing today.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, 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. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA The next Item, Mr. Speaker, stands in the name of the Minister of Health.

THE NARCOTIC DRUGS ACT, 1973

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, in recent times there has been a large amount of interest and concern shown not only in Barbados but all over the world about the manufacture sale and distribution of narcotic drugs. We in Barbados are finding ourselves being caught up in the nuisance generated by the indiscriminate use and

distribution of narcotic drugs, and there have been complaints from many sectors of the Barbadian community about the adequacy of the existing laws to deal with the situation. An examination of the present narcotic drug legislation reveals that it is inadequate and that it cannot deal effectively with the domestic control of these drugs, and further, because of the cumbersome procedure necessary when new drugs recommended for control by the International Narcotic Bureau are put into use, many of these drugs remain uncontrolled for considerable periods.

As a result of this close examination of the existing narcotic drug legislation, Government has found it necessary to draft this legislation. We have also taken the opportunity at this time to bring Barbados in line with the Single Convention of Narcotic Drugs which was adopted in 1961. This Single Convention has replaced numerous existing international treaties on the control of narcotic drugs at international level, while at the same time providing greater flexibility in the administration of international control.

Taking all these matters into consideration, this House is being asked to consider this Bill regarding narcotic drug control. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the Government has at last come around to realising that we have a drug problem of some magnitude in Barbados. I believe that it was about six years ago when a former Minister of Education, in reply to some questions I asked, admitted then that we had a drug problem in some of our secondary schools. One would have thought that Government would have been astute enough to realise that if the drugs were found in the possession of children in school or of school age, that these children were not themselves the pushers or the peddlers of them. It means therefore that the Government has been doing little or nothing during the pass years to bring itself up to date when dealing with the drug problem until perhaps during the last year or two when we found ourselves coming face to face with situations when people of apparent high standing in the community, people who use, I would say, their close relationships with members on the other side as a means to peddle their ware, and cared little or nothing of the community as a whole which suffers as a result.

We have found that cases have been brought before the Courts of this island, not that the police have been more vigilant, not that the police have become more aware or familiar with the methods of pushing, peddling and trading in the drug commodity, nothing of the kind. I think that in fairness to them, our Customs Department has played a greater part in bringing to justice more of those persons

who have been put before the Courts than any police vigilance or anything of the kind. 6.35 p.m.

We have had a situation here, Mr. Speaker, where two school boys were suspected of stealing a car. Perhaps in the course of your practice you might have heard about it. It was found to be more acceptable for these two boys to claim that they were under the influence of drugs when • they committed the offence than for them to be convicted before the court as outright thieves. That is the kind of situation that we have been having in our community.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in this country where some of our drug pushers are people who are employed at our airport in the Public Service of this country. I say it and I know it. Many people coming into this country with drugs leave their packages with the drugs at the airport to be cleared by Public Servants working at the airport. I am not suggesting that the Minister of Health will know about every situation, but we have to ask ourselves whether we have conclusive evidence that the conviction of one man is not making the cell for the setting off of many others to start pushing drugs after a man is convicted. I have been carrying out investigations into this matter, Mr. Speaker, and I had intended tabling some questions with respect to this matter to know whether or not the Commissioner of Police could guarantee that these exhibits are really and truly disposed of in the manner in which the Courts would have them disposed of. That is a very questionable matter. (Asides) The Police trade them. Let the Commissioner of Police find out whether or not some of his own policemen are not pushing the same drugs for which some person has just been convicted.

Mr. Speaker, in this country there are certain things that we are tempted to accept for granted and we feel that all is well. When the Minister admitted that he had a drug problem in our schools, if the Government had acted then we would have put a sort of blanket on the whole situation and this country would have been free from the problems, perhaps, for another 50 years or more. The Minister, in carrying out his investigations, evidently found that people of some standing were involved for whom we might believe that Glendiary Prison was not made for. I do not want to accuse the Minister of conniving in anything, but if action had been taken then we are sure that there would have been enough people to be put before the Courts. If convictions had been secured against them then we would have made such an impact on the drug problem at an early stage that we would not have been in this position today.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the biggest drug problem in our first-grade schools in this country. What is the Government doing about it? It is not for me to add anything more to what is known about our South Coast Hotels and our West Coast Hotels. The pushing of the drug is becoming such a commonplace in this country that some people are not taking this matter seriously. It must be remembered that some of the Police who are expected to deal with this matter have not yet shown that they know anything about the whole exercise.

I think I once told this Honourable House that marijuana was being cultivated in Pinfold Street. (Asides.) I am not concerned with who has an office in Pinfold Street. I also told this Honourable House that there were groups of young men and young women who were using the entrance of Turner's Hall Woods in search of marijuana and "pot". Mr. Speaker, even the children of some legislators - I am not referring to legislators of this Chamber - have been involved in this matter. The drug has been found on premises of the Lodge School. I hope that we are not merely asked here to update our laws for dealing with this problem merely for the sake of doing so. 6.45 p.m.

We have got a serious problem in our midst and we need a clinic now to deal with these people whom medical doctors, psychiatrists and others encounter as patients from time to time. Don't let us wait until it is too late; let us get them somewhere where we can assist them at as early a stage as possible. Do not let the situation in Barbados become worse. Let us deal with it as it should be dealt with at this stage. We do hope that in updating our laws here today the policemen, the people who are going to be mainly responsible for putting the law into effect will be much more conscientious in stamping out the drug problem than some of them have been in the discharge of their duties, and let us hope that no hindrances will be put in the way of anybody who has got to administer the law when it comes to dealing with anybody who is in this drug business.

Mr. Speaker, this question of dope is serious enough and we are hoping that each and every one who loves his Barbados will take as actively a step as humanly possible in helping to rid the country of its presence. I have seen many of the addicts abroad in the course of my travels, and I have some idea of the feeling it gives some people of flying to Heaven.

There is one last point I want to make. I believe that the police have got to be a bit more tactful. Quite a number of our motor vehicle accidents to my mind are caused particularly by young people who are taking dope. I have had occasion to be at the scene of an accident one night not far from where I live and where there was a complete smash up of a car. There were two occupants - a male and a female. When I arrived, there were a few hundred people and I am to tell you that the happiest man on the scene was the person whom people pointed out to me was the driver. He was just walking up and down. Shocked! All the shock that anybody might tell me it is, as badly smashed as the car had been and off the road in a tunnel, he and his friends never left the scene that night until after the police had moved off. I do not know how they got it from where it was that night, but they never left it on the scene. He had not been acting normally, something was wrong, and if the police in the case of some of these accidents would carry out searches to see whether or not some of these drivers had been associated in some form with the taking of dope, we might come up with something here or there amongst these incidents. We certainly will be supporting this measure because we are concerned, and I am sure that it is the concern of each and every one of us on this side of the House.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I view the drug problem in Barbados as part of the good and bad effects of communication and the impact of communication in the last 70 years on the world. I think we must recognise that both in the sphere of communication by media and communication by transportation it is possible to transfer very rapidly the mores of one part of the universe to another part of the universe, and these standards are not always standards that are adjudged as morally correct in another part of the universe. To this extent I think the western world has been caught on the horns of a dilemma in that they have been introduced in a massive way to a large extent because of the money which they possess to some of the delights of the eastern world where a thing like marijuana was considered in some parts of the world as a normal thing to take. Also one must recognise that there are some countries which trade in drugs, not only drugs being properly used for medicinal purpose, but also drugs which are misused for non-medicinal purposes, and as a result it is incumbent on any country particularly like Barbados where over 50% of the people are under the age of 35 years to bring before its population the dangers that can ensue from the indiscriminate use of drugs.

Mr. Speaker, within the last ten years in particular there is no doubt that there is a growing and ever increasing sign of drug abuse. In this respect I am also going to talk about the misuse of alcohol to an extraordinary degree, and I believe that the experts are still divided as to whether alcohol is more deleterious on their health than marijuana; but we do have a drug problem, although from all the evidence provided by the social workers it seems that that drug problem is more or less in the realm of alcohol, and secondly in the realm of marijuana which is a soft drug as compared with things like cocaine and opium. I think it is true to say that to some extent it has affected our schools. Indeed I try not to mention certainly in this House or elsewhere matters that come to me in another sphere in my capacity as a lawyer, but I could not help but notice from time to time among the cases that come before the Court and to one's knowledge that a lot of the problems are occurring among very young people, and some of them in the schools.

I was very saddened two years ago to come across a particular case where a young boy at Combermere had got absolutely caught on drugs and had to be referred to the Mental Hospital, and the investigation of that case revealed that he had been roped into this by the way, and finally that he had been forced into establishing a sort of pushing ring among his young school boy friends. 6.55 p.m.

There are other schools in which this has occurred, but I do not think it is the schools only, I wonder how many hon. members realise that the drug party or the orgy is becoming part of the society life in this country? I have resisted the temptation to accept invitations to see how one goes into a trip at such parties because I do not believe that I need the experience in order to know of the dangers, but if you talk to a person who is sold on drugs he tries to convince you that unless you have that particular

experience you cannot recognise how good it is for you. I doubt that very much, I believe that is a misguided view, but I make the statement to emphasise this point, that we must have a campaign of education not only in the schools but certainly even within the homes for the parents so that they will recognise the dangers that could occur in the society, particularly the society with an abundance of young people such as we have, if we allow ourselves to abuse drugs even although there is a good side to drugs. This is one respect in which I hope that the Minister of Information would correlate his functions and duties with the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health to carry on a campaign by means of brochures, by means of publicity on the radio and on television as much as possible so that people will be fully aware of the dangers that might come to them.

When I talk of the preventive aspect of drug abuse, I must also mention the curative aspect. I think it is significantly absent from this legislation any obligation being placed on the Minister to provide curative centres for people who are hooked on drugs. In the State of Michigan in the United States the citizens duly took upon themselves to impress on their Mayor the necessity for such centres, and the parents who unfortunately found their children in this dilemma also took to campaigning for it, and today we can use the example of that State to see what can be done not only on the educational aspect but the curative aspect of drug abuse.

A quick perusal of this draft Bill shows that we have increased the penalties for drug abuse, and increased them tremendously, but I do not believe that in this area of quasi-social criminal legislation increasing penalties alone is a sufficient deterrent. I think we must place some emphasis on curing people who have become addicted, and it should not only be by way of voluntary but also by almost definite acts on the part of the public at large, including the governmental structure, and for this reason I would have hoped that the Minister would have looked at the financial implications of establishing a curative centre.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let me interrupt the hon. member. We have to suspend automatically for one hour. The House is now suspended until 8.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I believe when the suspension was taken I was making the point that the curative aspect of drug abuse was very important and that it had certain financial implications, and that this meant setting up a proper system to look at this aspect of the matter. I said this Bill was significant for the fact that it omits any mention of the curative aspect. Although I am aware that we are a small country and that it would be rather difficult in countries our size with limited resources to duplicate services for rehabilitation and for curative medicine, yet I feel that within the existing health structure it should be possible both at the mental institution, and indeed at our hospital, and as part of the out-patient services to set up a proper curative centre without too much cost to the Government. I will stress most strongly the urgent need for this if we are to combat the growing problems of drug abuse.

A lot of the people who are hooked on drugs need not only educational lectures and treatment, but they need to be helped, and although as I said before I welcome the increased penalties which are placed in this Bill, I think we should have attempted as well to do something for those who are unfortunate enough to fall prey to drugs. I should like to talk a bit about the growing of drugs in Barbados.

I think the Minister, and certainly all hon. . members, should be aware that the growing of drugs in Barbados could move from 'being in its experimental stage to the stage where it is becoming an economic exercise. The hon. member for St. Peter mentioned, I believe, a particular area, Of that area I was not aware, but certainly it has been proven that drugs were being grown in St. Peter on one plantation, also in one area of Christ Church - I think this was before the law courts - and I think that if proper work is done it will be seen that there are other places where this occurs. I think where this Bill is defective is that it lays down one penalty and one penalty only, leaving it to the discretion of course of the Magistrate or the High Court Judge to decide how much of that maximum penalty he will award in the particular circumstances. Up to date legislation in other countries, including Britain, the United States and Canada, has differentiated between the offenders according to the gravity of the offence. For instance, a person who may be just a smoker or in possession of drugs is treated differently from the person who is trafficking in drugs, and the crime of drugs is visited more severely than on a person who may be at a party and fall prey to partaking in a drug party, and I would like to see this Bill stipulate very much more severe penalties for the people who indulge in growing drugs illegally and also those who indulge in importing and trafficking drugs illegally.

I do not know if the Minister has seen the United States Drug Act of 1961, but I will commend to him, if he thinks the point worthwhile, either to postpone consideration of the Bill or sent it to a Select Committee so that some of these ideas can be incorporated in some aspects of the Bill.

I should like to talk about specific provisions in the Bill in so far as they affect matters of principle.

Section 2 of the Bill widens the definition of Cannabis sativa L. This is to be welcomed, because under the legislation Cannabis sativa L. is so defined that it applies only to the pistillate part of the plant, and I should stress here that contrary to what one would think, the female section of the plant is called a pistillate whereas the male section is called staminate, and we have found in working with legislation that although you can prove a person is in possession of marijuana you sometimes on legal technicalities cannot prove that that marijuana happens to be of the masculine plant and in particular the dried leaves or stalk of the plant Cannabis sativa L. 8.05 p.m.

To this extent the improvement on the definition section is to be welcomed, but I believe that when you are changing and improving a Bill you should also look at certain defects and that it is necessary to have certain safeguards to protect not those who may be guilty - although a few of those may well go scotch free - but those who may be innocent as well. I think that modern drug legislation should make it obligatory for part of the drug which is taken from a person suspected of being illegally in possession of drugs to be tested by his analyst, if he so pleases.

In Barbados the analyst services are very limited. There are only one or two analysts who are appointed in the Government Service, and sometimes I feel that an accused person is not given the benefit himself of having his own expert pass judgment on the particular drug. When the extraction has taken place in many instances you cannot afterwards bring your own chemical or botanical expert to pass judgment on the particular drug.

Just as earlier in this session, when dealing with weedicides and pesticides, there are sections which protect a person in those circumstances so that he could have his analyst's test, just as in the Food and Drugs legislation, particularly when dealing with milk, the person is given an opportunity to have his own chemist do a test. There is no reason why here such a facility may not be extended. I am not suggesting that so far we have had wrong opinions being given by the chemist. We have certainly had doubtful statements from the chemist as to whether what he has tested is cannabis sativa L. or not. I would like to strongly commend to the Minister the possibility of improving the Act in this respect.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that we have in a way, updated one of the sections dealing with places at which drugs are sold or used so that people who manage such places are now to be considered as committing an offence, I have felt, from time to time, that the existing legislation was not being properly worked. Frequently, I think, in detection one waits to see the long-haired boy and to grab him without recognising that some of these places harbour and encourage dope peddlers as well as dope users. Certainly, if only for the embarrassment, I think the time has come for the crime detection agencies to bring a few of them before the Courts, so that they, who are the real culprits in my opinion, should suffer some of the penalties.

I would have hoped under this section that the Minister in proposing the legislation would have dealt differently with the young person who had been smoking a significant number of grams of marijuana as in contradistinction to the person on whose premises he is found smoking the marijuana, particularly where that premises happens to be a place to which the public frequently resort. In Barbados it is well known that there are certain public places where you can go and buy dope. As a matter of fact, it is openly said that around places like the corner of Worthing View near to the cinema you will find people from overseas and some local ones peddling dope. Likewise in parts of Nelson Street it is being freely peddled and at one well-known, high-class restaurant it is embarrassing to go through there and to smell marijuana to high heavens while young people are congregating for clean fund only to find themselves caught in this position. I think we have to protect our young people from this sort of situation and rapidly prevent them from getting into these bad habits. That is the danger that we should look at.

I am aware that the Government has, from time to time, in conjunction with the United States Drug Agencies provided training courses for Customs Officers and the Police, but the accent so far has been training in detection of the existence of drugs. I think they also have to train Social Workers a bit more in helping when they have detected the existence of drugs. I would like to see increased training being concentrated now on this aspect of the problem in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that there is a provision for forfeiture to the Crown. I think, regardless of what we may think as to the true position, that some step should be taken to ensure that all drugs which are forfeited are properly destroyed. It would be a tragedy if suspicion attaches to people-so easy for suspicion to attach-that there should be proper supervisory services so that forfeited drugs are properly accounted for and are properly destroyed. We do not want to find a situation occurring here as occurred in New York where, in a big drug haul, the Police found themselves in an embarrassing position in not being able to account for quite a few million dollars' worth of cocaine which is one of the hardest drugs out. That happened in New York in one of the so-called tough Enforcement Agencies so that the particular Commissioner of New York City had to resign. I am saying that in big countries and in our own this danger could exist, and we must be ever vigilant in order to prevent it from becoming a real problem here.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this legislation has been long in coming. I do not know what has been the special problems. I do not know whether it was shortage of staff, or the normal inherent disadvantages of the Civil Service procedure, but Social Workers, Legislators, Lawyers, Parents, Parent Teachers Associations, Organisations and Educational Authorities and, indeed, Law Enforcement Agencies like the Police and the Courts have been crying out for improved legislation. I would have thought that we should keep this legislation frequently under review. It is not something that we should just pass and put down. One of the things I would like to see the Minister do in this Bill is to accept an amendment similar to the one accepted in the Pesticides Bill where the legislation which he is making is

certainly brought before this House at least either for affirmative Resolution or negative Resolution.

I would like to see the Minister accept some of the protections that I have spoken about as there are similar in the other Bill in order to improve this Bill. I can only hope that our problem will not get out of control. Some of our people, who are addicted to alcohol, provide the drug user a ready example of a misuse of drugs, because alcohol could be misused, too. I think that we must attack that problem. Professor Beaubrun of the University of the West Indies, who is the Psychiatric Expert on such problems in the West Indies, believes that alcohol is at present a more serious problem than marijuana is. I think he is being optimistic. I am not contradicting him; I have the greatest respect for his research, but I think he is being a bit optimistic. I think both of them are posing serious problems for us. When we look at the effect on not only human dignity, but human potentiality and the effect that these drugs can have if misused, then we must all be fearful of the outcome if we are not vigilant in guarding against their disadvantages.

We commend this Bill, and, as the Shadow Minister of Health has said, we are going to vote for it.
8.15 p.m.

We would hope that it is sufficiently non-contentious legislation that the Minister may consider trying to improve the Bill. It would not take long. I believe a Select Committee with a few experts and looking at similar legislation can improve this Bill. It is a non-contentious matter. The policy has joint partisan support on all sides of the House, and I think those of us who are parents, in fact all of us who have some human sentiment would be happy to see an improved Bill and improved legislation in order to protect our citizens in particular.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I think that this piece of legislation is a welcome one as hon. members who have spoken before have all indicated. It has come at a time when obviously we are all concerned about the growing problem in the use of drugs in the community. I think that the Bill to a large extent is fairly technical, but there are certain social implications of the Bill which I would like to make mention of if indeed to reinforce some of the points which have been made by some of the speakers who have so far participated in this debate.

On the question of the introduction of the abuse of drugs in the community, I think it is fairly safe to say that the contact which the Barbadian community has had with the outside world in one way or another has had a tremendous influence on the use and indeed the abuse of drugs, and I think we should direct some attention towards the influx of people into Barbados from the point of view of checking to

make sure that they do not bring, as it were, an increase in the drug problem. I believe that one of the main sources of supply of drugs in this community springs from the fact that we are developing our tourist industry and we are trying to make it so easy for people to come into Barbados and go out, without sometimes the precautions which we should take over what people are bringing into the country.

In the United States and indeed most of the developed countries where this is also a problem, a tremendous amount of care is taken to check people's luggage to make sure that they do not have drugs in their possession, and I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we have moved away from making dose checks of people who are coming into the airport and the sea port, and I contend that we should be moving back towards having very close checks of people in order to ensure that people are not slipping drugs into the country. It is quite a profitable thing to get drugs into a community where people might want to experiment with them and it is easy to get them sold thereby making a big haul profit-wise, and we have to be extremely careful of this. I think that efforts are being made at the present time to ensure that people are trained in the detection of drugs, and this is, I think, an extremely important development. We have however got to accelerate this training, because if you were to examine the situation as it is developing in Barbados, you will see that there are a number of suspicious looking people, not necessarily because they are wearing their hair long or because they are dressed dirty or in a way-out manner, who move into areas and settle, and I have a strong suspicion, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of drugs are circulating among this group of people, and indeed they are giving an opportunity for people who would not normally be exposed to drug use to indulge and indeed to become addicted to the drug.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that on the question of detection people have got to be trained - police officers who will be able to move into the areas all around the country and at times have raids where they suspect people have drugs stored or may be using drugs. I know that this Bill makes provision for this, but this is one area where we should try to see that this is enforced. Some hon. members made mention of the role which education can play in this whole process of identifying the drugs and rehabilitating people as it were, and this is also another important aspect of this problem because I doubt there are many people in this country who really can identify any of these drugs which we are talking about today. I am sure there are very few police officers who can identify these drugs; so for all we might know they might be in contact with people who might have drugs or smoking drugs and do not know it. We have got to have the kind of programme which will ensure that people become aware of what these drugs look like so that if there is any suspicion some report can be made so that we can get this whole problem brought under control. I was rather impressed with the programme I saw some time ago in the United States where organisations took it upon themselves - I am not sure how this was done but obviously it must have been done with the co-operation of the legal authorities - to get small portions of the various drugs and they had shows around the country to indicate to people what these drugs looked like, so that parents could identify these drugs when they saw them and try to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that parents can play a very important part in this question of drug addiction and

drug control and abuse. Because I may be much closer to a lot more young people than other hon. members, in discussions with groups of young people one often hears advanced the argument which was used by the hon. member for Christ Church West about parents using alcohol or smoking cigarettes. Children regard this as the parents' way of escaping from problems which they might have from time to time, and they do not see anything wrong for example in using drugs to give vent to their feelings or express themselves, and I think that is the kind of thing which sometimes can have a very serious effect on young people. They might not see alcohol or the use of cigarettes as their way of expressing themselves; they see the other way which is using drugs.

I think that anybody who has been in a community where there are numbers of drug addicts can immediately appreciate the problems which the community will face from the fact that people who are addicted to drugs are not keen on working, they hardly have the energy to go to work and they are off from work often, they hang around the place, are usually dirty, and in addition to that the criminal aspect steps in, and when people become really addicted to drugs they will do anything in order to get money to purchase the drugs. This is why I make the point, Mr. Speaker, that the control and detection of drugs in the early stages is a very important aspect, and I am sure that the legislation which is being introduced here will make sure this is done. 8.25 p.m.

Of course the legislation is only the legislation and we have got to make sure that we have people who are equipped to handle the problem. This brings me on to the point which was made earlier by some of the other hon. members who spoke, the question of rehabilitation to ensure that people who have had a drug problem are taken care of and are advised and treated so that they can come back into the society and really see the problem which the drugs would have created for them, so that it can make them useful citizens again.

Mention has been made about the drug problem which exists in schools. I am sure if in the definition of schools one would want to include the University of the West Indies, but I understand that there is also a serious drug problem at Cave Hill, and I think that again one of the problems which we find in this community is that some people seem to think that there are some institutions and people who cannot be prosecuted, and some people may adopt the attitude that because this is at the university the university is above the law. I think we have to get this out of our minds, because at the university we have a number of people coming from overseas, some lecturers, and these people can have a tremendous amount of influence in the community. I think that the average Barbadian still has a lot of respect for the person from overseas or the person who is teaching at a university, so when an attitude resulting from a drug problem is displayed by these people it can be taken in quite early by the people in our community, and therefore I think we have to ensure that the Barbadian community develops along the best lines possible. We want to make sure that we have a community in which people will be able to enjoy a good standard of health, we want to have a community where we would be rid of this kind of problem.

I do not believe we are going to get rid of the problem totally, but I hope that every effort will be made to ensure that the community is rid of the problem as much as possible. I think that the Bill is one which every hon. member will support, because I am sure that we feel it is an extremely important piece of legislation.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to my colleagues on this side, and I have listened to the hon. member for St. Lucy. Perhaps my speech might be considered as reactionary, but if this Bill which is before the House was not a Bill we could all agree that I would have voted against it because I do not think that the penalties are rigid enough. You will observe that a person who is convicted of an offence under this Act is liable to five years imprisonment, a fine of \$5,000 or both. My honest view is that the only way to stamp out crime is not to attempt to half-stamp it out but really stamp it out. If I were on any committee to which a Bill of this nature was referred I would certainly recommend that not only a fine of \$25,000 be paid, but the person would also get 20 years in prison and 20 strokes with the cat-o'nine tails, and I am quite sure you would not have to get any narcotic squad to track down crimes of this nature because nobody is going to be prepared to get 20 strokes with the cat or have to pay \$25,000.

I am quite sure that wherever you find these drug pushers they are in a position to pay a small fine, and I consider this \$5,000 to be a small fine, chicken feed. A few years ago we had some young men in our midst throwing acid on people, and there were also some people who used to "bounce and draw" others, but from the time Sir Allan Collymore gave one of them 15 years and another 20 years in prison, all that stopped. It is my submission to the Minister to look at this fine a little closer, I am not particularly satisfied with it, it is too small.

This brings me to the point about where in this island you are most likely to find this drug pushing and trafficking, and it is at the sea port and at the airport. The people who we do not expect to do these things are the people who are really bringing drugs into the country. As the member for St. Lucy quite rightly said, you only have to look like you are together and way out and the people believe it is that type of person who is dealing in drugs, but it is many of the people who use the V.I.P. lounge through some of the members of this House, I am not saying that we condone this, but we have friends in other places who use the V.I.P. lounge as just another place to pass through and probably two or three days later you will find all the nude parties going on and the drug kicking. Those are the people whose luggage I believe the officers at the Customs should search.

Only recently I read an article in the Advocate where the Customs Officers were complaining of interference with their duties at Seawell Airport. I know this is true. There are some people who have no regard for law because they are friends of members of both parties and they believe that because of this,

and more so because they are friends of the members of the Government, they should be allowed to bring in whatever they like. They feel that because they are first ladies and second ladies in a country their luggage should not be searched, and I think there is something of a similar nature happening at the sea port. 8.35 p.m.

I repeat that if this Bill should go to a Select Committee - I do not know what is the Government's view - there should be a more severe penalty and a flogging for offences whether committed by a child or an adult, and I am quite sure that the Government would not have to spend all of this money in training Narcotic Squads. That is my view. Mr. Speaker, I remember in 1966 I drew to this to the Government's attention, and at the time I was laughed at by the now High Commissioner in London. He said that it was not true and that everything was under control. It is known that people are now growing dope in Barbados. I also drew to the attention of the Government that I was reliably informed that many of the yachts that were moored off the Aquatic Club contained dope and the people on them were bringing the dope ashore and selling it. You can also find dope in the hotels. Every time you read the newspapers you can find that somebody living in a hotel was involved in dope pushing. You can find this sort of thing going on along the South Coast in particular, and you can hear some people talking about their dark brothers with their white sisters. I do not know how they work it out, but you can find young boys and young girls on the beaches smoking dope.

Another point I would like to make at this stage, Sir, is that I have always been critical of the Television Programmes where people can see all these sophisticated crimes. You can see such things as "Mission Impossible" and a lot of nonsense. They show people how to get into your house at night when you have gone to sleep after a hard day's work, but you do not see anything educational in that type of show.

Mr. Speaker, before young men and young women go and look for work, around twelve o'clock in the day you can find them lining up in front of the Empire, the Olympic and the Plaza to see a Wang Yu film with somebody smoking dope and doing a lot of nonsense. I feel that we should ban all film shows until week end, or that the theatres should have no shows during midday.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker less than two weeks ago I closed a seminar at the Hilton Hotel where personnel from the United States assembled in Barbados with others from Grenada, St. Vincent, and St. Lucia in the Carifta area for training in connection with the identification of these drugs. I do not think many people in Barbados would recognise some of these drugs if they saw them and it is only lately that the Police Department and the Customs Department have had their officers trained to identify these drugs. Some parents would not be able to recognise these drugs even if they saw their children with them unless the drugs were demonstrated to them. I feel that these drugs should be made known to parents and

everybody, so that parents would be able to keep a watch over their children.

An essential thing to do is to blot out the sources of entry of these drugs and that would be the airport and the sea port. I also think that our coastal waters should be properly patrolled at all times. Now, high-priced stuff comes in small packages and you do not have to get a 10x4 package for it to cost a lot of money. Small packages could be dropped by buoys, anchored off, and locations given so that they could be easily picked up at sea. I think that a Radar Station, a good patrol and coast guard by Police night and day as well as a close watch on ships coming from the other Islands would be necessary in order to wipe out or eliminate this drug business. It will not be an easy job.

For instance, in the United States of America searching is not done by Customs Officers because they would not know their way around the ship. A man would have to leave something in a clothes locker for a Customs Officer to find it. A Customs Officer would not know where to look for something hidden by a man who knows his way around a ship. It is foolishness sending a Customs Officer aboard a ship to find small packages because he would not be able to find them. He would search a locker and a mattress, but he would not know anything about the crevices and cracks aboard a ship. In the United States a Searching Squad trained by the Navy does the searching. These men are trained to search water tanks, bottom bilges, all types of tanks and so on. The average Customs Officer in Barbados dressed in a white uniform or white shirt would be only making fun if he were called upon to search a ship.

Now, in the United States when a Searching Squad comes aboard a ship to search, you will find the members of that Squad dressed in dungaree and ready for action. They are ready to search all crevices and cracks, but our Customs Officers are not equipped for this sort of thing. We would now require a Squad trained specially in this type of field and dressed in clothing suitable for searching a ship. I asked the Officers here if there was any magnetic instrument for detecting drugs, and they told me that the only thing they had discovered up to today was dogs trained in identifying drugs. I know that the Police and the Customs Officers at the Airport have had training in this field, but I am saying that it is not merely a question of searching.

Mr. Speaker, in all parts of the world you will find at the airfield that there is a long stretch of land between the aeroplane and the people who are looking out for dope and so on. In Barbados you require a longer distance between the aeroplane and the Customs Department to enable officers to sit and observe the fidgetiness of a man suspected of carrying drugs and not depend on the searching of a suitcase. You can watch that man from the time he comes off the aeroplane and say that No. 5 is a suspicious looking character and tell your officers to move into position. You cannot say that you are going to search every fifth person, because if a man knows that, he will become the seventh person in the line. It is a question of observing the actions and behaviour of a man and picking him out to be searched. This sort of thing is done in all parts of the world. I have travelled extensively and I know that these are the tactics people

use at airports. Some high-priced things come in small packages and it is possible to overlook a small package.

Mr. Speaker, I do not even know whether all of the Customs Officers at the airport are trained in drug detection. I think there were three or four in this Training Course from St. Lucia, some from Grenada, one or two from St. Vincent and I believe the largest number was from Barbados. What they have learnt can be passed on, but how much do they know about it? I do not think that anybody in Barbados including myself would be able to identify one of the marijuana trees. Years ago I have heard about dope and of Barbados being used as a pass-through port. It is no longer a pass-through port. I have heard mention being made of dope passing through Barbados intransit to other countries, It is no longer a pass-through port but a stop-off port nowadays. These are some of the evils that a developing country inherits and part of the price that you pay for high-class tourism so you have to equip yourself to suit the age in which you are living.

Mr. Speaker, we require better patrols, coast guards, police patrol and better equipment at the Ports suitable for searching. The dirtiest area you will find aboard a ship is the area where a Customs Officer will not go, so a man can put a small parcel under the bilge floor. The Customs Officer may not even know that there is a floor under there. 8.45 p.m.

You cannot tell a Customs Officer to check there. Perhaps he does not even know that there is a floor under there, or if he looks there he will skin up his face and run because he will find tar, grease and much that will turn him back. You have to have people specially trained who know where to search for it, people who will tell you to open the manhole of that tank or open the fuel tank, because this is stuff that can be sealed in air-tight containers and dumped in a fuel tank or water tank and when suitable taken out. It might not be moved in packages big enough for Customs Guards at the gate to see; it could be in his shoes, and he could make four or five trips with such small quantities, and it is not discernable to the Customs Officer.

This is a first class piece of legislation, but the officers who have been trained are beginners in learning and what they know we want them to pass on to their brothers in the same field if they are to use it to good advantage for the benefit of the country. I think every Barbadian owes it to the community to eliminate and wipe out something as vicious as this, because we never know whose children will become victims to some unscrupulous person who is interested in making money. All over the world you will find people whose only interest is money and they will get it at the expense of anybody's child who can become an idiot for the rest of his life, be driven to crime or caused to get into accidents.

The hon. member for St. Peter made mention of the disposal of the stuff I am Minister responsible for police and it is something worth paying attention to, and I will draw this to the attention of the Commissioner of Police as soon as possible to make sure that whatever the law requires for the disposal of this stuff it is carried out and it does not get back on the market. There is a very strong temptation with the high prices that this could happen and it should be completely eliminated.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Minister mentioned the use of dogs because it has been reported quite recently that dogs have been the most successful means of detecting marijuana either on persons or in most inaccessible places. For quite a long time now I know that the Police Department has been feeding their dogs at a very expensive rate, probably a greater rate than they feed some of the human beings in this country, and I would hope that the authorities would see fit to increase the number of dogs available in Barbados with this specialised training, because I was quite pleased last night when I came in at the airport to see a sign telling passengers about the delay which may be necessary in order to keep the drug problem out of this country.

I have heard in this very Parliament the Minister of Tourism speaking about getting people through the airport quicker, that this is a tourist community and you cannot keep people waiting back; but I want him to know in no uncertain terms that I went into Puerto Rico which is a big American city and landed at 8 o'clock the Sunday night and never got through customs until about 9.30, and every bag was searched, and there was the same big sign telling you that they had to do a search in order to keep drugs out of the United States. I do not want him to get up in here and tell people you have to let tourists walk in here and not search them to keep them back because we want to keep the tourist industry going, because the first prosecution I heard of for drugs in this country came from a hotel on the south coast, and I think it was Southern Palms. I do not want the Minister to get up and talk about tourism because I think the health of the community means more than letting tourist walk through Seawell however they feel like.

Another point is that I heard a police officer was vigilant and saw two persons walking through St. Joseph and by chance he asked them where they were living...(Asides) I did not hear what the hon. member say. As soon as you mention a hotel in this country, the hon. member becomes an expert, but I have told the others on that side that he has as much regard for Bajans as I have for hell.

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is this all about?

Mr. BOLDEN:

A police officer said he saw two people walking through St. Joseph and he called them and asked them where they were living, and as a result of that he smelt marijuana on them and they were arrested, and when he went down to the house they not only had marijuana but the opium pipe and everything, and it is alleged that they are growing it down there. I would not like to name the spot, but we have got to be very vigilant and the authorities should think now about bringing trained dogs into the country. Barbados is not too big, and I think policemen on patrol can control dogs, and once the knowledge is there that dogs are trained in detecting marijuana, you will find that people will be so scared to walk with it that you may be able to stamp it out. It is going to be a difficult thing on the West Coast of the Island because you have all those yachts which come in there, but before there is a serious grip on our community, you have to control it in the early stages. I think the Government should consider reintroducing a number of dogs.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, as other speakers have said, is that the plant is not known to quite a number of persons. I have seen many policemen in the District "A" Magistrates' Court trying to identify the drug. I know they have been using photographs etc., but I believe that as part of our educational training the Ministry of Education should find some method of bringing the drug to people's attention. One police officer told me there is a film which shows the development of the plant and what it looks like at the early stages and when it is fully grown, and the Ministry of Education should consider using this film in part of the Government's time once a month on television to show people what the plant looks like and to inform parents how best to combat it. We all might not be fortunate to be able to smell it. I do not believe I would be able to recognise the smell, but I believe it is time that the Ministry of Education do something about identifying the plant to the people in authority and particularly to parents who have got growing children.

I saw recently a report in the newspaper that China is boasting of how she is growing poppy and all these drugs to throw on the West. This is the way they hope to capture the West. It would take a long time to travel from China to Barbados, but with international travel which takes only a day from the farthest part..(Asides) I do not listen to asides from the ex-Attorney General; he may find himself like John Mitchell With international travel it is possible that it might be coming into Barbados and into the other Caribbean countries and I would think that this is just the time when the Government should be well equipped to handle any influx of this drug. 8.55 p.m.

Another thing is the question of treatment in respect of punishment. In several states of the United States the method of penalty has been changed or altered in some way where the Judges are now empowered to make a specific order for treatment rather than fine or imprisonment. We have seen in our courts a number of young persons who have been caught with drugs. I remember a specific case involving a man who came from Christ Church, and he was found growing marijuana in Black Bess. He was convicted and the case had its usual run, but where you have circumstances like these I believe the court should be able to act as like in the...

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir, I am asking for leave...

Mr. BOLDEN:

I have not given way. As I was saying, I have noticed that where young persons are involved with drugs the plea made with respect to these young men was that somebody had sent them the seeds and they were growing them to see what it was like. Whether this is a good excuse or not I do not care to judge, but what I would like to see is some method whereby a court can call for a Probation Officer's report, a medical report or probably a psychiatric report, and if it is found that the person involved will benefit from an order where he has to attend for treatment or whether he must be confined in some institution where he could be treated before he becomes a drug addict, I would think this is a method of treating the young person who is now becoming involved and not yet hooked on drugs. A specific amount as a fine could be imposed on a pusher or somebody who is growing it where it can be seen that this person is growing it in order to peddle it. I think these are the persons who should be dealt with here.

There is one State in the United States where a person can be given life imprisonment. I believe that drastic fines will deter people from even attempting the crime. If you break down your offences into minor and serious and make the penalty fit the specific area of the crime, I believe you would be doing some good. I would hope to see this implemented.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The moment of interruption has arrived. You may continue until 9.30 if the matter can be concluded by then.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I object to the business being continued in accordance with Standing Order 6(5).

Mr. SPEAKER:

The House now sees it quite proper to entertain a motion for the adjournment.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

This is a special sitting of the House and the adjournment is automatic.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER:

It now being 9.00 p.m. and this matter being controversial, this concludes Government Business for the day. This House now stands adjourned till Tuesday at 12.00 noon. 9.00 p.m.