THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th November, 1976

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport); Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Mr. J. G. ODLE, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. ST.JOHN, (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism and Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, B.A., M.A.; Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Community Development); Mr. DeL. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc. (Econ.) and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting for Tuesday, the 9th November, 1976, are before you for confirmation. If there is no objection, the Minutes will be confirmed. *(Pause)* There being no objection, the Minutes are duly confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to announce that I have received the Accounts and Statements for the month of August, 1976, prepared by the Accountant General.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE ACTING GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. H. B. ST.JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following Message:–

MESSAGE No. 6/1976

HIS EXCELLENCY THE ACTING GOVERNOR-GENERAL

TO

THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency Arnott Samuel Cato, President of the Senate, Acting Governor-General, has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that, under provisions of section 29(1)(c) of the Constitution, he assumed the functions of the office of Governor-General on 16th November, 1976.

A. S. CATO
Acting Governor-General.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:–

(1) The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1976.

(2) The Report on the audit of the Sugar Export Levy Fund for the year ended 31st March, 1976.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:–

(1) The Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1976.

(2) The Resolution to grant the sum of $410,523 out of the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1976–77, Port Department as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976–77 No. 23 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

(3) A Bill to amend the Pensions (Prime Minister) Act.

(4) A Bill to amend the National Emblems and National Anthem of Barbados (Regulation) Act.

(5) A Bill to amend the Interpretation Act.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek your permission to give notice of two questions on behalf of the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who is not now in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, the questions are as follows:–

To enquire of the Minister of Education: Is the Honourable Minister of Education aware of the danger posed to children by traffic on the Government Hill Road on their way to and from the schools sited on the compound of the Springer Memorial School?

Is the Minister aware that there is a paved road inside the walls of Government House leading from that compound to the north gate of Government House?

Will the Minister ensure that his Government makes the necessary arrangements with the new Governor-General to permit that paved road to be used to take the children off the road to and from that compound to the north gate of Government House?

To enquire of the Minister of Finance:– Will the Minister of Finance state and give a breakdown of the amount of money spent on all conferences – overseas visits and other travelling by Ministers – Civil Servants and Parliamentarians since September 3, 1976 until the present time?

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, a Bill to amend the Pensions (Prime Minister) Act, was then read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, a Bill to amend the National Emblems and National Anthem of Barbados (Regulation) Act, was then read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, a Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, was then read a first time.

12.25 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken and that Item No. 2 be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

THE FINAL APPROPRIATION (1974–75) BILL, 1976

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a conventional Bill which gives full legislative sanction to the supplementary funds granted during the financial year ending 31st March, 1975 in the amount of $24,810,753, and I anticipate the passage to be a mere formality since the money has already been granted and spent.

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

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

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

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

The Preamble was postponed.

The clauses of the Bill were called and they stood part.

The Schedule was called and it stood part.

The Preamble was called and it stood part.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, each seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, the Bill was read a third time passed and cited as the Final Appropriation (1974–75) Act, 1976.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. ODLE took the Chair.

12.35 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976–77, No. 20

THE RESOLUTION IN THE SUM OF $11,244,941 WAS CALLED.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of $11,244,941 out of the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976–77, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976–77, No. 20, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Earlier this year one of the periodical reviews of salaries and emoluments paid to Government Officers and public servants was undertaken, and whatever we may have said at the time it was undertaken and settled according to a particular formula. The salaries have been paid for some months, but no supplementary grant of funds for the wages of unestablished, non-established, casual or temporary staff was made under the former regime. The salaries of established staff will continue to be paid as a matter of course, since they are paid by virtue of statute and are directly chargeable upon the Consolidated Fund. There is some urgency about this matter which we feel should not have been neglected for so long. There is some urgency about it, since the funds for paying unestablished temporary staff will very soon run out unless supplemented. This sum of $11,244,941 is needed accordingly.

If there are any questions which Hon. members on either side wish to ask, I will do my best to give the answers, but I would ask all hon. members to bear in mind that there has been a very full debate on this matter during the last Parliament. I would add only, as a matter of new information, that I have entertained a delegation from the National Union of Public Workers which raised salaries revision among other questions with the new Government. I was able to explain and convince this delegation that the financial position of the new Government was such as not to permit a reopening of the negotiations at this stage. I also think that I was able to convince this delegation that the programmes which were going to be set in train by the new Government, and the determination of the new Government has shown to keep down the cost of living will make the question, in the immediate future, of reopening the negotiations merely an academic one. It will be the aim of the Government to keep cost of living increases at such a low level, and to make sure that Government funds are spent in sufficiently useful and productive ways, as to enable this Government to recapture the confidence both of the public sector at employee level and of the private sector throughout the decision making and employee level so as to give some hope for the future that we will not have the acrimonies and the recriminations which accompanied the grant of the earlier salary increases.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to associate myself with some of the remarks made by the hon. member for St. Thomas. It is refreshing to hear that he is now in a position to appreciate the financial position of the Government. When he was on this side he was under the impression that when we were in the Government we were not stating the truth about the financial position of the country. However, that is all in the past, and I do not see any necessity here for commenting on a previous decision taken by the House of Assembly. I think that would be unparliamentary to do so. The money has to be paid, and we are glad to see that the Resolution has been brought to ensure that the people are paid.

In passing, I would also like to point out that I think it is high time that the civil servants of this country start taking a serious look on the burden which any Government, this one or some future one, has to bear in paying their salaries or wages. They may very well find it worthwhile to look at the question of getting other amenities rather than asking for these substantial increases in salaries year after year. After a while, Government still has to find the money to pay civil servants, and they may very well find that the actual increase which they do get in their hands may be a lot less than what they had bargained for, although Government may have agreed to it, being whittled away by taxation. I think it is in their interest and the best interest of the country to start looking at other methods and assisting the Government in order to see that the purchasing power of the

money they get will go as far as possible, and the need for having to come repeatedly to the Government seeking substantial increases in salaries would become less and less as time goes by.

We welcome the remarks of the hon. member and share the belief of the people of Barbados that they are going to take drastic steps in reducing the cost of living, or in seeing that the cost of living only increases at small measures. In recent times there has been a complaint by the public of Barbados about the sudden increases in commodities especially after the removal of the sales tax. I think that we would like – especially all of us who have the interest of Barbados at heart – to see something done about holding the cost of living down and preventing these sudden increases in the prices of commodities, especially essential commodities, which the man at the bottom has to deal with at all times.

I would again, like to stress that we associate ourselves with this Resolution. It has come out of a decision made by the House of Assembly on a previous occasion to pay these salaries and, therefore, the decision has been made and we have to respect it.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Replying very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate all that has been said by the hon. member throwing his weight behind the Government's new policy of holding down the cost of living and endeavouring to spend our money productively, but I would just like to correct a remark which has been the subject of frequent misrepresentation. I am not aware of any complaint by the public of any sudden increase in the cost of living since the removal of the sales tax. I am aware of complaints by the hon. member for St. Michael South West, and I have gone to the trouble to invite, only yesterday, the Statistical Department to investigate the truth of these complaints. The truth of these complaints is that the cost of living fell in Barbados during October, that the items on which the sales tax applied have fallen by the largest amount: household furnishing, personal services, and so on. There was some slight increase in the overall prices of food, but this increase does not in any way relate to items which were the subject of the sales tax. It relates to items, indeed, which have come from CARICOM sources, and which have never been subject to any kind of tax at all. We utterly and absolutely deny that there is any evidence of any sort, statistical or otherwise, of any large-scale increase in the cost of living since the removal of the sales tax.

It is only a matter of commonsense that when you take off a 5% tax that prices go down, I believe we will be flying in the face of common sense to accept what the hon. member for St. Michael South West has been trying to thrust down the throat of the public which, alas, from his point of view, is no longer as gullible as it was five years ago regarding the claims made by members of the Democratic Labour Party.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

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

12.45 p.m.

Head 3 – Judiciary – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 3 – Judiciary – stand part.

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

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

Head 4 – Public Service Divisions – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 4 – Public Service Divisions – stand part.

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

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

Head 5 – Cabinet – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 5 – Cabinet – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 6 – Prime Minister's Office – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 6 – Prime Minister's Office – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 7 – Defence and Security – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 7 – Defence and Security – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to say that the Prime Minister will have eventually to face what the housewives say and not want the member for St. Michael South West says.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not know what the hon. member is talking about; but I hold myself out to face what anybody in Barbados says about Defence and Security.

The question that Head 7 – Defence and Security – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 8 – Port Management – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 8 – Port Management – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 9 – Audit – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 9 – Audit – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 10 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 10 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 11 – Ministry of Legal Affairs – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 11 – Ministry of Legal Affairs – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 12 – Ministry of External Affairs was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 12 – Ministry of External Affairs – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 13 – Ministry of Education – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to move that Head 13 – Ministry of Education – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 15 – Ministry of Health and Welfare – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 15 – Ministry of Health and Welfare – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 16 – Ministry of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 16 – Ministry of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 17 – Ministry of Tourism, Information and Public Relations – was called.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to move that Head 17 – Ministry of Tourism, Information and Public Relations – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 18 – Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology – was called.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to move that Head 18 – Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 19 – Ministry of Communications and Works – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that Head 19 – Ministry of Communications and Works – stand part.

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

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

Head 20 – Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce – was called.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to move that Head 20 – Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of $11,244,941 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976–77 NO. 21

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of $184,000, to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1976–77. I do not wish to be long in introducing it, Sir, but in the absence of the Minister of Communications and Works who deals with this subject, I think that I should let the House know that we are actively pursuing a programme of expanding the Post Office service in this Island that has been discussed so often in this House over a period of time.

There may be some delay – I hope short – in the commencement of work on the new Post Office Headquarters while plans are being reviewed. The public may hear that we are actively looking at the reorganisation of the Post Office service in this country. Welchman Hall, in the parish of St. Thomas, is being considered for a number of developmental projects; and this may very well include a Post Office that has so long been projected.
12.55 p.m.

The Post Office should be a paying proposition, and many members of the public may have taken note of the proposal in the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party during the last election campaign to increase revenue from the sale of stamps. I have had some interest in this, Sir, and therefore the Minister has been kind enough to include me in a delegation which will be visiting St. Vincent towards the end of the month, a very short visit, one which we hope will not attract the unfavourable attention of the Leader of the Opposition who has discovered after so many years in Government that the Ministers are forced to travel a lot in the course of the discharge of their official duties, so we can judge by the questions which were asked on his behalf today. This delegation will be going to St. Vincent to inspect the very successful programme which the St. Vincent Philatelic Agency now carries on and which has made the sale of postal stamps one of the most significant items of St. Vincent's revenue which stands at nearly $2 million more in a small country than Barbados itself. The hon. member for St. Andrew and I along with the Postmaster General expect to go there on 26th November, and only this morning I was discussing with the Premier of St. Vincent the final arrangements for our visit. We may use this as a model or we may in fact take other models which are available right here in the Caribbean for the promotion of sales of stamps, and we are hoping that with this promotion and with one or two other measures that the postal service in Barbados will be in a position to finance some of their own expansion.

We are also, I should say, undertaking a study of re-opening the post offices on Saturday mornings at least and perhaps increasing to some extent the mail delivery services which now exist. Cabinet has also at the behest of the hon. member for Christ Church West and myself enquired whether urgent and early consideration

can be given to the employment of women, as, you cannot call them postmen or post persons, you will have to call them mail carriers and initial efforts which I hope were not in any way due to male chauvinism but which would have had the effect of postponing the time when women can be so employed. We have rejected this and we are asking for really urgent action in this direction, and we very much hope by even the time of the next Estimates in March of next year that we will be in a position to indicate to the House and to the public what we have been able to do to streamline the postal services in respect of employment in the Post Office, give better service to the public over six days instead of five and do this all with a saving to the Government because of the increased revenue to be expected from an energetic stamp promotion programme.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, in a short reply, I should like to point out to the hon. member that some time ago a Bill was passed in the House which made it necessary for any receipt of sums of money over $10 to have a stamp, and I should like to point out that is observed more in the breach than in compliance and I wonder whether his Ministry can look into that aspect, because it is a bit disturbing to people who are concerned about what is going on in this country to see receipts being given reputedly for sums over $10 and no stamp affixed thereto.

As regards the employment of women as carriers of mail, I should like to point out that I took the initiative and started that in my capacity as Minister of Communications and Works, and already the word had gone forth to the Postmaster General to see that something is done about that, and I enjoy hearing that it is to be continued and that we will see women in the very near future being employed. As I said on another occasion in this House, with the way in which certain things were being scrapped or subjected to public enquiry, we have been wondering how many other things would not see the light of day, and if women are to be employed as carriers of mail, they are to be complimented and I welcome your support in this matter and look forward eagerly to that day when this is done.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I give the hon. member the assurance that we will look into this matter of stamped receipts. As far as I know, the main area where unstamped receipts are regularly issued is in the retail trade. There are a very large number of bills issued in stores which operate as receipts, described as cash bills, and are both cash bills and receipts, and I am told there has been some legal argument in the past, but an *ad hoc* opinion by the Attorney General makes me feel that it is possible for them to be considered receipts. and certainly legislation can be introduced and the Stamp Act amended to make it clear whether cash bills given in retail establishments are receipts or not. I agree that this concerns the Ministry of Finance perhaps even more than the Post Office since it will be shown as a receipt to the Ministry of Finance, but it will also have its effect if large numbers of stamps have to be bought for receipt purposes on Post Office revenue and I give the hon. member the assurance that in their search for tax revenue the officials of the Ministry of Finance will take this into consideration.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976–77
NO. 22

Head 106 – Airport Development – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it is sometimes forgotten that Capital Estimates contain the salaries and wages of casual workers, and since naturally the capital works in general cannot be carried out without paying staff, this Resolution seeks to appropriate the necessary sum to enable temporary casual workers attached to capital projects to be paid the agreed salary increases.

I beg to move that Head 106 – Airport Development – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 108 – Port Management – was called.

Hon. H. B. ST.JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 108 – Port Management – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 113 – Ministry of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 113 – Ministry of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 118 – Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on Head 118 which is the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture who is not here present today, I would want to inform the House that only last week I have put in train the necessary preliminary steps to undertake the re-development of the Scotland District which was promised in our party's manifesto during the last general election.
1.05 p.m.

Just in passing, perhaps, I would like to commend the officers of my Ministry as well as the officers of the Ministry of Agriculture for their very speedy attention to the proposals contained in the Manifesto and the expedition with which they prepared the necessary working paper. A working paper has been prepared which identifies the type of development that is warranted; the physical development involved in the building of dams, the control of slippage in the area and the preservation which will prevent the Scotland District from slipping towards the sea and perhaps going along into the sea via Long Pond as it has been for centuries since the original forests were cut down for the purpose of cultivation.

Not only physical development, but the prospects of agricultural development will also be covered in the plan. I have asked the officers concerned to prepare very full terms of reference on the type of agricultural development that can be expected in the Scotland District in future. Very briefly, we are hoping that the schemes for damming the underground rivers and the aboveground rivers will provide irrigation waters that can be used in the appropriate places. We are hoping for incentives for tree crop development, fruit crops. St. Andrew, we are sure, can very easily provide Barbados with all the requirements of fruit which it at present consumes, and we are looking not only for fruit to be sold as fresh fruit but also at the production of fruit with the intention of preservation, because we have always seen the St. Andrew development scheme in its agricultural aspects as essentially being one as integrated with processing, and we are looking forward to agro industries being developed in appropriate parts of St. Andrew.

The third branch of the development relates to the social aspects of rural development. There has been a diminution in the population of St. Andrew in the last thirty or forty years as many of the agricultural areas became more marginal as in more recent times, villages which have been subject to slippage have been partly abandoned and the inhabitants resettled. We are hoping that the development of the area will achieve some decentralisation of population, and we are hoping to give the existing population more industries which will create employment by way of a return to the cultivation of land which has been allowed to run down, particularly during the last fifteen years of Democratic Labour Party Government which, as we say, made a negative contribution to the development of St. Andrew as a whole.

The brief which I approved on Monday is now going the rounds of other Departments, but I have already made contact with the Inter American Development Bank and we are confidently expecting that before very long we will be able to put out the scheme feasibility study, and indeed I would not like to set a timetable, but I hope that in the relatively near future work can begin on aspects of the scheme with the assistance which we are expecting from international financing sources.

Separately to the Scotland District Scheme itself, and although I have spoken about St. Andrew, I should really make it clear that we have set our terms of reference for the entire Scotland District from Boscobelle right down to Bath. Separately from the Scotland District proper which embraces a small part of St. Thomas, a moderate size of St. Joseph and a small part of St. John, as well as virtually the whole of St. Andrew, separate to that part of the scheme, the Government is also undertaking a separate appreciation of the extension of the East Coast Road from its present terminus at Bathsheba to Blades Hill, St. Philip to provide a coastline network which we hope will uplift and rehabilitate the eastern side of Barbados by providing communications towards the airport on one hand and towards Belleplaine and the new industries we hope to establish there at the other.

As hon. members may have heard, Bath Plantation has been acquired by the Government and the first section of the extension on which we are looking is the construction of roadworks between Bath and Conset Bay where we intend

to improve the communications with a view to expanding the fishing facilities on the east coast. This may involve some reallocation of priorities within the Ministry of Communications and Works, but we must say this – it probably will be said again when we come with the supplementary to supplement the vote for MCW – but some reallocation of priorities is absolutely necessary in that Ministry. We cannot believe that the large scale spending of money on projects within the constituency of St. Michael North Central of the then Minister of Communications and Works in the couple of months immediately before the election which exhausted the vote and which will have the effect of laying off large numbers of MCW workers if we do not find money from somewhere was the best priority for the spending of MCW funds at that time. It is to be deplored, Mr. Chairman, – and I am glad that the electorate of Barbados has very generally rejected such works – it is to be deplored that Ministers could have found it necessary or appropriate to go on a spending spree in their constituencies which involved not $5,000 or $10,000, which is more than the permitted limits on electoral expenditure but which involves for example, on Parks and Beaches $800,000 and involves at MCW over one million dollars. It is not appropriate, it is not right that the employment of people at MCW, that the priorities of Government, especially of Government financing, should be put at such risk by Ministers desperate for a seat in the last, hard moments when their party's ship was sinking, and if, as I say, there is some reorganisation of priorities, if people who would prefer to be working in Breakneck Hill or surfacing roads in the Garden Land find themselves having to work in St. John on projects that are for more long term use for the people of Barbados, you cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs, we will have to reallocate our scarce resources from these wasted projects to projects which are more useful for the long term prospects of the island.

The third area relating to the east coast in which the Government is taking an interest relates to the provision of recreational facilities. We can observe from the files of Government that there has been a little patch work and piece work approach to the obtaining of lands for the provision of more recreational facilities in the eastern parishes of Barbados. We see Foster's Funland was in negotiation and lands at River Bay were in negotiation for purchase by the previous Government.

1.15 p.m.

I have only today put these acquisitions into temporary cold storage, not because we are rejecting the concept of recreational facilities, but because we believe that the entire East Coast which contains the major part, surely 80% or 90%, of the unspoiled coast-line of Barbados must be looked at as a whole. We must start from the College Savannah area, go right up to River Bay and, indeed, go around the Champion Ground, Archer's Bay, and come on to the northern side of Barbados.

Cabinet has set up a Sub-Committee consisting of the Hon. Minister of Housing, the Minister of Health and myself which is going to examine, and in this exercise we are going to have the collaboration of the National Trust, all the unspoilt areas of woodlands, cliffs, of the beach and park land which exist on the East Coast of Barbados with a view to preparing an overall plan for their use as parks and recreational areas. In some cases acquisition will be necessary, but we think that a plan for acquisition, which looks at the whole East Coast and sets it within a context, is a plan that can be more easily carried out because we would be able to set our target for each year, we would be able to set our target within the communications network that may be necessary, and we would be able to know exactly what land we should be buying this year, next year, and so on, and not purchasing land *ad hoc* from any friend of any politician or of a particular political party.

The National Trust has made known to us that there are agencies in Canada which have funds available for undertaking a survey, and has indicated that they will be willing to undertake such a survey in collaboration with the Government. It will cost us something, but not, of course, as much as if we had to survey the whole area and prepare plans for recreational facilities all on our own. I expect that the Cabinet's Sub-Committee will very soon meet and report accordingly, and that before very long, certainly within the next few months, we will be able to have in our hands a plan for the expansion of recreational facilities in eastern Barbados to go hand in hand with the plans for economic development which are outlined here today.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was very attractive in his remarks until he decided at some time, or he still feels, that he is on the side of the Opposition and he must go on making political harangues. What I would like to say to him is that they now have the Government, and it is high time that they start behaving like a Government rather than continuing the exercises of people who would like to get the Government. There is no Minister,

either past, present or future, who is going to sit down in his office as a Minister and not seek to generate employment for the people in this country, especially when he is beset everyday with hundreds of people from all over Barbados asking for jobs. Therefore, it is very inhuman and almost bordering on cannibalism to come in here and try to suggest that any Minister in the past Government seeking to increase the opportunity for employment among people in this country was doing so for the sole purpose of getting a seat, especially when you are dealing with certain people. I am one of those, certainly, who would like you to bear in mind that whether I get in the House or not is immaterial to me. I do not make my living out of politics. Being a Minister for five years has cost me more from my pocket than if I had remained for five years in my practice, so let us get that clear.

The position is this. If you go through St. Michael North Central, of which I am fortunate to be the representative, and you assess the value of the work which has been done there it does not come to that wonderful figure, which is the figment of the imagination of the hon. member, in excess of $1 million. I would like to assure him that some of the works in St. Michael North Central had not been done by me. They started long before I took over that Ministry, but that is not the important thing. The important thing is not whether the roads were done by me or by a previous Minister. The important thing is that in Barbados these things are important to the ordinary man in the street. Roads, water, light and housing are still important issues and far more important to the man in the street than big buildings like the Financial building, the National Insurance building, or something of that nature. They will continue to be important to the man in the street until each and everyone of the roads in this country that needs to be done is done, every place that needs light will get light, and every place that needs water will get water. The hon. member must not try to belittle them, because these things affect the day-to-day living of the man in the street far more so than the financial building.

When a man gets out of his home and has to step in water after a heavy rain, he is concerned, and his immediate reaction is to curse the Minister whether that Minister is a member of the Democratic Labour Party or a member of the Barbados Labour Party. When a man is walking about at night and he stubs his foot, due to absence of proper lighting, he will want to curse the Minister regardless to whether that Minister is a member of the Democratic Labour Party or a member of the Barbados Labour Party. When a man wants water and he has to go long distances to spend a lot of wasteful time at a standpipe catching water, he will also want to go to the Minister.

I am saying that the present Minister of Communications and Works will do no less than I have done. He will do more in that capacity of providing light, water, roads and other employment opportunities for the people of Barbados. I would be the last person, if he does that, to come in here and want to criticise him by saying that he is doing that for political reasons. I would not indulge in that type of cheap politics. I would agree with the hon. member that there is a need for reassessing the priorities of the Ministry of Communications and Works because that has been my view, but unfortunately I had been in that Ministry for too short a period of time to put into operation some of the views which I have about reorganisation in the Ministry of Communications and Works.

When it comes to the proposals for the development of the Scotland District, there have always been proposals for the development of the Scotland District, but the important thing involved in the development of the Scotland District is money. The amount of money which is required to make an impact upon what obtains in the Scotland District is not available to the Barbados Government, and the hon. member will soon find out that. We can spend a few million dollars when the year goes by, but how far can that few million dollars go in relation to what is needed in the Scotland District? I have no fault to find on that issue. I wish him luck. He was rather attractive in the type of proposals he was putting forward with regard to what should be done in the area of the Scotland District. I would like to see a paper on it which I could study, analyse, and if possible make some suggestions, because I am as interested in Barbados as he is. I do not want him to get away with the idea that he is more interested in Barbados than I am. I do not want him to feel for one moment that my role on this side is purely to oppose or criticise him. I do not believe in that type of thing.

If there is a contribution to be made, which is going to redound to the benefit of the people of this country, I will make it. If there are any suggestions that I can give him, and he is prepared to accept them, which will be to the benefit of the people of this country or to anybody on that side, I will give them. Let him get this straight. I am interested in Barbados just as much as any member of the other side professes to be, but I think it is the height of ingratitude to get in here and try to interpret

what any Minister has done in his Ministry during the period that he was responsible for that Ministry in terms of vote-catching.
1.25 p.m.

Therefore it is uncharitable for you to get up and say that. *(Aside.)* I know that as well as you do. I knew it long ago. So there is no point in knowing it now. Anybody in the Ministry of Communications and Works will tell you that I have never been concerned with whether anybody votes for me or not. Check fully with the staff of the Ministry of Communications and Works and they will give you their opinion as to how I ran my Ministry.

I would like to throw out this warning. It may suit them to get up here and criticise me in my role as Minister of Communications and Works, which is indirectly criticising the staff in there, and therefore instead of eliciting their enthusiasm and support you might be reducing it. That is not the type of thing that we should be setting out to do at this particular juncture.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I have been doing a lot of talking this morning. (ASIDE: You advertising?) Everyone knows Sleepy Smith. What do I have to advertise myself for?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I agree entirely with my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central. When we listen to the Prime Minister he claims that in this country one of the basic problems is unemployment, and he gets up here and criticises the former Government for providing employment. At least he did not say that we stole $1 million. He said it was providing work. It was not corruption. We have not come to the corruption yet. It was providing work for people that he says are 27 per cent unemployed in this country in his budgetary reply; and now he comes here and tells the public purely for cheap politics that the last Government spent $1 million on projects in the constituency – you can see what he is inferring. He deals with half truths. He does not tell you the straight facts. His statement was to give the impression that the former Minister of Communications and Works spent $1 million in his constituency. That is the way he puts it. He is a genius at this sort of thing.

What is important is that if $1 million was spent in providing roads, then $1 million was spent in providing food and wages for Barbadians. That is what they do not seem to understand. The Parks and Beaches Commission was providing jobs for Barbadians. All of these projects are providing employment.

If he goes through the country he cannot truthfully say – if he would let the present member for St. Andrew bring to him a list of applications for roads, water and light in Barbados, the requests could cover the whole of this Chamber. If you tote up the cost of providing roads from the requests that come in from the citizens of this country it will come to $15 million if not more: because with the development of Barbados people want roads, light and water. There is no use telling somebody that they can drive down Blades Hill when they come out of a little lane and they have to come with two pairs of shoes. The Government is providing roads for people with children who have to go out. There are weddings and funerals and Church on Sundays. Children have to go to school. People walk about at nights. When you provide lights in village streets you are providing a service for Barbadians; and that is more important, as my colleague, the member for St. Michael North Central, said, than some big road stretching from Bath to Conset.

The man who lives in the Green Fields.....(Hon. B. A. MILLER: In Green Fields?) You cannot tell me about the Green Fields. I was born here in Barbados. My navel string is buried here. Are you now hearing about the Green Fields? I can call any part of Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. You will both take your seats.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member in breaching Standing Orders by failing to address the Chair and talking indirectly across the House to other members.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I was rudely interrupted when I was saying that the election is over. As the hon. member for St. Michael North Central said, we have come into the House to support the Government when they bring something as happened today; but the Prime Minister gets up and starts denigrating and casting slurs at the Opposition. When we spent $1 million in providing roads we were providing roads for Barbadians. I am sorry that the Minister for Communications and Works is not here. I would ask him to get the staff to submit to the Prime Minister the requests that have come into the Ministry of Communications and Works for roads throughout the entire Island and he will see

that the requests are for millions of dollars which that Government cannot satisfy in five years or even 10 years; and as my colleague asked, are you going to give the people in the districts where they have their homes light, water and roads or move them to where the services exist?

Are you providing employment by spending money? I wish I had more money to spend, and I am sure that my colleague feels the same way because unemployment, as we well agree in this House, is one of the main problems facing the young people of this country. Do not come here and pretend that the spending of $1 million is throwing money in the air. At least he did not accuse us of carrying it away this time; but you accuse us of spending it badly.

My colleague's constituency got perhaps the less roads. I did mine and they only gave me 20 more votes than Hinds. Am I to apologise for putting a road in Halls Road which did not have roads for 300 years? Should I apologise for that? Or for building a road in Valerie? I did not put it in my yard. It is there for all time. Go in for these grandiose if you have the money to do them; but I would not like to be a citizen living in a little gap or cul-de-sac or in the roads in St. Lawrence which you can see now are being fixed, or even in some of the roads in the constituency of the member for Christ Church West and hear talk about a big road from Conset or from Belleplaine to Bath and every time my child comes out it is in difficulty, and when there is a funeral in my gap, the hearse cannot come out. It is midnight and the doctor cannot come in.

The last Government was spending a colossal amount on roads. Let the Minister check the files. You have the files now. Nobody burned them. They are over there. I did not touch any. I collected my files from Education with the Permanent Secretary present. I did not touch one. All the files of the Ministry of Communications and Works are there. Nobody ran away with them or carried them home and burned them. Let the Minister give you some idea of what the demands of the poeple of this country are for these basic commodities of life – roads, telephones and water and you will be amazed to see.

I will defy you to classify on any priority basis and satisfy the demands of these people. Let us get down to priorities. I was Minister of Communications and Works. My people say I know that this road is to be done. I am a politician. I see this whole question where members of Parliament will be Chairmen of Statutory Boards will rebound. I am Minister and I can say that water should go here, roads should go here and lights for here. Can I tell my people when they have been without them for as long as somebody in St. Thomas, that I have not got the power to give them, when their roads are equally bad and they need light and water? Home drum beats first.

You are hearing about the roads that they are going to do in St. Andrew now. They will build a road from St. Simons to Walkers. You are going to do all these things in St. Andrew. The Minister has got to do it. There is to be a Post Office in Welchman Hall, a Police Station and a Library. I bet you that those things go up fast. There is to be high rise building in the City. All right. What are we quarrelling about? You have to give the people what they want; but do not come here and decry us.

You will ignore this aspect and go in for the developmental projects; but do not pooh pooh this as if it is not something that is needed. Have you seen some of the roads in Hindsbury Road? Have you seen some of the roads in St. Lawrence that need repairing? What are you going to tell the people? That you cannot get out to go down to Bath, or that you cannot get out to go down to Conset when your own road that you must pass every day is in a bad condition?

Let us cut out this folly. You organise your priorities. You do not have to do any roads in my constituency if you do not want. I will ask you some questions from time to time. Whether you do them or not, put in water or light or do anything in St. Michael South Central that is your business and your Government's business.
1.35 p.m.

It does not matter to me whether you do it. But you have got to admit that these are still the basic needs of the people – that they should be able to get out of their homes, that the doctor should be able to go to them – and there are thousands of roads in Barbados like this, and if any Government says it is interested in the working classes and the masses of this country, then they must at all stages endeavour to meet these basic needs, because this is all part of the development of Barbados. A road in Hindsbury Road is not a road for the member for St. Michael North Central; a road in Hindsbury Road or Halls Road is a road for the people of Barbados who for years have been deprived of it and who are entitled to these roads; so do not come in with all this talk that you are spending money. There are two things that you do by it; you provide basic conveniences for people and you provide employment, and these are things

Barbadians will need because of years of neglect like in housing and other areas where you as a Government and we as part of the parliamentary process have got to endeavour within the limited resources of our country and such money as we can get from abroad to try to meet.

If you check the files you will find that when I was Minister of Communications and Works we had discussion with the Inter-American Development Bank to try and get money for tenantry roads and subsidiary roads, but they do not lend money for that sort of thing, and that is why we have heard that the roads are getting in bad condition. Let the Minister hand you the file which is in the Ministry of Communications and Works; get your technical people to cost with present day costs and see the amount of money needed to supply these demands. My colleague the member for North Central and I used to visit your constituency to see the condition of the roads. The Prime Minister will realise that in Barbados there are still too many bad roads where people cannot get in and out on the first rainy day. What did we have to do in the meantime? We have given them marl fill here and marl fill there. You will find money spent on marl fill as a temporary expedient; so do not come in here and give the impression that... *(Asides)* You are not going to make me talk because that is my profession. I can talk all day.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. James must refrain from his cross talk.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All I am saying finally is that the Prime Minister when he wants to can rise to great heights and make statements that are non-controversial. You are in Government now and you should get accustomed to the feel. Two months have gone and it is nearly three and you should get accustomed to the feel and sit down in the chair. Why should he everytime he opens his mouth bring in some talk like that? You have won the Government. Why say that the former Minister, the member for St. Michael North Central spent nearly $1 million in his constituency as if by so doing, if he did and he did not, and not carrying away the money and not being accused of corruption he was not providing employment for Barbadians and meeting some of the basic needs?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that I consider it most unfair of the Prime Minister to seek to give the member for St. Michael North Central a bad name when he was Minister of Communications and Works. I can tell you, Sir, that when he was Minister of Communications and Works his methodology for fixing roads in the various constituencies was to go out with the representatives of the particular constituency, do a complete survey with all the technocrats in his Ministry, and he made decisions about the roads on an island-wide basis. It so happened as you yourself know, Mr. Chairman, that in his constituency and the constituencies surrounding it and indeed within the constituencies of St. Michael it was discovered that the roads in many respects were among the worst in this country. In my own constituency, Mr. Chairman, there are roads that you have to see to believe, and they are right next door to highways in this country. As my colleague said, the fixing of roads, the provision of fundamental services is a very expensive proposition, and I do not think it is fair to suggest that in some way the former Minister behaved ultra vires or the former Minister behaved in a corrupt manner.

I know the Prime Minister has this capacity to use inflection in his voice to excite certain people into believing that the point he has just made or the point he is about to make is a really fantastic point. Those of us who have got accustomed to him know how he goes about this, and some people may even applaud him for it, but I could not sit in this House knowing as I did and knowing as I do the way in which the then Minister of Communications and Works went about doing his work and allow it to pass through this House that the Minister behaved in some way detrimental to the community.

I remember seeing the hon. member for St. Thomas in a photograph in the Advocate newspaper at a time when they were installing, I believe, three or four lights in a gap in St. Thomas, and I remember him suggesting, as I am told, that he was instrumental in making sure that lights had been placed in the constituency, and that is an activity which all representatives of various constituencies engage in. I hope it is not true that the Minister of Communications and Works has ordered the stoppage of work in all of the constituencies where representation is now by the Democratic Labour Party. I refuse to believe that is true. I for example know that there is a road in Passage Garden. Work was started on it after the technicians in the Ministry of Communications and Works were satisfied that it was perhaps the worst road in all of Barbados.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, I can assure the hon. member that I live in the constituency of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the Leader of the Opposition, and not only is the Minister of Communications and Works continuing the work in that constituency

but he has started road widening and new work next to the People's Cathedral and right on, and really to make remarks like that on suspicion is not well founded. I see it every day. In fact I can give the hon. member the assurance and I would not mind leaving the House and taking him there.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I would be very wary of leaving the House and going anywhere with the hon. member at this time. I said I was very glad that the Minister of Communications and Works would not do it but persons in my constituency have come to me and indicated that work in the constituency had stopped. I think you will agree it is my right and my duty to raise the question. I am very glad to be assured by the Hon. Attorney General that it is not so. I look forward to the completion of the work on the roads in Passage Garden and I look forward to the completion of the work in Richmond Gap; but I rose primarily to indicate ... (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You now want to sell Daphne's house?) As long as it is paid for by a cheque I can take to the Bank.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross talk.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is unfair for anyone to suggest that the former Minister of Communications and Works set out to do his work in a partisan manner.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it does not seem as if any other hon. member wishes to speak. This capital works seem to have become a debate about roads. I am going to try to lift it a little above the level of Passage Garden and Richmond Gap. The things that have been said, political harangue, cannibalism; the hon. member for St. Michael South West used the well known technique of saying I do not wish to believe it, I hope it is not true. I can imagine how he would behave if I said I hope it is not true that Leo Leacock used to give 10% on all licences that he got for cement to a certain person in the Ministry. I do not want to believe it. I do not believe that Sam Gibbs used to bribe anybody. That is the technique that this false rhetoric will lead to.

1.45 p.m.

I will counsel the hon. member in his fledgling days in the House of Assembly to understand that the speaking techniques of the New York School of Journalism or whatever it is do not cut much ice when you come in here. We pay little attention to methodology, we do not deal with technocrats, whether *ultra vires* behaving in a corrupt manner or not, and we do not use techniques of rhetoric that were outworn when Cicero left law school. If the hon. member wants to talk about the roads in Richmond Gap, he has every opportunity of talking about them.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, I have been studying the debates in this House of Assembly for the last fifteen years and a number of the techniques might have been borrowed from the speeches made by the member for St. Thomas.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is there not some limit to points of order? The Standing Orders say you must set out succinctly what rule of order is alleged to be breached. Is there not some limit to interruptions? The techniques of oratory are matters for the hon. member for St. Michael South West. I perhaps some day will collect a whole list of "I hope it is not true" and just remember to release it a piece at a time, and perhaps when I finish the hon. member will take to wearing a shamrock in his lapel. I hope it is not true.

The debate, if I may say so with respect to the hon. members on the other side for St. Michael North and South Central, when shown of some of the irrelevancies and the unnecessary noisiness of the Leader of the Opposition, displayed a genuine division between the demands of development and the demands of social amenity. All the language and the talk about people must have roads, lights, water and so on does not conceal the fact that Barbados is not a country (a) that can afford to subsidise employment directly out of taxation – this is a fact of life that has to be faced – or (b) that can pursue social welfare schemes at length in substitution for development. There has to be a balance and a mixture of both; there must be. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central well understands that and brings, I think, some measure of intellectual capacity to the grasp of this problem which may be lacking in the Leader of the Opposition. I do not believe that I have to go any further with the Leader of the Opposition than merely to repeat that he said that when he was Minister of Communications and Works he approached the Inter American Development Bank for money to build tenantry roads and subsidiary roads. If he does not understand what is involved in development banking to such an enormous extent that he thinks that Development Bank Funds from abroad, or indeed from Barbados, are available for building tenantry roads, then he should really keep off the subject altogether.

Common sense will tell even the Leader of the Opposition that if you take a million dollars and use it to keep 200 people in work for a year you have not done as much as if you spend a million dollars on a development project to put up a factory, you organise a commercial enterprise if you do it properly and give employment to 200 people for the rest of eternity. A million dollars invested in MCW is a million dollars taken from taxation, spent and finished with. A million dollars invested in a development project, a road that contributes to the – I beg hon. members' pardon, but I have to use one of the hon. member for St. Michael South West's words – the infrastructure of Barbados is a road that has development content. When you build a road that makes it easier to get from the little down-in-the-bottom fishing port at Conset Bay to a factory six or siven miles up the coast at Belleplaine, you are making it possible for the catch of fish to increase at Conset Bay, thereby giving work to more fishermen, because you are providing the means to communications with a preserving operation, which in itself gives more work to people. So you ask the Government what should it do, spend a million dollars on subsidiary roads when there is serious unemployment, giving work to fifty people for a year? Or spend a million dollars on a road which will give work to thirty more fishermen and sixty or seventy more people working in factories for the rest of their lives?

These are the priorities that have to be examined, and it is a measure of the failure of the Democratic Labour Party, particularly in the last five years, that they lost sight of those priorities altogether. That is the true division.

I appreciate what the hon. member for St. Michael North Central said, that you have to be a cannibal if you object to giving work to people, but many years ago when the New Deal was being developed President Roosevelt said it is better to dig holes and fill them in again than to have people out of work, and the immediate priority, when economists realised that there was some truth in this, the immediate priority was to find another equation that would introduce the element of permanent development and permanent employment.

I am sorry the hon. member for St. Michael North Central is now out of his seat. I am informed that a petition with – I am told 187, but suppose you say over a hundred people – has been received relating to one of the hard courts that the hon. member put down in his constituency in the run up to the election asking for the hard court to be dug up, at a cost of $26,000 it was put down, in Carringtons Village. If the very people who live in Carringtons Village realise that....

Dr. CADDLE: If the hon. member will give way, I would just like to make this clear for the benefit of the hon. member. I did not build the hard courts in Carringtons Village, MCW was not involved. I would like to draw to your attention that the same people in Carringtons Village who wrote a letter to the Ministry of Education asking for the hard courts, some of them might have changed their minds: deal with them, do not come in here and give the impression that I got anything or that I was involved, I was not involved in it. Whether it cost $26,000 or not had nothing to do with MCW; be realistic about that. (ASIDE: Was it a coincidence?) It is a coincidence in any constituency, so let us be realistic about that, I had nothing to do with it. I will repeat that we have a serious issue of building in Barbados, let us stop indulging in this type of exercise which is not going to do anything good for the people of this country.

Hon. J. M. G.M. ADAMS: I do beg the hon. member's pardon. Obviously what has happened is that we have got the wrong side of Carringtons Village; I think the Minister of Education sat for St. Michael South Central, and I shouldn't be surprised. Nonetheless, this is surely an ideal example of what the original argument about pump priming was, it is better to dig holes and fill them in again, except in this particular occasion what has happened is a hole has been filled in and now it is being dug again. You cannot expect us as a Government to stand by and say that the slate will be wiped clean and we will draw a line and nothing that ever happened will be adverted to in the future. I have heard hon. members – perhaps not any hon. member who is now in the House – but certainly the hon. member for St. John when he was criticised in here for things the Government was doing, he didn't go back to August, 1976, three months ago, he went back to fifteen years. "When the Barbados Labour Party was in power they did so and so" and I expect that in this Parliament I am going to hear the Opposition tell us of things which we did when we were last in power.

1.55 p.m.

The Opposition believes that by going in the Opposition it ceases to be the subject of criticism.

Dr. CADDLE: Were any one of you ever in power before now? Let us be serious. What is the point of coming here to harangue people? You, personally, were not in power before now. We have to see your mistakes and then criticise them.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has a very good point, indeed. If he is publishing a self-denying Ordinance that he will never refer to the Government of the earlier BLP, then we will be happy to assist him. I only hope he will bite some of his colleagues and infect them with the principle of not looking at things which no longer matter. We are talking about what was done this year. The Democratic Labour Party and its representatives cannot expect that merely by saying: "All right now, give us a break." that we are going to abandon criticism! You can beg for a break. Sometimes you will get it. *(Asides.)* Appeal for light? I dare say that the umpire will, occasionally, hear your appeal. But if you lack the courage to take decisions and say, "No. This is a point beyond which we cannot go. The demands of development say that money must be spent in this direction for the long-term benefit of Barbados. We cannot spend it on this because it is merely of short-term advantage." If you lack the courage to say that, then do not elevate it into a principle. There is no principle in that. It is the easiest thing in the world, if you want to ruin the country, to employ everybody in Barbados doing nothing.

Mr. Chairman, there would be no difficulty, if we wanted to be out of power in the 18 months that we understand the hon. member for St. Michael North Central has given us, after which he will take over as Prime Minister, if we wanted to be out of power within that 18 months. We would take all the money in the Treasury, employ every unemployed person in Barbados in the way that the hon. member for St. John said we should. What figure did he set? Twenty dollars a week? He said that we should give every unemployed person $20 a week until we could find work for him to do. We could do that. We could empty the Treasury and go home. The Treasury has been empty already since our term of office, but we have not spoken about this. It has been empty already. In the first couple of weeks after we were in power cheques could no longer be met by the Accountant General, and we have only just been able to restore economic activity and restore the Government's finances. I took remedial measures. The Attorney General drew it to my attention – it was in his Department – that persons were unable to get payable orders cashed because the previous Government had emptied the Treasury and gone to the limit of the Government's overdraft at the Central Bank. We did not worry to deal with this because there have been crises of confidence in this Government already created by goodness knows what forces. We, therefore, did our best, repaired the situation, and I am happy to say that the Government's overdraft which was at the limit of $24 million is under $2 million today.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is telling us that it is cannibalism if you object to the misspending of money! I am happy to say that confidence is being restored in the Government. Yesterday I was able to discuss with a Manager of one of the leading Banks in Barbados certain matters, and one of the first things he indicated was that the Bank had $10 million that it wished to invest in Barbados Government securities to assist the Government with its Development Programmes. Why? Because people with the kind of resources that are needed to develop this country have confidence in our Government that the money will not be misspent. They know that they can give us money and that they can put it in our hands, and it will be properly spent. That is exactly the difference between what we are trying to do on this side and what was done in the last few months.

I make no apologies for indicating that Development Programmes must have a greater priority in Barbados. Water, roads and lights are second to none, Sir. With regard to getting water, roads, and lights for St. Thomas, when I was in the Opposition and you saw me in a gap with somebody from the Electric Company talking about light, you will know that those people have light and they got it without the payment of one cent by the taxpayers of this country. They got it by my harangues and my pressures to make sure that they would get some of the basic amenities of life. You can do it in the Government, and you can do it in the Opposition. The only thing is that in the Opposition you do not have access to the taxpayers' money, so you have to work a little harder at it. That is the difference.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that head 118 stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

Head 119 – Ministry of Communications and Works – was called.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 119 – Communications and Works – stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do not pass.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of three money Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, each seconded by the Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business.
2.02 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. Speaker suspended the Sitting until 2.45 p.m.
2.03 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is now resumed.

Mr. ODLE: Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time, and there being no questions, we move on to Private Members' time. When the time expired for Private Members' Business the hon. member for St. Thomas was addressing the Chair.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is little more that I wish to add to what has already been said on this matter. There have been criticisms of the abolition of the 5% sales tax on the quite specious grounds that has led to a rise in prices. When they are so politically bankrupt, when they are so starved out for argument that they have to say that reducing the price of goods by taking off the sales tax causes a rise in the cost of living, then their whole argument has to be judged by the nonsense involved.

I will have something to say shortly about another matter which was raised relating to the licensing system, and that is that the reason why we have set out to abolish the licensing system wherever it is not needed is to protect manufacturers in Barbados, or to discharge our responsibilities under the CARICOM Treaty, and that the licensing system is wasteful, it is inefficient and it can be corrupted.

There is no point in having a licensing system for flour and if all the licenses are granted, as was pointed by the Hon. Minister for Food and Consumer Affairs. If we do not refuse licences what is the point of having licences except to waste time in the Ministry concerned? To take the particular example of flour, as soon as you abolish the licences the price of flour is reduced.

We are aiming at finding a substitute for licensing even in the matter of monitoring import price control because we think they create hindrance to the speed of taking business decisions and the proper administration of forward looking commercial enterprises. If you do not know whether or not you are going to be allowed to bring in certain goods, perhaps you cannot take your business decisions in such a way as would result in economy to the public.

I have been pushed by the Opposition to say how we will find the funds to carry on the Government in the face of its bad financial position. I have never known a party yet in my life discover overnight, the night being the 2nd of September, 1976 that what they were saying about Barbados' progress under their regime has suddenly turned into a situation where Barbados was the worst governed country or had the worse economic position of any country in the world. You never heard any of the members opposite who have run from their places now say one word about the financial position the Government was in until they lost the Government. All of a sudden they have lost the Government, and like little sheep who have lost

their tails they are asking me to say how I am going to get Barbados out of the mess that they put Barbados in. I say to them wait and see how this Government will deal with the difficulties into which they now in the Opposition have dropped us.

Now, I have a very small point to make. I really would rather not have to make these miserable, petty fogging comments to deal with these malicious comments. It was set out that I, as Prime Minister, choose to live in my own house because I then draw a house allowance of $800 a month. It has come to my attention that this in fact being bruited about in the by-ways by people who perhaps should know better.

Now if the Prime Minister lives in Culloden Farm he does not draw house allowance, but his pension is calculated as though he did draw it. The former Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John has applied for and even by this time has been paid a gratuity of $90,000 cash which he has got from the public treasury in respect of his services as Prime Minister, and that $90,000 includes a gratuity calculated on the house allowance although he never drew it. Although he never drew the $800 a month, he is still being given a gratuity as if he had drawn it.

He is also getting his parliamentary salary, and on top of that his Prime Minister's pension. So he is as well paid as a Minister. He is the only person who is in a position to draw a pension and a parliamentary salary; and if anybody should be misguided enough to make him a Minister again he would be entitled to draw the ministerial salary and the Prime Minister's pension; but we are putting an end to that. He can keep the few months that he has drawn in excess. I will give him that. We are putting an end to that, but it ill comes from him who has held out for every penny that he can draw legally from the Treasury to talk about the $800 a month that his successor gets by reason of living in his own house.

When you live in Culloden Farm you pay $100 a month for domestic staff. For that $100 a month, the former Prime Minister got a butler, a cook, and another maid whose combined salaries were upwards of $1,000 a month. He had the services of five or six gardeners to whom I understand instructions were not given not to attend around the pig pens which he kept for private profit. He paid no income tax. The law was changed, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker,on the basis of his occupation of Culloden Farm. He did not pay electricity and telephone and so on.

In my own house, I pay income tax for occupying my own house. I pay land tax for occupying my own house. I employ a gardener full time and I also have the services of another gardener who comes in once or twice a week, and I employ my own domestic staff; and it has been calculated for me that my occupancy of my own house is saving the Government on the salaries of the staff alone, because the $800 which is paid to me is less than the difference between what the former Prime Minister paid and the cost of domestic staff – a difference of over $900 a month.

I do not like going into these petty things; but they get talked about, and unless you contradict them they continue to be talked about. The former Prime Minister never paid one cent in tax for Culloden Farm. He never paid electric bills. I have to pay additional electric bills because there are police around my house and I have to put up big search lights outside in view of the present security situation. They have insisted on that.

3.00 p.m.

I do not want to underline it, but I am just suggesting that when you have to be as petty as talking about that, it reveals something. I am obliged to the hon. member for Christ Church West. If I chose now to rent my house, I do not believe that I could take a rent of $200 a month for it. I would want a little more for a furnished house of that sort. Of the $800 I pay over $400 goes in tax so that the net value to me is $400. If I moved into Culloden Farm they would pay my domestic staff, pay my electric bill, and I would be drawing rent from my own house; so why this pettiness and cheap-mindedness? This is not serious politics. A man cannot even take a decision based upon what the law and custom allow without this type of petty carping.

Mr. Speaker, there may be other occasions when I will deal at greater length with the subjects raised during the debate, but I think this debate has gone on for a great deal of time, and I know that the hon. member for Christ Church West wishes to deal with foreign policy matters that were raised, and I believe the hon. member for St. Michael West will wish to reply, and I am urging the House to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. Michael West and reject the ridiculous Resolution of the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have had the benefit of reading the speech made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central in so far as he dealt with matters relating to the

Ministry of External Affairs. I wish I could have said that his discussion of the question of foreign policy of Barbados was on a high level and was based on a critical analysis of the contents of the Throne Speech, and indeed of the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. Instead I think the hon. member's speech was characterised by a series of disjointed questions, a complete lack of analysis and a repetitious formula that I do not advocate should be emulated.

At the outset I think I should make it clear that this Government intends wherever possible to invite discussion on matters of foreign policy not only in an effort to stimulate a better understanding of foreign policy by Parliament and by the country at large, but also perhaps in an effort to arrive wherever possible at a bi-partisan approach to issues dealing with foreign policy. The guidelines under which we will conduct our foreign policy were adumbrated in the party's manifesto. I should like to restate that we must bear in mind that this country's foreign policy must be conducted under certain constraints. These constraints are of course the size of the country which of necessity means that we have a limitation of resources, and also a limitation of human resources, and we could never expect that the embassies which we have in foreign countries will be as many or need be as many as the embassies which larger states with bigger resources have. Although we have an abiding interest in many of the discussions going on multilaterally and bilaterally in world affairs, I regret very much to say that no Minister of External Relations of Barbados either now or in the future will be able to service adequately the whole realm of foreign relations which impinge on our day to day policy, and that is why we have said that we will underscore the representation of our nationals abroad, the promotion of our trade opportunities, and the defence of our vital interests as three basic guidelines guiding our foreign policy in the future.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the Leader of the Opposition, wanted us to make positive statements on certain aspects of our bilateral relationships. I would like to assure the Honourable House that the Ministry of External Affairs, from the first day I went to the Ministry, has been engaged on an over-all review of our bilateral and multilateral relationship. I am not in a position at this moment to give all of the conclusions reached. For one thing, Mr. Speaker, the conclusions reached will be submitted to Cabinet for final Cabinet approval wherever we believe that any shift is necessary in our bilateral relationships.

I should like, however, to deal at this time with the issue of our relationship with the Republic of Cuba. This Government has not had to worry about the wild allegations made in the foreign press in particular and on some of the platforms of the Democratic Labour Party about our attitude towards the Republic of Cuba. When we were in Opposition we pointed out to the then Government that we had sufficient nationals in Cuba which justified our having closer relations with the Republic of Cuba. This was well ahead of the decision of the Heads of Governments of Caribbean countries to open formal diplomatic relations with Cuba, and I would like to stress that the fact that Cuba might practise an ideology not necessarily espoused by all of the Caribbean states was no reason in our way of thinking why we should not promote any necessary mutual vital interests existing between ourselves and that country. We have no intention of changing our point of view on this issue. Our relationship with the Republic of Cuba is cordial. It is based on mutual respect and we have no intention of intervening in the domestic affairs of that country just as I seriously believe that that country has no intention and certainly will not be permitted to intervene in the domestic affairs of Barbados. We intend to promote these bilateral relationships in so far as the mutual interests of Cuba and ourselves demand. We will not ever follow a foreign policy based on emotionalism despite whatever carping criticisms there may be.

In the realm of foreign affairs one has to be pragmatic. One must recognise that where your very vital interest is is where you have to make urgent decisions on matters. In the Caricom area we intend to, as we have said before, deepen Caricom relationships, but again this will be done on our abiding faith in promoting a wider regional unity and without of course, Mr. Speaker, in any way undermining the democratic system of Government which we have in Barbados.

3.10 p.m.

The hon. member raised the question of our relationship with the Organisation of American States. In our Manifesto we pointed out that we will be doing a review of our policy towards the OAS. For the benefit of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central I should point out that in August 1976 the requirements for membership of the Inter American Development Bank were changed and it is no longer necessary for a country to be a member of the OAS in order to qualify for membership of the Inter American Development Bank, or indeed for loans or assistance from that organisation. I am not saying, and I want to be specific about this, that

we have come to a final conclusion on our relationship with the OAS, but during my Washington trip I took the opportunity of having extensive talks with the Secretary General of the OAS, and I have pointed out areas of concern to Barbados in which we at present were not being satisfactorily serviced by that organisation. Our discussions are still continuing and they are at the stage where I would not like in any way to affect those discussions. Suffice it to say, however, that whereas the past Government was prepared to sit down and put up with a situation in the Organisation of American States where we were a net contributor to that Organisation and not getting any reciprocal benefits, the Barbados Labour Party while in Government will not go for that form of membership.

During this year alone Barbados was entitled to U.S. $200,000 in assistance in one form or another and it is not getting that. I can state as a fact that in the 1,739 employees in the Organisation of American States only two are Barbadians, and none of them at a level higher than P.4. This could not be satisfactory to any party that carries the interest of Barbados at heart, and I have been adamant in drawing to the attention of all the people in the Organisation of American States that we will not continue our membership if this is going to be the attitude towards Barbados in particular, and the Caribbean in general. I am happy to inform the House that within a few days of my return from the United States of America one of the top personnel officers of that organisation visited Barbados and had far-reaching discussions with the Head of the Civil Service, the Chief Personnel Officer, and the Head of the Foreign Service to see in what way arrangements could be made for the increase in the number of Barbadians employed in that organisation.

Similarly within the United Nations system, the Hon. Prime Minister has made a speech before the UN and I believe that his policy statements are there for everyone to see, but we have taken pains already at the United Nations to show the trend where our review of foreign policy will lead us. I would like to state that we have participated fully in the discussion on apartheid, and on 11 resolutions adopted on question of the apartheid policies of the South African Government, Barbados voted positively in favour of those resolutions specifically.

The Opposition may like to know that we have requested the Security Council to take action under Chapter 7 of the Charter for mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. This is a resolution not completely unanimously passed by the Assembly in view of the fact that certain arms suppliers like the United Kingdom and the United States of America did not vote for this resolution. We supported the resolution which proclaimed that any collaboration with the racist regime of South Africa is a hostile act against the oppressed people of South Africa and contemptuous of the United Nations, and we condemned strongly all states of foreign economic interest which continue to collaborate with the South Africa regime. Our delegation reaffirmed on behalf of the people of Barbados the legitimacy of the struggle of the South African people by all possible means to fight for the seizure of power and the right to exercise their fundamental rights, particularly the right of self-determination.

We supported the Resolutions which authorised the Committee against Apartheid to organise a world conference for action against apartheid in 1977 in Nigeria, and we also asked the committee to even secure an international conference for Trade Unions in Geneva against apartheid. We supported a resolution which condemned the continuing and increasing collaboration of various countries with South Africa, particularly the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and Israel which have extensive trading relationships with South Africa.

I believe that this is the first time that any Barbados delegation in our ten years of independence has had the boldness, the courage of their convictions to sanction and vote for and promote such a resolution in the United Nations at all. If the hon. member wants to know whether there is any change in foreign policy, certainly that vote is testimony and the direction in which our foreign policy will be going. Likewise, we welcome the proposal made for an international convention against apartheid in sports, and we decided along with other members to set up a drafting committee to prepare texts for such a convention.

We participated fully, Mr. Speaker, in the discussions for the elimination of racial discrimination. I would like to underscore particularly that we voted against an amendment to a resolution which asked for the deletion of reference to the NATO countries in the paragraph by which the Assembly would condemn countries, including NATO members, who assisted racist regimes. In the past the foreign policy of the Democratic Labour Party would be either to vote for the resolution, that is, for the amendment to the resolution or alternatively to abstain, because they never had the courage of

their convictions to take the line that was in the interest of the conviction of this country. They always had the fear that they would not be supporting the line that was dictated since 1966.

There are other areas of our performance at the United Nations which will be reported on from time to time. I would like to say again that we have found in the United Nations system a situation where there are only eight Barbadian nationals employed by the United Nations Organisation in the professional grade, and all of them are at the lower end of the scale of the professional grade. I took the opportunity to address the Fifth Committee myself and to intervene in the debate on budgetary matters and to draw it as forcibly as I could to the attention of the Secretary General and to the General Assembly that Barbados could not tolerate a situation where her nationals particularly her young nationals who are women were being discriminated against in this way.
3.20 p.m.

The hon. member wanted to know what was our policy towards Koreans. It is very simple. It is a policy not followed by the former Government. We see no reason why the People's Republic of North Korea, like the People's Republic of Angola, and like the People's Republic of Vietnam, should not be entitled to full membership of the United Nations. This was not a policy which the last Government supported *in toto*, because they were, probably, scared of United States' reaction to this issue, but since we subscribe unmistakably to the universality of the United Nations we make no apologies whatsoever for following such a line in our foreign policy.

On the other hand, this Government is not going to be emotional, as I said before, about our bilateral relationships. Regardless of whether we like it or not, we are part of the Western Hemisphere, and regardless of whether we like it or not, we must recognise that, perhaps, the largest number of our citizens resident overseas reside in the United States of America. There is no reason, once the United States of America shows respect for the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of Barbados, why we should not continue to have harmonious relations with that country, as, indeed, we intend to continue to have harmonious relations with Canada, the United Kingdom, or France, or Yugoslavia, or any other country for that reason. Barbados will not be jockeyed, as I said before, into adopting lines simply for the purpose of posing on the international scene as being against Colonialism, or Neo-Colonialism, or Imperialism, without giving true meaning to the stands which it adopts. Just as the United Kingdom can promote relations with totalitarian and communist regimes, just as Russia can conduct diplomatic relations with the United States of America, there is no reason why this country should not continue to promote relations with the United States of America or, indeed, with the USSR. We have to decide, as I said before, where our vital interests lie.

I think that the purpose of the hon. member's statement was simply to come to one issue, and that is the issue of the former Ambassador to the United States of America. All of the ranting and raving that he had about foreign policy was to read into the record a letter that I consider to be pretty – I better not say what I think the letter was – a letter written to the Hon. Prime Minister by the former Ambassador. I want for the purpose of the record to make a few things quite clear. On the 2nd September, 1976, former Ambassador King offered, through a letter to the Governor-General, to put his appointment at the discretion of the Prime Minister. This meant that if the Prime Minister had reacted immediately the Ambassador's resignation could have been accepted immediately, and the Ambassador could have been in Barbados by September 3, 1976.

As I understand it, the complaint is that by the time the Ambassador received notice of termination of his appointment that there was only six more hours to go for the completion of midnight on the 15th September. I gave specific instructions in the Ministry,that, despite the final date of termination, which was a date of termination not only for Ambassador King, but for High Commissioner Mrs. Gale and Consul General, Mr. Elliott Mottley, that they were all entitled to remain in their posts for the purpose of saying goodbye and paying diplomatic civilities to the other Embassies and also for making arrangements about the repatriation of their families and their household effects.

Now, this Order, from my researches in the Ministry, has been carried out, and that meant that up to the 25th September, and had the Ambassador made further representation he could have remained longer for all that was involved there. The Ambassador had an extra 10 days within which to make arrangements to return home. I want to read into the records of this House that, in the case of the Consul General, he fell ill and he was given the full facilities that are extended to any person of his

rank; the use of the house, the car, the staff, and everything at the cost of the taxpayers of Barbados to see that he was not in any way inconvenienced during his illness. When he was ready to return to Barbados, he received full protocol treatment at the Airport.

Now, in the case of Ambassador King, similar civilities and courtesies were extended to him to the extent that the Head of the Foreign Service inquired whether there was anything he wanted done so as to facilitate his reintegration into the life of Barbados. The only request we had from him was really as to whether or not we could find as alternative house for a tenant who was living in his house. He was met at the Airport by the Head of Protocol. I did, as I thought it was my duty to do. I issued instructions, in fact, as I thought it was my duty to do, that a letter should be written to the Ambassador thanking him for his services, and I signed that letter.

In the case of High Commissioner, Mrs. Gale, she fell ill. She also was allowed to remain in the post until she recovered fully. I have been preparing for recommendation to the Cabinet a paper recommending that although neither Mr. Mottley nor Mr. King qualified for gratuity due to the fact that they have not served for a full year, they be allowed to draw a proportionate share of the gratuity for the 9-month period they had served. I resent very much the technique of the Democratic Labour Party, which is to go around and make people believe that I am conducting foreign relations on the basis of any personal vendetta. I will confess this one point that at the time when the notice of termination was instructed, and not necessarily sent from the Ministry, no person in the Ministry was told, and there was no report from the Ambassador himself saying that he was Chairman of the Permanent Council of the OAS for that month.

Now, had Ambassador King telephoned the head of the Foreign Service and drawn this to the attention of the Head of the Foreign Service, and representations had been made to me, I would have made the appropriate representation to the Prime Minister to guide him in the exercise of his discretion under Section 100 of the Constitution. I trust that the clarification which I gave to hon. members will be looked at in its entirety, and that this tendency of the Democratic Labour Party to go around giving cheap political jibes that we are victimising people in their employment will be stopped.

What I have stopped, and I make no apologies for doing this, is the situation where an Honorary Consul in Miami, Mr. Colin Mayers, was being paid $500(US) a month for being Honorary Consul whereas no other Honorary Consul was paid that at all. He was paid above the normal grant given to all of our Honorary Consuls in the United States, Europe and elsewhere simply because of his connection, and that decision was taken on the decision of one person and one person only in the Government of the day. The file is there for everyone to see. On this point I will face the Democratic Labour Party, not in this House, but on the public platform on this issue, Mr. Speaker. Whenever I find that they were running Foreign Relations as though it were the private preserve of the Hon. Member for St. John, I make no apologies at bringing that to an end within 24 hours of my seeing the file.
3.30 p.m.

If he calls that victimisation, let him convince the people of Christ Church West to remove me in the next election if I am standing. He does not have the ghost of a chance. Not only will I increase if I am running again, but I give him a bet here. Let him leave St. John and come into Christ Church West and he will see what is victimisation, if he wants to see it.

I want to make my position clear on that. There is no reason why Mr. Colin Mayers should have been singled out for special treatment in this way. By a stroke of the pen I revoke this as from today, H. deB. Forde, Minister of External Affairs and $6,000 US is saved the taxpayers. If that is victimisation let the Democratic Labour Party run me out of Christ Church West next time.

I am sorry that I have to bring the debate to answering that sort of charge that has been made; but I am hoping that when I make a ministerial statement on foreign policy to invite the Opposition at that time to do the decent thing, to move a Resolution and let us have a proper debate on the basis of principle and above the level of trying to interpret people's actions in the wrong way.

The question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question was put and resolved in the negative without division.

The question that those words be there inserted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

RESOLUTION RE PROBLEMS SURROUNDING THE NORTH POINT

Mr. L. SISNETT: Mr. Speaker, when this Resolution was tabled on 12th October, it was tabled with a view to perhaps having some immediate action from this side to have the ship North Point which was acquired under the leadership of the former Prime Minister put into action; because here was a situation where we found that Barbados has gone into perhaps international shipping, and we were overnight faced with a ship in the Port of Bridgetown.

The North Point, acquired under the Democratic Labour Party has been a measure of controversy since it arrived on 27th July. Mr. Speaker, I believe that you were as ignorant as most of us that Barbados had gone into shipping; because to my mind, I believe that this is the kind of thing that most Barbadians never knew about – that we were going into shipping on such a scale. The ship arrived in Barbados under some unusual circumstances. Under the Laws of Barbados, Mr. Speaker, any ship that is registered in Barbados, any ship that is flying the Barbados flag must be authorised by the Comptroller of Customs who happens to be the officer of registration for all ships.

Here on 27th July, 1976, we found the vessel North Point arriving in the Port of Bridgetown without the knowledge of the Controller of Customs who should issue a certificate of registration; and that same ship produced a certificate of registration signed by a former member of the former Government in the person of Captain Fergusson, a self-appointed master mariner. This was a very unusual practice, because, as I said before, every ship that carries the Barbados flag must be registered by the Controller of Customs. Here we have a situation in Barbados where suddenly one vessel, the property of the Barbados Government arrives in the Port of Bridgetown without the knowledge of the Controller of Customs and is duly represented by the former Minister for the Port. These circumstances are to my mind rather questionable.

Now when I tabled this Resolution I thought that the ship had arrived in Barbados or in the Port of Bridgetown and that therefore we should do as a Government everything in our power to get the ship sailing; but on further examination of some of the points about how the ship was acquired, I am very dubious about the relevance of this ship and putting Barbadians to earn a living. I realise that every Barbadian put on this ship is another family fed.

I would like to see the North Point perhaps sailing, but when I consider that on many points surrounding this vessel we will have to ask ourselves what really went wrong in the dying hours of the former Government to have caused the former Prime Minister to have gone overboard and to have acquired at the expense of the taxpayers of this country such a vessel.

The mathematics surrounding the North Point are just simply frightening. We are told that the ship cost $1.75 million Bds. I would like to think that any Minister of Government should have taken the money of the people of this country and put it into a concern like the North Point, a ship which is 32 years old. It is remarkable that every time the former Prime Minister of Barbados opens his mouth he makes a perfect landing. On Sunday, 14th November, he told you, Mr. Speaker, and the public of Barbados that the North Point is a good ship and that criticism came from people who knew nothing about ships. To my mind the North Point might be a good ship – good for nothing or no good at all.

Perhaps the taxpayers of Barbados would like to know a few of the facts surrounding the North Point. The North Point came into Barbados on 27th July, 1976 and has since been tied up in the Port of Bridgetown. This vessel has been under the charge of the Port Department, and from checks with the Department, it means that the ship is being maintained at the cost of $900 or perhaps $1,000 a week out of the money of the taxpayers of this country; and over and above four months it is a question of over $4,000.

3.40 p.m.

In the course of the year, I believe it would be $48,000; but what is the purpose I am asking, Mr. Speaker, of the taxpayers of Barbados having to maintain a ship that is totally useless? I must explain at this point that the North Point is not a ship like one you would find in the inner careenage like the Daerwood, the Calmar or the Lady Joy. The North Point in nautical terms is a self-landing barge. It was built in 1944 by the United States Navy and it reminds me, as one person says, of Noah's Ark, only that Noah's Ark was built to specifications; but in the case of the North Point as it was built during the war it was not built with any specifications. It was built perhaps to last a voyage and it was built to land

tanks, trucks and jeeps and troops on beaches. It was never meant to be a commercial entity. It has been involved, I am told, in the Viet Nam war. As a result, Mr. Speaker, the starboard side of the ship has a knock in its bottom 260 feet long; on the port side we are told it has another dent some 60 feet long.

One does not understand how a country as poor as Barbados where people are suffering so much could have gone into an endeavour without perhaps consulting to find out whether this kind of ship is the kind of ship that one could put into trade. We were told that the North Point was acquired to transport cement from some factory in St. Lucy and this factory as far as I am concerned has not yet been on the drawing board. What was the rational explanation of the former Prime Minister? I am very sorry he is not here today because if there is any one person who would be able to shed some light on the reasons for acquiring the North Point, certainly it must be the former Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John; but it would seem as though we would have to have soundings of another plot on the Government of Barbados to get him back into this Chamber. I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that the money spent on the North Point could have been better utilised in perhaps introducing some industry into Barbados. Only this week an international concern was interested in the North Point doing a service between Barbados and Venezuela and that concern was advised against the North Point doing any trade at all, because of its unsuitability for any trade.

I would like to go further in explaining the position of the North Point to give a few facts surrounding this self-propelled barge. The North Point was built in 1944. It was one of nine ships in that series. They are not ships for commercial trade and were built during the war to no specific classifications. They were just assembled perhaps to make one voyage in landing troops in some part of the world where there was a war, and the North Point was one of such. The North Point was originally the Kempter County, and there were nine others including the Dodge County, Floyd County, Hampshire County, Pitkin County, St.Clair County, Sedgwick County and Mecker County. The North Point is a very old lady.

Now during the course of the past month there were reports circulating in one of our local papers that the Government was being offered a fantastic figure of $825,000US, to repurchase this by the Space Research Corporation of Canada. To my mind this offer has never been given to our Government because I would like to think that our Government would readily accept this offer if it was offered to them because the North Point has no value whatever for commercial shipping. It is not a ship. It cannot be accommodated in any of the ports in the Caribbean. In the Caribbean we do not have what is called dock-side cranes. The North Point does not have a single crane. Have you ever seen a ship with one bow anchor? A ship must have two anchors and the North Point has got one. It is so ridiculous a situation that the North Point does not even have a gangway. How can you get aboard the ship? We had to climb aboard that ship on a ladder at the side of the ship, and yet we spent $1.75 million of the taxpayers money for a ship with no cranes and no winches. Where is the member for St. John? I would like to see him in here. Perhaps he is the one person who would be able to answer these questions.

It was stated in a report in the Advocate News some time this month that the same North Point was duly registered with Lloyds of London. As you know, Lloyds of London is an international organisation that would register any seaworthy vessel. I have checked the records at Lloyds where the North Point is concerned, and I have found that the Kempter County renamed the North Point is nowhere registered with Lloyds of London. Conversely, Mr. Speaker, it is not classified. It was never built to be a commercial entity; it was built as a troop carrier for carrying men here and there and putting them on a beach and going back out to sea. Perhaps if it lasted two voyages it was very good. Contrary to what was said in the Advocate News there is a North Point registered with Lloyds of London, but do not be mistaken. Though it was said that the North Point was duly insured for $US5 million, what I am saying is that a check with Lloyds of London reveals that there is a North Point registered there with the registration#5257050, but it is not the Kempter County renamed the North Point. It is a tug registered in Wilmonton, Delaware, and it is owned by the Tungsen Curtis Bay Company of Delaware. It was built in 1939.

3.50 p.m.

It was built in 1939. Lloyds of London holds absolutely no record of the Kempter County which has been renamed the North Point. We, the people of Barbados, and you too, Mr. Speaker, were told that the Kempter County, renamed the North Point, was registered in London to the tune of U.S. $5 million. I would like to think, despite what has been said about the North Point, that it could be put into trade, but when you consider a ship 32 years old and in the course of one day, according to the

figures I have been given by those aboard the ship, it consumes an average of 2,200 gallons of fuel, Mr. Speaker, it costs approximately in the course of an average working day when the weather is good to run the North Point $7,000, the average cost per day to maintain the North Point, provided you are not having ill winds when the ship will reduce from its maximum of nine knots perhaps to four or five, this figure of $7,000 could well go to $11,000 or $12,000 per day. Can we afford this, I am asking you? What are we to do with the North Point? That is the question that we are faced with. What are we to do with the North Point? When you go on the wharf you see the North Point in Carlisle Bay; what are we to do with it? It costs an average of $1,000 per week to maintain the North Point out of the taxpayers' money. Are we to continually maintain this ship? What can be done with it? This is a serious problem, this is a direct case of hiding and buying land and not being able to work it in the open.

They bought the North Point but now it is the problem of the Government and the Port Department to maintain the North Point. Can we maintain this vessel out of the taxpayers' money? What are we supposed to do with it? The former Minister responsible for the affairs of the port, Captain Fergusson, was the one who went to Eureka, California and he was the one who did the voyage down to Barbados on the North Point, and he is the one who advised, according to the reports, the Government of the suitability of this ship, but now the ship is the responsibility of this Government. My main concern, Mr. Speaker, is that this Government is not in a position to maintain the North Point for any length of time.

We have been accused of in many cases of voicing corruption in the former Government and we have been asked to bring to light any charges of corruption against the former Government. I would like to know what really went on in the former Government, in the dying hours of the former Government; what was going on that drove them to such a measure to so hastily acquire a ship without consulting the Parliament of this country that it was going to acquire such a white elephant that we are saddled with today?

It has been said that the North Point made the trip from California to Barbados, and I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it did make that trip with 3/4 million feet of lumber, and I would like to know if the Minister responsible can tell us if the Government was paid for that lumber. It was consigned, as far as I know, to the Barbados Lumber Company, and among the cargo which left the port of Eureka were two Mercedes Benz cars and a little yacht. The yacht, according to the crew which was aboard the vessel in California, was the property of Captain George Fergusson. He said it was his, and he was cleaning the hull and painting it. What happened suddenly that the former Minister could report that it is the property of the Government? What went on?

Mr. Speaker, further in stating the facts about the North Point, it is just one of about 1,053 ships built during the war in 1944. They were called landing ship tanks: they are not ships in the sense, as I have said before, for transporting cargo. Forty one of them were lost during the war in 1944 and just when the ships were five years old they were retired to commercial shipping. It was not known whether these ships would have been good for commercial trade and so therefore as they were built for such a trade it was difficult to decide what amount of tonnage these ships could carry. As a result quite a few of them, as history will prove, have broken in half because they were never devised to carry heavy equipment.

I would like to see the North Point run. I do not know what money was spent on the North Point, and as I said, it is regretted that the former Prime Minister is not here, because he was the one who made the deals perhaps, he was the one who said last Sunday morning that every person knows everything about everything, and he is the one I thought would have been the best person to give this Government an insight as to what was going on in his mind when he acquired the North Point. I would not like to know that any Barbadian goes aboard the North Point in an effort to earn an honest day's pay and as a result loses his life, but what are we going to do with the North Point? It is your money, Mr. Speaker, it is our money, it is the money of the people of Barbados, and we are saddled with a white elephant.

4.00 p.m.

The *North Point* made a voyage from California to Barbados on what is called a Provisional Certificate of Seaworthiness. It made the voyage on condition that at Barbados the Loadline Certificate, this is the Certificate of Insurance, would be renewed. Mr. Speaker, the Loadline Certificate was issued for a period of 25 days, as I have been told. I have aslo been told that, in order for the *North Point* to leave the port of Bridgetown, it must have a valid Loadline Certificate. Now since it was issued with a Loadline Certificate for 25 days only, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that this ship must go on

dry dock in order to have its hull inspected and major repairs carried out. Mr. Speaker, it was only issued with a Provisional Certificate to last 25 days. Barbados does not have a dry dock to accommodate the *North Point*. At the next port of call, the North Point must produce to the authorities in that Port a valid Certificate of Seaworthiness. I am asking you, again, How are we going to get around this problem?

The *North Point* cannot go on dry dock in Barbados. The nearest dry dock, perhaps, is Trinidad. How are we going to get around the problem of satisfying the authorities in Trinidad that the ship is sailing with a valid certificate of Registration? It seems to my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Barbados are saddled perpetually with this problem of maintaining the *North Point*. It is out in the Careenage at this point in time, and under international sea laws it must have a full complement, that is, a full crew in the case of an emergency to pull out to sea. It is being manned at this point by a skeleton crew. A ship of this design with, perhaps, a night watchman and, perhaps, two other helping hands aboard is a danger to international shipping. What are we to do?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out what we are supposed to do with the *North Point*. The operational cost of the ship, as I have said, is very high. The overhead expenses are very high. It was built in 1942. Replacements for the engine cannot be found, as far as I am told. The makers do not exist any more, as a matter of fact. The boat is being propelled by two General Motor engines. Three pieces of tools for this ship cost the people of Barbados some $4,000. Obviously, the Port Department was not in a position to order them and, therefore, it is operating without these tools. The makers of the engine have gone out of circulation, and we are saddled with two General Motor engines which were capable, perhaps of propelling some locomotive some part of the United States aboard a self-propelled barge.

I would like to know if the Minister responsible could shed some light, perhaps, on the Cement Factory for which the *North Point* was acquired to go into trade between this country and Guyana. I would like to know if the Former Minister of Finance and Prime Minister of this country could have taken such a lump sum of the taxpayers' money to acquire this vessel before even the Cement Plant was put on the drawing board.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions surrounding the *North Point*. I, perhaps, do not have all the facts, but my main concern is to see the ship work, if it can work. Judging from what the experts have said – those who have taken a look at the bottom of the ship and who are more knowledgeable than I am in such matters – they are rather dubious of the *North Point*. What I would like to find out, Mr. Speaker, is if the former Government could shed some more light on this matter and give this Government the reasons and the rational explanations behind the acquisition of this ship in so short a space of time, as if it were a hot deal. Why have the taxpayers of this country been saddled at this point in time, with a vessel that serves the people no purpose at all? Mr. Speaker, the former Prime Minister is not here, and he is the one who could answer these charges and throw some more light on this matter. I would like to be more informed. All of the members on this side would like to be more informed as to what went on in the dying hours of the former Government as to the reasons behind the acquisition of the white elephant known as the *North Point*.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if any hon. member wants to say anything. I will second the motion and reply at the same time if it is convenient to hon. members.

4.10 p.m.

The Government does accept this Resolution and we say that soon after this Resolution was filed a Committee was appointed to go into the future of the *North Point*. I cannot remember off-hand all the members of the Committee, but the Ministerial members are the Minister of Communications and Works, in his personal capacity, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central and myself as Minister of Finance; and we do have some expertise in the form of the Port Manager and other persons with a knowledge of these facts.

It is anticipated that the facts surrounding the *North Point* – none of which has so far been set out – will be the subject of the investigations of this Committee, and therefore I do not want to go too far in pre-empting investigations in any other place. It does seem that this matter was raised some time ago. The initiative is hard to investigate. I will not attempt to search for the original source of buying the *North Point*. Sufficient to say that it seems to me that some other ship was looked at at some stage which might have been suitable, but that ship was sold

out and so they bought this for $54,000 under the United States AID programme.

On 2nd October, 1975, Dr. Gerry Bull who is connected with HARP, the Space Research Corporation etc. and the former Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John, signed an agreement for a fixed price. I will read Article 5 which says that the company for whom Gerry Bull signed agrees to undertake certain tasks at the fixed price of $390,000US. For this Dr. Bull's Company was to have the *North Point* towed to a recognised shipyard to be re-commissioned and put through sea trials to secure a certificate of sea-worthiness. Notwithstanding this fixed price, apparently the memorandum which I must consider secret by standards of these days because it is to be found only in one of the Government's red secret files – was on the 29th December, 1975 submitted to the former Prime Minister by Dr. Bull in which he said that the United States Coast Guard and the American Bureau of Shipping had over a period of time – I have read the coast guard's documents and the other related documents to which Dr. Bull referred – they had banned ships of this type for commercial use.

Dr. Bull's own words are these:-

"Basically these letters said that the L.S.T.'s hull was built to wartime standards and that postwar uses have shown the hull too thin and flexible for safe commercial operations."

This was signed by the man who had agreed with the Government of Barbados to make the *North Point* seaworthy for $390,000US.

He went on to tell the former Prime Minister that there was need to do certain things on a system of lateral straps and longitudinal straps, and very important that the bow door of the ship is to be welded shut or else to put in a bulk head behind the bow, so that the ship's capacity for roll on and roll off can be terminated.

The whole point about these ships is that they have to operate in shallow draft where the cargo can be driven in and driven back out on trucks if necessary; and indeed I myself and I belief the hon. member who has just spoken, have walked through those very same doors to get on to the launch and you can see that you can drive down them; but apparently if this ship is ever to get a certificate of sea-worthiness they will have to shut those doors permanently or put in a bulk head so that you will not have this drive in drive out arrangement.

This memorandum was submitted to the former Prime Minister, and Dr. Bull said that it would need another $200,000US. I carried out investigations when I took over the office and I was surprised to see that Dr. Bull's company had been paid the whole of the $390,000US. I think enough to bring it up to $1 million BDS. I cannot remember the exact figures but it would be more than was agreed and there was still no certificate of sea-worthiness. Dr. Bull was asking for another $124,000US.

I instructed that a full investigation be made into this additional demand, because as far as I could see Dr. Bull and his Company had agreed to make the *North Point* sea-worthy for $390,000US. Having done this, out of the accounting in the Ministry of Finance – it is drawn to my attention that the original stipulation was that the company would apply its best efforts to perform the scope of work as detailed in a professional manner etc. If there was to be any additional work it had to be identified and negotiated with the Government prior to execution.

The Chief Accountant in the Ministry of Finance was asked to look into this business of the extra $124,000. He analysed this for me on 26th October, that is last month, and I found a paragraph, information which was supplied by his visitors, the people in Dr. Bull's Company – Jeantec Services – was authorised to carry out additional work by an unnumbered letter from the Prime Minister's office. A search was made by the Director of Finance and Planning and no letter authorising anybody to carry out extra work was found; but these gentlemen had a letter signed E. W. Barrow dated 31st December, 1975 which does not appear on the Government's files anywhere.

It states:

"Pursuant to our meeting in Miami with Dr. Bull in a memorandum of 29th December, 1975, delivered by Mr. Brathwaite"(that is Mr. Carlton Brathwaite) "I take note of the increased work required to L.S.T. *North Point*. We hereby agree to the increased work, freight and cost subject to audit verification of the actual cost increase experienced prior to payment of the final balance outstanding."

This is signed Errol W. Barrow, and it is a letter which appears nowhere in the Government files; but I have no reason to doubt that the signature is authentic. Mr. Speaker, you will understand that in my opinion this reveals more questions than answers. There are a number of

questions I would like to ask. For example, how could any Minister write a letter without the authority of Parliament or Cabinet authorising some company to incur expenditure on behalf of the Government and people of Barbados and do not even put the letter on the file?

I will not comment further. I only wish to say that when hon. members on the otherside say that if we have evidence let us produce it, they may rest assured that I regard that as evidence. I am finished with the details. Since then we have tried to find some use for the *North Point* which is anchored sometimes in the Harbour and sometimes in Carlisle Bay, consuming the taxpayers substance day by day. There are questions of how we are going to pay the crew etc. These are day to day matters.

We have sought charters, but nobody has offered as much for the boat as would cover its daily cost of operation. Nobody has offered us an economic amount up to now. We have tentatively put it about that the boat is for sale. I believe that the best offer we have got is $125,000.
4.20 p.m.

I think that is the best offer we have got so far. In the meantime the boat has been examined by a Lloyds surveyor and he has advised us against paying any more money to Jeantec, that is Dr. Bull's company. He said too much has already been paid, that we paid 25% of $US390,000 which we were supposed to pay when we got the certificate of seaworthiness, and he said not only have we not got the certificate of seaworthiness but we could never get it with the ship as it is, and he said we should not have paid this 25%. He commented on one or two other points: the question of the lumber and the things that were loaded on this ship. He said that of the vouchers which were shown to him for materials supplied to the ship two-thirds of them were never supplied. He also commented as to how when the ship was repaired – it is a very thin-skinned vessel – it was repaired with a thick metal weld which has made it more unseaworthy than it was before. He said there was some welding but what work has been done is not good machine engineering because the doubling of the plates has not met the specifications of any of the American bureaus of shipping or the classification societies. He says that the recommendations of the American Bureau of Shipping have not been followed. They are very specific.

As the hon. member has said it is only fitted with one bow anchor and will need another, and there is no collision bulk head; of the three electric generators, one is broken up, that in the engine room it is so noisy that you cannot talk. All sorts of things are mentioned. It is $7,000 a day to operate. What to me is of course very amusing is that this vessel still apparently will be used as a tank ship because it still has accommodation for 300 officers and men of the United States Navy, although the crew required to run it might be only 20 or 30. That is the situation we find.

Around the *North Point* there were also some unhappy circumstances. It was supposed to be loaded with a quantity of building equipment which the Government of Barbados had also bought from the Government of the United States. This equipment apparently was supposed to be used in the Seawell Airport project. Most of it when I first begun to enquire had not been delivered anywhere near the Seawell Airport project unless you call Mr. Carlton Brathwaite's office at HARP near Seawell. I myself paid a visit to the Port one day and was shown a piece of heavy building equipment – one of these things that drives and scoops, I am not sure what it is called – and it had on it an AID stamp showing it was a Government to Government enterprise, and I was informed by a Customs Officer that he was very glad to see me, that he had been abused by Mr. Carlton Brathwaite who called him a Barbados Labour Party yard fowl because he Carlton Brathwaite had sent down to the Port to get this piece of equipment which I understand would cost over $100,000 and the Customs Officer would not give it to him, and if he had given it to him it would not be there for Tom Adams to find when he came around looking at things. In other words, this man is so bold and insolent that a customs officer who does his duty and refuses to deliver the Government property to Mr. Carlton Brathwaite then finds himself cursed in the course of his duty for doing what he knew was right.

I personally wonder how a customs broker who attempted to obtain delivery of that piece of equipment, which I have no doubt if you put it in the hands of the Director of Public Prosecutions would tell you amounted to attempting to obtain by false pretenses, can go on being regarded as an honest customs broker in all the circumstances. However, we have been able to recover some of the things belonging to the Government which arrived here on the *North Point.* Mr. Carlton Brathwaite has been written to and he replied again very insolently but the end of it was that the Government has recovered some of the things.

A cargo of lumber came for the Barbados Lumber Company of which Mr. Brathwaite, I understand, is Chairman. There is no record of the freight which would run into thousands of dollars; $90,000 in freight. There is no record of the Government ever having recovered this. All of this will be looked at by the Committee and hon. members may have the assurance that not one penny further will be paid to the Space Research Corporation or any of its agencies without the fullest possible investigation of this matter.

It has been said that an offer by the Space Research Corporation is to be made to cover the entire cost of what the Government has had to spend on the *North Point* so far. I cannot anticipate the decision of the Committee, but I believe that such an offer will be favourably received. A sinner seeking to make amends for his sin will always be regarded as a prodigal son welcomed home by this Government, and if they know what they have done wrong and seek to recompense the taxpayers of Barbados, I do not think the taxpayers and their elected representatives and advisers will turn their back upon them; but this entire matter represents a sad and sorry lesson in how not to go about public spending, and I am obliged to the hon. member for St. Michael North East for putting this matter down on the Order Paper of the House so expeditiously and within such a short time of his entering Parliament and for giving us of his expertise as a former sailor and as someone who is interested in the sea and ships. We are really much obliged to him in these circumstances.

I regard the Resolution as an endorsement of Government's actions in this matter. Indeed it cannot be other than an endorsement because we have already acted upon it and I will urge all hon. members to give it support and consideration.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes all the Business for today.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 23rd November, 1976 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

4.26 p.m.