

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976-81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th October, 1976.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.10 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. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); 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. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A.; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, (Chairman of Committees); 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.; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc., (Econ.), and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.B., LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 19th October 1976 are before you for confirmation and unless there is any objection they will be confirmed.

There being no objection, the Minutes are duly confirmed.

PAPERS PRESENTED

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

- (1) The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1976.
- (2) The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1976.
- (3) The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1976.
- (4) An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the several districts of the Island for the quarter ended 30th September, 1976.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

- (1) The Report of the Registrar of Trade Unions for the year 1975-76.
- (2) The Report on Vital Statistics and Registrations for the year 1974.
- (3) The Physical Development Plan for Barbados.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

The Resolution to approve the Physical Development Plan for Barbados.

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

A Bill to provide for the exemption from the payment of duties or taxes on certain articles imported into Barbados for the purpose of being used exclusively in connection with the expansion and improvement of the Deep Water Harbour.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Questions:—

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:—

Will the Minister please state the number of licences issued for the years 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976 so far for the importation of cement into Barbados?

Will the Minister further state the persons or firms to whom such licences were issued, the amounts for each and whether the cement arrived in Barbados and when?

While I am on my feet I beg leave to give notice of the following Questions on behalf of the hon. member for St. Lucy.

To enquire of the Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport:—

Is the Minister aware that due to the construction of the Telephone Exchange at the Old Parry School pasture, the youngsters of the area are no longer able to use these grounds for recreational purposes?

Is the Minister aware that the grounds at the St. Lucy's Secondary School are large enough to accommodate these youngsters along with the school activities?

Will the Minister therefore state whether the Government will favourably consider making part of the school grounds available to the young people of the area so as not to rob them of the opportunity to participate in organised sports?

To enquire of the Minister of Health and Welfare:

Can the Minister state the reasons for the delay in the opening and functioning of the Out-patients Clinic at Benthams in St. Lucy? And can the Minister state when it is expected to become operational.

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works:—

- (i) Is the Minister aware that provision has been made in the Capital Estimates for 1976–77 for the construction of a Bridge at Pie Corner, St. Lucy?
- (ii) Can the Minister give any indication as to when the construction will begin?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the

exemption from the payment of duties or taxes on certain articles imported into Barbados for the purpose of being used exclusively in connection with the expansion and improvement of the Deep Water Harbour, be now read a first time.

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

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

12.20 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee for the purpose of considering.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of procedure, the Hon. Leader of the House has now got to move that Government Business be now taken. All the Clerk said was "Orders of the Day" and he is asking you to leave the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is well taken.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with Government Business, there is one other question standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy and I think it is appropriate that it could be asked on his behalf at this time. It is to do with a low cost housing project for St. Lucy.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Sir. The question is asked of the Minister of Housing and Lands and reads as follows:

Is the Minister aware that:

- (i) there is an urgent need for the establishment of a low cost housing project for St. Lucy?
- (ii) there are plans for establishing such a project at Nesfield?

Can the Minister state whether or not this Government has any plans for continuing this project or developing one in another area of St. Lucy?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister give details?

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply for the purpose of considering one money Resolution for the service of this Island, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77 No. 18

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is in the name of the Leader of the House but I am asking for leave to deal with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no objection.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution relates to a matter that has excited public interest to some extent since the date of the last General Elections, and indeed since the date of the bye-election in the City of Bridgetown held earlier this year. In view of the allegations which have been made over very wide areas indeed, in view of the suggestions which we have seen that the appointment of Board Chairmen from among the ranks of the House of Assembly will lead to corruption, and that since getting into power there has been victimisation of the workers of the Parks and Beaches Commission, I intend to deal with this Resolution at length because the entire history of this year's activities in the Parks and Beaches Commission, and indeed some of the previous year's activities, requires to be analysed.

For some years the Parks and Beaches Commission and its activities have received the general approbation of members of both sides of the House of Assembly. The Parks and Beaches Commission was set up to deal with just those things, the parks and beaches of this Island. The relevant legislation is to be found in section 4 of the Parks and Beaches Commission Act which is now Chapter 233A of the laws of Barbados which reads as follows:

- "4. (1) The functions of the Commission shall be—
- (a) to control, maintain and develop the public parks and beaches of Barbados;

- (b) to provide a lifeguard service at such of the public beaches of Barbados as it thinks fit;
- (c) to secure the observance of sanitary and cleanly conditions and practices at and in respect of the public parks and beaches of Barbados;
- (d) to maintain and assist in maintaining, to such extent as the Minister directs, existing and future beach facilities;
- (e) to advise the Minister on—
- (i) the erection of beach and ancillary recreational facilities.
- (ii) the control of the erection in any public park or on any beach of huts, booths, tents, sheds, stands, stalls, bath-houses, shops (whether fixed or movable) and on the removal of coral from the ocean bed or any other thing the removal of which might cause the encroachment of the sea; and
- (iii) such other matters relating to the public parks and beaches of Barbados, including matters pertaining to beach control and the protection of the seacoast of Barbados from erosion or encroachment by the sea, as the Minister may refer to it for such advice;
- (f) generally to carry out this Act,

together with such other functions as may be conferred upon it by the Minister for the purposes of this Act or by any other enactment."

The Chairman of the Parks and Beaches Commission was a Mr. Lisle Carmichael, and in 1961 Mr. Lisle Carmichael was a candidate of the Democratic Labour Party at the General Election for the City of Bridgetown. In 1966 Mr. Carmichael did not receive favourable consideration from his Party's selection procedures, but again in 1971 he was that Party's candidate and at a bye-election in May 1976 he was also the candidate. I recite this at some length because it appears that in or about the month of April 1976 certain conversations were held between Mr. Carmichael, Mr. Philip Greaves

and eventually the manager of the Parks and Beaches Commission.

12.30 p.m.

These conversations related to a crash programme, so-called, of urgent work. So far so good. Barbados has a situation of high unemployment, and any money which the Government has available that can assist in alleviating this unemployment should be used, other conditions being equal, for this purpose. But when we examine the minutes of a meeting of the Parks and Beaches Commission held on 5th April, 1976, we discover that Mr. Carmichael informed the Commission on that day that Mr. Philip Greaves had verbally directed that the Commission be given the responsibility of cleaning some additional areas, neither parks nor beaches, and maintaining them in a clean and sanitary condition. It was necessary to hire a good deal of additional labour for this purpose and, in respect of this, hon. members may care to consider the relevant dates.

Mr. Elliott Mottley had already accepted a job, which would necessitate a by-election in the City of Bridgetown. A by-election was going to be in May, and we observe that Parks and Beaches, which was under the control of the then prospective Government candidate for the City of Bridgetown, suddenly decided on a programme of work. I think that hon. members will have no difficulty coming to the conclusion that the programme of work was, at least, as much directed towards the electoral prospects of the Democratic Labour Party in the City by-election as towards the alleviation of unemployment in Barbados. If we had any doubt about this, all we need do is to have a look at the list of those who were employed in the 258, and we observe that almost half of that number were resident in the City of Bridgetown where Mr. Carmichael, the Chairman of Parks and Beaches Commission, intended to run.

Now, anybody familiar with the Electoral Offences and Controversies Act will be aware that it constitutes the act of bribery, for which severe penalties may be imposed, to offer anybody a job in return for electoral support. I would ask, perhaps, the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Michael North Central to bear that in mind should they ever recover office again at some distant date towards the Twenty-first Century. It is an offence not only in he who offers to provide it, but it is an offence in those who accept it. We have a situation where, according to information available to hon. members on this side, there is some evidence of an intention to practise

large-scale electoral bribery in this country. We have not pursued this. Mr. Carmichael was defeated in the by-election, and he was defeated in the General Election. But we give a warning here and now to all concerned that this may be the very last occasion upon which this Government, speaking as individuals, are prepared to overlook acts of electoral bribery, or the appearance of acts of electoral bribery. I mention that in passing, Sir.

Now, of the 258 workers nearly half came from the City, and the balance, a very small number, came from adjacent portions of St. Michael. Unemployment in the country districts was entirely ignored. To me the suggestion is inescapable that the crash programme, I repeat, was designed to enhance Mr. Carmichael's electoral prospects in the by-election and, subsequently, in the General Election. The Manager of Parks and Beaches Commission had minuted to the effect that everyone of these 258 workers was informed that this was a crash programme for which he or she was being employed, and that the work would come to an end on the 30th September, 1976. I state this upon the basis of written information, and I have no reason whatsoever to doubt that it is true.

There is some evidence that members of the Parks and Beaches Commission itself and employees of the Parks and Beaches Commission were worried about the crash programme. We are not fools even if we are politicians. We are certainly not fools where we are employed on Statutory Commissions under the Democratic Labour Party's regime, who know what politicians can get up to. There could be no doubt in anybody's mind that this was a crash programme designed to whip up electoral support. Now, what happened? The electoral support was insufficient, and the Barbados Labour Party got back into power. At an early stage representations were made to me that even the Parks and Beaches regular workers could not be paid unless some money was forthcoming. Why was this? The sum of \$875,000 was voted under Head 16(6), Item 1, in the Current Estimates 1976-77 to meet the recurrent administration expenses of the Commission. As a result of the verbal instructions given by Mr. Philip Greaves to Lisle Carmichael and which was passed on to the Manager of the Parks and Beaches Commission, it was evident from the start that this amount would be insufficient to meet the liabilities of the Commission during the current financial year. Nonetheless, the work proceeded and no supplementary provision was sought in the previous Parliament. You may well think that had the then Ministers not felt they

had something to hide; had the then Ministers not wish to conceal exactly what was going on from the public, that some supplementary provision would have been sought between the date of the dissolution of Parliament. No supplementary provision was sought, the work force was increased from 270 to 528 in order to undertake the additional responsibilities, and the Parks and Beaches Commission had it not been for emergency measures, of which I will inform the House later on, would have had to close down unable to pay even the existing staff very soon after the General Election.

Now, I am in receipt of a Report made into the accounting procedures involved, and the Report states that the work which was done did not appear to be the kind of work for which funds were voted from Parliament; that the areas where the work was done were neither parks nor beaches, and that vehicles were bought. In other words, items of non-recurrent expenditure were paid for out of the vote for recurrent expenditure. The Report states: "The Accounting Officer of the former Ministry of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance may be in breach of the Financial Rules in not taking positive action to regularise the improper and illegal situation which had developed in consequence of the management of the Parks and Beaches Commission." The present Minister, Senator Mapp, has commented that the Accounting Officer in question was, as far as he was concerned, in a hopeless position in view of the positive action by the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance and the Minister of Finance.

I must say that I agree with Senator Mapp, and I do not propose to take any action against the Accounting Officer in question in consequence of his having permitted the carrying out of improper and illegal acts as a direct result of the verbal instructions of Mr. Philip Greaves. The Accounting Officer, I agree, found himself in a hopeless situation. All that we feel able to say at this level is that we understand his dilemma. During the war and after the war, unfortunately for the persons concerned, many persons were shot and hanged for carrying out illegal orders. We do not, on this occasion, intend to shoot or hang, or take any disciplinary action other than drawing it to the attention of the Accounting Officer in question, and of all Accounting Officers in the Public Service, that an order remains illegal even if given by a Minister. We can only comment on it and give the House the assurance that the present Ministers of the Government will bear in mind the condition of the

Government of this Island after 15 years by the Democratic Labour Party.
12.40 p.m.

Now what was done after we got into power? At an early stage these matters were investigated and I authorized the advancement of \$200,000 from a Head which provided for the making of temporary loans to Statutory Bodies in order to enable the Parks and Beaches Commission not just to pay its regular staff but indeed to keep on the 258 workers until such time as they had been promised the work, that is up to September 30, 1976. Far from sending them home after the election, when we discovered that the programme was due to end on the 30th September we said pay the men up to that day, and the funds from which the Parks and Beaches Commission is now operating have been used for paying the 258 illegally employed workers as well as the regular staff of Parks and Beaches.

Now we are mindful of what has been said by the hon. members on the other side, I think outside the House, what has been said by Mr. Eric Sealy, what has been said by others about the desirability of employing these men, but we cannot tolerate that a situation where taxpayers' money was used to finance Mr. Carmichael's campaign, in our view, we cannot tolerate that that situation should be accepted. We cannot tolerate that. Nonetheless we intend to take no reprisals whatsoever against any of the persons concerned.

The Parks and Beaches Commission is going to have an enlarged role in the forthcoming plans of Government. Honourable members may have seen that for example we intend to embrace the burial grounds of this Island many of which are tourist attractions by way of parks themselves. St. John's Church yard springs readily to mind. We intend to embrace them within the definition of the works which may be done by the Commission.

This morning I met with the Lord Bishop of Barbados in my office only a couple of hours ago and asked him to submit at his earliest convenience a list of the burial grounds which the Anglican church makes available to the people of Barbados for the purpose of the disposal of dead bodies so that we can commence a programme of work on these burial grounds, using the agency of Parks and Beaches to enhance the status. We think it wrong that, for example, St. John's church yard should be kept in such a very good condition, well planted, well tended, while St. John's burial ground just across the road is

overgrown with grass and very difficult to be comfortable when attending a funeral.

We think it very wrong that the present representative for St. John should have allowed the St. John's burial ground to be such an eyesore in his own constituency, when we are hiring new workers at Parks and Beaches, those whose work came to an end on the 30th September will receive first consideration of being rehired. However, Sir, we must say this; there will have to be some redeployment staff because the City has always received an exceptional favour from those who are responsible for hiring at Parks and Beaches. The work at St. John will obviously have to be done by the Bath depot, and when you look at those who are presently employed at the Bath depot, 3rd Avenue New Orleans, City; Green Park Lane, City, Belleplaine, St. Andrew; Mason Hall Street, City, Chapman Lane, City; King William Street, City; Phillips Land, City; Lightfoot's Lane, City; School Gap, Chapman Lane, City; Parkinson Field, St. Michael; Neptune Road, The Farm, Gas Product Gap Club, Reservoir Road, St. Michael. I have read all those names before I come to one in St. John. As you look down the whole list of these presently employed at the Bath-Cattleshew region, — and there is nobody from St. Joseph; not one; and only four from St. John. The great majority of them come from the City — Kensington New Road, Sobers Lane, St. Michael. There clearly has to be a general review and redeployment.

I think it unfair to the people of the City to make them catch a bus to be up at Bath at 7.30 to start work in the morning anyhow. (*Asides*) They will have to carry them on lorries. We will have to have a special transportation because the people in the City have to be carried everywhere. The only place where perhaps it seems that there is some — I see at King George V Park, but many come from St. Philip. I see that one from St. Thomas has managed to squeeze in at King George V Park but even there she is surrounded by Green Park Lane, Emmerton Lane, Hutson's Alley, Sobers Lane, Marshall Gap. They are the people cleaning up King George V Park.

The East coast road itself, further North, Cattleshew; three from Belleplaine; one from Lakes, one from Chalky Mount and one from St. Joseph. Holatown, Beckwith Street, 3rd Avenue, New Orleans, Spruce Street, Alkins Road, New Orleans 6, New Orleans 8, Lightfoot's Lane, Dukes Alley, 8th Avenue, Emmerton Lane, 5th Avenue, Emmerton Lane. They are the people who work at Holatown.

I do not think that hon. members will have any difficulty working out that Parks and Beaches have been used not only as a means of relieving unemployment throughout Barbados but of relieving unemployment in the City of Bridgetown. I do not see that people in the City have any less right to work than other people, but one would think that displaced agricultural labourers from the estates that have been taken out of sugar all over Barbados perhaps might have some claim to help go and clean King George V Park or look after beaches in the parishes where the estates formerly were situated. This is the situation which we have found.

Mr. Chairman, hon. members on the other side, I am quite sure, are going to support this Resolution for \$890,000. At the present time the money is necessary to pay existing staff to carry out existing programmes and to a limited extent, try to meet some of the prospective programmes we have in mind.

12.50

At the present the money is necessary to pay existing staff to carry out existing programmes and to a limited extent try to meet some of the prospective programmes we have in mind. To have employed the whole of the 258 staff would have cost according to the estimate \$1.33 million. The Government does not feel that a Supplementary Estimate of this scale is possible at Parks and Beaches at the present time. We hope by rationalising some of the operations to release some of the present staff to carry out the additional work which we are contemplating and we also hope to raise revenue at Parks and Beaches by making the services of its staff available for a fee to private persons, and of course when we see how successful this has been we will know what we can do in next years' programme in the way of providing staff.

We have done our best, but most important we think that we have brought to bear on this particular problem resources of honesty and political integrity which were evidently not available to the previous Minister and to Mr. Lisle Carmichael when they instituted the crash programme. That crash programme was not an act of kindness to the 258 servants. They were made to feel degraded by being told in effect that they were being given jobs in order to vote for Carmichael, and nobody can do a good job with high morale if he knows he is only being given a job, not because the Government really cares for him, but because the Government needs votes in a by-election. They were deceived, Mr. Chairman, by being told that their work would be useful and then by being put to work with baskets and

hoes on the Polytechnic site next to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which site is almost as bad as it was and will have to be cleared anyhow if the building programme for the Polytechnic is going to be carried out. All of these things are destructive of morale, destructive of the human spirit. How can we expect people to respect us if when Elliott Mottley goes away you employ people in the city and tell them that they have to vote for Mr. Carmichael? How can we be respected if this is the attitude of mind which we apply to our relations with the public?

I do not know if it is true, Mr. Chairman, that as many as 92 persons were given jobs on the school meals service from St. Michael South Central shortly before the by-election. The actual number being given jobs is being checked on, but we believe that the spirit which informed the activities of Mr. Philip Greaves and Mr. Lisle Carmichael was not absent from the Cabinet which after all had to approve this entire matter. We do not know how many of the additional staff taken on at the Transport Board to carry out a crash programme of cleaning buses shortly before the general election were residents of St. Michael North Central. We just know that St. Michael in its widest sense evidently took a lesson from the City shortly before the general election time. I sincerely hope that none of the candidates concerned were so ill-advised as to suggest to any person that they were getting jobs in return for electoral support, and I am sure neither the former Attorney General nor the former Minister for Education, Health and the other Ministries would have brought themselves within the law of bribery in their dealings with these two commissions. I am really quite sure since they are hon. members of the House that they would not have taken that risk with their seats and their future parliamentary careers and so on. But we see how these things can snowball if they are not checked, and I thank God that the Barbados Labour Party got into power at a time when it can check.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I like to listen to the Hon. Prime Minister. As I say, we are going to support this Resolution because we are committed to providing employment. As members of the Government we have had to come to the House from time to time with Resolutions. The mere fact that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance comes with a

Resolution for Parks and Beaches is no big thing. What I am quarrelling with are some of the remarks he has made. What I find is that when I was practising at the Bar he had not qualified and now that I am at the Bar he is in Government, so we have not had a chance to test his legal theories because he has come out with a theory that the mere fact that a Minister appoints under the law a person from his constituency to a post *prima facie* makes him liable to some electoral offence. That is the biggest nonsense I have ever heard. Just as he has checked the members of the city and where their addresses are, he can check the school meals and find out from where we appointed them, and I make no apology for my appointments. What the new Minister has to do is to revoke them. Suppose you find, which is not true, that the 92 were from St. Michael North Central, do not think I will apologise for that. I represent people and the people of that area have put me in here. Do not think I would come here and apologise for giving jobs to people from my constituency who needed them. Just as he has checked where the people from Parks and Beaches were from, let him check where the people from the Transport Board are from and see if appointing somebody from his constituency legitimately makes him open to charges of election bribery. He could only be talking to the laymen on his side. I do not think he could be talking to the hon. member who is a Q.C. or to the Minister of Legal Affairs; they would not subscribe to that sort of theory. That is why I say I regret that now that we can tangle he is now in Government. When I was in Government he was out and now I am out he is in Government. Do not think you can get away with these half-baked legal suggestions.....

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member must not ascribe improper motives to me. Under the Election Offences and Controversies Act, of which he is not familiar, Section 6(2) reads:

“A person is guilty of bribery who, directly or indirectly, by himself or by any other person on his behalf —

- (a) gives any money or procures any office to or for any elector or to or for any other person on behalf of any elector or to or for any other person in order to induce any elector to vote or refrain from voting; or
- (c) makes any gift or procurement as is specified in paragraph (a) to or for any

person in order to induce that person to procure, or endeavour to procure, the return of any person at an election or the vote of any elector."

If the Leader of the Opposition says that being the law I am misleading the House, I can only pity the poor litigants of Barbados who thought they had got rid of him 20 years ago and now find themselves saddled with him once again.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But I am getting some of the same litigants who were satisfied with him, and I can call names; so if he wants to get in a slanging match, let us get into it. These are only insulting remarks from him. If a Minister has got a constitutional or legal duty to make an appointment, how is that related to any electoral controversy when he is running a Government? What nonsense is he reading? All it shows is that he is literate and can read.

1.00 p.m.

All he has shown is that he is literate and he can read, but if a Minister by law, or somebody by law, has a constitutional or a legal duty to perform and in the performance of that duty somebody from his constituency gets appointed, how is it relevant to the electoral law which he reads? All he shows is that he can read, but it has no relevance. But let us get back to the debate, I am only dealing with the red herring that he is drawing across the trail.

Let us face facts. The Opposition is going to support this Resolution because we are committed to providing employment for people in this country, and even when he talks about the crash programme workers, the crash programme workers were people who wanted work, people who were prepared to feed their families, people who had four, five, six and more children, so if he is going to criticise the fact that the Democratic Labour Party provided employment for people who did not know where the next meal was coming from and he thinks that is a legitimate criticism, if he says that destroys their morale, if he says that made them feel by working for an honest living rather than doing something which might bring them in conflict with the law, if he thinks that is a crime, then we stand guilty of a crime, but we provided 258 jobs for family people, especially women, who were prepared to work, the work given to them, in order to earn a living. If that is a crime then the Democratic Labour Party stands guilty of a crime. Carmichael, Philip Greaves, everybody.

Then I was wondering the same time when he reads out his list, he says it is unfair to send

somebody from the City to King George V Park. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Health is concerned with employment, and I was watching how she was watching the Prime Minister, and I am satisfied that she does not consider it any disgrace or any problem, especially as the Democratic Labour Party has standardised bus fares, for her people to go to King George V Park, Barclay Park or Farley Hill, because if I know her, she is concerned that her people, especially the women in her constituency, should be employed, so when the Prime Minister suggests it is unfair to send people from the City to St. John or to other outside areas, I am sure that if there is one member on his side whose support he does not have it is the lady member for the City who wants her people employed.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would be very much obliged if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would not make any assumptions about the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health would not be at all happy, and she was not at all happy during the bye-election and during the general election when foul means were used for the obtaining of votes against her. I am not objecting to City people working in Timbuctoo but not if the price for that is a vote against me, so do not make any assumptions about me, my turn is going to come.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All I am saying is that when I heard the Prime Minister say it is unfair to send people — I am not dealing with votes, voting is finished, we are all in here except for two elections that are being contested — but I would wish that the Government would pick up everybody in South Central who want jobs and send them to St. Andrew, St. Peter, St. Lucy to work. I can give them some names, and I would not feel it unfair to send somebody from St. Michael South Central to St. Andrew, St. Peter, St. George, or St. Thomas for work, and I do not think my colleagues would think it unfair. I am not dealing with any votes because the twenty I got were enough to bring me in here. It could be two, so I am not dealing with any votes now, voting is finished, and I do not think any honest person agrees with the Dems using public funds or any other means to get votes, it is wrong.

All I am saying is that I was watching the Minister of Health watching the Prime Minister when he was suggesting it was unfair to send people from the City up to the country. What worries me with the Prime Minister is this, the Prime Minister told this nation that of the 258 workers 24 were from outside the City. Today

we are getting nearer to half. Unless my arithmetic is wrong half of 258 could not be 24, but he told this nation when it first broke that the number was 24. You can read the Advocate, unless it misreported him, that 24 were from outside the City, but today you get him saying that the number is nearer to half. You can read it in the Advocate and he cannot deny that, because I will bring it in here on another occasion as a personal statement that the Prime Minister said that only 23 or 24 were from outside the City. Today in his speech to this Hon. Chamber he is telling you that it is nearer to half. Half of 258 cannot be 24 anyhow.

What I am saying is nobody on this side can be satisfied with the question of using taxpayers' money to get votes, but the Prime Minister is the same one who in this Hon. Chamber got up in the Budget Speech and said that the unemployment rate in Barbados was nearly 28% and it is unfortunate that the first people – and one member on that side, I do not know if it is the member for Christ Church East – said how the people jumped up when Carmichael lost. Well, I hope they jumped up when they were laid off by your Government too. In spite of the employment given to them by the Democratic Labour Party they jumped up when the candidate for the City lost, well I hope they are jumping up for these last two weeks they did not know where the next bread is coming from, or if they jumped up when the Democratic Labour Party lost one would expect them to jump up now when they are home with not knowing tomorrow or next week what is going to be their fate.

This is surprising from a Government that promised the people of this country 3,600 jobs. I do not know whether in a millennium or 300 years, but that is in your Manifesto. You promised the people of this country, 3,600 jobs and one of the first acts of your Government is to lay off 258 at one place, some at the Transport Board and it either seems that you have not got the ability, the foresight, the initiative at least to use those people who are working in some other area, you just lay them off, you just knock them off like a hoe handle. I am not arguing that you must keep on people if there is no work for them, but surely since you have come into power on the basis of mismanagement and a million and one other lies you told the people, at least you should have the ability and the initiative...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member is accusing hon. members on this side of telling lies and I submit that that is unparliamentary. If he wants me to refer to the

specific passage of May's Parliamentary Practice I will do so. In other words he is calling us liars, and if he is saying that it is not unparliamentary I may have to return the compliment to him, so I am taking the point. I am asking for a ruling on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. The reference of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has given that connotation, so I will ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those references he made.
1.10 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will withdraw them, but I hope the Chairman appreciates that I have not said that they lied in here. I said that they told lies to the electorate during the campaign. I am not saying that any member has lied in his speech today. I am not referring to anything said in a Parliamentary Debate in here. If he objects to that, I will withdraw it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I object to it and to the subsequent remarks he has made.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am abiding by his ruling, but I do not accept that it is right. If you said that we lied to the electorate during the campaign, what is unparliamentary about that? I would not object to it. Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, let us get back to just one or two other points which the Hon. Prime Minister introduced. He spent a long time on the political overthrow of the Government in order to justify the sending off of two hundred and fifty-something people who, today and during the last few weeks, do not know where the next bread is coming from.

Now, I was informed by the Chairman that at no time were these people told it was a crash programme. When the Prime Minister gets in here and says that the Government did not go for a supplementary before the election, I would like to tell him to look at a Cabinet Paper and he would discover that the Minister of Housing came to the Cabinet with a supplementary for \$1.3 million, and it was sent back for more details. Do not come in here and give the public the impression that the last Government was not looking at the possibility of a supplementary for the Parks and Beaches Commission. He can check on it. The Cabinet Papers are there. The Ministers did not steal them. He can get the Cabinet

Secretary to tell him that the meeting was held at Culloden Farm. I can give him details. The Cabinet Secretary will tell him that the Minister of Housing came with a supplementary for \$1.3 million for the Parks and Beaches Commission. The Minister of Finance wanted a breakdown and so on. Do not come here and give the public the impression that we were spending money not knowing where it was coming from. The election intervened.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister mentioned \$1.3 million, which shows that he knows that the last Government was coming up with this particular figure. It shows that he has read the Cabinet Paper.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Am I to understand from the hon. member that this was a meeting of the Cabinet at Culloden Farm?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairman, We used to meet there once a month, and I hope that the Prime Minister will institute that for his Cabinet, too. It is a good idea. Be that as it may he knows that there was a Cabinet Paper for this amount, and the Minister of Finance, if it is properly recorded as it was, asked the Ministry of Housing to give a breakdown. Do not come in there and give the public the impression that we were just spending money willy-nilly.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Leader of the Opposition is, obviously, misrepresenting what I have said. I said quite clearly that the Government was afraid to come to Parliament for it. The supplementary was presented to the Cabinet, and it was not brought to Parliament before the elections. I stand by that. The Government did not want the exposure in Parliament of having that supplementary for \$1.3 million debated in here.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If the Hon. Prime Minister will check the dates he will see that the application, or the recommendation and submission of the Ministry of Housing, was very close to the election date. The Minister of Finance was not afraid of anything. What is the difference between \$1.3 million and \$890,000? I am pointing out to him that if he would check the date, I think it was some time in July that the Minister of Housing came up with the submission. It was very close to the election date in August. If he checks it and he wants to be honest to this House, he will tell this House that the submission of the Minister of Housing was sometime in July 1976. There was no idea of being afraid to come to the House. All that

happened was that the Prime Minister, as he probably would have done, asked for a breakdown as to why so vast an amount was being required for a supplementary given early in the year. That is what the Prime Minister asked for. They had been given \$890,000 in the Budget, and they were coming for a supplementary. I was in the Cabinet then. Do not come in here and mislead anybody. When my term of office in that Cabinet is being abused, I will...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must be aware that even on the Table of this House, he must be consonant of the provisions in the Official Secrets Act, and it is unparliamentary for him as a former Minister to threaten the breach of the Immunities and Privileges Act of this country which governs this House. It is wrong to disclose matters dealing with Cabinet secrets under the Official Secrets Act.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, they did not threaten the Prime Minister when he came and said that the Cabinet was afraid to do it. If you cannot get me for corruption, then try me under the Official Secrets Act.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not sure whether I cannot get him for corruption either, Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Do it. I dare you to do it. Go through the two Ministries I have held; check things, and lock me up if you can.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. It is, obviously, out of order for a former Minister to refer to the specifics of Cabinet. It is even more out of order when he refers to them wrongly, for the minutes to which he refers, which I have in front of me, are the minutes of the Cabinet meeting of the 6th August. It reads: "Supplementary provision for the Parks and Beaches Commission deferred", and not a word more than that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is interesting. I did not even know it was so near to the election. The Prime Minister is telling this House that we were afraid to come to the House with the supplementary, and in the same breath he is telling this House that the application was deferred on the 6th August, Parliament being dissolved on the 11th August. He still has the gumption to say that we were afraid to bring a supplementary to this House. That is what you are going to get. He only proves my point. He would know how Cabinet operates. He has been

in it for about six weeks. I thought it was July, but he is telling me that it was the 6th August. Parliament was dissolved on the 11th August, so how are you going to come to a Parliament that is dissolved? In spite of what is in front of him, he will get up and put into the records of this House that the Cabinet was afraid to send the supplementary to the House, so we dissolved Parliament so as not to come to this House for the money.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied that the Government, if it were so minded, could not find alternative areas in which to employ people, especially at Christmas, so that they would be able to get a bread. I am very pleased to see that the Prime Minister this morning had a meeting with the Lord Bishop to repay the Church for the support which it has given. He started out by making Reverend Hatch the Deputy President of the Senate. That is payment No. 1. Number 2 he went and repaired and cleaned a graveyard. Payment No. 2. (*Asides*). I agree Jackie Opel said that you have to pay. If you sell your soul to the devil, you have to pay. This is just the second area in which I am very pleased to see...

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Is the hon. member saying that the Cabinet has sold its soul to the devil? In which case he must withdraw it, or is he saying the Lord Bishop? If he is saying that the Cabinet has, I object. If he is saying the Lord Bishop has, then let the Bishop and the Lord above in heaven deal with him. He must withdraw it, if he is saying that we sold our souls to the devil, Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, thanks to Christ I do not have to get my salvation from the Lord Bishop, Roman Catholic, or anybody. Each man's soul is his future responsibility.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. The Hon. Prime Minister has stated a point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I will ask for your ruling on it. The hon. member cannot, gratuitously insult people for as long as he wants, and I am taking the point, Sir. Last week he had a field day. I was not here, but I am here today. I am taking the point that the Hon. Prime Minister, on a point of order, has objected to certain remarks as being unparliamentary.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What sort of a prank is that? Mr. Chairman, how would I know whether the Bishop has sold his soul to the devil? I would withdraw it. There is only one person who can tell you whether he has or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that the remarks be withdrawn.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Not withdrawn, but you can strike them from the records.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be struck out from the records.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I would not withdraw that.

1.20 p.m.

I am glad to see that the Government is paying for the support it got from the church during the election. I am not against.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is suggesting that this Government used various means to obtain support from the church, and is now using Government and public funds for the purpose of repaying. The suggestion is clear and I am objecting to that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: To what are you objecting? That the Government is now going to do graveyards for the Anglican Church? I hope you include the Methodist too if they have any. I do not want any discrimination on the grounds of religion or sect or anything. I am asking that not only you have a meeting with the Lord Bishop but that you have a meeting with the Superintendent of the Methodist Church, with the Roman Catholic Church.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member may have in past Parliaments been able to get up on a point of order and expatiate. When I am taking a point of order I would like you either to rule it in order or out of order. The suggestion here is that this Government and this Parliament will be taking public funds and paying for support given at the election. That would be a clear election offence, Sir. That is what the suggestion is and it is imputing improper motives to the mover of this Resolution and it is on that ground that I am objecting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The suggestions coming from the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition are out of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Never before in the history of Barbados have we found that the Government was repairing church yards. We had a disestablishment Bill in this House and the Anglican Church is an independent body. The Anglican Church is no longer established. It is no different from the Church of God or the Salvation Army or any other religious body; so

do not let the Minister of External Affairs and Legal Affairs try to mislead you. You are an educated man, Mr. Chairman. Do not let him come with all this monkey foolishness. You are an educated man, and all I am saying is — I am talking about my personal experience and this is one way I nearly lost my seat, through the church, and thank God that my God seems to be stronger than their God, and that is why I am here.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please get on with the debate?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I am saying is a fact, that nobody in Barbados who has followed politics — the Dean, the Bishop, the Roman Catholic Bishop, before the election — every single thing showing support and even after the election the Roman Catholic Bishop said time for a change was necessary, and he is going to get up on his feet and tell me — the mere fact that there was a meeting today as the Prime Minister said, between the Bishop and himself, is it not some form of repayment for the support you got in the election? Am I an idiot or what?.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am drawing Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 28(7) which says no member shall impute improper motives to another member; and I am going to ask the Hon. member, despite the fact that he might feel very strongly at having failed as a Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, despite that fact, that he would really control himself today. We will reply on certain aspects but it is unnecessary in a debate to impute improper motives. This quarrel with the church is a different matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Quarrel with the church? The church is not God, and He is the only one I worship. All I am saying is that the Government today by what the Prime Minister said is endeavouring to repay the church for the support they got during the election.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is out of order. He is imputing improper motives.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that if you had listened to the Prime Minister as I did, the Prime Minister said he met with the Lord Bishop this morning and asked him to submit a list of burial grounds so that the Government could use the Parks and Beaches body to repair.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is misquoting

the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister said to submit a list of the burial grounds which the public use.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What the public use; and he is going to use Parks and Beaches funds to clean the burial grounds of the Anglican Disestablished Church because the public use them. The public do not use the burial grounds unless somebody is dead. What we are saying is that the Anglican church charges the public. Do they do it free? Does the Anglican Church bury people free? So when you talk about the public use, those were pre-disestablishment days, but we are talking today about now the churches are charging the very public you are talking about, to bury them, and what the Prime Minister is saying is that he is going to use the Parks and Beaches staff and money to keep the Anglican Church burial grounds in order. That is all I am saying. Is there something wrong with that. Is that imputing improper motives based on what the Prime Minister said? I am saying it is done purely as an attempt to repay the church for the support that they got from the Dean, the.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already call the attention of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to his conduct. He is persisting in irrelevance and I direct that he discontinue his speech and resume his seat.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I had not hoped that this debate would have reached the depth that it has reached, but of course I forgot that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was speaking. He seems incapable at any time of getting up in here and making a speech which befits the office which he now holds. I have no doubt that he will not hold it for a long period of time, for it is clear that the more he speaks the more he displays not only to this House but to the public of Barbados that he is possessed of a propensity for discourtesy and abuse which are qualities any Hon. Leader of the Opposition should not have.

The points with which we are dealing here are simple. It is a fact that Parks and Beaches throughout its life had a regular staff in the vicinity of around 250 workers. It is a fact that sometime earlier this year at a period of time which coincided with a by-election, that a large number of people in addition to the well established number of staff were taken on. It is also a fact that the vast majority of those people were people who lived and resided in an area in which the by-election took place. With those facts in mind together with the additional fact that the Chairman of the Parks and Beaches

Commission also happened to be a candidate in the very by-election, with those additional facts taken into account we on this side made a reasonable charge, and the charge that we make is that from that evidence, in our opinion, we feel that the taxpayers' money was being used to influence the votes of these people who had to vote; and we also point out — and this is a fact — that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refuses to accept or deny — and it is a vital fact in a consideration on this — those additional workers when they came on to work were made to understand that they were only going to work temporarily.

1.30 p.m.

These additional workers, when they came on to work, were made to understand that they were only going to work temporarily. I have heard no one on that side dispute that fact, and I want when any one of them gets up in the future to let us know whether he is challenging that fact or not. Let them challenge that fact because it is from there we will be able to say if this side has the correct report or that side has the accurate report, for our information is based upon the record which we found and from information supplied to us by employees of that organisation and either that information is accurate or not, and if it is inaccurate then those who have supplied that information lay themselves open to very grave and serious offences. Let us get these facts very clear, because the whole point is that this House should not be misled by anyone as to true facts. We say that our information is that the people were told that the work was only temporary and would expire around September. What is more, the fact that this had a political motivation is clear for these reasons also, that the Chairman of the Parks and Beaches, Mr. Carmichael, a political candidate of the Democratic Labour Party at the Democratic Labour Party Headquarters announced what he was doing in relation to his conduct as Chairman of the Parks and Beaches. Obviously there was politics involved in the hiring of these people.

I also want to make it clear that we regard it as important the manner in which Government funds are spent and the authorisation procedures, and this is one thing I think everybody who has ever had any knowledge of the Labour Party in the last fifteen years would recognise. We have been consistently saying that it is our opinion that proper and right procedures accounting-wise have not been carried out by the Government, and we regard it as wrong that any Minister can authorise a Statutory Board to burst its vote and therefore broke the law.

Now, Sir, I was involved in a very successful attempt when there was Local Government in trying to establish these procedures because this is the kind of procedure that the City of Bridgetown used to operate under, and I well recall the battle that took place for the appointment of the Jackson Commission of Enquiry by this Government because there was a tendency for people to administer public money with reckless disregard for procedures. I condemned that when it was done in the City and in the other Councils, I condemned it when it was done by the Housing Authority, I condemned whoever did it and that is the important point that we will take, and that is one of the points we are taking here. We go further. I think it is legitimate for us to take into consideration the fact that employment policies were also in our opinion wrong, and this is a matter of opinion, because we feel that since everybody in Barbados is a citizen of Barbados, the fact that you live in the City ought not to give you any priority of employment when the work to be done would be more efficiently done if the labour to do that work was drawn from a nearby geographical area, and that is why I roundly condemn any suggestion that it was right to bring people from the City of Bridgetown to St. John or St. Joseph to do work of an unskilled nature when there are plenty of people available in the housing areas to do the work and would be able to get to work without any expenditure on the part of Parks and Beaches or on the part of Government. This seems to me to be a matter that we should roundly condemn, and I want to say that I think the time has come when serious consideration should be given, and it was in our manifesto, that we should have a Labour Department set up in a manner in which we have regional labour exchanges in Barbados, and people who live within a reasonable geographical area could form a pool for the work to be done in that area.

Mr. Chairman, if we had Local Government in this country no man could tell me that if you were going to do beaches in St. John you would come to the City and recruit people to do the work in St. John. That is wrong because you would be unfair to the people who live in that area and who have to share the burden of employment, and that is what I roundly condemn; and I condemn it not only because of that but because it is an attempt to divide this country and parcelise this country unfairly. I condemn it because in my opinion it is an inefficient use of money to transport labourers to a point when you could get labour from that very point. It is not a fact that this is one of the

reasons also why we create industrial estates not only in Bridgetown, but in other areas, so that they can draw from a pool of labour in those areas which have labour available. What kind of business sense it is to use gasolene and vans to carry people out there? That is why we question the object of that type of exercise.

Now with respect to the question of the Church, I have absolutely no doubt that whether it is the Anglican Church, whether it is the Methodist Church, whether it is the A.M.E. Church or the Mount Tabor Church, the basic position is that this Government was faced with a situation in which it had to make a decision as to whether it could continue to hire these additional people and pay for them, and we like anybody else in Barbados and like the hon. members on the other side cannot fool the public into believing that this Government which has weathered the storm of criticism for fifteen years, as a Government that has just got into power, should want to put people out of work. You cannot fool the people with that. We recognise that these people were used in a terrible way, because they were used not genuinely to provide employment for them, not to provide an efficient service, but to get votes, and it is because of that that we decided that we were going to see whether it was possible to find an equitable method of providing work for these and for other people with Parks and Beaches. It was because of the record of Parks and Beaches — as the Hon. Prime Minister said Parks and Beaches can receive praise from both sides of the House — that we decided that the institution could well be used as an agency for providing landscaping skills not only on public parks and beaches, but in other areas, and one of the things that struck you first was the question of burial grounds. Now which Church in Barbados has more burial grounds than the Anglican Church? So to come in and talk about repainting the Church for electoral favours, I say that I do not go to any Church at all. I do not know of any priest who voted or canvassed for me.

1.40 p.m.

I do not go to any church at all, I do not know any Priests who voted or canvassed for me. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition gets in the Church and preaches on behalf of himself and on behalf of his Party. His trouble is that he was not able to persuade a larger number of people to vote for his Party and that is what his grouse is, so to suggest that we came in here and that this again is in repayment of services is utter rubbish. The basic position is that the Anglican Church in Barbados because of its historical connections with Government and the intertwining

relationship that existed happens to have more burial grounds in which the public are buried than any other Church. I can think right now of Mt. Tabor Church with historical associations, which I am sure that nobody could possibly have any objections if the Parks and Beaches went there to clean it up.

The basic position is that the Churches were started because we feel that it is a disgrace to have Church land in that condition, burial grounds in that condition, particularly those that have attraction not only to Barbadians but to others, and St. John's Church is one of them. We will go further. To show you that this is the attitude of the very Parks and Beaches of which the hon. member's Government was in control at the time, during the time when employment was provided for the traditional staff and additional staff, private property in St. James was cleaned up. Let them deny that. Private property at Paynes Bay, below the Tamarind Cove Hotel, opposite the gas station in St. James, and other areas, so this is all foolishness that the hon. member is coming in here and trying to attempt to suggest that because we are thinking of utilising the labour for cleaning up the church yards that we are repaying any debt.

I want to go further. The significance of a statement made by the Prime Minister the hon. member has not grasped either. It is the intention of the Government to amend the Parks and Beaches law to permit Parks and Beaches to provide services for private people for a fee, because we are satisfied that you can build up skills in that organisation which private people would like to use. We are satisfied with that. All over Barbados there are thousands and thousands of lots of land that are empty, that are overrun with bush, that provide a haven for insects and pests that breed in there and cause other people to have to expend additional money to keep their land under control. I feel the time has come when the public health laws of Barbados should be enforced, and we should have a pro-bushing drive in Barbados. In other countries of the world if you are an owner of land and you do not keep your lands properly bushed the Government goes in, bushes it and charges you like your Local Government rate, and this would let a lot of people feel that they cannot buy land put it down and have no social responsibility.

We regard the Parks and Beaches Commission as an agency fit, eminently suitable for carrying out that policy of ours. The truth of the matter is that we do not seem to understand the instruments of the Government we have. We forget that the services the Parks and Beaches are

presently providing in Barbados, in other countries of the world would be provided by Local Government bodies. This is what we keep forgetting because of the decentralisation that occurred, and if you go to the City of Kingston in Jamaica you will see that the Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation regularly issues pro-bushings notices, and if you do not do it the City Department cleans it up and charges you. It is added to your rate and they can sell out your land if you do not pay it. So that we are trying by persuasion to create an institution for private people because we are dissatisfied with what we have found. It is wrong for this country for a number of reasons to have this land under used and we feel that the machinery of the Parks and Beaches Commission is ideally suited for that. By that means we hope that the Parks and Beaches will have a regular roster of people who are interested in this type of work and can be deployed, and we hope that the orders that come in when we amend the law will be sufficiently large to keep them continuously employed, but it must be recognised that Parks and Beaches is only one area of Government, that money is limited in Barbados, and there are a number of agencies, so I hope the hon. members will see this in that light.

You cannot make political capital out of the fact that these people have been laid off. We are saying that we are demonstrating by our policies that we are looking out for opportunities for employment for these very people, but we say this, we think it is wrong to have used the taxpayers' money to employ these people without even having the implements. This is another fact that I challenge anybody on the other side to deny. They did not even have the implements and a member of the staff of Parks and Beaches had to be hurriedly sent to Trinidad and Tobago to bring in implements for the very workers to use. That is a fact.

If we are talking in terms now of efficiency, do the hon. members, on the other side wish to tell this House that their Board was so efficient that it conceived of a plan to use these men and women and that their plan involved using them without having implements? I keep saying that the time has got to come when the public in Barbados must know now the recklessness, the incompetence, the corruption that occurred in the administration of public money in this country. The accounting procedures, all of that has to be exposed, because public money must be accounted for and it must be spent wisely, and that is a conception the Hon. Leader of the Opposition does not understand. He thinks it is good Government to hire people from the City

and carry them up to St. John to do work when there are people in St. John, equally taxpayers, equally unemployed, equally skilled at doing this work. He thinks that is good Government. This is his conception.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. I dare the Leader of the House and I want him to expose any corruption, because they have been using the word "corruption" and up to today the public of Barbados does not have one instance of corruption. Because it is a word in the English dictionary he has used it. I want you to reveal to the public who are waiting anxiously any corruption you find in Government. Lock up me in any you find; I dare you to do it.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: The hon. member obviously wants the taxpayers to feed him at Glendairy; they have fed him long enough. The position is, I say quite clearly that if you use the taxpayers' money for the purpose of getting favours, I call that corruption. If you use the taxpayers' money in any processes contrary to the established norms or regulations dealing with expenditure, I say that is part and parcel of corruption. If you use the taxpayers' money for your own private purposes, I say, Mr. Chairman, that that is corruption.

1.50 p.m.

The basic position is that when you review the whole of this matter, you will see that the Leader of the Opposition finds himself in a very embarrassing position. Having shot off his mouth as usual to the newspaper, emitting there from his usual vulgarisms in his usual style, he finds himself in a position today in which he must take a stand with no argument. The facts are clear, and I am sure that now the facts have been exposed the public will see things and come to the conclusion that, far from wanting to put anybody out of work, the Government's action was trying to preserve the existing number of people who were regularly employed, and we are steadfastly looking for alternative means to provide employment for those who have been turned off.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal very succinctly with this Resolution that is before us. It is a Resolution for the sum of \$890,150 in order to carry on the programme of the Parks and Beaches Commission until the end of the financial year, 31st March, 1977. As the Leader of the Opposition, the member for St. Michael South Central, has said this is a Resolution which we support because it was this Government that established the Parks and

Beaches Commission and the programmes for which that Commission has been responsible; therefore, we are in favour of the continuation of the programme. What we are questioning, however, is the fact that this programme, apparently, will continue, but certain workers, who were employed by the Parks and Beaches Commission earlier this year, have had their services terminated. We characterise that particular act as callous and showing unconcern for the employment situation in this country.

The Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party indicated in the 1976 General Election that the BLP programme would be creating job opportunities immediately for some 3,600 persons.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member for St. Michael South Central has misquoted our Manifesto. The members on that side did it last week, too. The Manifesto stated that the BLP programme for creating job opportunities will immediately generate some 3,600 primary jobs which will in themselves provide the base for additional employment throughout the Island.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. member is going to quote from a document, I would respectfully suggest that he be asked to make it a document of the House so that the records would show that he is quoting accurately, and prosperity would prove whether the document was right or wrong.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I take the points being made by the member for St. Philip North and the member for St. Joseph, the Minister of Agriculture. The Manifesto said that the BLP programme would create some 3,600 primary jobs which would in themselves provide the base for additional jobs. I am sorry I did not make the point quite clear that the 3,600 jobs would in themselves create more employment. It is 3,600 plus, and this is one of the promises that they made to the people of this country.

Let me stress these words. What are the facts, Mr. Chairman? The facts are that one of the first acts of the present Government — far from creating 3,600 jobs — was to remove from employment, at least, 258 persons. That is the record of this Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have to interrupt you. It is now two o'clock, and we will have to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2 p.m., and this sitting is suspended until 2.45 p.m.
2 p.m.

On Resumption :

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Mr. ODLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg that the Bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. (A Pause) There being no question this is time for Private Members' Business. The instant Order of the Day is Private Members' Business.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to move that Item No. 1 under Private Members' Business be the instant order of the day.

Dr. CADDLE: I beg to second that.

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

HOUSE SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment was taken the hon. member for St. Michael South was addressing the Chair. He may continue to do so now if he so desires.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I so desire; and I am not quite certain which particular matter we are dealing with at this particular moment, because as I recall it, there was a Resolution moved by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and then at last week's sitting there was a Resolution moved by the hon. member for St. Michael West, and I am at a loss to know — and I will ask your guidance, Mr. Chairman, on this matter as to which particular matter we will be dealing with; whether what was moved by the hon. member for St. Michael West which is an amendment to the motion or whether it is a separate motion in itself. Maybe if I can get some guidance from Your Honour.....

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understand it from the hon. member for St. Michael South, time in this Honourable Chamber does not necessarily mean the acquisition of knowledge and we must of

necessity let the hon. member understand that with an amendment to a main Resolution having been proposed, discussion must take place on the amendment.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am drawing to Your Honour's attention the Minutes which were confirmed today, and I am going to read from page 9.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South Central please take his seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to let it be seen that we want to be fair to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Already this morning an opportunity was given to each and every hon. member to tell us what there was that was wrong with the Minutes. The time for this having expired we will now proceed.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am not complaining about the Minutes. Just listen to me and you will understand what I am complaining about. I am not complaining about the Minutes. I am reading the Minutes in relation to my motion which I moved; and I want to read the Minutes which were confirmed, for you to give the Honourable House guidance which it obviously need....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South Central for the second time please take his seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But Mr. Speaker, I am....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South Central for the third time please take his seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am just asking for guidance. I am raising a point of order. Is the Leader of the Opposition allowed to move a point of order and ask for Your Honour's guidance? You have not even heard me to decide what....

Mr. SPEAKER: For the fourth time will the hon. member for St. Michael South Central please take his seat?

The hon. member for St. Michael South may proceed.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a point of order. But I hope this is not taken out of the time I have to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South cannot be heard on a point of order when he has the right to the floor. In other words, there is nothing – unless the hon. member for St. Michael South speaks, so to speak there could be nothing before the House arising out of which ~~there could be any~~ point of order.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the Resolution moved by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and as hon. members will recall, that was a Resolution noting the speech from the Throne and regretting the absence of measures (1) to provide for services adumbrated in Government policy or (2) to create an immediate impact on the employment situation. I was making the statement as well as a call in the following context.

2.55 p.m.

The people of this country and members of this Honourable Chamber, those of us who were here before the last general election, will recall that on many occasions the member for St. Thomas in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition at that time referred to the mismanagement of the finances of this country, referred to high unemployment in the country, referred to, in very scathing terms the way in which the economy of the country was functioning, and he made no bones about it that the interests of this country were not being served by the measures adopted by the then Minister of Finance. He complained about the size of the national debt, and without trespassing on the grounds of the member for St. Michael South West who I am certain will deal with this particular matter, I merely wish to make the point that while criticisms have come from the then Opposition, the Barbados Labour Party Opposition, that there was a huge national debt too sizeable for this country, while the whole tax basis whether it was land tax, retail sales tax or any of the other measures introduced for improving the finances of the country, whatever particular financial measure there was, criticism of these measures were levelled by the then Leader of the Opposition and other members who were over on this side at that time.

Since then, Mr. Speaker, a glad hand of promises has been made to the people of this country, and far from telling the country of what measures would be introduced in order to deal with the gap – and there was a gap between

revenue and expenditure, and that was also one of the measures that was criticised — we have heard nothing at all. In addition to that, there was a claim that this Government should go back to the bargaining table as far as the Unions of this country were concerned, the National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Workers' Union, the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union. There was a call that the Government should go back to the bargaining table. In addition to that, there were the promises made to the country and one promise has been fulfilled, that of the removal of the sales tax which in itself will create a further gap or widen the gap between revenue and expenditure. If one goes through the Throne Speech as well as the other promises made in the document to which the Barbados Labour Party is committed, their manifesto, one will find measures calculated to impose further expenditures on the people of this country, but in spite of that, we have had no proposals, no measures and no suggestions as to how that gap between revenue and expenditure would be closed or how these new measures are to be financed. I am calling here and now on the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. We are told this is an open Government. The member for Christ Church South Central confirms that. He has said it on more than one occasion. It is open as far as the Cubana situation is concerned; let us hope it is open as far as the financial management of this country is concerned.

I am saying that there is a gap between revenue and expenditure, that there was a deficit as far as the money which the Government takes in from its various sources as revenue and the money on current account being spent for the goods and services of this country is concerned. In addition to that there have been proposals put forward, some of them implemented which will served to widen that gap between revenue and expenditure, and the call I am making is that in the face of the severe criticisms that have been levelled against the financial management of the economy of this country, in the face of the criticisms that the national debt is too sizeable for this country, in the face of all that and in order to bring about a measure of relief as far as the thinking persons of this community are concerned, I am calling on the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister to bring to this Honourable Chamber a special Budget to explain and tell the people of this country how that gap between revenue and expenditure is to be closed, because we have been told that the budget introduced this year was really no budget, that it was too short, and that it did not deal with the problems of the country. With the new

Government and one that has been so highly critical of the size of the national debt, of projects introduced by the Government of that day, and with these new financial skills and ministerial expertise which the Great Combination has for this country, I am calling on the Minister of Finance to come to this Honourable Chamber and explain to hon. members and to the people of this country at large how that gap between revenue and expenditure is to be closed, and how the other glad hand of promises which are now being implemented or which are adumbrated and promised are to be financed, whether it is the free uniforms for the 60,000 or 65,000 school children in this country, the free national health services for which we are told there is a steering committee, the coastal road and the St. Andrew development and the other projects that have been made.

3.05 p.m.

That is the question that I raise at this stage and I do not wish to dwell on this for any length of time. I want, Mr. Speaker, to refer to Standing Order No. 25 which relates to the question of amendments. There was a Resolution moved by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the terms of which I have read out, and then there is a Resolution or an amendment, I am not certain how to put it, but then I realise that time in this Hon. Chamber does not necessarily mean knowledge of the rules of procedure of this Chamber, and I take your statement on that which applies to all 24 of us in here and I am certain that under your guidance we will not have two separate Resolutions on the floor of this Chamber. As I understand it, there is a particular procedure for amendments which are normally couched in the form of leaving out certain words or adding certain words or stating that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is attempting to direct the Chair. The Standing Order to which you refer deals specifically with the method of putting the question on amendments. We have not reached there yet, do not anticipate this Chair. Please get on with the debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not anticipating anything nor would I in all humility try to direct the Chair, I am merely referring to an original motion, a motion moved by the member for St. Michael South Central, and to an amendment moved or purported to be moved by the member for St. Michael West. One of these matters must be before this Hon. Chamber.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, as far as the free National Health Service is concerned I believe that we will have to await the proposals on this particular matter, and we are not in a position on this side of the House to speak on that particular matter in terms of what is proposed for this country, how it will operate, the cost of it or any of these matters. One thing I do know and it is that the introduction of such service in other countries has been accompanied by heavy financial costs to the taxpayers of those countries, and I await the recommendations of this steering committee that we have heard about. We have not been told of the composition of this committee, we know from our research that such programmes are very costly and have placed heavy burdens on taxpayers in other countries, and in the face of the situation in this country there is all the more reason why we are asking and why it is necessary that this whole matter be clarified. I think we are very reasonable out here and we say we will await the proposals because we believe that the Ministers must be given time in order to propose and to elaborate what their programmes are, but we are just warning that from our research into such services in other countries the costs have been burdensome, very heavy, and we fear that it will be no different in this particular country.

As far as the training of more doctors at all levels is concerned, we note this particular proposal which again is a proposal no one in this country will be opposed to, because it is necessary to have a larger number of trained personnel to deal with the health problems in this country. We have started that particular programme already in terms of the scholarships programme, in terms of the national development programme, in terms of assistance under certain scholarships and fellowships programmes which this country enjoys with other countries, including the United Kingdom, and we note the continuation of an existing programme. We think that it can be intensified, as indeed we have proposed, when we come to deal with another matter such as the Student Revolving Loan Fund where funds can be made available in this and other areas to meet national needs.

As far as the training of para-medical staff is concerned, which is one of the primary tenets of the BLP Government, we also note the continuation of the policies and programmes which were found by that Government. The programme for para-medical training has already started, and indeed Barbados is one of the co-operating centres for the training of para-medical staff through the establishment of

the Division of Health Sciences of the Barbados Community College where programmes for para-medical personnel have already been introduced, and we believe that the Minister of Health is on good grounds

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is up against time.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, when this particular programme has been proposed in continuation.

As far as the re-organisation of the administration of the health services is concerned, this policy is a continuation of the programmes initiated by the BLP Government, because there was an agreement for a study of the health services which would include the administration of the health services, and this is a continuation, so we have no quarrel on this score because most of these proposals except the free National Health Service which is a new programme being introduced.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my address and I again call on the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister to bring a second budget to this Hon. Chamber to tell the people of this country how he is going to close the gap between revenue and expenditure, and how he is going to provide for these proposals adumbrated and set out in these proposals.

3.15 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, first let me answer the question which the former Minister of Health posed, as I address this Chamber on the Resolution which is now before us. It is a very simple way to close the gap. As a matter of fact, the gap was closed on September 3, 1976. It is very simple. The corrupt practices of the former Government would bring to Barbados some more money into the Treasury. That is the answer. We need no budget. It is not necessary for you to do anything about finance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say to the hon. member for St. James that it is not good enough merely to make reference to corrupt practices by the other Government. You must prove them, and until you are prepared to back up such statements in the law courts, do not let us hear about them in this Honourable House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, we had a classic example today of the Parks and Beaches Commission. The Chairman of Committees was in the Chair at that time. I am sure that when you read the debates, you will find enough to satisfy

you that it is a fact. We know for sure that people were charged and convicted in the law courts of this country for corrupt practices which were carried out at the Housing Authority. We are going to back up such statements in due course, but I am now going to deal with the amendment to the Throne Speech.

I have listened in three sittings, today being the third, and heard empty speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition, a display of bad manners, and all that we have gathered is that the Opposition is asking the Government to carry out their policies immediately. That is today, when you look at the Manifesto of the same Government for 1961, when the then Governor of Barbados had made his Throne Speech, it was very clear that the Opposition had stated on page 3:

"The party is firmly convinced that time has come for intensification of agricultural production within the country and that the development policies should be immediately concerned."

This is their Manifesto. They go further, Sir, and state:

"Two key industries which the party proposes to have established immediately are a flour mill which would also manufacture corn meal, and the manufacture of both grey and white cement."

Now, in three sittings over a span of about 18 hours, after a display of bad manners on the day when the Governor-General came here to make the Throne Speech, the Opposition led by a Parliamentary joker.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there is no Parliamentary joker in here. I am appealing to you, otherwise I am going to answer him and go out. You must ask him to withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. It is insulting, and if Your Honour does not protect me, I am prepared to go out. I hope that you will bring a new dignity to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is noted.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I want him to withdraw it. I am no Parliamentary joker. I came in here through the people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat! Will the hon. member for St. James please confine his remarks to....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the words "Parliamentary joker". I have him as a joker, but he may not be a Parliamentary joker. I expected that, after having five years in the Senate, five year in the Lower House, I think a year or two before he left Barbados, bringing it to 12 years, I would have heard something of substance from him. The only positive thing that I have heard from the Leader of the Opposition between the Senate and down here is when the Governor-General said in his Throne Speech that he would not be making such generous contributions to the Pension Scheme. The Leader of the Opposition sat at the side of the Prime Minister and said: "I hope you are not making that retroactive." That is the only thing that was positive.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. I did not sit next to the Prime Minister in the Senate. It is not true, and he knows it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Not next to but close to, Sir.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition did tell me that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This is the type of Opposition about which you talk. You talk about some sort of critical support. I do not know what critical support you are talking about. I would have thought that after hearing us over there for 15 years of which I served 10, and hearing the outstanding contribution which we made on that side and was able to bring a Government down by solid arguments, the Opposition, or the Leader of the Opposition, would have taken an example from us. What do we hear? An attack on Mr. Speaker; an attack on the Prime Minister regarding the \$800 a month that he is receiving for Culloden Farm, and a lot of cheap dog-eared monkey politics. He should sit down and make a study of the Manifesto, make a study of his own form of Government, and let us have constructive criticism. All that we can hear is that they want something done immediately. I know that many of you over there do not realise that there has been a change of Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member get on with the debate. It is only a question of your

interpretation of the word "immediately" as against that of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Let us get on with the debate!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of "immediately" is now. I think it is an unreasonable proposal for the Leader of the Opposition to be calling upon the Government, sitting here for a couple of hours, to implement every conceivable thing in their Manifesto immediately. I heard him talk about the Minister of Labour and whether he could find jobs and so on. He talked about Parks and Beaches workers being laid off. He spoke about the Ministry of External Affairs and said that the Prime Minister made no contribution at the United Nations when he was dealing with the foreign policy of the country, and he did not give us any constructive criticism.

Mr. Speaker, we did not argue that way when we were on the other side. We made constructive criticism and we made salient points, which were accepted by the Government. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that it was you the former Prime Minister came over on the other side and spoke to when they were having a corrupt practice with the shrimp industry, and they wanted to put 51% into the hands of the Fergussons and that crowd. You, Mr. Speaker, got up and challenged the former Prime Minister and told him that it was a wicked measure. The Prime Minister came over there, and I think it was the first time he ever spoke to you in Parliament, and said that he agreed with you. That was constructive criticism and that is the sort of thing we expected from the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want the Opposition to get up in here and talk about a lot of nonsense and policies that they could not carry out. I have heard the Minister of Education or Health in here in this very debate pointing out that he was sure we could not carry out the programme for the school leavers when we took them back into the schools, and in the same breath he said: "I have a proposal which I am going to invite you to use." In one breath he is saying that we cannot carry out the programme, and in the same breath he is saying that he is going to give us some advice on what to do. We ask this simple question: "Why was it not done by him?" We have heard a lot of these cheap remarks. There is no wonder why the former Minister of Education walked out when we were taking the vote for the Miscellaneous Act and called for a division. It was something unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this amendment. It is a Throne Speech by the

Governor-General based on the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party.

3.25 p.m.

It is a programme which we set out to do in five years and it is until then that we have to be judged by those who have to judge us, whether we are fit to rule again or not; but we are not going to be bulldozed by the cheap gibes of the Opposition as to call on us to implement any scheme immediately. I have heard someone saying he wonders how the old age pensioners — do not worry about the old age pensioners. I am going to visit one tomorrow who is 100 years old. Then they will come in here and be sympathetic with the people who lost their lives on the Cubana flight and saluted the police within the region for the same action — he tagged it on the Government. That is what the Leader of the Opposition did, tagged it on to the Government, when the real culprit is the person who invited Cubana airlines to come to Barbados and have links with Cuba. I have made reference to the member for St. John, I think.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You mean the hon. member for St. John.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would have to say the Rt. Honourable for that matter because he is a privy councillor in England. I do not even think he is worthy of taking that with him, because I have a very strange feeling that on that day when the ill fated Cubana airline touched down, that the member for St. John happened to be on Paradise Beach with a ship-to-shore radio. I have a sneaky suspicion that he is an accomplice.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us come a little closer to the Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. That should be struck from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right. Please take your seat. To the Leader of the Opposition will you please take your seat.

I would kindly ask the hon. member for St. James to withdraw that remark.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I shall withdraw the remark and I, Mr. Speaker, am not challenging your ruling. I said I have a suspicion. I am not saying that he is an accomplice.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the Resolution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is my suspicion and I am entitled to such a suspicion. I am entitled to

a feeling. I feel that there is a man walking down Broad Street but that may not be so.....

Mr. SPEAKER: But you need not express it in this Honourable Chamber.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I accept Your Honour's ruling, but I shall go further. I recall very well in here the Opposition challenged the member for St. John....

Mr. SPEAKER: He is the hon. member for St. John.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He is the member, whether....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am insisting that he is the hon. member, and I will have you refer to him as the hon. member and I will have him refer to you as the hon. member for St. James at all times.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: All right Sir. I shall abide with Your Honour's ruling. I know you are quite aware of the fact that I mean no disrespect to the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER: You might not mean it but you might show it. Let us go on.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Well, Mr. Speaker, believe me, Sir; if you continue in that vein I am sure that you will go down as one of the finest Speakers of all time. There is no maybe about that, and I am looking forward to that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: We will come to that later.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: However, Sir, no one can convince me that the hon. member for St. John did not know that there were troupes from Cuba en route to Angola that had touched down on Seawell Airport. As Minister of Aviation nobody can convince me about that. He was Minister of Aviation. I have chatted with a number of experts and I am told that every single moment at Grantley Adams Airport is monitored and nobody can convince me of that. The hon. member for St. John came in here and it is on record that he said he did not know, therefore he abdicated his responsibility to the country and that is why I believe today that we have found ourselves in the pond of international terrorist. That is my firm belief.

I think the Deputy Prime Minister scored a point which I think he would never be able to score in his life again, when he said he should go to the nearest Police station and give evidence....

Mr. SPEAKER: And the hon. member for St. James is yet to score his point in his contribution to the amendment to the Resolution which is before this Honourable House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not think you are recording well enough the points which I am scoring, Sir. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, you yourself know you have been a good point scorer and you might find it very difficult to appreciate other people's points in scoring.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would think that the amendment to this Resolution moved by the hon. member for St. Michael West is one which is an admirable one. I have no doubt in my mind that it sets out a bold and imaginative programme for the economic and social advancement of our nation, and I am quite sure that the end result is that the people of this country are going to salute us for the bold steps which we have taken to assist them in having a degree of dignity and respect back in the society.

As far as the Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Youth Affairs is concerned, I am confident that there is a matter of time which, I believe, we are going to score the points which you were speaking about. I leave on this note, Mr. Speaker. A good Opposition will always make a good Government, and this is an established fact down through the Westminster model. Any good Opposition proves itself to be a good alternative Government and I have no doubt in my mind that history is going to record that we from the Barbados Labour Party who sat in the Opposition during the past fifteen years will go down in the records here as an outstanding Opposition, and therefore I have no doubt in my mind that we are going to be an outstanding Government.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, for a very long time in the history of Barbados people have been encouraged to withhold voluntary compliance with taxation in this country. It had started when the planters, the former colonial people ran this country and it has continued right into 1976. On many occasions at election times it is the habit of the electorate to expect people wishing or soliciting their support, to make promises about the removal of taxes or the adjustment of certain taxes in their favour. There have always been problems of taxation, and when you look closely at the problems of taxation, these problems of taxation resolve themselves on two views. The first view is the point of view of incentives; the second is the point of view of resources.

3.35 p.m.

If people support the point of view of incentives, they are usually urged to make additional concessions of various kinds to the electorate or to the taxpayers without paying due regard to the unfavourable effects on the public revenue. If on the other hand they are arguing their proposals or policies on the basis of increasing the resources, then they see the increasing of resources as available for investment through additional taxation even at the cost of worsening the disincentive effects. Now it can be argued quite convincingly that there is a lot of misplaced concern with incentives, except when incentives are given to foreign investors with the purpose of bringing in capital to the country, and usually what affects developing countries is not a lack of incentives but more often a lack of resources. No Government regardless of political ideology or regardless of its political colour can pay scant attention to the non-revenue yielding services — education, health, transportation, communications and works, etc. — which have to be financed out of Government revenue.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking about just and unjust taxes?

Dr. CADDLE: I am just talking about taxation in relation to money for development.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please continue.

Dr. CADDLE: Whenever the Government has to make proposals either for increasing work, that is, giving more employment to people who are unemployed, or intensifying the already existing programmes, that Government has to pay due consideration to taxation, and therefore in a place such as Barbados it can be very faulty and dangerous to encourage people into believing that the best way of running a Government is by reducing taxes. People in a country have to be educated that in Barbados the money for development, the money for producing or providing more employment opportunities comes to a very large extent, almost 100 percent, by way of taxation by the party in power.

When one looks at some of the moves made by the present Government there is more than one view in which to look at these things. In relation to the sales tax which has been hurriedly removed, there is another view which I believe any good Government would examine before hastening to remove it. It is far-fetched to indicate to people that the mere removal of the sales tax will mean to them \$6 million which they can find at Christmas time to buy hams. A sales tax is an interesting tax. It is equitably applied; it is the last thing attached to the item.

The merchants, the shopkeepers and other business people do not benefit by it, unlike other taxes such as consumption taxes or customs duties which when they are applied to an item permits the businessman to make his profit or his mark-up much higher than it would be if the things were not applied. In the case of the sales tax, since this is the last thing applied to the item, the businessman cannot take advantage of the use of a sales tax. At the same time everybody who buys has to pay it. The person who refuses to work and tries to get his money by methods which the society would not approve of will have to pay sales tax. A person who sets about stealing will also have to pay the sales tax when he goes to buy things.

When one thinks in terms of alleviating some of the burdens of the taxpayer, it is interesting to observe, Mr. Speaker, that in Barbados it is the man whose income can be identified easily who is called upon to pay the brunt of taxes in the country, especially direct taxation, and one would always like to believe that a wise Government would be interested in relieving some of the burden or anxieties on the part of a fellow who has an income which can be readily identified and taxed. I think it is a point which one has to bear in mind because when you realise that you are removing a tax and with that tax you are wiping out a certain sum of money whether it be \$6 million or \$7 million, provision will have to be found at some time to recover that sum of money which has been lost by the removal of that tax, and therefore any wise person in this country must at some time expect that at some future time in Barbados there will have to be adjustments upwards in the tax or fiscal policies of the Government.

When one looks at the taxation potentials of a country like Barbados, one will see it in terms of four factors: (1) the real income per head; (2) the degree of inequality in the distribution of income; (3) the relative importance of different kinds of economic activity and their social and institutional setting; and (4) the administrative competence of the organs of the Government to collect that tax. For a very long time in Barbados and many other developing countries there are reasons to believe, and very often these are well supported by facts, that people who are required to pay taxes keep more than one set of books, one to fool the Government and one to show the true intent or purpose of their business. It is also noticeable and also proven that in many of these countries, because of this delinquency in paying taxes you find that the money which a person is expected to pay on his income, which when assessed by social outlook and then compared

and contrasted with the money which people indicate on their returns to Government, there is a wide gap. In other words, what Government collects is only a fraction of what they should be collecting, and this is true in Barbados, this is true in many other developing countries of the world, because the problem which confronts the Government is the administrative competence of the collecting organs of the Government. I am therefore hoping that the present Government is able to carry out its programmes because after all I am a Barbadian and anything that is going to happen in Barbados is going to benefit me, and I am hoping that they will be able to carry out their programmes.

I would like to believe that before they set about either to push up taxes or pull down taxes, to add on new taxes or remove old taxes they would have done an in-dept study of the taxation policies and programmes as they now exist in Barbados. Sir, to rush in with the removal of taxes in this country as it now stands with its problems, you will find that very early in the near future we can find that we have to go back and do things which we very much would not like to do to the people of this country. One also has to bear in mind, and when I say "one" I mean the present Government, that last year was a special year in the history of taxation or collection of taxes in this country. It was a year in which taxpayers paid their tax dues from 1974 and also started to pay their tax dues for 1975, and because of this there must have been an undue amount of money available in 1975 which is not going to be available in 1976 or in the years coming, and that is a very interesting point. To put it another way, that is why I am a bit concerned at the haste with which we have seen tax adjustments being made in this country, because I think we could be encouraging the public to go on withholding their voluntary compliance with taxation policies of the Government if we do not take a full and meaningful analysis of what is going on in the country at the present time.

Sir, it is the responsibility of the present Minister of Finance to find the money for any of the proposals, but at the same time I would have to warn him that when you have encouraged people's appetites to expect certain things in the way of not taxing them enough or removing taxes, you could find later on you have a rather difficult road on which to tread, because always in these small societies there are groups of people who will set about lobbying against the imposition of increased taxes or the imposition of new taxes.

3.45 p.m.

I would now like to turn to another point which has been mentioned in the Throne Speech, and that point is Immigration. It is my belief, and I would like to stress the point, that immigration in Barbados has too long been handled in a very *laissez-faire* attitude. We are a small country and it is true that we have depended in the past on the goodwill of many countries, notably North America — Canada and the United States — and Britain, to assist us in getting some of our surplus population off. One only has to go back to the thirties to be convinced of this, because during the thirties it was estimated that at least 35,000 people in this country were unemployed and could not be supported by the economy of the country, and that came about dramatically due to the changing attitudes of the Guyana Government, the Trinidad Government, and the shortage of work in Panama, because I think you will recall that at that particular time many Barbadians left this place and went to Panama, to Guyana and to Trinidad, and when those avenues were closed they remained here and we had the crises which were a characteristic feature of our history occurring in the thirties.

Again, since World War II we have looked to immigration as the answer to some of our problems, especially problems centred around unemployment, and again when we find Britain, and more recently Canada and the United States, tightening up on their immigration policies and procedures, we have again found it difficult to ease the burden on the people of this country. But while that is true, we will find ourselves in a rare position in this area in the Caribbean, and taking the world as it now stands with all the intrigue and the undermining and all the sabotage that is going on in the world, I think we have to be more careful about the type of immigration policy which we dish out in connection with this country, because if we are too lax, if we are too generous in these policies, we could be opening our doors to saboteurs and other people who will come in here put us, as the previous speaker has said, as pawns in this international intrigue.

In addition to that we have to relate our immigration policies and programmes to the demographic features of this country. We have problems of unemployment, there has been increasing population and the former emigrating opportunities which were there are no longer there, and therefore one has to be concerned with the rapidity and ease with which foreigners can come into Barbados and get jobs at the expense of Barbadians getting jobs, and I think before one can be that generous one has to

ensure that Barbadians are secure in their jobs and also secure in the knowledge that their position, their rights in Barbados are protected by a meaningful and well disposed Government. I think it is nice to hear the words "putting Barbados first" but to put Barbados first you have to put Barbadians first and no better way of putting Barbadians first than to protect the employment opportunities of Barbadians.

When you look around this country it is interesting to observe the ease with which foreigners come in here and start at the top, and Barbadians, regardless of their qualifications, regardless of their endeavours, locally and overseas, find it very difficult to reach or aspire to those top positions in many of the endeavours in this country. You will expect any programme being initiated that the people in this country, the Barbadians, when we are putting Barbadians first can rest assured in the knowledge that their position in this country is protected and their rights to employment are always and will always be protected by all 24 members of the House of Assembly.

Sir, immigration for a small country has a lot of effects which I feel have been lost on previous people, and I will repeat that any immigration policy must take into consideration the demographic features of this country. Our rising population, our large number of unemployed people, more people being educated now and therefore expect to aspire and obtain better jobs rather than remaining down at the bottom of the ladder, all of these things must bear their due importance on the framing of any new immigration policy of this country.

When you think in terms of unemployment, I think very often politicians are so concerned with their political ideologies and their political colouration that they seem to overlook that they are dealing with human beings and humanitarian attitudes which one expects to flow easily from the representatives of the people are lacking. When you have to deal with people seeking employment, very often it is the peculiar problems of the person, the straitened circumstances which the individual relates to you that compels you to get up and do something to get that person out of that plight, and as a man of the people, and you as men of the people, or to use the term "grass roots person," you will know very well what I am talking about, and when people come to you seeking jobs and they relate their plight to you the question of somebody voting for you or not voting for you does not enter into the consideration when you set about to get an individual a job, and you have

to bear in mind that in a small society such as Barbados where all important people are known, identified, and where they live or work is well known, it is very difficult for any politician to put a barrier around himself to protect himself from the inroads made by large numbers of people seeking employment, and it is good if for no other reason than to give the people on the other side who, when they were on this side, criticised the Government, an opportunity to realise and appreciate what it is to be disturbed, as the Bajans say, morning, noon and night every day by someone wanting a job, and someone who very often believes that just by waving your hand or pressing a button or giving the word, recalling the experiences of Christ and the Centurian where the man said you only have to give the word and it will be done, they come and say that if you give the word they will get the job.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are now within the province of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. CADDLE: It is only from that point of view if no other point of view that it is good for members to appreciate now the problems that are concerned with this type of thing, where large numbers of unemployed people call you before you wake up in the morning and last thing at night asking you to get jobs for them, and when you hear of their plight you have to become very hard-hearted not to accede to their request in some way to get that job, and therefore it is disheartening to hear politicians seeking to gain some point against their opponents, seeking to make their opponents feel that they are unworthy, they are people without dignity, and they are less than human when in reality what we should be showing is a deep concern and feeling and a show of humanitarianism or philanthropy for those people outside who do not get a job and the prospects of getting are not as soon as some of us would like them to be.

However, I know full well, as I have seen in other countries and I have also read in the history of this country, what unemployment can do to a country, and in this area I would like to know that something is being done urgently for people, especially at this particular time of the year when many of them are looking forward and hoping that they will have a very bright Christmas. This particular time of the year when people become more concerned with not having a job, because it is Christmas, and Christmas is one of the important occasions in Barbados when people like to know at least they can buy their Christmas meal, and therefore they like to know they are working.

I am hoping that everybody in Barbados will want to identify themselves with the problems surrounding the unemployment in this country and assist in whatever way they can in reducing this unemployment. When one looks generally at Barbados, and I have been hearing of many of the problems confronting this country, but I would like to say it is very easy when you are not a member of the Government to sit down and criticise and say what should be or should not be done.

3.55 p.m.

When you get in the Government, as I have been, and you see the problems confronting this country, then you start to realise that it is an entirely different matter. Many of the criticisms which have been levelled at us from this side, I think in the very near future we could very well use those criticisms against the present Government. It would only be necessary for us to go and get the necessary records of the proceedings of the House of Assembly and come in here and read out what had been said on this side at a certain time, but I do not believe it is the intention of members on this side to indulge in that kind of harangue and embarrassment. We are in a very interesting stage of the development of Barbados when we have to be concerned with the people of this country and not really concerned with whether my point is right or your point is wrong, or whether or not my political colouring is a better political colouring than yours. We must indicate to the people of this country now that we are concerned about them.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we persist in the type of harangue which I have heard in here since this new Session began, then we are not going to impress the people who ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Harangue? From which side of the House?

Dr. CADDLE: From both sides of the House. If you want me to withdraw it, I will withdraw it. If we persist in that type of behaviour, we will find that the people outside who are expecting proper solutions for their problems will lose their faith and may have to resort to the situation of taking the matter into their own hands and see what they can achieve for themselves. I would not like them to do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know the hon. member would not aid and abet.

Dr. CADDLE: I would not aid and abet. I give you my assurance on that, Mr. Speaker. It

is not my intention to aid and abet, but I know that a hungry man is a very angry man. If people are angry they can lose their reasoning, and they can resort to Collins and other things of that nature in order to demonstrate how angry they are. As a grass root man, I know you are well aware of how angry people can become when they feel that you are not paying due attention to them. They are now running the Government, and it is their opportunity now to get a knowledge of the problems of this country and some of the experiences which the former Ministers of the Government have had in running the affairs of this country. I want to assure them that nobody on this side grudges them of the opportunity, and I would like to assure them that as they set about to implement the proposals and programmes enunciated in their Manifesto to make sure that the people of this country are not victimised in any way because of their political colouring, or their political convictions.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems which we find in Barbados at the present time — it is not the representatives or the 24 members of the House of Assembly, but it is very often the people who support the 24 members of the House of Assembly who go around making remarks and doing things which create in the minds of other people that they are being victimised. This is something which I hope is only a passing phase, and in the very near future we will see the type of operation in this country where every person in this country regardless of political colour or political ideology, will know that as long as a job is there and as long as he is qualified he will get the job and he will not have to hide his political coloration, or he will not have to go around begging and doing things which also could go a far way in making him less than a human being.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, last week I had reserved my right to speak, on seconding the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is no longer reserved; it is your right to speak.

Mr. SIMMONS: I claim it now as of right. The member for St. Michael West has congratulated the Government on the imagination of its programme as outlined in the Throne Speech on October 6. When this debate opened, the Leader of the Opposition, who sat previous to this Session on both sides of this Chamber, attacked the Throne Speech on the basis of its vagueness.

Mr. SPEAKER: He did not sit at one and the same time on both sides.

Mr. SIMMONS: That is impossible, Mr. Speaker. He may have had the intention. Mr. Speaker, speakers subsequent to the Leader of the Opposition have all complained that the speech delivered by the Acting Governor General was in its nature vague. We were counselled by the Leader of the Opposition that the people who voted for us would be out there waiting to see that we honoured our promises in the speech and, of course, the promises in the Manifesto.

Now, one of the early complaints of the Leader of the Opposition was that he could read in a Sunday newspaper that the Minister of Finance had to take certain initiatives to meet payments. He wanted to know how a columnist could know this. Assuming, Mr. Speaker, that that financial position, as represented by the columnist, was true then, surely, it is testimony to the fact that the management of the economy in the previous administration was so poor as to have left the finances of Barbados down the drain to such an extent that three weeks ago there was a deficit of \$41 million on current account. People were walking all about Barbados talking about that. He should know how the country arrived at that position, because it could not have been generated by this administration. It must have started under his administration.

Mr. Speaker, he said that at least it would be better for the Prime Minister to come and tell the House about these matters than for him to read of these things in the newspaper. (*Asides.*) I am not misquoting him. I took copious notes of what he had to say. I cannot understand. I cannot understand how he can now complain

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member for St. Philip North to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am addressing my remarks to the Chair, and looking at the lone bird over there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Philip North will not refer to any other member in here as a bird. You will kindly withdraw those remarks.

Mr. SIMMONS: I withdraw the remarks, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps it was that in dealing with the Leader of the Opposition, I was accustomed

to his references to animals that I suddenly found myself to be an ornithologist. If the member of the Opposition was complaining, as I understood him, that money was obtained in a quiet way, an extra Parliament, surely it was better to raise money in that way to pay people in Barbados than to have expended money in a surreptitious and secretive way as his former Government used to do.

With reference to Carib West, Mr. Speaker, we only read in here in the last Session on the front page of a newspaper that the public funds had been invested in Carib West. Where did the money come from? Why were the Parliamentarians not told about the matter? It does not lie in their mouth now, Sir, to complain about quietude in Government. There was a complaint that we had taken off the 5% sales tax, and it was said that when you take off the tax something else would have to be put on. That was alleged by the Leader of the Opposition. The Minister of Finance, in due course, will have to present to Parliament his Budget. We will see how he will attempt to raise the money to finance the economy for the year that is coming.

However, in the meantime, the Leader of the Opposition must recall that soon after the assumption of power in 1961 his Government instituted a crash programme. They had people picking up rocks at Seawell Airport and so on. In the Budget immediately following the assumption of power the then Prime Minister, the present member for St. John, taxed chicken backs and necks, flour, sugar and rice.
4.05 p.m.

I remember that well. Earlier on he taxed the very thing that the poor people of this country were then using as the basic of their meal. You would not see that under this Government in the Budget Speech; I will predict that, Sir, because I believe that on this side we have a better conception, we have been closer to how the average man operated in the last fifteen years. We have a better conception of the pinch than the members on the other side.

There was a complaint found that nothing had been mentioned about the coast guard; that we had a short statement on defence and security. When I wind up I will have something to say about defence and security from a different angle. It has not always been the policy of this party, Mr. Speaker, as enunciated in the Estimates debate earlier this year that we would like to see the coast guard integrated with the Harbour Police. Mr. Speaker, you well

remember that it was pointed out to the then Prime Minister who for the first time appreciated a point, that the Coast Guard has no power of arrest. When he was making a speech in here one evening about the Coast Guard going so many degrees latitude and turning so many degrees longitude, the simple point was made to him that they had no powers of arrest; even if the people were bringing in dope there was nothing they could do but run them down. It will be implemented in this Government's life time, Sir, during the next five years that there will be an integration of the Coast Guard and the Harbour Police. My friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has heard the point made several times and so he must be aware of our policy. The Coast Guard played a useful part in the Cubana crash the same day as the speech was delivered by the acting Governor-General, and why we did not get up and praise him. Under the old regime the Coast Guard used to praise themselves on CBC every night and when fishing boats were helped to get into Barbados on the Coast Guard you used to see it on TV, but the day when Garfield Mason mushroomed from Bayfield and was nearly killed fishing off Barbados, and his poor boat was destroyed and he was sent to the bottom of the sea because the people in the coast guard boat did not see the fishing boat — that is what they said — a whole open sea, one fishing boat and a coast guard boat, and they cut the boat in half and sent the man to the bottom of the sea. Not a word was said about it. The man could have lost his life, and his five children would have been impoverished. We never heard anything about that.

During his speech the Leader of the Opposition sought to complain about the treatment to the former Ambassador Mr. Maurice King — I am not sure where he was; *(Aside)* oh! The OAS. Again Sir, there is a saying that 'eggs do not go to big rock dance' and 'if you have glass windows, don't throw stones.' In the same way as he is seeking to complain, wrongly informed, about the treatment to the former Ambassador, I would like, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say to the hon. member for St. Philip North that the Chair has never complained about Mr. Maurice King.

Mr. SIMMONS: No Sir. The Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, you will recall when you were on the floor of this House before you ascended those four steps, where you are now exalted to that position which you grace with the utmost dignity — before that, you will

remember, Sir, that about 23rd March in this House of Assembly you saw one of the very members of the then Government party, Mr. Hoppin, cry like a child in his Chambers at the way that members of his own side treated him.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this now an attempt to amend the amendment?

Mr. SIMMONS: I have not moved it, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I am replying, — before I finally congratulate the Government — I am replying to some of the criticisms made by the Leader of the Opposition. The debate was some time ago; perhaps Your Honour might have forgotten each and every point that was made by him; but the point that I am trying to make is that when the Leader of the Opposition was complaining about inhuman treatment the Leader of the Opposition himself should have been aware that before the by-election in St. Philip North this year he went on television and tore up a teacher in Blades Hill called Ena Reece and humiliated her at a public meeting to the point where she was moved with tears. So let him not tell of inhuman treatment when he himself, in my submission, was an author of inhuman treatment earlier this year. Let him not forget the treatment that was meted out to Mr. Waldo Ramsay, let him not forget the treatment that his own Government gave him; but I leave him in the good and careful and trusted hands of the Attorney General who will deal with him next week in turn of replying to the submissions made by him. When I say 'deal with him,' Sir, that is how I mean.

I refuse to answer *in extenso* the argument that because there was a drop in the crime rate, according to the Commissioner of Police, that that was something for which the then Government could take credit because they were employing people. That is altogether too simplistic an explanation for the state of crimes, Sir, and I am not getting into that because there are several matters that one has to look at when you are trying to analyse why the rate of crime dropped.

Now Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the Throne Speech.
4.15 p.m.

As we look through the Throne Speech, there are other aspects of it which cause us to offer the Government the greatest congratulations. They say that we do not show how we intend to create employment. Earlier today I had to read from page 4 of the

Barbados Labour Party manifesto, where it is stated: "The BLP programme for creating job opportunities will immediately generate some 3,600 primary jobs which will in themselves provide the base for additional employment throughout the Island. The main avenues will be: Plans for Housing Construction; St. Andrew's Development Scheme; Agro-Industries; National Playing Field Programme; Parks, Beaches and Caves Development; Establishment of new Towns."

On page 2 of the Throne Speech we see that the Government intends to provide for new and additional fishing ports with cold storage and marketing facilities. What are the benefits to accrue from this kind of development? Clearly, Sir, in establishing these fishing ports there will be the creation of jobs. To that extent it will be labour intensive. I use the words advisedly. So we are providing employment. If you are at the same time tying this in with the policy of development of the fishing industry as a separate industry, then of course you are trying to stimulate the greater production of fish so that they can be sold at a cheaper price, and at the same time you are feeding the community with a protein product at a cheaper price. What you cannot sell here you may have to export, or with the processing plant that the Ministry of Agriculture has in mind, then, Sir, there may be also openings for canning. "The processes for bringing the Physical Development Plan for Barbados into effect at the earliest opportunity will be completed. However, as soon as possible thereafter a revised plan will be presented to reflect the changed situation and to incorporate the development of Oistins, Speightstown, Holetown, Belleplaine, Welchman Hall, Central St. George and an area in St. Philip as subsidiary urban areas."

The Leader of the Opposition must understand again this kind of infra-structural development is job creating and to that extent is a vehicle through which the Government aims to reach its objective of 3,600 primary jobs. The works programme outlined at the bottom of page 5 will be designed to stimulate economic growth by providing roads, buildings, bridges, and water supplies for domestic and industrial use.

I also say that these programmes are socially useful and at the same time they are labour intensive. "The necessary examination will be given to the construction of a new coastal road in the parishes of St. Joseph, St. John and in northern St. Philip to link up with

the East Coast Road at Bathsheba and the St. Philip Road at Blades Hill in order to develop those coastal areas. My Government considers the housing of the people and especially low income workers, to be a matter of the highest priority and accordingly proposes to develop a National Housing Plan aimed at achieving this objective, which will introduce a new and dynamic community approach to housing."

Now in these two, the development of a coastal road and the housing plan, again, Sir, you have programmes which are socially useful; they will provide some basis for economic development and thirdly, they will in their creation be labour intensive. So that when the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues complain that the Speech is vague, and that it offers no hope for creative employment, then I believe I have been able to demonstrate just from a cursory glance through the first seven pages of the Throne Speech that the Government in fact does have plans for creating employment in this country. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Government's plans cannot be implemented in one day. We pride ourselves on this side as being a socialist party; the Leader of the Opposition will say his is also a socialist party. Without quarrelling with him I ask him to accept as a matter of political philosophy that a socialist Government must plan its economy. That is a fundamental principle of democratic socialism, that your economy must be planned, and the various matters I have referred to today are all part of an integrated and planned economy for Barbados. Because we are not talking of Euro dollars or fiscal incentives and using language that is the language of the monetary economists does not mean that we are not dealing with the economy. The economy consists of various sectors. The Government's agricultural plan is part of the general economy of this country, and it is planned to be integrated into these other things to which I have alluded earlier, and we will not be hurried, or to use the recent language of the Deputy Prime Minister, we will not be bullied or hustled into instituting into this country purely *ad hoc* measures which last for two days or two weeks, and then you find the mass of people back in unemployment. Look at the programme that they had for the Parks and Beaches. It was to come to an end at the 30th September after the elections. We have a different attitude to that. As I have already mentioned, we had in our manifesto before September 2 that the Parks, Beaches and Caves development would be one of the avenues through which the Government would create jobs.

I do not want to anticipate another debate or an earlier debate, but clearly the extension of the workings of the Parks and Beaches Commission to throw them into avenues which were formerly not within the purview of the Commission is a means of extending the functions and a means of creating a wider opportunity of jobs for people operating under the aegis of that Commission. It is all part of a plan. As I said earlier, they had a crash programme for a few weeks in 1961, people were given immediate work and then they were thrown back into unemployment. Our Party believes that any work that is given to people must be on a long term basis. There is no sense giving a man money for a month and then throwing him back out or laying him off for ten months and bringing him back at Christmas and giving him a berry. He must be given work that is scheduled for a continuous and permanent period as far as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the plans of the Government, and the way the Government has operated since 2nd September all point to the seriousness of this Government in dealing with the problems which immediately confront this Government.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the plans and the success of the plans can only be realised through the co-operation of the people at large in this country, the total electorate, those who vote and those who do not vote, the administrative sectors of this economy — like the civil servants and the people who function at administrative level in the Statutory Boards — and I wish to make an appeal to those persons to assist this Government in running the economy of Barbados and in running this country as a whole for the next five years in the interest of each and every one in this country irrespective of political persuasion. You may be a Dem today but you may find that you need something which necessitates help from a member of the BLP. We have tried as far as possible and will continue to try and will assure the country that we will not operate on the basis of partisanship, so we are appealing. We on our side for ourselves are willing to let the daggers that were drawn during the election to be sheathed again, and each one of us implores ourselves to be more productive.

All of that may well assist the Government, but at this very moment in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, there is a nasty and sinister plot taking place in this country night after night — I know what I am saying, you have sat up — and I want them to know that I

know that there is a nasty and dangerous plot in this country to make life as difficult as possible for this Government, far lest to achieve its overthrow, but we know it will go ahead, go out of here and wherever you are and make your plans, but rest assured.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member for St. Philip North addressing the Chair?

Mr. SIMMONS: I am sorry, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am no plotter.

Mr. SIMMONS: Not at all, Sir, you do not have any walkie-talkie walking about at night in the Pine, or you are not in the bus stand or meeting at private houses in this country at night in the last couple of weeks making plans and trying to drive fear into people. I issue a warning for myself, let them make their plans, but let them attempt them and they will see what they are fighting.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I take it that they are finished. I have the right to reply to my motion, so I want to know what they are doing. I will sit down and give them a chance, if they are playing cat and mouse, because Rat Week is over. I will give way to them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I recognise the hon. member for St. Michael South West?

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have had a word with the Leader of the Opposition in the absence of the Leader of the House, and I would beg to move that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are still in Private Members' Time.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I know, Sir, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not supporting that, it is Private Members' Time. I was under the impression that an hon. member on that side wanted to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition please take his seat a minute? I am not prepared to entertain the Prime Minister's motion unless there is a consensus of agreement between both sides of the House on a matter of this sort. We should appreciate the fact that it is still Private Members' Time and if

we want to bring this to a close at an earlier moment there should be agreement by both sides of the House.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I agree with that. I thought that the Leader of the Opposition understood that I was suggesting that since hon. members might not care to begin their speeches and have them interrupted by the termination of Private Members' Time, that the next Order of Private Members' Business could be done to give the hon. member for St. Michael North East the opportunity to start that. It was to accommodate hon. members on that side who might not have cared to interrupt their speeches, either the hon. member for St. Michael South West's speech or the reply of the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure he would prefer to make his reply on a day when both of us can speak anyhow, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister will no doubt appreciate that this ought to have been arranged not in the House proper but between the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition so that when we come before the House we would have something concrete upon which we can go.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Prime Minister misunderstood me. He did indicate that a member on his side wanted to speak. I assumed he wanted to speak on the Throne Speech, but I have got the impression that he wants to start a Resolution which is standing in his name. In those circumstances the Opposition is not going to postpone further consideration. I was under the impression that the member mentioned to me....(*Asides*)....I am not giving way, we will spend the next ten minutes on it if it is necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I have been hoping that other members on that side who wished to air their views would have wanted to speak and that is why I was reluctant to get up, but I am quite prepared to start.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair does not seek any excuse for the cause of your delay in rising, get on with the debate. (Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: He has to read, Sir).

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution that stands in the name of the Leader of the Opposition is a Resolution which.....

Mr. SPEAKER: We are now debating an amendment to that Resolution. That is what is before the House.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. I was about to say that the Resolution had been amended by another motion which seeks to congratulate the Government on its — and I was trying to find a word — imaginative and a number of other such words describing their programme. It is quite appropriate that now that the election is over that members on the other side can gloat and indeed congratulate themselves.
4.35 p.m.

It is quite appropriate that they should put in a Resolution suggesting that, for the first time in the history of Barbados, imagination has come to the fore in the programmes that have been proposed for the Government. I would like to suggest, however, that in fact the election is over and that the time has come for us to look at the programme of the Government in terms of what it can reasonably do as opposed to what it proposes to do. It is unlikely that the question of the sales tax can be discussed in rational terms because, Sir, as you have heard, the removal of the retail sales tax was campaign promise, and it has been fulfilled to the extent that it has been removed. I should like to suggest, however, that the mere removal of the 5% retail sales tax on the day in which it was removed does not in itself provide the framework for good Government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that some \$7 million at the rate of \$500,000, or \$½ million per month, used to be collected in the Treasury, and I also believe that the Minister of Finance is now without that \$½ million every month. I believe, also, that in the Throne Speech a tax which had been proposed for tickets for persons leaving the Airport is now proposed not to be introduced, which means that another quantity of money required for the running of the affairs of this country will now not be available in this country.

It would not be pointed out to many persons that already the Port Charges have been increased. I believe, Sir, that at some point it is going to be pointed out that Port Charges have gone up from \$15 to \$19.50 for incoming cargo, or a 30% increase. Now, Sir, you know that there is a Barbadian proverb which says something about what sweetens goat mouth. I say that the time of the burning is about to come. Any Government in any country must have money to run its affairs. Any Government will have to find revenue, and I say that the

removal of the sales tax is the fulfilment of a campaign promise, amen; but the time has come now when the Government has to find a replacement for that \$7 million. Before the removal of the sales tax there was already a deficit, and with the added \$7 million, plus the \$800,000, plus other factors there will be some \$10 million approximately which will not go into the Government's pocket.

There is a philosophical point about the removal of the sales tax which I believe that, now it has been removed, the Government can discuss with the people of Barbados. It was made to seem as though the imposition of the sales tax was some heinous crime perpetrated against the people. Mr. Speaker, in almost every developed country in the world there is a tax either akin to, or approximating, a sales tax. You have visited a number of these countries and in the case of New York City, where I believe you have visited some time in passing, you have gone into places where you have paid a Federal tax, a State tax, and a City tax. Taxation is as old as human development; therefore, I believe it is a retrograde step to have led the people of Barbados into believing that the imposition of a sales tax per se was a vicious and wicked act.

I believe that in the heat of campaigning this impression might have been left by the members of the Barbados Labour Party, and, having made a commitment to remove it, they have done so. What is going to happen when we come to getting other revenue? We will have to impose a tax of some kind. My friend, the hon. member for St. Michael West, said that \$7 million would have been left in the hands of the consumer. Mr. Speaker, you are a consumer, I am a consumer, and all of the hon. members are consumers. Now, \$7 million will not be left in our hands. It is more likely that the \$7 million will repose in the hands of those who sell: the merchants, the business people. These are the people who are likely to have the \$7 million. What has happened is that the Government has deprived itself of \$7 million in revenue, but there is no corresponding \$7 million benefit to the people of this country. What is likely to happen, Sir? There are some things which I know....(Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please. There is no talk about cutting out wastage. Let us proceed.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, one of these days not so long from now, I hope the hon. member will realise that he is a Minister and he is no

longer a member of the Opposition. The fact is that so far as the people of Barbados are concerned, I am told and I have received it on good authority, that the prices of items which carried the sales tax have not shown any appreciable decrease. In fact, Sir, in some instances far from there being a decrease in the prices there has been an increase in the prices.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have now reached the end of Private Members' Time.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resumes in Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. J. G. ODLE took the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77, NO. 18

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking on this Resolution for the sum of \$890,150 which is for the purpose of carrying on the operations of the Parks and Beaches Commission up to the 31st March, 1977. I want to set the position in its stark reality. The fact is that, in its Manifesto pledge, the Barbados Labour Party Government made a promise that it would immediately create some 3,600 primary jobs, and those 3,600 primary jobs would in themselves create additional employment; so that what we are talking about is an immediate programme for the employment of additional persons – over 3,600 persons in this country because, quite rightly, the Government realises that unemployment is one of the major factors in this country. We have no quarrel with that. Our analysis indicates a similar conclusion. Unemployment is a major problem in this country, and we will recall in this Chamber the arguments that were advanced as to whether the rate of unemployment was 12%, or 10%, 25%, or 28%, and there was much thumping on the table of this Honourable Chamber when the then Leader of the Opposition, the now Prime Minister, the member for St. Thomas, asserted that the rate of unemployment in this country was 28%.

4.45 p.m.

Whatever the figure was, the Great Combination had the solution to that particular

problem and it told the people of this country give us the Government and we will deal with that particular problem of unemployment, we will immediately create 3,600 jobs and more. Now we have got to judge the promises and the fulfilments because on this side of the Chamber we find it very difficult to conceive that a Government which is interested in providing and generating additional employment opportunities, that such a Government could take as one of its earlier actions, not the step of giving people more jobs or of guaranteeing that the employment of those who had been put to work by the previous Government, would continue in employment, that being in a position to provide food, clothing and shelter for themselves and their families; but no. One of the first actions of the Government was to put 258 persons out of employment, and that is why we characterise that particular action leading to the dismissal of those 258 persons, as callous, as being a breach of faith with the electorate of this country and of showing a lack of concern for the plight of the people of this country by depriving people out of employment and of their bread. That is what we charge from this side of the Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way. We have heard that this is supposed to be a crash programme, that the workers are supposed to have been told that their employment would terminate some time in September, but we have had no evidence, no word of support for that type of allegation or that particular statement; and we would like to know because the workers that we have spoken with have not indicated that they were told that this was any temporary programme coming to an end in September. *(Aside)* I would be glad if the Hon. Prime Minister would give us that particular information. I believe he has it and he could let us have it.

Mr. Chairman, what I am really saying is this, that there has been some assertions or some suggestion that the workers were informed that this was a temporary programme coming to an end sometime in September. What I am saying is this. If the Government was really interested in providing employment for people as it asserted in its Manifesto, that far from putting 258 people out of work it would be securing employment for people and generating additional employment opportunities; but far from that we have had the opposite, and it would have been a very simple matter in this Resolution for the Government to come to this honourable Chamber and ask for the funds for the continuation of the work of the Parks and

Beaches Commission, including provision for those workers who have not been put out of work. What we are saying is this, that those 258 workers with their families, with their commitments, have been put in a very intolerable situation simply because the Barbados Labour Party, the Government now, told the people that the programme would come to an end in September, and in order to justify their own prophecy, have now put the people out of work.

Now this is not now a question of Government and Opposition. It is a question of the people of this country, it is a question of dealing with one of the major problems in this country, one of the problems which face any developing country — that of generating additional employment opportunities for people. It is on this score that contrary to its very philosophy, contrary to its own programme as elaborated in its Manifesto document, that the Barbados Labour Party have broken faith with the electorate of this country on this particular matter, and in particular to those workers who have been dismissed, have deprived these workers who had the opportunity of earning a livelihood, of meeting the commitments that they may have entered into, of making it much more difficult for them to provide for their clothing for their food and for their shelter....

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have been able to assist the hon. member with the information for which he asked. By letter dated 12th May, 1976, the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Housing was informed that the Commission had given authority to employ the 258 workers on a crash programme, and we have been specifically informed that on recruitment the 258 workers were told in the presence of the supervisory staff and some members of the office that they were being employed to carry out certain projects that were of a crash programme in nature and that the crash programme would be completed by the 30th September, 1976.

We can only go on what the responsible officials tell us and on what was in the letter Mr. Philip Greaves offered to write in May. We can only go on that; so the authority include Philip Greaves and the manager of the Parks and Beaches, if you want to know who said that they were told that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am making a specific point, that if this Government is interested in providing and generating

employment opportunities for people, that it would have been quite feasible and in accordance with the programmes suggested by the Government, that the Government could come to this honourable Chamber for the funds to secure the employment of the continued employment of those 258 workers; but the fact that they have not done that is an indication — I am charging — of callousness as far as the workers of this country are concerned; and now we are hearing that the Parks and Beaches Commission is to be provided with the facility of carrying out work in the private sector for private persons who may wish to employ the services of the Parks and Beaches Commission. 4.55 p.m.

Now we are hearing that the Parks and Beaches Commission is to be provided with the facility of carrying out work in the private sector for private persons who may wish to employ the services of the Parks and Beaches Commission. Now I would like the Prime Minister to give this House the assurance that if any such development takes place that it would not put out of work those gardeners, those handymen and those workers who earn their living as such as a result of that area of employment. (Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Where?)

I am talking about Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross talk.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I hope you will protect me from the member for St. Thomas. I hope there is some type of assurance that if the Parks and Beaches Commission gets into this area that they would not be depriving the hundreds of gardeners and handymen and workers who engage in this type of employment. That is all I raise on this particular question because it is a possibility.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to speak on this matter much longer. I merely wish to register on behalf of those workers who have been deprived of their employment opportunities, not by the Democratic Labour Party Government, but by the Barbados Labour Party Government which came in on the pledge of generating additional employment opportunities for the workers of this country or prospective workers, that far from honouring that particular promise, they have started out by dismissing persons; and when you strip these particular proposals of the advocacy, when you strip it of the plaster and when you strip it of the cosmetics, what it amounts to is the fact

that 258 persons have been made unemployed as a result of the actions of the Barbados Labour Party Government. (A VOICE: You said that 258 times.) If I need to say it 259 times that is my right so long as the Chairman permits me to do so within the framework of the Standing Orders.

Mr. Chairman, the position is that we are going to support this Resolution for the continuation of the work of the Parks and Beaches, but we register our opposition and our disapproval of the action of depriving 258 workers of employment at this particular time of the year when it is coming on shortly to Christmas, and when these workers on the basis of employment generated by the Democratic Labour Party Government may have entered or would have entered into commitments for themselves and their families.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to be very long in this debate. When the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance introduces a measure in this House of Assembly, he has a way of introducing it in such a way that those who hear him not being fully *au fait* with all the facts may be led into believing that he is in truth and in fact here to shed nothing else but light on the truth. I am not a lawyer but I heard him read from Chapter 233A, the Parks and Beaches Act. Now, Sir, nowhere in this Act so far as I have been able to find is there any definition of "Parks" and he sought to make a great hubbub of the work which the members of the Parks and Beaches Commission were asked to do, and to anyone hearing the introduction it would seem as though the Parks and Beaches Commission had performed work in Barbados that was ultra vires. At least that was my understanding. There may be some question, and they have made the point, that the Chairman of the Parks and Beaches acted, as they say, illegally.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the persons who worked for the Parks and Beaches Commission in this country did honest work in Barbados on projects which approximate, if they are not exactly, parks and beaches. I remember in the area of St. Michael South West there is a canal which leads to the beach and the surrounding area of the beach; you know I am speaking of Lands End; and it is interesting that the member for Christ Church South Central used the term that all over Barbados there are areas of land which harbour mosquitoes and that sort of thing in the course of his intervention, because nowhere was this more pronounced than in the area surrounding Lands

End which butts and bounds on the beach and which to all intents and purposes is part of the Lands End area, and I recall that among the projects which were carried out by the Parks and Beaches Commission was the clearing of this area which had large numbers of old trucks, old cars, bush and other mosquito harbouring debris.

It is not particularly important at this stage, Mr. Chairman, what the Government says in the context of the politics of the situation. I think what is important is what is done and what it proposes to do. The Prime Minister very magnanimously in his introduction suggested that on this occasion he will take no action against the public officer and I think I heard him say he would take no action against somebody else.

Mr. Chairman, the Barbados Labour Party seems to have a mission, a political mission. It is their mission, it appears to me, to bury the Democratic Labour Party, and therefore they are going to at each opportunity take time out to keep two recurring thoughts going; they first shout corruption and then they name a statutory board; they shout corruption and then they name something else. Mr. Chairman, the association of ideas are such that after a while what will happen is that as soon as someone says "Parks and Beaches", people will think corruption. As soon as someone says "B.M.C." people will think corruption, and by and large if they are successful, what will happen is that they will not have to worry about fighting another election in this country at all, because they would have so saturated and brainwashed the people of this country into believing that there has been this massive, to use their term, corruption, that the people will turn against anyone who has even passed within distance of the Democratic Labour Party.

5.05 p.m.

Not only will they not succeed on that, but I say that the answer is a very simple answer. As I said, Sir, it is not what they say, it is what they do. I say that if they have evidence of malfeasance, if they have evidence of corruption, it is their duty to put it before the Director of Public Prosecutions and to prosecute those who are prosecutable, lock up those who are "lock upable," whoever they are send them to gaol, but do not let us come week after week.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, is the hon. member asking to be sent to gaol?

Mr. TAITT: For the benefit of the member for Christ Church West, I say to the Government that if they find that the former Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce is guilty of an indictable offence, lock him up. The Attorney General knows the law better than most of the people sitting over there, Sir, and I think he knows what his task is, but I think it is not fair to the people of this country to go on this way, get into gear. Each time they open their mouths it is "corruption, corruption," like a toothpaste commercial. They have a problem with a plan, they add it on to a list to make it seem as though the Democratic Labour Party brought it in to the general ambit of corruption. I say the time has come that they become specific, let the chips fall where they will, but let us not have this constant snide reference to corruption and this attempt to bury the name and the memory of a Party whose contribution, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you well know, Sir.

I am very interested in how the Prime Minister said that they will now embrace burial grounds into the definition of parks. It is very interesting that the Government will see it fit to get into the business of cleaning and clearing the burial grounds, and yet the same Government says to us that the cleaning and the clearing of places where the living could enjoy recreation was somehow corrupt. I do not understand this, Mr. Chairman, but again it is part of the slip and slide approach, it is part of the association of ideas approach, and I think they have I suppose the right to do it, but they should be aware that we on this side are not just going to let it pass, we are not just going to let it happen.

There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that within the breast of a number of persons in this country there has been the feeling that they are going to be victimised. There is no question that when those 258 persons were given their notices that 258 families of very poor people in this country started to feel that the end of the world had come. There is no question that not only in Parks and Beaches but in other areas persons began to feel that they were being victimised or that they would be victimised, and there are persons in the constituency which I represent who have represented to me that they believe that when the time comes for persons, if the time should ever come, for persons to be re-employed that because they are demonstrably members of the Democratic Labour Party they will not be employed. I am very pleased to hear the Prime Minister give the assurance and I am certain that all the hon. members over there

will wish to endorse that assurance that when the time comes for re-employment of persons for the cleaning of burial grounds or wherever, that those persons who were fired will be re-hired, and I would like to believe that the Prime Minister of this country and the Government of this country are beyond victimisation of ordinary poor people, whose only crime would have been to support the political party of their choice.

I am certain that the Attorney General would not stand by and let anything like that happen in this country. I am positive that the whole 17 members, including you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Speaker, will wish to be certain that justice is not only done in this country but that it is seen to be done, because integrity is their watchword, and I have heard some of the arguments put in here which seem to suggest that they detected or found out some fault in something we did when we were in power and therefore they have a right to do it. Mr. Chairman, you know that this is very strange logic. They are in fact saying that since we might have done something wrong they are entitled to do it wrong. I hope that is not what they intend, I hope that this whole business of dealing with the Parks and Beaches will be dealt with in the fairness and in the matter to which they have led the people of Barbados to believe they are committed.

There are some ominous signs in this country. It is true they have only been in power a short time, but already there have been some ominous grumblings among the ordinary folk in this country wondering if some demon is going to descend upon them some time very soon; persons who are in the ordinary life carrying on their ordinary work. You know, Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair that I should say that there are some persons who sit in the Gallery who seem to wish to participate in this debate, but there are some people from St. Michael South West who sent me to represent them here and I am going to represent them until they say I should leave, so you can suck your teeth, you can do anything. Not you, Mr. Chairman. They can suck their teeth, I am here to represent the people of St. Michael South West who sent me here in massive numbers....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have one minute more.

Mr. TAITT: That is why I was talking about the massive numbers, Sir. I would leave this debate with this one point, that if they have an evidence, if they have knowledge that

the people on this side have committed crimes they have a moral, a legal duty to prosecute the persons or for ever hereafter hold their peace.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, this debate raised very serious issues of principle, and I would have expected that the Opposition having been cast out of power would have approached the subject from that level. I wish to start from the beginning.

In the month of March, 1976 this House passed a Resolution granting the supplies to run the country between April 1, 1976 and March, 1977. At that time the then Government, the Democratic Labour Party Government, would have based its programme for the year, if we are being charitable to them, on well thought out plans, and its plan thought out for the year for the Parks and Beaches Commission was that it would have taken \$875,000 to run the affairs of the Parks and Beaches Commission between April 1, 1976 and March 31, 1977. As early as May, within two months of the beginning of the financial year, the records of the Parks and Beaches Commission disclosed that the Government had taken and had almost spent the whole of its vote and that by the end of August the Government had spent the full vote of \$875,000 for that year, which would have meant that in the absence of a supplementary provision the Parks and Beaches Commission would have had to lay off even its regular workers.

5.15 p.m.

I think one must clarify for this Committee and this Honourable House the stark facts, because if we are to believe the Opposition today all the Government has to do in other Departments of the Government, and it is the past Government I am referring to, is to have allowed every Statutory Board: BMC., ADC., CBC., and every Department of the Government to have spent the whole year's budget by the end of August, 1976, and the long and short of that is that whichever party won the Government would have had to come back to this country with massive taxation, or, instead of this happening, we would have had to close down the whole administration of this country, and some 20,000 or 30,000 people would have been out of work.

Let us carry the argument to its logical conclusion. I would have expected the Opposition, if they understood about budgeting, and if they understood the full implications of this Act, to have come into the House with one or two alternative points. Point No. 1. It was

either that Parks and Beaches estimates were very badly prepared, assuming they had a plan, and the past Minister of Housing, Mr. Philip Greaves, had no concept of his Department's work. They would either have to concede that, or alternatively they must concede what is true. That in March, 1976, and as early as January when the Estimates Committee would have met, they had no concept at that stage of needing no extra money and had no employment plans for a crash programme.

When we consider all of their loud-mouthed talk, the system of the advocacy and the plaster and the cosmetics, the fact is that they went on a crash programme because they were confronted with a by-election in the City of Bridgetown, and they intended to use this as a means — a means which they had accused Mr. Mottley several times of adopting — of buying votes in this way in order to win the by-election. Let us face facts. They had no regard for financial rectitude, no regard for the political implications of their actions, no regard for the implications of the country as a whole, a selfish attitude that they adopted on this question. It is a lesson that we must learn, because if we were as reckless as this Government wherever they have misspent, overspent and malbudgeted, we would have had to come to the country and bring a massive dose of taxation in order to create short term employment without any long-term plans for the security of the workers as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, this Government will not at all follow that type of practice. I want to make it absolutely clear that if the Opposition persists in this type of argument they will be over there for 150 years, and will be buried for a little longer. Now, let us get the position clear. Corruption is defined in many ways, but corruption is not always taking a penny out of a man's pocket, or getting a direct financial benefit in your pocket. Corruption is defined in political terms as the type of actions where you use public money for your own direct political benefit. In this instance, I say very seriously that the evidence leads to the conclusion that the Parks and Beaches vote was being used to bolster the Democratic Labour Party's chances in the City by-election, and that is evidence of corruption. If you read authorities on this, you will see that this is so.

I want to deal with one of the other arguments. I am glad to hear that this Opposition is now satisfied that there must no longer be political patronage. Many a time when I was on the Opposition benches, one of us

would have asked the Government how it is that they were employing in the School Meals Service only people who were carrying cards of the Democratic Labour Party? We have asked them that. In my constituency, I have had in the last election the main canvassers against me saying: "You cannot do anything with us, because we are with the Dems. We carry the card." They were openly campaigning and telling the people that we were going to close down the School Meals Service. That is the position.

Mr. Speaker, political patronage became the way of life in this country. The hon. member for St. Michael South West will know that on two occasions at least he was confronted with Barbados Labour Party people whom he did not recognise asking for jobs and sent to him in this case by Mr. John Connell. He did not recognise a young lady until she told him that she was from the B.L.P. He must know that.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I think the hon. member will agree that, in trying to find employment for the two persons, I never sought to find out whether they were BLP or DLP.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member will recognise that they were under the impression that she was a member of the DLP., and that she was a card-bearing member.

Mr. TAITT: I do not so recognise, and he knows that, Sir. In the finding of employment for people, I never sought to differentiate between one kind of Barbadian and another.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will give the hon. member that assurance, but when we look through the employers in the Industrial Park, almost every one of them will tell you that they have to choose the people sent to them by the Ministers of Government first who were, invariably, members of the Democratic Labour Party. That is a fact.

Mr. Chairman, we have had debates in this House on numerous occasions on these issues. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, since the Barbados Labour Party has come into power the people have a lot more freedom. Even the discarded Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John — even him could get on the Television and talk as much as he likes, and that is something that was never allowed any hon. member on this side, including the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. During the time when we were in the Government, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central appeared, at least, once in a big programme.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Once in 15 years.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: At least once, Mr. Chairman. I hear that we are victimising people. These are the allegations. We are restricting people's freedom. We want to restrict the freedom of the people who may be associated with terrorists. We are going to restrict them, and as long as I remain in here in charge of internal law and order, I will not be condoning any practices that breach the laws of Barbados. I want to give a serious warning in this House. No matter who you belong to — you could belong to the DLP, the Executive, you could be manipulated by the DLP members and so on, but I want to make it absolutely clear that people will obey the laws of Barbados as long as I am here.

I want to talk about this rewarding of the church. As I understand the Hon. Prime Minister to say, there are areas in which Parks and Beaches, subject to the amendment of this Act, can be extended without affecting people at present employed in similar areas. Let us be serious. We do not have to reward any Church. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central has not yet got over the fact that, were it not for the absence of the recount, he may not be here. That is the problem with which he is very seriously concerned. He is still here thanks to Charlie Hinds not asking for a recount.

Mr. Chairman, we are looking at the future employment of the people. We are not concerned with whether or not the Church gets the benefit indirectly, and it is not the Church that has benefited. I want to go on record as saying that I have seen members of the Parks and Beaches staff being sent to work on private people's lands and no money is going back into the budget of the private person's land.
5.25 p.m.

As a matter of fact I have had one person phone me up and said he is so thankful to the Parks and Beaches Commission for cleaning up his land in circumstances where they were looking around for anything to do since the by-election was on.

The other point one must bear in mind in this debate, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that this was

a crash programme. Now what is a crash programme? The DLP in 1961 started a crash programme in order to impress people, and soon had to bring it to an end. For the purpose of the by-election they had this crash programme which they knew they would have had to have brought to a close at the time; but the chronic unemployment situation in this country cannot be laid at the doors of the Barbados Labour Party. Fifteen years of Democratic Labour Party rule were shown to have created massive unemployment in Barbados, and when we pointed out that the quarterly reports for March 1976 of the Central Bank at page 89 showed that there were less people employed in industry under the DLP than had been employed under our Government in 1961 it came as a startling revelation for a lot of people in this country. When you look at the employment statistics you also see that in the time of the DLP they had no greater employment of persons than were employed under the Barbados Labour Party. These are facts. This is the Central Bank Statistics (ASIDE: They are wrong). They are wrong? They were signed by the Minister of Finance then. Mr. Barrow, the hon. member for St. John signed them and allowed the publication to come out; so do not tell me now they are wrong. Also the ILO statistics. Honourable members must know that we have now got access to Cabinet files as well, and I do not intend to breach the rules of this House by referring to those files; but hon. members must know that they can no longer tell us that we are wrong on issues.

We have the papers now, and the files will bear out the contention of the present Prime Minister when he made his reply to the budget speech about the level of unemployment in Barbados. It is because we are very concerned about that level of employment that our future policies must be fitted to creating not only additional jobs but creating jobs that will in turn generate money for the country to create further jobs in the economy. This Government is not going to victimize anyone. If we were going to victimize people we would have brought an Act down to the House the first day to stop the past Prime Minister from drawing his pension, getting his gratuity and drawing a member's salary, and just earning about \$1,000 or so less than the present Prime Minister. (Asides) Is not he doing that? He does not even have to come in the House ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Surely the motives of a member of the House

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Does he understand what is a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Carry on please, the hon. member for St.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. You must draw to the attention of members on the other side that Mr. Michael Adams, some manager who drives the Parks and Beaches van is still working, so what victimization could he be talking about? If the boy went up there and carried away CBC equipment, could not he be fired?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, what I want seriously to say is that I would wish people who are employed in the public service of Barbados — and that is why, Mr. Chairman, I have never been in favour of Ministers having the right to hire and fire, or even of the Cabinet having that right in relation to Statutory Boards. I have never been in favour of it. I said so in the House, and the then Government argued against me most strenuously when I said that, but that is the principle they say that has been accepted. Now I hear them arguing differently. I am hoping that members who may be card-bearing members of the DLP, whatever they are, will feel it as part of their duty to cooperate in the interest of Barbados so that we can push this country forward and get a better standard of performance and efficiency than we have had before. We have to try to motivate Barbadians to create true wealth in Barbados, and that is what we are appealing for here.

Obviously, since we have come into power we are being every day challenged by certain events including the allegation of victimization. I would have expected that on a Resolution such as this we would have got full support from the Opposition; positive suggestions from them rather than carping criticism that does not bear the weight of scrutiny, that does not bear the force of argument and that does not point to any principle and motivation for the country to go on.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Resolution for the sum of \$875,000 which would go towards assisting the burden which was placed on the Parks and Beaches Commission by the former Government. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of events which

led up to this very serious situation. I sat and I heard members of the Opposition using phrases and words to the effect that we, the Government, were callous, we were guilty of calculated acts and all sorts of things.

Mr. Chairman, on October 5 this year the Leader of the Opposition got together in his office outside the compound of this Honourable Chamber and he said to the members who visited him on that occasion — members of the Parks and Beaches Commission — that he was dismayed at the act of Government. He went on to say that it was a callous and calculated act. I could never have imagined the Leader of the Opposition to have been so malicious in his statements and comments. Mr. Chairman, I say 'malicious' because the Leader of the Opposition knew full well or he should have known; if it is by way of ignorance that he did not know he should have said that ...

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member for St. Michael South East has used the word 'malicious' in respect of the member for St. Michael South Central, and I am suggesting that this particular word is unparliamentary in as much as it is imputing — it is not only insulting but it is imputing improper motives to the member from the point of view that ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that the member for St. Michael South Central is in his place and made no objection to it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. It is not that the person of whom it is spoken must object. If a word is unparliamentary anybody could object. So do not think that if I did not object and somebody else objects that that is the answer to it. It is either unparliamentary or it is not ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I complain now then. 5.35 p.m.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition said that the Manager of the Parks and Beaches Commission informed him that at no time were the workers told that they were on a temporary basis, and that they would be laid off. I have got here a written communication from the Manager and I shall read it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, at no time, if he is reading and quoting, would he see that I said the Manager told me anything

because I had no conversation with the Manager. So if you are quoting, quote correctly and honestly and do not be malicious either.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, there are a number of malicious objections coming from that side anticipating what is coming from this side. You must not allow particularly the Leader of the Opposition who should know better. They have found themselves in a dark hole at this time and are displaying a total ignorance of what is going on in here.

Mr. BRADSHAW: "The workers after being selected were informed that they would be employed to carry out certain projects that were of a crash programme nature. They were also instructed what their work attitude should be on the various job sites. This was done in the presence of the supervisory staff and some of the office staff."

So, Mr. Chairman, you will see that the workers were told by the Manager that they were on a temporary basis and that the crash programme would have come to an end. So there is no truth from the other side when they suggested to this House that no information was communicated to these workers, and that is why I said, Mr. Chairman, that it was a malicious act, because information should have been sought first before this Government was accused of acting in a callous and calculated manner.

For the financial year ending March 1977 a sum of \$875,000 was voted by this House to finance the operations of the Parks and Beaches Commission. There were to be 244 workers employed in that service. By April this year an additional 258 workers were taken on. No supplementary budget was sought. You will see by simple calculation that the work force had doubled, yet the Government of the Democratic Labour Party did not find it fit to come before this House and seek money to pay these additional 258 workers. By July 9 this year communication was sent by the Parks and Beaches Commission to the Minister drawing to his attention that the monies which the Parks and Beaches Commission had would have been exhausted and unless something was done swiftly and almost immediately by the end of August operations would have to be closed. Nothing was done. Mr. Chairman, when we have got to approach this business as to who was responsible for the laying off of workers, we must take into consideration the fact that the Parks and Beaches Commission had drawn to the attention of the Minister that the monies which they had would have been exhausted by August 31 and when we

the present Government took over office on September 2 those funds would have been exhausted, it could therefore be no fault of ours if no money was there. It was the Democratic Labour Party Government that refused to vote the money to keep these people in work. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross talking from either side of the House.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, I heard a loud aside from a juvenile recruit talking about Government not having to vote money. Does he understand that the only person who can move a Resolution for money is a member of the Government. Does he understand that it is the practice of the Democratic Labour Party to put people out of work and then blame other things and other factors, like the Leader of the Opposition when he turned off 400 workers from Highways and Transport and then said it was the oil crisis, and the hon. member for St. Michael North Central had to put them back to work. It is typical of the D.L.P. to do that and then blame other factors. This is nothing new.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, what is important about the Parks and Beaches Commission and its operation is that the Minister responsible for the Parks and Beaches Commission was a Cabinet member, and when the plight of the workers was drawn to his attention, if he or his Government had cared about the workers' plight and their concern, he would have seen to it that urgent consideration would have been given to the financial position of the Parks and Beaches Commission. You see, Mr. Chairman, there was a letter dated 18th April and this was a letter sent by the Parks and Beaches Commission to the Permanent Secretary, and I shall read thus:

" 12th May, 1976.
I am directed to inform you that the Commission acting on verbal instructions from the Minister to the Chairman has commenced cleaning operations on additional areas including Indian Ground, Delamere Land, Harbour site, Elks Playing Field, with effect from 8th April. The Commission has been further informed that the interim fund to meet this additional expenditure should be used from recurrent expenditure for 1976-77."

Mr. Chairman, what that simply means is that there was departure from financial policy where recurrent money, money to be used for recurrent expenditure was used from the capital expenditure. In other words, there was money allocated for capital expenditure as well as

recurrent expenditure and both of these monies were exhausted, and this is departing from financial policy and proper financial measures.

The Minister on 14th May received correspondence from the Permanent Secretary drawing to his attention the letter which he received from the Parks and Beaches Commission and he told the Minister that before any action could be taken he would like to confirm that the instructions were given to the Parks and Beaches Commission, and this was the reply to the Minister; it is very important. The Minister replied on 24th May.

"The Parks and Beaches Commission was given instructions through its Chairman by the Minister of Finance."

This is the Minister of Housing writing to the Permanent Secretary that the Parks and Beaches Commission was given instructions through its Chairman by the Minister of Finance to undertake the additional expenditure. "I was present". That is the Minister, and he pointed out that the work could not be considered part of the Parks and Beaches Commission's work which arose and which money was already voted for.
5.45 p.m.

It was agreed to use the money from Capital Expenditure on this service. I want the hon. members on that side to understand that it was the Minister of Housing who in his reply to the Permanent Secretary said that it was the then Prime Minister who gave the instructions, the verbal instructions, to employ these 258 workers. As Minister of Finance and as Prime Minister of this country it was his bounden duty to have made sure that he came to this Hon. House and make provision for this additional money to employ the 258 workers for which he gave instructions to have employed. Mr. Chairman, you will see who were made political tools; the workers.

On July 9 budgetary proposals were submitted to the Ministry amounting to \$1,383,962.85. This money was needed to retain the crash programme. Here again this is a comment. "no action was taken on these proposals," but what do we see? Those same proposals were resubmitted to the Parks and Beaches Commission, were delayed along the line and then returned to the Cabinet on August 31, during which time members from that side were in office. Nothing was done. What is worse, Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Mr. BRADSHAW: This is a letter, Mr. Chairman, on 10th August from the Chairman on the plight of the Parks and Beaches. At the meeting on Tuesday, August 10, 1976 because of the financial plight it was agreed by all members present, with one abstention, that there should be a reduction in the number of crash programme workers. I am going to accuse them categorically today that they had planned to lay off the workers, but now they come before this House with cheap politics.

Mr. Chairman, I shall conclude by stating that there was a breach of the financial and audit rules. They used funds which were voted for Capital Expenditure on Recurrent Expenditure programmes without obtaining the permission of this Hon. Chamber, and for that they also stand condemned. They are going to come and tell us and this Hon. House that they care about the working masses, that they acted and they carried out efficient Government. They are guilty on this score of corruption and displacing the 258 workers.

I want to support this Resolution so that we can continue to pay the monthly as well as the weekly staff for the financial year ending in March, 1977.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, after so powerful and stirring a maiden speech in his capacity as Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Housing, a speech from which all the three ambassadors now on the Opposition benches, the Leader of the Opposition has much to learn, the hon. member for St. Michael South West has a good deal to learn and the hon. member for St. Michael South has all to learn. I will obviously not have to wind up for any length of time, the essential points are made in the hon. member's speech.

The lay off had been planned on August 10 when every single member of the Commission said that the workers should be laid off and the Chairman begged until after the election, since you want to know all the facts that I have let come out in the debate. On September 15 I was asked to confirm the lay off and I said no, if the programme was to last at least till the end of the month I will advance \$200,000 to give the workers a chance to have at least another couple of weeks of work. Those are the facts that are coming out now.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West said nowhere is a park defined in the Parks and Beaches Act. If he was a lawyer he would read and see — not if he was a lawyer, if he

could read — he would read and see that the Parks and Beaches Act confines the work to public parks.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I admit to not being able to read in quite the same way as the Hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You are probably right. I have known in all my life that there are perhaps in this island 250,000 people — perhaps there are 249,000 — who can read better than the hon. member and I am glad to be reckoned among those, but being serious for a moment, do not try and read Acts of Parliament that you cannot understand. The Leader of the Opposition cannot always understand and he at least has had exposure for many years.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I did not study to be a judge like the Prime Minister, I studied to be a lawyer. He studied to be a judge and studied longer for his Bar so he would understand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I never failed Roman law though. There are one or two small point which were made. The hon. member for St. Michael South West spoke of cleaning up around the canal at Lands End. I suppose a canal can be passed as a public park, but I didn't think he needed any other example if one needed to be drawn of what was meant when responsible authorities who have now reviewed the matter said that work that was illegal was done. He didn't need any better example than the canal at Lands End. Just let me tell the hon. member something about that same canal, since he has raised it. A meeting has been held between the Minister of Communications and Works, who is unfortunately not here because he is attending his Permanent Secretary's wife's funeral, myself and others, and we examined the new harbour project and its impact on the environment of the coastline of St. Michael West, and we have insisted that that same canal is to be improved and upgraded and made sanitary so that it will no longer harbour the mosquitoes and rats. We have added to the project to insist that a road be carried past Exmouth and carried up to Brighton. All of that we have added to the harbour project since we have come into power. (Mr. TAITT: That was agreed upon). That was not part of the harbour project, it ended at Exmouth. The road there was intended to go as far as Exmouth. You can see the plans if you want to. (Mr. TAITT: I have seen them). Well, if you have seen them why are you saying things that are not true,

because I cannot say you are telling lies, but these projects, the general upliftment that we will give to that depressed part of North Western St. Michael, the coastline at Brandon, Lands End and Westbury Road, we will do it and we will give upliftment to people in the self-same City, some of these self-same workers perhaps at Parks and Beaches if they care to apply notwithstanding who the M.P. is, notwithstanding what their politics are, we will give them on the basis that when we are selecting workers for this type of work, when we are getting out the City's allocation, we will turn first to those Parks and Beaches workers who were laid off and not on any crash programme basis.

5.55 p.m.

If he says that that work at Lands End was always scheduled, he must be out of his mind. He must be out of his mind to say that it was a good thing for the Parks and Beaches Commission to do a few months ago, because it would mean that it was not necessary to do it then since it would have been done anyhow as a part of the Harbour Project. You must catch him one way or the other. If they intended to do it anyway, why did they put the Parks and Beaches to do it? The bush will grow up by the time it is covered in concrete, and the bush is already growing. The mosquitoes are coming back. The Parks and Beaches are only digging holes to be filled in later. The beach was always clear. The hon. member may not know St. Michael South West as well as he pretends. The beach has been cleared from Brighton down to Brandon for some time now. We get all of these extraneous matters.

When you see the lion lying down with the lamb — the last time that I saw the Leader of the Opposition in company with Mr. Eric Sealy was at the foot of the House of Assembly. Eric Sealy had on a shirt marked "Sleepy must go", and he was cursing the Leader of the Opposition for eating the salt meat in the House of Assembly's dining room in what he thought was a.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: How about when he walked to Government House and lie down with you? What foolishness are you talking?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I know it is not a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South Central please take his seat.

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this country is such a free country, according to

the other side, that if I walked to Government House there is no way I can stop the Leader of the Opposition from walking with me. Would you want me to push him down in the road, if he walked with me? He can come and walk with me any day. But there has seldom been such a turn about from "Sleepy must go" to our great and good friend, the Leader of the Opposition, as we have seen in this short space of time. Everybody is taking up the cause of the Parks and Beaches workers all of a sudden. At first it was Harper and Sealy against the Minister of Education, and it was Harper and Sealy against the Leader of the Opposition. All of a sudden all is forgiven, and the lion is lying down with the lamb. They will all get up with mosquitoes from the same part of St. Michael South West.

Mr. Chairman, this Résolution should pass. It has gone on a long time, but I think it has exposed some of the hypocrisy of which people can be guilty. After a speech like that made by the hon. member for St. Michael South East, nobody can indict the Barbados Labour Party for doing other than its duty in this particular regard. Our duty will always be to see that while we have to provide employment, we will provide productive employment under conditions of dignity for people in this country.

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution 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. H. B. ST. JOHN, each seconded by the Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Resolution to grant the sum of \$890,150 out of the Consolidated Fund was read a first, and second time and agreed to.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

THE CARIBBEAN INVESTMENT CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1976

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. The object of the Bill is to permit the Caribbean Investment Corporation to enlarge its areas of operation by the inclusion of tourism as part of its plan of operation. I think this is an area in which there should be no controversy, and it will be generally agreed that the scope and function of the Caribbean Investment Corporation should be enlarged having regard to the resources of these countries.

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

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

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into committee on this Bill.

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

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. J. G. ODLE took the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and it stood part.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to ask the Minister whether provision has been made to increase the capitalisation.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Not yet.

The Question that Clause two stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

6.05 p.m.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

THE STUDENT REVOLVING LOAN FUND BILL, 1976

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education, to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a Student Revolving Loan Fund and for related matters.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown to deal with this Bill in the absence of the hon. member for St. George South who is absent from the Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a Student Revolving Loan Fund be now read a second time.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think you will admit that this is somewhat unusual. Normally the members of the Opposition are given the circumstances and the surroundings to the measure or the Bill being introduced. I

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member well knows that this Bill came before this Honourable House and lapsed because of the dissolution. It was introduced at large at that time by the Hon. Minister of Education. The Objects and Reasons are well known to hon. members or ought to be well known by hon. members on the other side who were all members of the Cabinet.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is well taken.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Christ Church West has made the point. All that could have been said in the introduction of the measure was said.

Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that this is a measure which on this side of the House we will support. The origin of this particular measure dates back to the time when we on this side of the Chamber formed the Government and we are pleased to see that it is introduced. It will take its place among those measures for the reform of the educational system introduced by the Democratic Labour Party and it is a measure which will give to the young people of this country and those who are interested in pursuing a higher education, opportunities so to do by providing funds, and we do hope that the Committee will provide funds in adequate measure for them to pursue their courses of study.

We were quite clear in making it mandatory that those particular areas of studies should be in the interest of national development because the importance of using taxpayers' funds through the loan procedures for higher education should be in those areas which would lead to national development, and we take a very broad view of this.

Along with the national development scholarships programme under which programme I believe, approximately between 40 and 45 national development scholarships may have been approved in such areas ranging from accountancy, aircraft engineering, dentistry, medicine, and all of the areas — secretarial science, teaching of drama and so on — over 40 national development scholarships have been awarded. Now these are scholarships for which the recipients are not required to repay any funds. Under this particular loan programme there are individuals in this country who will wish to study, who have saved up some money or who may not have saved up some money, and we believe that funds should be available to them to pursue their courses of study; and this particular measure before us we are happy to support it, and we are certain that this will work in the interest of broadening the educational system of this country. It is one of those areas which both myself and the member for St. Michael South Central, the Leader of the Opposition, worked on and had negotiations with the Inter-American Development Bank in order to work out the terms and conditions for this particular measure so that benefits could accrue to this country out of our membership of that particular international organization.

With those words, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that the Committee would be very liberal in its administration of this particular measure.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition would say, I shall not be long; but I am concerned, Mr. Speaker about Clause 16 of the Bill. When this Bill was last in this House I had adverted to the fact then that as the Bill is presently drafted, admittedly it does give the Committee a discretion to recover outstanding loans. If the loan exceeds the monetary jurisdictional limits of the magistrate and the student is overseas, proceedings cannot be brought in the magistrate's court.

6.15 p.m.

If the loan exceeds the monetary jurisdictional limit of the magistrate and the student is overseas, proceedings cannot be brought through the Magistrate's Court because there is no process in the Magistrate's Court for issue of documents out of its jurisdiction. This is in Clause 16. (*Asides*) The Leader of the House is making some comments, and he will probably clarify the whole thing later on, but I am just concerned that perhaps to limit this jurisdictional aspect of the magistrate may have the effect of allowing recalcitrant borrowers to slip through, and of course the whole purport of this is to tighten up because of the past experiences of the Minister of Education.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I shall not be long, but I only get into this because this Bill was one which I introduced when I was Minister of Education. I do not agree with the hon. member for Christ Church West that it was merely reintroduced because this new Parliament as he knows has in a lot of new members who were not in the old Parliament and who were not even in Government, therefore I think a lot of us would have liked to have some idea of the purpose of the Bill and how it came about, and obviously it shows.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the hon. member would get on with the debate because each hon. member knows whether he was here before or not.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But one reason given for the short opening by the Minister of Health was given by the hon. member for Christ Church West that all of us were in here last time. That is what he said and I am only dealing with something that was said in the debate. There seems to be a plan or attitude in here that I am going to be curtailed and I cannot express my view. I have seen it today with the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please take his seat? Now the hon. member will rise and apologise to the Chair for the remarks he just used. It is a reflection on the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What remark? If you can tell me the remark I will withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That there seems to be an attempt to curtail you with your speeches.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, but this is three times today that I got up in this House and tried to raise a point and I was told to take my seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please take his seat? You have withdrawn the remark and you are trying to pursue the matter further by stating that this is X number of times. You cannot do that with this hon. member in the Chair. You can get on with your debate.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not going to stand for anybody shouting at me. If you are Speaker, speak to me. I am not standing for shouting from anybody in this Chamber. I want to make it quite clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not stand. I cannot have two hon. members speaking at the same time. The hon. member might not stand, he can sit. It is now his privilege to address the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, it is not enough merely to ask that a Bill be read a second time even although it was introduced in Parliament before, and this is all I am saying. What I am saying further is that I remember the point raised by the hon. member for St. Philip North being raised on the last occasion and that even strengthens my point that there should be an explanation on the second reading, because obviously his input into the new Bill had not been taken care of with the present Government in bringing down the Bill or they forgot about it. He has a very good legal point and I can see the difficulty that can arise in the instances to which he has drawn the attention of the House.

H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point that the hon. member for St. Philip North made, it is fairly clear that the draughtsmen disagreed in point of law with the contention of the hon. member which I understand to be that a Magistrate's Court in Barbados has no jurisdiction to award judgment when once the defendant is abroad. The position as I understand it is that there is a special procedure in the Magistrate's Court which deals with this and the procedure is that if the defendant is abroad he does not have to be served personally; you serve it by advertisement

on the Notice Board outside the Court and that is deemed to be good service. That is true. You will find that in the Magistrate's Court Rules or in those parts of the Petty Debt Act which still apply to Magistrates' Courts. That point is not in my opinion a very valid point. I think that the basic position is that all of us as hon. members in respect of this matter should do everything in our power to encourage those who borrow from this fund to live up to their obligations. As has been said, in the past all did not live up to their obligations, and I know that in the future all will not live up to their obligations, but any of us who have influence I hope will use that influence whether on that side or on this side on any defaulters even of this fund or of a historical fund to make good anything they have not honoured in the past.

The second point is that I hope that the administration of the fund will be flexible enough to take into account the circumstances of Barbados. Very often people have very good intentions, but are not able to find bondsmen and I hope that the question of bondsmen will not act as a barrier to providing funds to people who are really in need. We must devise in this country an alternative system of assessing the credit worthiness of people other than by the insistence upon providing bondsmen. I think Barbados has had a long and unhappy experience with bondsmen because many of us know that we are plagued periodically with this question of bondsmen, so that we must try and develop another system of assessment. This should not give us any difficulty. As has been said, all the arguments have been exhausted in the previous Chamber. We are only recognising that this Bill has some merit and we have brought it back. We are not that type that because it was introduced by the other side we would not bring it back in. After all when they came in in 1961 they saw nothing but goodness on the files, and they implemented some of them. The trouble was that they did not implement all of them.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I shall only be a brief moment. I do hope that the Committee that is set up will recognise that those persons who will be seeking to use the fund and who for whatever reason will be going into hard currency areas to study will need to be given different treatment, if you will, to those persons who will perhaps be studying within the Caribbean. I have found, for example, with the National Development Scholarships — and our Government

eventually did something about that — that those persons, and I think my friend from St. Michael West will bear me out on this, who were attempting to study especially in North America would have extreme difficulty because of the limit placed in Barbadian currency on loans etc., and I am sure the intention is to give students the facility wherever those students should choose to study.

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

On the motion of Hon. B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. J. G. ODLE took the Chair.

6.25 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 15 inclusive were called and they stood part.

Clause 16 was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 16 stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in seconding clause 16 I feel it my duty as the principal legal adviser to the Government to reply on the legal question raised by the hon. member for St. Philip North. It must not be thought because this Bill was introduced in a short manner that each of its clauses, including clause 16, did not receive the considered opinion both of the Cabinet and of the legal advisers to the Government. We certainly looked at this clause.

There is provision in the legislation of Barbados and in the rules governing both the Magistrates Court and the High Court for process of substituted services, but even in the absence of such provision it would have been impossible for any legislation to be drafted which would ensure that at all stages we are able to deal with people who leave the country. The answer to this lies in the reciprocal provisions for the enforcement of judgement, and this country itself has such agreements with various countries and various provinces of Canada, and indeed with one or two States of the United States. I can assure the hon. member that wherever possible the Government will be advised to have agreements signed so that those agreements could be sued upon in those

countries with which we do have reciprocal provisions for the enforcement of judgement.

The question that clause 16 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 17 to 21 inclusive were called and they stood part.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

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

6.35 p.m.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be now read the third time.

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

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

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass and be cited as the STUDENTS REVOLVING LOAN FUND ACT, 1976.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 2nd November, 1976, at 12 noon.

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

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

6.40 p.m.