THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday, 21st March, 1977.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P. (Speaker); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., LL.D.; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport); Rt. 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. (Econ.); Hon. Miss B.A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc. (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C. LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism and Leader of the House); Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Community Development); Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc. (Econ.) and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were taken by Fr. F. A. Cayless.

Mr. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday 8th March, 1977.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes stand confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection the Minutes stand confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Annual Reports and Statements of Accounts of the Sugar Factory Workers' Severance Payments Board for the years 1968–75.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I beg to lay the following:–

The Non-Contentious Probate (Amendment) Rules, 1977.

The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1977.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1977.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1977.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1977.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Contract "C" for the construction of the Administration Building re Expansion and Improvement of the Port of Bridgetown.

Mr. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:–

Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1977.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1977.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1977.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1977.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to be entitled the Appropriation Bill, 1977 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.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the reply to the Parliamentary Question No. 10 is now ready.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 20 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West is now ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 16,18,20, 42,43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of this sitting.

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

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken, and we are asking for leave to deal with the Appropriation Bill.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is not opposed to leave of this kind. I would just like to say however that we are not going to oppose it, the Bill has to be passed, but I can imagine the Democratic Labour Party when in power coming to suspend Standing Order 44 to deal with this. It just shows that occasionally matters arise which have to be dealt with out of the Standing Orders, but as I say, we will not oppose this on this occasion.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I must say with regard to the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition that it is a most remarkable one when we consider that on the last occasion the House met hon. members were informed by me on the adjournment that the Estimates would be circulated on Friday, 11th March and that we proposed to do the Estimates on 21st March at which stage we would be asking to deal with the Appropriation Bill first and second reading although five days would not have elapsed in that time.
12.25 p.m.

If the Opposition had then insisted on the five day rule, we could have come back to the House on the 15th March, read the Appropriation Bill a first time and then gone home; but the Opposition did not so insist. It indicated that on the 21st March it would accept a first and second reading, and acceptance should be open, not churlish. No exceptional exercise in reasonableness has been called for in accepting this. Ever since the 8th of March the Opposition said that they were accepting this. I would rather that they did not accept these things if they are then going to get up and grumble about them.

It would take very little off the Government to have come back on the 15th March just for the second reading of the Appropriation Bill; but I believe that it would have taken up a lot of the time of busy, hard working barristers and other persons who are very busy, who have more work than they can do – but not at the Bar etc. – to have come back here for the formality of the first reading of an Appropriation Bill which would have been in their hands in good time.

I also want to say this, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to take this opportunity to mention it, the Opposition was offered what we obviously considered in our ignorance a very valuable concession of calling the Heads of the Estimates providing they gave us 24 hours notice. In the old days this did not matter because you could talk out to the end. There was no time limit either on the length of speeches or the length of time that the debate took.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am prepared to hear the hon. member for St. Thomas; but I think that the matter now being dealt with could be better dealt with when we come to the second reading.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Of course, Sir. I am saying only that the Opposition did not give notice, therefore we will have to start from Head 1. The Opposition has refused the concession that we have offered and if we do not reach the Head that they are interested in it is their hard luck. They had the means of handling it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing remarkable about the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition on this particular matter. We said that we are not objecting to the procedure whereby the first reading and the second reading of the Appropriation Bill would take place at today's Sitting. We are not opposing that. What we are pointing out is the very unusual nature of this particular request, and we are actually accommodating the Government on this particular matter.

The Standing Orders particularly state that a certain period of time should elapse between the first and second reading. That is written into the Standing Orders precisely to safeguard certain rights and privileges and to ensure that certain procedures are followed; and on the very first occasion on which the "Great Combination" comes before this House to lay before it its Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure they have to do it under cover of a particular Standing Order rather than by adhering to the Standing Orders.

This is the first time that they have had the opportunity, and they are doing it not in accordance with the Standing Orders as set out, but by asking for the suspension of some of those Standing Orders. We are not opposing the request but we are pointing out, and I think that we are entitled to do this, and this is what the Leader of the Opposition set out to do. We are saying that the Standing Orders set out certain procedures dealing with this very important Bill that can come before this Hon. Chamber; and we recall on occasions previously when we have attempted, on matters not as important as this one to seek suspension of certain Standing Orders, the Opposition came from that side when they were in the Opposition.

This is a matter of national interest. We realise that the Government has been busy with other matters and hence could not give apparently the necessary attention to these very important matters. We merely wish to point this out for public consumption so that it will be realised that on the first occasion on which a major matter, the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1977–78 have to be brought before this Hon. Chamber the Government starts out by asking for the suspension of Standing Orders in order to ensure that certain procedures are followed. We do not think that there is anything remarkable about that. The Leader of the Opposition was merely pointing out that situation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE : Mr. Speaker, there is a well-known saying that a drowning man catches at a straw. In this case one can see that a drowning party catches at straws. I want to draw to the attention of this Hon. House that last year in fact on Tuesday, 16th March, 1976, on the reading of the Appropriation Bill the then Leader of the House, Hon. C. E. Talma asked for the suspension of the following Standing Orders – Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 – exactly the same Standing Orders which the present Leader of the House has asked to be suspended. Now, any examination of the previous debates since I have been in this House in the last five years also reveals that on each occasion the then Government asked for the suspension of the same Standing Orders. So what is the row? What is the comment? Apparently this Government is not ever to do any of the peoples' business. We are to be harassed in public and in every way; and the hon. members do not feel the people of this country should ever change the Government. So we are going to find various political points raised at the opening of a debate on the Appropriation Bill.

What the Hon. Prime Minister said was that since the date he gave notice to the Opposition, if they were objecting then and if they wanted us to give the Bill a first reading on one day and a second reading on another day this would have happened. It was indicated in much more favourable circumstances at that time that the Opposition had no objection and hence we did not call the House back on the 15th. This is the position. If we had called back the House to a meeting on the 15th we would have had the first reading of the Bill and today we would have done the second reading of the Bill.

Why make snide remarks about the "Great Combination"? To score political points. Well, if our greatness is underlined by the fact that we have set aside the same Standing Orders as the hon. member's side used to do then I can only say that we regret very much that we have followed what he now thinks is a bad example.

The question that the Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
12.35 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the First Order of the Day under Government Business be the Second Reading of the Appropriation Act, 1977.

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

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

APPROPRIATION ACT, 1977

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Estimate time comes once a year, and for many years it has followed very roughly the same pattern in our parliamentary life. I have every anticipation that the pattern will see no substantial departure on this occasion, since the Opposition has not only seen fit to ignore an offer made for its benefit, but has also indeed come in here today immediately to start on the carping, and substantial carping of little meaning and less sense that has characterised its first six months in Opposition.

The time limits which are imposed in the Estimates, Mr. Speaker, do form a constraint within which debates on the specific areas of Government expenditure can be initiated and pursued. We have to complete these Estimates in five days, and it is the Government's intention that these five days will be from now until Friday at the standard 9½ hours per day, which is allowed by the Standing Orders. This, inevitably, means that, with the average amount of discussion that has become common in recent years, certain Heads will not be reached. We have no idea which Heads will excite the greatest public attention, and it is unfortunate if some of those are not debated in the course of the Estimates debate itself which will ensue when the House goes into Committee. For this the Government cannot be blamed. We did not impose the time limits. They were imposed by the previous regime. We did not impose the time limit on speeches. They were imposed during the previous regime, and we have done everything we can to permit and allow an adequate discussion on the issues.

I will have, with those few preliminary remarks, to deal with the substance of the Appropriation Bill itself. Now, Sir, every year we appropriate funds for the use of the Government. It has been the practice, certainly during the 10 years that I have been in the House, for the Minister of Finance to explain that he is appropriating the largest ever sum for the use of the people of this Island. It has been his custom to explain that when he came into Parliament he found a Budget of $18 million, $23 million, or $26 million, depending on the accuracy of his recollection at any given moment, and that now he is dealing with sums in excess of $100 million or whatever.

Well, for the first time, we are now dealing with sums in excess of $200 million for the Estimated expenditure for 1977-78 as revealed in the Draft Estimates is $276 million – $276,386,901 to be precise. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a figure in excess of $250 million, for this period compared with a figure of $208,865,255 for 1976-77. As against this sum which represents an increase of just under $68 million in the two financial years, we estimate a revenue of $225,672,591 on current account an increase of $43 million over last year's estimated revenue of $182,480,111. Those are the current figures. Capital expenditure, which is estimated for the current year, is $102,057,826, an increase of $22 million over last year when the figure was $80,208,359.

As has happened for many years now there is an estimated excess of current expenditure over current revenue. This year the estimated excess is $50.7 million, an alarming figure by any standards, and one to which I shall return to later. In addition to that the Capital Expenditure of $102 million also represents a liability which will have to be financed other than from direct Government revenue.

Well, Sir, as I said, this excess of $50 million is an alarming figure, but there are certain factors which hold out some hope that when, in a year's time, I again address the House on the Current Estimates, the figure will prove not to have been such a frightening one as it may seem on this occasion. For a number of years there have been some over-estimation of expenditure and under-estimation of revenue, and I must confess quite freely, Sir, that in the six months available to me – indeed, it is only five months – in

dealing with the Estimates, I have been unable to reverse this trend to the extent which I would wish. This over-estimation of expenditure and under-estimation of revenue have meant that, while for a number of years a deficit on Current Account has been budgeted for an actual deficit has been realised on very few occasions.

In 1968 – 69 there was a deficit on the Current Account of $3.3 million, a relatively substantial sum for that time. Again, in 1973–74 when the economy and the financial management thereof really began to go into the doldrums the deficit was over $15 million on Current Account, more than 10% of Current Expenditure. Again in 1974–75 the deficit on Current Account rose to $70 million, which was somewhat less than the amount of Current Expenditure at the time. In 1975–76 there was a reversal of this trend occasioned largely by two things. The first was that there had been an exceptionally good sugar price in the crop season to which that area of revenue attached. It was, therefore, possible to tax the sugar industry specially – legislation was passed for the purpose – and to realise thereby an amount of $14 million.
12.45 p.m.

It was therefore possible to tax the sugar industry and special legislation was passed for the purpose, and to realise thereby an amount of $14 million. The second factor was that there was some $8 million I believe of receipts of corporation tax which represented more than one year's earnings in tax, and when those two amounts are discounted, it will be observed that even in 1975–76 there was a basic deficit position. I am very glad, I must say, that it was ameliorated by the circumstances of special taxation receipts. Indeed these special taxation receipts have given budgetary assistance over a number of years. First of all there were accelerated receipts of 1975 and these have given relief certainly in the last financial year and to a lesser extent this financial year. Then there were the receipts of corporation tax. However in the absence of these special receipts I have to record that according to the best estimate and we are now within eleven days of the financial year, and I have some confidence in the quality of the estimate, there will be a deficit this year on current account of $9 million.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that although I regret there should be a deficit at all I am very pleased that it has been possible to hold this deficit down to under $10 million. I am very satisfied indeed with the performance both of the Public Service in restraining expenditure and of the increasing signs of buoyancy in the economy that we have seen in the last six months as a result of which revenue collections have been much more buoyant than expected.

The Opposition wishes to criticise the removal of the five per cent sales tax, but is afraid to do so directly because it recognises in my humble opinion not only the fact that the sales tax was an intense irritant to the public and its removal a corresponding salve, but also that the removal of the sales tax has had a beneficial effect on the economy as a whole, and increased what used to be called the general buoyancy of the economy to an extent where instead of the budgeted deficit about which more will be said, we only face a deficit of $9 million. I heard the hon. member for St. Michael North Central cry out "prove it". The hon. member's expertise on economic matters has never been so highly developed as to accord his remarks on these points the respect given to statements made by some other hon. members, but on this occasion I will forgive him for he could not, I think, have access to the information that notwithstanding the repeal of the five per cent sales tax, that taxes on goods and services during 1976 are estimated to have risen by $8 million, an amount considerably more than the expected yield from the sales tax. He could not be expected to know that taxes on goods and services are exceeding not only the expectations of an increase on the amount for which they are attached, but at least are covering already the revenue lost as a result of the sales tax. (A VOICE: By increasing other charges.) There have not been any increases in other charges notwithstanding the continued asides of the hon. member. I think really I should ask him to take a lesson on the meaning of the words "the general buoyancy of the economy" from the hon. member who is sitting on his right, the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John, and I use it with no apologies.

The situation of the budget this time last year was that there was an estimated excess of current expenditure over current revenue of $26 million. To that must be added no less than $30 million in supplementaries passed during the current year, and to this $30 million in supplementaries should also be added the $12 million in statutory expenditure which does not appear by way of supplementary, but which was occasioned by the increase in Civil Service salaries. So to the estimated excess of $26 million on current account is to be added another $42 million on current account occasioned by supplementaries and by the increase in salaries, a total of $68 million authorised expenditure over

estimated revenue and that authorised deficit of $68 million has been reduced to $9 million. That is why I say that I have been satisfied with the economic performance of this country during the last six months.

This morning I specially asked the senior officials of the Ministry of Finance whether they were satisfied with the general control the Ministry of Finance had been able to exercise during the financial year over spending by the Departments, because very strict control was on. Funds may appear especially in the Capital Estimates, but there will be no more starting of the school in St. George without a proper assessment of its general impact on Government's spending in that area. The money will be spent but it will not be spend casually without a proper foreknowledge of what is going on. There will be no more payments from a vote "purchase of Assets" of $½ million to the Minister of Finance's friends on the grounds that their solicitors had said that the mortgagee wanted his money, so release $500,000 urgently. These steps have been stopped and my officials who were questioned about the effect of the whole business tell me that they are very satisfied they have been able to keep good control except for a short period before the election. Fortunately the election is over and the authorised deficit of $68 million stands at only $9 million, less than it was for 1973–74, about half of what it was in 1974–75. I think that for an economy which over and over again we heard from the former Minister of Finance and from the hon. member for St. Michael South was in a terrible way, demanded an immediate budget that was a $25 million deficit and then another $20 million, they used to say $25 million to meet Civil Servants salaries, for an economy which was in that condition and which we were mismanaging by repealing the sales tax, I think that although we are in a very bad way and there should not be a deficit on current account at all, despite that I think there are some grounds for satisfaction in the first few months of operation under the present Government.

Now I want having said all that to say a few words about the nature of deficit financing. We have never said on this side of the House that borrowing money is wrong. I had to say over and over and over again and I have been having to say it since about 1968 that borrowing money for the development of this Island was that those who are to be beneficiaries of the development in years to come bear some of the cost as a proper exercise of Government activity. Repeatedly what we have had to say is that borrowing money to waste on projects which are not productive, the very unfortunate borrowing of money which is to be used on a current account deficit is counter-productive in the long run.

12.55 p.m.

What we would say is this. We face the fact that there has to be substantial borrowing in the first two, or perhaps this year, next year and perhaps the third year of Government to meet these very bills which we find undesirable on Current Account, but at least we have started out in 1976–77 by borrowing only $9 million to meet our Current Account deficit and this is easily covered by the expansion of Treasury Bills where in two years when the value was much less, 1973–74 and 1974–75, the amount then amounted to something like $34 million, 33½ million to be exact, we think that the record of borrowing in this year is one which will reveal that we are making an effort to keep things to a minimum.

Also the House will be glad to hear that we are trying our best to keep down foreign borrowing. When I come to the question of the Estimates we have a notional ceiling inside the Ministry of Finance of $260 million on estimated expenditure, and hon. members will observe that our notional ceiling has been exceeded by an amount which I personally find very undesirable. We have tried our best, we have made all the cuts that we can see in the submissions by Departments, but we have still exceeded it and I regret to say that one of the areas in which we have exceeded our ceiling is in the Ministry of Finance itself. The Capital has certainly exceeded our ceiling, but even in Current and in particular in an area which will not be debated during the Estimates in Committee, it will have to be dealt with before Your Honour, the area of Charges of Debt, in particular there our initial calculations turned out to be more, and a part of the reason and a part of the pressure that we will have to face on our balance of payments is that we are starting to make substantial repayments on our foreign debt. The debts which were incurred in the terrible year of 1973–74, the year in which the sabbatical leave was taken by he who should have been looking after the country's finances, the year in which after I had warned at a meeting at Eagle Hall in 1972 that the country was facing the greatest economic and social crisis since 1937, and after I warned, the then Prime Minister could go on television and say that Leaders of the Opposition have to make dangerous and alarming statements to justify their position. Whether the statements were dangerous and alarming history will judge; unfortunately history is already

judging the pockets of the taxpayers when they look at the Charges of Debt. They do not only include the payment of interest, the Head Charges of Debt includes the repayment of external loans which to my regret has had to go from an estimate of expenditure in 1976–77 which is printed as $25 million to an amount of $33 million, and the main part of this increase consists of instalment repayments of external loans, EURO dollar and US dollar loans which have now fallen due of almost $7 million.

When you talk about the refrigerators and the stoves that the Government is forced to impose restrictions on hire purchase so as to cut down a little bit on consumer expenditure on imported goods, let us all bear in mind that if we did not have to pay back the $7 million in foreign currency this year that was borrowed to alleviate some of the mismanagement of four years ago, that we might not have to put on those hire purchase restrictions at all, that the balance of payments, not just the Estimates, is affected by the $7 million in foreign debt that has to be paid out for the forthcoming year, and indeed these repayments form part of the mistakes which were made in the calculations at an earlier stage during the consultations on the Estimates.

The budgeted expenditure for 1976–77 was $25 million but the actually revised figure of the Charges of Debt was apparently held down to $18 million, so we are in fact budgeting for $15 million more on Charges of Debt than the actually revised expenditure during the previous financial year, and this is a substantial amount of money.

Now, Sir, the Capital column. It is my experience, especially in recent years since the time limit has been imposed, that the Capital Estimates get an insufficient amount of discussion and therefore I am tending to be a little longer on Capital Estimates than as is normal on second reading speeches on the Appropriation Bill. At the very outset I want to say something about the nature of the Capital Estimates and their relation to the Planning Division of the Ministry of Finance. It does seem to me that some Departments of Government do not fully understand the significance of a Development Plan. They do not fully understand that the services which are meant to be rendered by the Planning Division of the Ministry of Finance and Planning. They well know that the Government has a duty to report to the people on what its plans are, but I think that many Departments use the Capital Estimates and have used for years as a means of putting forward plans to the public rather than a serious means of putting forward amounts of money which they truly know can be spent in a financial year.

I am going to say right away that we have estimated for $102 million for Capital Expenditure, I do not expect that more than $65 million will be spent, and we are only going to spend $65 million if we can maintain the pace of work which has been accelerated at the Port, and I would like to pay a tribute to the hon. member for St. Andrew, the Minister of Communications and Works, under whose administration the contract for the Port steel has been filled, the work is ahead of schedule not only in terms of time but in terms of reclaimed land, because we have reclaimed a considerable amount more than was budgeted for under the original harbour scheme and may have some 32 or 33 acres of land to dispose of in the Port in the bulk store area than the 25 which the previous Government had made allowances for.

1.05 p.m.

But as I say, we will only be able to spend $65 million on Capital Development Works if we can increase the pace of work at the Port, increase the pace of work at the airport – these are schemes that were started by the previous Government, but just as it fell to them to continue with the building of our Queen Elizabeth Hospital and our expansion of the Airport and the Port which they found in progress in 1961, this is a continuity of Government and we will have to carry out these schemes with expedition. We will have to expand the work at the Community College, make sure that this is kept up at a pace which does not fall behind schedule. We will have to start the work at the Polytechnic – I am going to say a word about that. We will have to make sure that there is proper planning and proper management by the destruction of some of the bad old political ways of handling Government expenditure on capital works as well as in other areas.

We have to make sure that we draw down on our foreign credit which is available for all of these projects at a pace which can maintain speedy development in the public sector, that is if we want to reach the $65 million. I also much regret to say that if you are to reach $65 million we have to dispose of funds which are not funds for the development of Barbados at all; because we will have to pay on our capital account some of the $12 million lost by the International Seafoods scheme – lost, strayed or stolen. We will have to replace some of the money lost – or

all I should imagine, on the Bath Plantation racket – and I make no apologies for using the word – and these will have to be charged to our capital accounts and they will represent a pure loss to the people of Barbados at this time.

There is a day of reckoning, and the day of reckoning for International Seafoods and for Bath will have to come during the forthcoming Financial Year. We are going to hear a great deal, I am sure, depending on who makes the leading speech for the Opposition in reply to this, arguments about the continuing of the old Government projects. We are not shelving the projects. We will see that they continue. Would that hon. members on the other side could see this so readily as they found the Queen Elizabeth Hospital as a continuing project and found the Airport and the Port as completed or nearly completed projects.

But let us hear from the Opposition that we also found International Seafoods and Bath Plantation as continuing projects, but projects on the debit side rather than on the credit side; and that the money which will have to be paid to repay the Government position in these two projects is going to be as much or more than the money to be spent on the Port, the Airport or the Community College this year. That was the position this Government was faced with when it came into power.

To review in general terms items of capital expenditure and to continue with what I am saying about the amount of actual capital expenditure and estimated capital expenditure is that the conclusion that can be drawn from the continual over estimation of capital expenditure is this: in the past, instead of directing their plans and their thoughts about their plans into the Development Plan many of the revenue officers directed them into this book, the Annual Estimates.

I am told – and I am sorry that the former Minister of Education is not here in his seat – but when the last Development Plan was being prepared the Ministry of Education did not even meet the deadline for the submission for what it had to say, and that the education part of that Development Plan had to be written by the Ministry of Finance and Planning after, I suppose, the appropriate consultations on the telephone and whatever.

The Ministry of Education came out without fail every year with a parcel of projects for school building and school repairs which reveal the intensity of detailed planning which is always attractive when you see it, when you know that people are ready to go ahead with the schemes, but which perhaps may not represent the best balance in the overall projects that might be pursued in Barbados.

I single out the Ministry of Education, not just for a criticism but to remind those responsible in that Ministry and other Ministries that for example international aid is not intended all to be for Education. The International Development Bank has made funds available for three major projects in Barbados. Two of these are for educational projects – the Polytechnic and the Community College. I have been told by the planners of the Inter-American Development Bank that our planning system is over balanced, that our planning arrangements for international finance are over balanced in that particular direction.

I just mentioned this, Mr. Speaker, because you will have an idea of the difficulties that face the Ministry of Planning that perhaps are not always determined by individual Ministries, but we have to put forward specific planning specifications. The Inter-American Development Bank recalls – I think I have the figures – that 70% of their funds allocated to Barbados are for educational purposes, whereas they would prefer it the other way around – 30% allocated for educational purposes and 70% for other developments. My answer to that was that we have this amount already. Let us make that 30% so that the other funds allocated can now rise to 70%.

I just mentioned that to show that these are some of the planning difficulties that beset the Ministry and which make it harder to have proper estimations of capital expenditure. I will go through the Capital Estimates because I do not believe that we will have a chance for a detailed analysis. I am not going to be long. I am going to pick out as far as is possible the major Heads which may not be reached.

In the Ministry of Finance and Planning I have already dealt with one or two of these items including International Seafoods Limited; but it will be observed that under the Head previously called Purchase of Assets, now entitled Equity Contribution, there is an increase of more than $6 million which covers the cement plant, the flour mill, Land Reclaimers Limited – that is the company which is going to handle the rental and management of the bulk purchase installation at the Port, International Seafoods Limited, as I

have mentioned just now, Barbados Mortgage Finance Company Limited, distribution of equity shares, the joint Barbados and Trinidad & Tobago Shrimping Company and the Barbados National Fisheries Company.
1.15 p.m.

There is a very substantial increase there, possibly, one of the largest increases in any of the items in Capital Expenditure, and that increase is International Seafoods. Hon. members may also note at that point – "Purchase of Assets" – that there is a line on page 25 A marked "Other Purchases of Assets". In due course, in Committee, that will be deleted. I do not like, and I did not like, the use of that previous item when words like "include" were left in there by the previous Minister of Finance. The *North Point* was bought out of that vote although not mentioned in the Estimates. It was vaguely connected with the Cement Company; the $500,000 for the purchase of land at Heywoods was paid for out of that vote, and that vote had a dangerous elasticity – an elasticity which contradicts the brave and proud words of the former Minister of Finance on his political platform when he says that no Minister can spend money unless it has been to Parliament first. I have questioned one or two former members of the Cabinet: Did any of them know that $500,000 had been paid towards Heywoods when the Cabinet had decided that an option be taken? One hon. member, in particular, said that they never knew those things. That is what I mean by a certain elasticity in the vote, but I do not want to dwell on this too much. The Commission of Inquiry, in due course, will have its full inputs to make in this area.

The reason why I am deleting "Other Purchase of Assets" is that nobody will point the finger at me and say that I directed the Permanent Secretary of Finance to pay money from a vote which was not mentioned on the grounds that the word "including" was an all-embracing one or on the grounds that the definition of the project mentioned in the vote was sufficiently elastic to allow for the *North Point* being bought, or my friends being paid $½ million to let them pay a mortgagee who was pressing for his interest and some of his repayments. That is why I will be deleting it in Committee.

I should mention that that vote, although large, really relates to a very large project. The total vote there is $17 million, $7 million more than last year, but we are allowing for the new project a Transportation Study, and for the Scotland District Development Study. There are new projects which are covered by that vote. I think that when hon. members – if they reach it I will defend it, but if we do not reach it – understand the scope of the project which the $17 million may cover. They may, perhaps, agree that this Government is a Government that intends to develop Barbados and not spend money wastefully and drag it back into the morass from which we are painfully climbing.

With regard to the Ministry of Agriculture, its vote has declined somewhat; the reason is that I have had to apply to the Ministry of Agriculture's Estimates the kind of guillotine that should have been applied long ago. There is no point in asking for $20 million when you do not have the planning resources, the trained manpower and even the on-the-ground manpower to spend more than $2 million of it. There is no point, if a Fisheries Project is going to cost $3 million, but you do not have a pre-feasibility study, putting in $3 million. We believe you must put in $50,000 to start your studies, and then we will know whether it is $3 million, $1.5 million or $2.7 million. Proper budgeting procedures need to be applied to this sort of thing.

In the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs now appears the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and were it not for that these Estimates would be – I would not say more realistic. They are moderately realistic now, but they would be even less. It is the intention of the Government *vis-a-vis* the Barbados Marketing Corporation to take a decisive step to re-finance it. There have been a number of previous re-financing. All of them have foundered on mismanagement not only by the previous Board but, in my opinion, also by the previous Minister.

The Barbados Marketing Corporation has bank liabilities, despite a supplementary in the last few months, of $2½ million. The accounting system leaves much to be desired, or left much to be desired, as far as I am concerned. If the hon. member for St. Michael West was to let it all hang out and discuss and let the House know the difficulty which he had in putting forward the Corporation's case, I think that there are many employees of the Corporation whose ears would be a good deal more than red. Cabinet papers were put up with the most gross form of double accounting that one could find. The Cabinet was being asked to

supplement votes when in different paragraphs the same sum of money is being asked for. For example, we were being asked to pay overdrafts, and then being asked to give sums of money for items which were already reflected in those overdrafts – in other words, which had already been paid for and were responsible for the overdraft. We were being asked both to pay for the item and to pay the overdraft.

Well, a supplementary was advanced and we have now managed to get every sum of money in down to the last $400,000, which was approved by the hon. member for St. Michael South West who was the Minister. I believed it was called the "Onion Loan" and so on. We have got right down to these details. We are going to pay off one Bank. The Government intend to float long-term financing for the long-term loan owed to that Bank, and we are going to maintain the Barbados Marketing Corporation with an overdraft for working capital, give it some money to expand the Supermarket a little bit, give it regular funds by way of a Development Grant to enable it to do one of its primary purposes and that is paying the farmers for the development of special crops, and most of all we are going to put it in good hands to control, supervise, and manage. I think I am very happy to say that it is now in good hands, as Chairman, of the hon. member for St. Michael West, who has shown the qualities of supervision that was so gravely lacking before.

Another small thing, Sir, for the benefit of any Bank Managers who happen to be hearing this debate or to see it reported. We are checking all of these Acts to make sure that nobody from any Bank will come to any Minister to ask the Minister to sign for an overdraft. I cannot blame the hon. member for St. Michael West. I blame the Bank for insisting that they are only going to lend out money if the Minister signs. This is one of the ways of eroding the Parliamentary control of which the hon. member for St. John has spoken in and out of this Chamber. If Ministers are free, without the consent of Parliament, to guarantee overdrafts, then Parliament is nowhere.

I believe that the Barbados Marketing Corporation in the past as in the present – I do not want to say which Commercial Bank, but the Corporation will soon be paying off its account and removing its money from that Bank. I gave instructions that, according to the law, a Permanent Secretary was to write to the Bank to indicate that the Minister's approval for an overdraft had been given, and the Bank Manager was insolent enough to say that he had to have the Minister's signature. He will, in future have to deal with Ministers of the Church and not of my Government. I mention that in passing. We have to get this personal control by Ministers out of the area of Government.

1.25 p.m.

We have to get away entirely from that. Ministers have no business running the day to day arrangements of a statutory corporation, contrary to what is believed by some Chairmen of statutory corporation, and I refer to present Chairmen and I refer to present Chairmen present in this House, Statutory Corporations are not set up to free their operations from civil service procedure only; they are set up to free their operations from day to day ministerial control and they are set up to be run by Boards which have a greater knowledge because of their greater experience in the subject rather than by a Minister who, even if he has the knowledge, has no right displaying it in the affairs of a corporation. This business of statutory corporations saying and convincing their Chairmen, their fledgling Chairmen in some cases, because you have to forgive a fledgling while he is learning.....

Mr. SPEAKER: We do not want the Reporters to be disturbed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:.....saying first of all that they do not have civil service methods in there and therefore they do not have pensions and so on, so they must have slightly different salaries from civil servants with similar responsibility, and then they go on and ask for the same conditions of service which the civil servants have, they all want housing allowances, entertainment allowances, travelling allowances, and then they want the corporation to set up pension schemes, and then when the Establishments Division of my office says that if you want civil service conditions of employment you must conform to the salary levels appropriate to the responsibilities which would apply in the civil service, you then hear a great howl "no, we are supposed to be free of civil service methods, we must have more money." I only counsel Chairmen of Statutory Corporations not to let the wool be pulled over their eyes by this type of argument. It is an argument that has a lot of attractiveness when it comes to the people with whom you have to work daily. I am sure that the hon. members concerned are taking these implicit criticisms in the spirit in which they are intended. I do not even know which of them it

was or there are who have statements attributed to them in the press.

Now, Sir, under Ministry of Communications and Works, I do not wish to steal any of the thunder of the hon. member for St. Andrew, but hon. members ought to be made aware that the Government is considering a number of substantial developments under the Head of Communications and Works. Two of these are major road developments, both of which will be associated with overseas aid. I think that we have to start indeed at the bottom of the department to make civil servants and those technical officers and others understand that we are speaking of major road development. One of them is connected with the Bridgetown Harbour. We are planning to extend the road from the new harbour development through Brandon, Brighton to Spring Garden and Paradise very much along the lines of the old spine road, very much the road which we promised in our Barbados Labour Party's manifesto of 1966, very much the same sort of thing. It will cost some money, but we have interested the Inter-American Development Bank in this project and we think that we have every prospect of getting international financial assistance.

The hon. member for St. Andrew and myself, along with a number of technical officers, the Permanent Secretary of the Port, the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, the Acting Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Communications and Works two Saturdays ago walked the whole length of the prospective road to Paradise from Brandon, and some of the people who went on the tour did not know that there was so much bush and jungle within a mile and a half of Bridgetown. We walked the whole length of the road and we think this will bring much needed development to the depressed areas of St. Michael South West and to some extent to St. Michael West, to the depressed areas of St. Michael North West and the depressed areas of northern St. Michael where living conditions are not always of the best, where there is some overcrowding and too little development. We envisaged this road as a connection between the present industrial development in Spring Garden, the major Oil Company, the rum refinery and the power station, as a link between the two areas, and we are actively looking out in all the areas through which the road will pass for industrial and warehousing sites. At the back of the Mental Hospital I would not like to say how many acres, but it seems to me to be about fifteen and other acres twenty of which are just in scrub and bush owned by a single land owner.

We are anticipating that we will have great new development in this area, certainly within the next four or five years; I am very hopeful it will be less. We are also planning another major road project in connection with the Polytechnic. One of the greatest tributes that has been paid to this new Government was paid by the hon. member for St. Michael South who now, it is apparently agreed, accepted, signed, sealed and delivered is the author of the article *sub nomine* Erskine Sandiford in the Sunday Advocate, and in one of these articles, the writer blamed the Prime Minister and the present Government for taking so long to decide to move the Polytechnic from Constitution to Wildey. I was very pleased when I read that. I can think of no greater tribute to the way I am viewed as a planner compared to the way the former Prime Minister was viewed as a planner by the hon. member for St. Michael South that he never criticised the former Prime Minister for taking five years to decide that the Polytechnic should be placed in the wrong place, and taking only five months to criticise me for taking five months to decide it should be put in a proper place. I regard that as a very great tribute to how he views the new Government, that he was unable in five years to stop the hon. member for St. John from making a fool of himself as a planner where the Polytechnic was concerned, but he thinks that five months is too long for us to decide. Well it did not take five months. We had decided that by December and just had to straighten it out with the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Polytechnic is going to be sited at Wildey as was mentioned in a Government Information Release some time ago.

We also intend to build a connecting road between Wildey and the Warrens area which will make it possible for traffic from the North to get the Polytechnic site, and will also assist in by-passing some of the congestion of Bridgetown. I have no doubt that we will be plagued in the forth-coming years by the constant repetition parrot-like from the Opposition that they also had that idea.

1.35 p.m.

I am going to tell the Opposition this. It is no use to have an idea, it only becomes useful when you put that idea in force; that is the whole point. We had an idea long ago and we have had ideas long ago on the various matters. The Barbados Labour Party had ideas about polyclinics and health centres back in 1961, they appeared in our Manifesto, they appeared in the Manifesto of a losing Party in 1961, but we have not pursued the Ministry of Health, we have not

even said they took 15 years to carry out our ideas of 1961 because we regard that as a fruitless and wasteful exercise. Virtually every development idea whether it comes to physical development, where a good road would lie, or what Barbados needs has been put forward at one time or another by somebody, and the difference which we will be asking the public to see between that Party and this Party is that that Party would sit down and read and talk about a road from Warrens to Wildey, this Party will stand up and get up and go and build a road from Warrens to Wildey. That will be the difference.

One other road project which has not got to such a stage of discussion in Cabinet that I would wish to talk about at this stage, and there is one major project of maximum importance to the east coast of Barbados which I would wish to mention and which is being pursued from our own resources, that is the East Coast Road. I believe that preliminary feasibility work is already being done on this. This is a continuation of the East Coast Road which was built by the former Government perhaps 12 years ago now and indeed represents its last, if not its only exercise in major road building in this country. It is an error to think that because Barbados has too many roads that no more roads should be built. This Island has more mileage of roads that it needs for the purpose of getting from one point to another. You only have to go over the flat areas of St. Philip and realise that the villages and districts of St. Philip could be better served by a smaller network of better roads. The fact that we have perhaps more excess mileage in some areas has beguiled and bewildered us and therefore we have never given priority to road development and more importance to the use of roads when once they are built, and I am going to instance the very East Coast Road.

For a long time that road was a recreational road, but recently through the initiative of the Ministry of Communications and Works a bus has been put to run along that road and it goes I believe from Bathsheba to Speightstown. Your Honour can testify that business is picking up in Speightstown as people from St. Joseph and St. Andrew realise that the market hawkers have not yet reached the Bridgetown price levels and that Speightstown has its own attraction as a market centre. There seems to be no doubt that, for example, the Alleyne School will become more attractive due to this single apparently small thing, just the use of the East Coast Road as a transportation artery as apposed to a mere recreational road. We believe that when this road is continued through St. Joseph and through somewhat depressed – not depressing, Sir, they are charming places – but economically coastal villages of St. John, we believe that when this road is continued through that we can give some development to the parish of St. John and the northern parts of the parish of St. Philip which they have not had in all these years of returning the hon. member for St. John to the House of Assembly. All these years whatever his ideas were apparently he never thought of connecting Martins Bay to College Savannah and Blades Hill far less connecting it to the north.

Despite all those years of service to the people of St. John this has not come forward but we believe again that a road such as this can open up the facilities of the Alleyne School for the children who live in those areas, it could carry communication to the airport to the south without having to take tortuous and difficult hilly roads, and more important still perhaps we believe that another scheme for which he had to ask the assistance of the Inter American Development Bank, that is, a scheme to develop crustacean and other in-shore reef and coastal fisheries in St. John, we believe that without this road such schemes would be meaningless.

When they talk about the Barbados Labour Party discriminating and showing political disfavour to persons who voted for the other side I really want to know when they see that road running through Martins Bay and Consett Bay who they think we think the people in Martins Bay and Consett Bay voted for, and we are not going to be turned back by the fact that we are bringing a major development to the constituency of the President of the Democratic Labour Party, we are not going to discriminate against the inhabitants of St. John in any way or in St. Michael South West in bringing forward development. We are not going to do it, and I look forward to seeing the same boys who sit down at College Bottom without work since the friends of the hon. member for St. John closed down Bath Plantation as an agricultural centre, who sit down there and wave at the car of the hon. member for St. John, we are going to see that they are going to be given something to do and not to have to sit down at the bottom of Society Hill, their only purpose in life presumably being to pick a lime and to think that something good has happened to them because they get a wave of the hand of the hon. member for St. John.

Going further down still, and I do have some doubts, unless the Opposition specially ask

for it, that we will reach the Education Heads of Capital Expenditure, I think that it is well known that the Minister of Education has brought a verve and determination to his office sadly lacking in his immediate predecessor and lacking also in the confusion, the self-advice, the mistaken self-advice exercised by his predecessor but one, the hon. member for St. Michael South. Hon. members who look at the Education Estimates will see that the Government is not only saying that the school leaving age is going to be raised to 16, it is also providing the means by which the 15 and 16 year olds will be accommodated. A school building programme is already underway at the Roebuck School, a glance at Head 115 of the Capital Estimates for the Ministry of Education will reveal that St. Lucy – phase IV about which so many lies have been told on the Barbados Labour Party by the hon. member for St. Michael South, the former Minister of Education, misleading his poor colleague, the hon. member for St. Lucy.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. He is referring to hon. members and he must withdraw that, he cannot say that so many lies have been told in this House. Is that parliamentary, Sir?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I withdraw it, Sir, I am very sorry. So many mis-statements of fact have been uttered about the St. Lucy School, imagine, Sir, at a political meeting – we have to go over this again after a parliamentary question – imagine at a political meeting the hon. member for St. Michael South said at Pie Corner that the Barbados Labour Party had so little regard for the people of St. Lucy that it took funds which were supposed to finish the St. Lucy Secondary School and diverted them to other purposes, and when I challenged the hon. member he said he did not say that, he must have been mistaken, and I have gone to the trouble of getting a transcript of his speech and send to him so that he can understand that while he may seek to adopt the mantle of the hon. member for St. John at the top of the Democratic Labour Party he must not seek to adopt all his ways at the same time as if he can say one thing today and then deny that he said it the next day. 1.45 p.m.

It seems that he is trying to serve his apprenticeship to qualify him for the leadership of that party. He thinks that you have to make misstatements of facts and then deny them before you can sit in the President's chair. Hon. members will see from the notes the range that it is intended to work on, and hon. members will see that three schools have been earmarked for possible construction or conversion during the coming Financial Year to assist with education at the secondary level.

I do not know when we will reach the Head, Ministry of External Affairs which is very small. Hon. members may care to know that we have been able to halve the capital vote for the Ministry of External Affairs. I hope very much that we will reach this Head. On the Head National Affairs Item 6 of that Head indicates that the sewage scheme is intended to be proceeded with during the forthcoming Financial Year, and it indicates also that the work on community health clinics will proceed.

The actual amount of money spent during 1976–77 apparently was only $100,000 where $1 million was voted. This is the kind of thing that I mean when I say that the departments have been doing their planning for the Capital Estimates instead of in the Development Plan, budgeting for too much more than it was possible to spend in the Financial Year.

There is a vote of $4 million for the National Housing Corporation. We are only asking this year for $1 million for land and property acquisition. In my first week in office I called for the files dealing with all outstanding acquisitions, and I am glad to say that I have been able to turn back one or two which seemed to be based on the fact that the land belonged to a well known and active political supporter of the Democratic Labour Party. I may very well have to come under this vote for some of the funds which may well be supplementary in due course.

Nonetheless, we have reduced the Estimates of $1.7 million for land to $1 million in the document before the House. Under Ministry of Labour and Community Services, Day Nurseries, a Youth Camp and the expansion of capital work for Sport, it can be confidently expected that most of those funds will be spent during the current Financial Year.

Sir, the exigencies of time have compelled me to deal at some length with these projects which may not be reached during the debate itself. I do not intend to detail hon. members much longer, but I very sincerely hope that on the debate on the Appropriation Bill – and if hon. members want to ask any questions on revenue – that in the debate on the second reading of the Bill itself hon. members will not ask for many details since they are entitled to do so in the detailed Heads of the Estimates.

I would say this in conclusion. If the Leader of the Opposition even at this late stage, even after he has spurned our offer, still wants some Heads debated he is still able to come and approach the Leader of the House and give a period of notice which must be not less than 24 hours, we will have the files and the appropriate public officers here and we will call the Heads if there is any particular Head on which they insist.

In this exercise we believe that if a man smites you on the right check, turn unto him also the left check that he may smite you on that. Do you know why I wan to be smitten in this way? The Opposition will be doing the public a service by setting out the areas about which they feel strongly. While the Opposition is apparently out of touch with public opinion at the present time, yet it must have a residual 20% of yard fowls who will be guided by their conduct in and out of the House of Assembly, and indeed we will be satisfying the yard fowls if we debate the Heads that the Opposition particularly insist on.

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

Mr. SISNETT: I beg to second that, and reserve my right to speak.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it is now ten minutes to two.

SUSPENSION

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that we now suspend until 2.45 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

On resumption –

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

RESUMPTION OF APPROPRIATION ACT, 1977

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of Barbados and the Financial Administration and Audit Act of this Island require that the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure should be laid before Parliament before the end of the Financial Year terminating on the 31st March in each and every year. I would like to be able to find some area in which I could congratulate the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance on the presentation of the Estimates for this year but, regrettably, the Minister of Finance, the hon. member for St. Thomas, spent all of his time in two main exercises. First, on holding out to the rest of mankind in a self-congratulatory kind of way that in the four or five months which have elapsed since he assumed the office of the Minister of Finance operating within the confines of the Estimates for 1976–77, which had been altered only in respect that the Government has come and sought approval for certain Supplementary Estimates during that period of time, he has been holding out that by some miracle, if I may borrow his expression of good management, he being the financial genius of the gift to mankind that the Almighty has vouchsafed to the Island of Barbados, that he has been able to perform a miracle whereby what he describes as a deficit of $68 million has been converted to an estimated deficit of $9 million by the end of the current financial year, a period which has not yet terminated. I will take him up point by point on this, and it is necessary for me to do so for the record, although I consider it tedious in some respects. The rest of his speech was a repetition of charges of mismanagement by the last Government, and the last Government did not know what they were doing and so on.

Well, we are accustomed to the outpourings of the hon. member for St. Thomas, but he exceeded himself today. It is true that he is virtually a new boy, but he has been in the legislature before and he is now addressing Parliamentarians, and, he is not addressing a gallery of uninitiated Congress with the BLP doctrine. He is addressing Parliamentarians, and his speech will go down in the records of this House, we hope, if they are not expurgated. I think he does not find himself in a position where he can distinguish between the requirements of electioneering during a period of an election and the serious duties which a Minister of Finance has to perform in informing the nation of the patterns of expenditure, and the directions and thrusts of the Government during the period upon which we are soon to embark.

If I may pick out the salient features of the Estimates for this year, the salient features of the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure presented in the Draft, which we all have before us and which was circulated before we met here today, is that the deficit or the shortfall between revenue and expenditure is of the magnitude of $50¾ million. I think that is the most significant

thing that emerges from a scrutiny of the Draft Estimates which have been placed before us. That is point number one.

The second feature is the carefully edited Press Releases given out that we are spending $378 million this year. For the first time we have the Capital Expenditure lumped with the Current Expenditure, and the Prime Minister himself has conceded that at the same time that he is accusing his predecessor in office of inflating items of expenditure and under-estimating revenue. He has conceded quite openly, which is unusual for him, that he does not see the Capital Expenditure exceeding $65 million. As far as I can remember that is what he said. Right at the outset he has said that he has inflated the Capital Expenditure by some $37 million. Now this is what the Hon. Minister of Finance has said himself. Then how does he reconcile his own aversion – his own statement, I should say? I would not like to use the term "aversion" because it may have the wrong connotation. How does he reconcile his own statement with the accusation which he levelled against me, his predecessor in office about the habit of inflating the Estimates?

I have said time and time again in this Chamber and outside that there is a certain absorbing capacity to the economy of this country. We do not have the management, we do not have the personnel, despite the fact that we have unemployment, and we do not have the technical expertise available to spend what I can see the Minister would be right on, with inflation and everything being written into the equation, more than about $60 or $65 million in any year on Capital Expenditure. Most of the expenditure in this particular direction will be in respect of projects which were formulated, financed, and initiated by my Government, his predecessors in office.

If I go through the Capital Expenditure Ministry by Ministry, which I will spare you the burden of having to listen to, but you will see on page after page in the blue pages – if you will just bear with me while I find it – they say: "To continue the work at Seawell Airport. To continue the construction of the extension of the Deep Water Harbour. To provide for the Flour Mill. To continue the work on the Community College. To continue and construct the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic."

Also on page 25, I think it is, you will find a very interesting summary. On page 25(a), part 2, under Capital Notes, this is what appears on the right hand side:

"HEAD 109 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

GENERAL

Item 1. Financial Institutions. Continuing Projects: Provision is made for subscriptions and contributions as follows: –

Inter-American Development Bank
International Monetary Fund
International Bank for Reconstruction & Development
Caribbean Development Bank
Barbados Development Bank",

and one new one which I do not see how it got there,

"Amalgamation of Financial Institutions", because I do not claim any credit for that particular bit of folly. That comes under the Head of Continuing Projects and, obviously, it is some kind of mistake.

If you will remember the election promises of the hon. member for St. Thomas, he was going to merge all of the financial institutions under the Central Bank of Barbados. The first speech he made in relation to any function held by the Central Bank, he said that he had been advised – I am just paraphrasing here, and I am not attempting to quote the hon. member because I do not walk about with his speeches in my hip pocket. He said that he had been advised that they would be incompatible to merge the financial institutions with the Central Bank.
2.55 p.m.

He said he had been advised that they would be incompatible to merge these financial institutions with the Central Bank. Another wild statement which was made not completely having a grasp of the finances of a country, to make a statement that you were going to merge all these institutions with the Central Bank. I just want a correction made that the amalgamation of financial institutions is not a continuing project although it comes under that head.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member has obviously forgotten that the Government has been in power for six months. It is continuing because it is going on now, and it is going to continue into next year. It has started already. Maybe he is surprised to know that it started last year, so it will continue next year. He does not understand what he is reading.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like the hon. member to inform the House what

vote he came to the House with for this amalgamation because this is a capital project; so you would have had to have had a vote to have initiated some action on it. So the hon. member would be financing this amalgamation out of his own pocket, out of his own rents and royalties; it could not be any vote made by this House. That is a very poor point for the hon. member to make. I am saying that it is not a continuing project. Continuing projects are those which the House approve and which were in the Development Plan and to which the Legislature of this country is committed by operation of law or Resolution of this House, and there was no such Resolution to my recollection asking for money for amalgamation of financial institutions.

Then you have Item 2 – Continuing Projects, on the same page: Cement Project; Flour Mill; Land Reclaimers Ltd. – purchase of shares; International Seafoods Ltd. – Repayment of net indebtedness; Barbados Mortgage Finance Company Ltd., – Acquisition of equity shares. And then you have New Projects – Joint Barbados-Trinidad and Tobago Shrimping Co. – contribution to equity; Barbados National Fisheries Co. – Cost of establishing marketing company; and then Other Purchase of Assets; unspecified; the same thing that he was criticising and which I do not criticise him for because Government.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member is casting very serious reflections on my motives. I said quite clearly in my speech that "Other Purchase of Assets" was going to be deleted in Committee, and that I was going to move that, and he is casting a very grave reflection on something I have already said in here when he said it is going to stay in there and he suggests it stays in there. He came with his speech prepared and what I have said has taken him by surprise, so he is still repeating what he prepared last night.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for St. John continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: All I can say to the hon. member in so far as he claims that he is going to delete that, is that I take it he prepared the Estimates, he had a hand in the notes and if he is now saying he is going to delete "Other Purchase of Assets", that must have come to him while he was on his feet. I have no doubt he may be ill-advised enough to delete that, but he will find that running a Government is like running the biggest business in the country, and there is no human ingenuity that can foretell what the Government will have to take equity in or invest in at a moment's notice if it is not to lose certain advantages. Anyhow, I would not worry to castigate him on that, but what I am pointing out here is that the only new projects which he claims under Part II – Capital of Ministry of Finance and Planning is the Joint Barbados-Trinidad Shrimping Company – contribution to equity, and the Barbados National Fisheries Co., and since I am here I think I had better deal with it because the hon. member made some very stringent remarks about losses by Barbados Seafoods Co., and here it is he has a joint project as a new project in which the same Barbados Seafoods is going to be involved.

Now let us examine the situation here. Those of us who read the newspapers will remember, and those of us who pay attention to what happens in the Legislature will also recall that as a result of a discussion which I held with Mr. Mahabir, the Minister who was then responsible in the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, at the invitation of Dr. Williams, the Government of Barbados, I believe over a year ago agreed to form a joint fishing project with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. All the details of that project were advertised in the newspaper and it was further stated that the Government of Trinidad and Tobago had agreed to make available to the Government of Barbados a sum of $20 million TT to refinance the shrimping industry and that the 20 or 21 shrimping trawlers would be jointly owned by the Government of Barbados and National Fisheries of Trinidad and Tobago, being a Government undertaking of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. That is over a year ago, but what I have been informed, and I have seen the Governor of the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago less than ten days ago, is that the $20 million which the Government of Trinidad said would be made available at what was considered an extremely reasonable rate of interest because it would be a Treasury Bill rate which was less than 5 per cent at that time, that the Government of Barbados as presently constituted has not drawn down or called for that $20 million, and that $20 million was to pay off the indebtedness in relation to the purchase of the shrimp trawlers for which money had been borrowed from the First National City Bank, and also the losses which as a result of the escalation of the fuel costs by 400 percent had caused the shrimp industry in Barbados to move from a position of profit in 1973 to a position of losing over I think $1½

million a year because of the escalation in these costs, and one of the terms and the attractions of the agreement was that the Barbados shrimping vessels which I arranged for would take on fuel in Trinidad at something – again my figures may be out by one or two cents a gallon – but instead of paying approximately 46 cents per gallon for fuel, I believe these are U.S. cents, they would be able to get fuel at 13 cents which was what the Trinidad fishermen and shrimping trawlers were getting it at. All of this time the $20 million has not been drawn down. The shrimping trawlers at a market value are now worth more than when they were originally purchased because the cost of boat building has gone up – and even at the depreciated market value the shrimp trawlers are worth considerably more; so that the physical plant and the assets of the shrimp trawlers would more than compensate for any monies which the Government of Barbados would take out of this $20 million loan to refinance the trawling industry.

To suggest then as the hon. member said, and I would like to try to quote him as accurately as possible ..... the hon. member for St. Thomas said that one of the reasons why they have such big debts is that they have to repay the money lost by the International Seafoods scheme, or either lost, or stolen and the Bath Plantation racket. I will deal with that. *(Asides)* I did not catch the "strayed" – lost, strayed or stolen.
3.05 p.m.

This is what I want the hon. member to do. I want the hon. member to get the ex-Auditor General who is one of their High Priests now, a gentleman whom the Public Service Commission .....

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not mind the ex-Auditor General, get on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like him, if he really wants a Commission of Enquiry, to find out who strayed or lost or stole any money from Barbados Seafoods, because the Government of Trinidad was satisfied with the operation of Barbados Seafoods and therefore he should not get up and make allegations which are aspersions against the conduct and character of business people in this community, private or public individuals, unless he is prepared to back it up with some kind of action. I do not know why all of a sudden in our situation in Barbados where we have no less than 26 Crown Law Officers, our Constitution provides for something that the Commonwealth of the Bahamas does not have in its Constitution, a Director of Public Prosecutions, a Police Force of over one thousand people that you always want to have an enquiry, get the people who are being paid to prosecute and investigate to do their work, but it is not decent and it is not fair to people who have had good reputations in this country and who have been trying their best to rehabilitate an industry which you would know, Mr. Speaker, because you took part in the debate when the other people cleared out, we domesticated the shrimping industry in Barbados, made it a 100% Barbadian operation so that we would not suffer the indignity of seeing ships sail over the horizon after they had been levied upon and had writs nailed to the masts by the Hon. Leader of this House in another capacity.

People were sent home by the hon. member for Christ Church South Central in another capacity, so we domesticated the shrimping industry and you would have thought now we would be proud that we had domesticated the shrimping industry and that we have gone into a joint venture whereby we have slashed the fuel bills by 300 or 400% with one of our sister countries in the CARICOM adventure. We have demonstrated the practicality of working with our neighbours, and this Government has not drawn down on the $20 million but is complaining that they have to find money because the money was lost, strayed or stolen. Money was not lost, strayed or stolen, the boats cost nearly $12 million and they lost money on fuel, and we refinanced, made arrangements for refinancing the shrimping industry and they have done nothing about it until after the Estimates, because if they had gone and drawn the $20 million they would not say that they have this additional amount of money to find.

What about the $48 million from Venezuela? He has not mentioned that at all today. The $48 million that I arranged as a kind of facility on balance of payments, an agreement with the Venezuelan Government and they have done absolutely nothing about it. I have not come to the cement plant yet because that is another story altogether, so this distortion that takes place in this Chamber is regrettable, for the sake of cheap publicity. That is the new project that they claimed on page 25(a), Part II – Head 109 of the Capital Estimates, which is a joint Barbados – Trinidad and Tobago Shrimping Company. I would like

to ask the hon. member a question which is rhetorical. Is he going to put the old arrangement into liquidation, give back the Trinidad Government the $20 million and tell them they do not want it any more and come to the taxpayers of Barbados for some new shrimping company with Trinidad and Tobago? Is that what is going to happen? Which Minister have they discussed this project with down there that the Trinidad Government told them to forget the former Government of Barbados, we now want a new shrimping company with you and not the one we agreed to give the $20 million to finance? That is what I would like to find out from him. Is this a new company now? Because we formed a company that they will wind up with before it has even started, or before they drew the money to start a new shrimping company now on the same old terms and agreement, but without the $20 million?

The hon. member for St. Thomas said that he now has to find money that was lost, strayed or stolen. Is that worthy of a Minister of Finance in a democratic society to come in here and make statements and wild allegations like that, that he has to find money when in truth and in fact the Government of Trinidad and Tobago is the one that is finding the money for this project which they have, according to the Governor of the Central Bank, not drawn down or even discussed, but which I can assure is still available for the Government of Barbados to use, because the Trinidadians do not go back on their word like that, because their international reputation would suffer.

The other continuing projects, the two that are mentioned here are the Trinidad and Tobago Shrimping Company and the Barbados National Fisheries Company. I do not know what that is, the Barbados National Fisheries Company, I have not heard anything about it, I do not know whether they mean the same Seafoods by another name which would be more palatable to them and they are now going to call it the Barbados National Fisheries Company, I do not know, but that is the only other new project on the whole page of Capital Estimates which are there set out for over $13,929,982.

Then the other things, coming back now to continuing projects. Rates and Taxes – Provision for renovation and improvements to office accommodation, and Inland Revenue – Provision for installation of records storage facility. They are small amounts, $25,000 and $40,000 respectively out of a total vote under this Head of some $30.9 million. Then we have Continuing Projects – Central Purchasing – Provision for office accommodation and storage facilities, another $50,000. So there under the Ministry of Finance and Planning is this new infusion of new genius, or original genius. There is only one single project which is not a continuing project and that is some amorphous organisation called the Barbados National Fisheries Company – Cost of establishing marketing company, but the other new project is one that was established well over 12 months ago. *(Aside).* The hon. member wants me to turn over the page. Yes, more continuing projects, thank you. On page 25(b) the hon. member drew to my attention that there are more continuing projects. Item 6 – Feasibility Studies – Public Investment Unit, Water Resources, Hire of Professional Services, and then we go to the new projects here. Listen to them, Sir. Transportation Study and Scotland District.

That is a new area in Barbados that has been added like the Deep Water Harbour, a Scotland District. No money has ever been spent on the Scotland District, all the money that the United Nations poured in here, $1 million a year over the past 15 or 20 years, all that money has washed down Bawden's River into the ocean and we have to start now on this new Scotland District that nobody has ever heard about before, so that is a new project.

We come now to the transportation study. I remember sitting on the other side and hearing member after member, maybe including Your Honour, ask what has happened to the King Report, why does not the Government implement the King Report? The transportation study, and we have had transportation study after transportation study, but this is now a new project. This is a project to move the buses from St. Lucy and send them down to St. Andrew to aid the situation down there. Leave out the people in Speightstown, leave out the people at Pie Corner and the children who come from Grape Hall, Orange Hill and all over the place, and take the buses down to St. Andrew. That is the transportation study. Let us be realistic and realise this. We live in a small society, what used to be virtually a mono-cultural society.

3.15 p.m.

That is like in the old days when they only produced sugar and nothing else. They have now transformed themselves. Any thrust that you make in a society like this, its objective must be a relief in unemployment and

providing a certain standard of life for all of our citizens, not only those in the Civil Service alone. Anything that we do must be towards diversifying the economy, even when there are limitations – there are limitations of the land. There are limitations which are imposed upon us by the very nature and size of the society itself, like being a dependent economy in the old days and an ex-colonial country. Therefore you cannot sit down in a little attic and just devise magic schemes, because there is a limit to what you can do; and the whole purpose of development planning in former colonial territories is to investigate and pursue those avenues of diversification and the building up of the economy; but there is a limit to what you can do, as the hon. member will find out; and if he draws up a development plan for four or five years, the hon. member will find out as he must be finding out now except for his speeches, that there is little new that you can introduce.

If the Government did not have a plan for social development, the Government would have to think of things like, in the 1950s, holiday with pay, National Insurance and things like that; but once you have covered the whole area of social improvement in the society, when you come to spending money there are only limited ways in which you can spend money sensibly, and the Democratic Labour Party investigated all of those avenues; but when you come and tell me that you are doing a big favour to my constituency in St. John – I may not spend a lot of time in here, but I spend a lot of time in my constituency; and I want to inform the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the Government when the East Coast Road was being constructed, had an engineering study done of all the possibilities of extending the road beyond Cattlewash where it terminated.

When the Government decided that that road should be built at the very modest sum of $600,000, the United Nations economist – he was appointed by the previous Government, that is the Government before 1961 – advised us that there was no point in building even that section of the East Coast Road because it would not produce anything for Barbados.

We thought differently and we went ahead and built the East Coast Road. We put a development cost on the land, but when it came to the other part of the road, all of the engineers, the highly qualified engineers who looked at the problem of constructing – I cannot remember now – it may be 18 to 78 – this is over 15 years ago – decided that the engineering difficulties of constructing a through coast road were such that it would be at that time beyond the financial capabilities of the Government of Barbados at that time. Further more because between Cattlewash and Consett Bay, there are access roads going down at intervals into every little hamlet. Every little fishing village. This includes offshoots of the road which meanders under Hackleton Cliff in St. John. With all of these little roads it would be unnecessary from the point of view of getting access, or even from the point of view of seaming improvement to build an East Coast Road at tremendous cost from the point of view of having all these little roads.

There is no community in the constituency of St. John that does not have proper access roads, even Glenburny, and water and electricity. Now, just to construct a road from Cattlewash to Consett Bay, without even investigating the engineering problems is, in my opinion, a waste of time. Before you embark on a financial liability like this you should go and get the reports. I am sure that in the 20 years that I have been representing the people of St. John, not one person has ever come to me and ask when you will build the East Coast Road from Cattlewash down to Consett Bay?

The fishermen were very concerned about the power outlet for sanding their boats and that kind of thing. They were very concerned that there was no light down there at night. They were concerned about the jetty. They were not concerned about a road and people driving at a high speed or any other speed in motor cars from Cattlewash down to Consett Bay thereby disturbing the calm and seclusion of those areas.

You can get to Consett Bay. You can get to Martin's Bay. You can get to Tent Bay. There is no reason why the Government should have it as any part of its priorities that they should construct a road along a railway line that has disappeared into the sea already. Everybody who has passed along there knows the erosion problems. The erosion problems are tremendous; and I am saying without any fear of contradiction that the people in St. John have never asked for it; so I do not want the hon. member to feel that he is doing anybody a favour or that he is going to relieve any unemployment, by building a road like that. There will be a cost to everyone else in the community. *(Asides).* It will not be the people

in St. John alone who will be paying for it and it will prove absolutely nothing. *(Asides).*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please, from the Government benches.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The other remarkable feature that I dealt with was the East Coast Road because I believe that it came up under Feasibility Studies. They want to spend money, and I can tell them before hand that I do not think we can afford it and I know that it is not necessary; but not everything that you say on a platform we must come in here with. We give you a little licence on a political platform, but when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money you have to be serious. So I do not want anybody to feel that they are doing us any favour. It is not going to get them any more votes in St. John anyhow; and even if they started now at Cattlewash, by 1981 the road will not even have reached Tent Bay, far less any part in St. John. So, do not let them waste any money extending the East Coast Road to St. John. The people of St. John want jobs and wherever there are jobs created in the island there must be jobs for the benefit of the people of St. John.

If they say that they are not going to discriminate, let them stop sending away people from the Marketing Corporation and from CBC and from all the other Statutory Boards. Do not start a liberalisation programme in St. John. We are liberal already so we do not want this kind of liberality on your part.
3.25 p.m.

Charity begins at home. Start in your own Corporations. The people who have to pay for motor cars, who have children to send to school, who have been unceremoniously dismissed by this Government for no reason at all except that they were not flag-wavers and card-carrying members of the Barbados Labour Party are suffering. Start your liberalisation there, and do not tell me how liberal you are going to be in St. John, even although the people did not vote for you. They are not going to vote for you anyhow, anytime, any place. Let us get the record straight on that. *(Asides.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have a little order on the Government benches. We have to try not to disturb the Reporters.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in September, 1976, the Government changed hands. Do not let us say how it changed, but the Government changed hands. No new Budget has been introduced. The only taxation measures that I can remember were in respect of the Repeal of the Retail Sales Tax, in my opinion, something that was unnecessary. The amount estimated from the Retail Sales Tax in a full financial year was $6 million. We had the spectacle of the Minister of Finance, the hon. member for St. Thomas, making a statement on television to the effect that he had been informed by the people in the World Bank that it did not matter because it was marginal; so we are in this state of luxury now in Barbados that $6 million in revenue is neither here nor there, according to him.

The thing I do not like is that there has never been a single word of corroboration of any of the pronouncements which he has made from time to time. Not a single word of corroboration. I would like to contradict the hon. member right now. He made a statement a couple of weeks ago that the Governor of the Central Bank had been directed not to publish some information that the Democratic Labour Party Government was cutting down on employment. I called up the Governor of the Central Bank and I said: If you say that – he did not say that he told the hon. member so – then you are the most diabolical liar that I have ever encountered in my life. I said, furthermore, I am going to say that I say you are the most diabolical liar. He said: "Well, I am a public servant, or the equivalent to a public servant, and I cannot make any comment either on what you have said or on what the present Minister of Finance has said." This is what we have degenerated to in Barbados where people are afraid to come out and speak the truth. If you want denials and corroboration you will get it. All of these statements that he comes out with in his own inimicable fashion – Do you know what I said to somebody? The hon. member for St. Michael West made a statement, I think, in here about how little children start crying when the hon. member goes on television, and it was not until I saw him the second time that I saw the resounding similarity between him and Barnabas Collins. There is no wonder that little children get terrified. The only thing that he does not possess that Barnabas Collins has is the two fangs protuding on either side of his face, and these, I believe, he is cultivating right now.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. I am suggesting to Your Honour that the hon. member is being insulting about the hon. member for St. Thomas now he is out of his seat. I know the hon. member finds it difficult not to be insulting because of not having

anything of substance to say, but at least he could raise the standard of the debate. After 25 years, at least, let us raise the standard of the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know whether he is objecting to my making the remarks, or that I have made them in the absence of the member for St. Thomas. I saw the remarkable resemblance between him and Barnabas Collins minus the fangs which I understand he may be cultivating now. I can repeat it. I am not afraid of zombies, or things that flutter in the night, or anything like that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the loss in retail sales tax is estimated for these few months at $2.75 million. Let us forget now the $6 million that we will not be able to collect in the Financial Year 1977–78. The immediate impact lost was $2.75 million and this, in the face of what he describes as a deficit of $68 million – that is what the hon. member said. He said that there was going to be a deficit of $68 million which he, by some miracle, without coming in here for taxation but by just taking off $2.75 million in retail sales tax, has generated so much activity in the country, not that the gross national product has itself increased by some $59 million, but that Government revenue has improved to that extent. The most spurious arguments that I have ever heard in my life adduced to try to establish something which he knows to be patiently and blatantly incorrect.

Now, he said that taxes, goods and services rose by $8 million. Quite a considerable part of Government revenue is derived from import duties. If the percentage of your tariff remains at the Common External Tariff level, let us take an average of 30%, and you are in an economy which is an importing economy and the prices of our manufactured imports go up by 50%, and let us say that you were only importing $100 million worth of goods. Now this is a joke, because we are importing about $350 million or $400 million of goods. The Central Bank's statistics will establish that. Let us assume for the moment that you are importing only $100 million worth of goods per annum and the price of your manufactured imports goes up due to no fault of your own. We are at the whims and fancies of these manufacturing economies in the United States, Canada, England, Germany and other places, who have been suffering from a high, although now reducing, rate of inflation down to about seven or eight percent in some places. If the price of your goods goes up 50%, not that it actually went up by 50% in all cases, but I am trying to establish something here in your own mind, Mr. Speaker, and your tariff is 30% which is a lower rate, because in some cases it is 50% and 52%, and you are importing a $100 million worth of goods; therefore, another $50 million on top of the import bill means 30% of $50 million more. That is $60 million. Now if it only went up by 25% and you were only importing $100 million worth of goods instead of $350 million or $380 million and the cost of your imports went up by 25% and your tariff is 30%, there is your $8 million.
3.35 p.m.

Now if it only went up by 25 percent and if you were only importing $100 million worth of goods instead of $350 million or $380 million and your tariff is 30 percent, there is your 8 percent. It has nothing to do with the Ministry of Finance, not even under my Ministry or anybody else because naturally your government revenue will rise commensurately in direct arithmetical progression with the cost of your imports. It has got to because we do not reduce the external tariff when the prices go up overseas, and in any state of international inflation there has to be a natural increment in your import duties. You have to reconcile these import figures with your Central Bank statistics on the amount of imports.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not need any explanation from the hon. member.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I want to explain...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You cannot explain what I am saying. I am the best person to explain that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would only try to explain something to the hon. member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know what he is trying to explain. I do not want any explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member for St. John giving way?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir. I did not make any statement about him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please continue your debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said that revenue collections were more than buoyant. I cannot read my own writing very well; I was trying to record the hon. member verbatim and I had to write very quickly. What the hon. member was saying as I understood him is that by removing the sales tax it generated a sort of state of activity in the country and therefore they were able to write off this deficit merely by removing the sales tax. There is a thing called elasticity of demand, and the 5 percent sales tax from the actual figures of the revenue derived from the sales tax, not something they were speculating on, did not lead to any reduction in the purchases of the commodities on which the tax was imposed. I should like to remind Your Honour that that tax was not on things like food or vitally essential commodities, and there was no falling off from the date of the imposition of the tax. The amount of revenue to be collected was estimated on the actual prevailing volume of sales at the time when the tax was imposed. The elasticity of demand therefore was unity. There was no falling off in the volume of sales as a result of the sales tax, but the sales tax was a kind of election gimmick, but the hon. member is now trying to get a virtue out of something which I consider to be most iniquitous, that is, the removal of the tax at a time when he knows that he is going to and has started already imposing more taxes in other directions on the poor and the rich taxpayers of this Island, like the airport tax. In other words, he removed the sales tax and to the uninitiated you just talk about removing the tax, but you do not talk about paying for the services.

Now the other feature about these Estimates is that the hon. member is now finding out that there are certain inescapable commitments which the Government has. Even in this Appropriation Bill which we are discussing at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, you know that the whole amount of $276 million we are not voting for. The Appropriation Bill, I believe, is less than half this amount shown in the Estimates, and 50 percent of the total expenditure as shown in the Draft Estimates would be $117 million for Civil Servants' salaries. That is where your trouble really is, that in a small community like this we are paying out for administrative salaries alone, nothing to do with back-props to administration such as water coolers, non-recurrent expenditure, stationery and so on, $117 million, but we do not vote for the total amount of expenditure because there are inescapables fixed by law which we do not vote for, because they have already been pre-ordained by legislation which this House has passed. So inevitably year after year, as I have said before, Government expenditure, unless you had large scale dismissals from the Civil Service, is going to rise. Government revenue does not always rise because you have certain inescapable commitments. Where you can save money is by making sure that either you do not allow them to insert these non-recurrent items at all, or even if they do insert them and they slip by you when you are preparing the Estimates, you have a curb on the non-recurrent items, but you can never spend less than $117 million; I would say that you can never spend less than $200 million because you have to pay for electricity, stationery and so on, but you can do without the water coolers, without motor cars for certain officials, you can do without refrigerators and you can cut down on burning lights all night at Government Headquarters and even in here in the Public Buildings. You can effect small economies in that way, but not to suggest that they are going to bring down some miracle of saving when in truth and in fact they have now come and asked the taxpayers of this country to find on recurrent account $80 million or $90 million more than we asked for last year. That is how they are going to cut down Government expenditure.

You can do without a Press Officer, but you are going to have a Press Officer. Those are the things where you can show your serious intentions. You can show your serious intentions by refusing to give Ministers or Backbenchers on either side of the House in so far as Backbenchers are concerned, or the Leader of the Opposition any increase in salary for the next three years, but a lot of them have now found out that far from Ministers living like millionaires that they have said they cannot stay in Government for longer than six months, some twelve months and some eighteen months. So the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Finance is going to find himself with a one arm band, with all these legal luminaries who now say they cannot live on Minister's salaries, unless he placates them by setting up this charade of a Commission of Enquiry into Parliamentary salaries I would like to know if the Commission decides to reduce the salaries whether they would accept it or they would not all walk out of the ministerial benches. I think it is an insult to Parliament to bring in some people from outside when we are the supreme authority here....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order. I am warning hon. members about something called interfering with the work of the Reporters. It is

being made extremely difficult for them to produce.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is also a rule about interfering with members when they are speaking too. Now I hear the Reporters are more important than members.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can continue. I will take good care of you.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if you take good care of me in the same way that I have taken good care of you in the past, I will have absolutely nothing to fear. I am in good hands.

But I would like to come back to the point. Your Honour will appreciate that there are certain inescapable commitments which a Government has and these are things which are fixed by law. We are not even being asked to vote on these items today, although in the aggregate of the estimates of expenditure these items are included.
3.45 p.m.

We are not being asked to vote for them here today in the Appropriation Bill because we have voted for them already, when we did the salaries revision we voted them. When we fixed the salaries for members of the legal service we voted for them, we cannot come back here, except by a substantive Bill, and change them, therefore we should be watching with a great deal of care the blandishments which are put up to us by various sectors of the public service for expenditure on items which will make them a little more comfortable in their offices. They have to resist some of this, and what invariably happens is that when we actually get in full swing in the financial year they then find out that they have to cut down on these items, so why put them in at all?

We have had to go through the Estimates from year to year with a great deal of scrutiny. Let us take the police cars. The police always want new vehicles. When they smash vehicles they are usually replaced by the Central Insurance Committee. What I do not understand is this. There has been no pronouncement on the total mechanisation of the Barbados Police Force, I think that they are reasonably well equipped with motor vehicles, but every year they come for 10 or 12 new vehicles. I forget how many they have, perhaps one of my colleagues can look it up and tell me, they either want a new duplex system of VHF communication or at least a dozen new vehicles, and I regret to say that with other Government Departments as well sometimes before we even discuss the Estimates in here they have already gone and picked out the vehicles, I would not like to say ordered them, that only happens in the Fire Service, but the police have invariably picked out the new vehicles. They can tell you that they want two Vanguards, look in the Estimates and see. How they know they want Vanguards? How do they know that the Vanguard is the best vehicle? Did they have an independent appraisal of the right type of vehicle for the Barbados Police Force? Other police forces are using Volkswagons, even the New York Police, but you cannot get a police driver to drive in a Volkswagon in Barbados, not even on pleasure. (Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Criticise them). M.Gs and that kind of thing. You tell me about criticising the police, I am a member of Parliament and I am discussing Estimates, if a policeman wants to arrest me wrongfully let him try. I do not have to do like you and sort of pander just to get a few votes and that kind of thing, I am discussing principle and I say we have to watch expenditure.

There are certain things that they feel are indispensible, which I know from experience they can very well do without. For the whole time that I was Minister of Finance, for the whole entire period every year the police said they must have a new system of VHF communication. There was a former officer in the Police Force who is a representative of one of the big electronic firms and he would produce some very persuasive arguments that they should have what they called a duplex system at all the stations, and that kind of thing, but in a small country like ours we do not have to have the most sophisticated systems if we could make do with the systems we have. That is my principle, but the point which I was making at that juncture was a very simple one, which is this, that we have inescapable commitments but we also have items of non-recurrent expenditure that we have to watch very carefully.

This is not a budget, the budget whenever it comes, if it comes at all, should be concerned about how you are going to close this $50 million gap between revenue and expenditure, as the hon. member for St. Thomas has now discovered. I have said over and over again I do not believe in raising Treasury Bills, local loans or foreign inscribed stock on the London market or anywhere else to pay salaries or for any item of recurrent or non-recurrent expenditure. That is counter productive and can only lead to disaster. We have got to learn in this country whether we are members of Parliament or whether we are public officials, or whether we are people in

Broad Street, to live within our means. You can expand it by developing the productive sectors of the country, by developing the infrastructure and all this infrastructural balance, as I will outline to you have been laid down already, therefore we can go ahead with our essential Capital developments which will create more jobs during the construction period and permanent employment thereafter. That is what we have to concentrate on, but to come in here and try to score a lot of cheap points in a congratulatory kind of way and use our Estimates, our Approved Estimates, my budget of 1976 and to say it is because you have been in office without coming in here with a single item of constructive financial legislation to raise any money, and say because you have removed the sales tax of $2.75 million that the whole thing has sort of blossomed forth and the economy is now in a state of buoyancy or rejuvenation, and all that kind of Tommy rot that I have heard here today, it is not worthy of a serious Chamber of the antiquity of the Barbados House of Assembly.

It is not like we have now discovered parliamentary procedures like some of the people who just got independence like Angola and places like that, we have had it for over 300 years, and to come in here and insult the intelligence not only of the members of Parliament but of the general public..... *(Asides)*... The hon. member now is objecting to my saying that we had a parliamentary institution for 300 years. In his arithmetic the hon. member mentioned this. $26 million deficit on last year's Estimates, $13 million supplementaries, he says, $12 million in increased civil service salaries, add therefore $42 million and $26 million, you get a total deficit, let us say, of $68 million which has been reduced to $9 million.

I would like to ask the hon. member a simple question, quite apart from the illustration that I have given in rising prices, what happened to the $18 million surplus? If you are doing all these calculations when in 1976–77 you had budgeted even for that year for a deficit and then when you get into 1977, which we are still in, you have $18 million surplus, what happened to that? It is a rhetorical question, but what happened to that? This does not come in anywhere in his calculations of $68 million and he says now it is the retail sales tax which the World Bank people told him is marginal, but you know, if I still used to go to the World Bank I would ask Mr. McNamara to have these people critically examined if they can look at an economy like Barbados' and to take, say $6 million in tax, which they themselves strongly advocated, not necessarily the same personnel, but certainly World Bank personnel, at the time of our crisis and to turn around and say now that that is neither here nor there.

3.55 p.m.

But if this is the kind of reckless approach which the hon. member has to the financial problems of this island, I think that we are in for a good rough time. I know that all of us are in for a good rough time. I think that all of us must deprecate that he is trying to solve his present difficulties and trying to grasp with the economic and financial problems of this island by what he describes as the mismanagement of the economy under the past administration; but he still has the same Permanent Secretaries no matter how he tries to shuffle them around. He still has the same people in the Treasury. He still has the same Governor of the Central Bank; but all of them are sitting down wriggling under the dictates of the Minister of Finance; but those are the people who are advising you now. Let the hon. member ask how much advice they have given me, how much I accepted, and how much I rejected.

The hon. member is always saying that somebody told him this and somebody told him that. This is the way he sees Barbados, the people of Barbados as some four or five year olds because they cannot understand what he says, like a child that you give a toy on which you can stamp on and jump up. *(Laughter).* That is the way that he gets on. That is the way he gets on all the time – this is the same gentleman who I understand when he was defeated as Secretary of the West Indians Students Union burst into tears and said that he could not understand because he was the son of the former Federal Prime Minister. Now he wants to treat us in the same way.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. The hon. member is being irrelevant. My submission is that a reference to the West Indies Students Union is as irrelevant as the reference to when he was given out and breaking up the bat and taking up the stumps.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two wrongs cannot make a right. Please confine yourself to the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sometimes in cricket if you give the wrong decision, stumps are drawn. So there is nothing wrong about that. *(Laughter).*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has never played a game in his life, so he would not know.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said that borrowing money for current account purposes is not part of his strategy. Hon. members will recall that those were almost precisely the words when the salaries revision was introduced here by me last year. I said that you cannot borrow money to pay salaries, and I repeat it here today. It does not take any genius to realise that. If you go on borrowing money for consumption – it is one of the greatest things that happened in Barbados when the supermarkets decided that they were not giving credit; and it is not a gain to the supermarkets, but to the people who spend money at the supermarkets; because I contend that anybody who has to trust food is either throwing away their money in other directions or they are not earning enough money; and the cure for that is to give them more money. You do not credit for consumption.

There might be a period in your life when you might be out of a job or something, and a person with whom you were doing business for a period of time, he might decide to respond to your request for credit over a period of time; but primarily what we are discussing today are the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure; and you cannot go on with the policy of inflating your expenditure because we do not have the courage to say that there must be a halt to unnecessary expenditure and that a few people should not have too high a standard over the rest of the community.

You cannot go on borrowing money to pay people. You should borrow money so future generations can see the result of what you have invested in; and the hon. member decided that today. He was speaking of the national debt of Barbados before elections and not of the national debt now. He is saying that he will not have to spend $103 million, but may be $65 million.

It is nothing more than I have been saying all the time. The absorbtive capacity of the economy of Barbados, both as regards management and personnel; and one of the unsatisfactory things about developing countries like ours is that they did not produce a wide spectrum of development goods because the minimum that we spend on development is about 50% of the money that we spend to provide employment for people in the developed countries.

I see that now today the Minister of Communications and Works has signed a new contract. It must be a new contract because I remember signing one. I do not know if he signed this one somewhere down in Boscobelle or somewhere else because I signed a contract and the gentleman shook my hand and said that he would get it finished before May this year. Now I hear that we have reclaimed 13 acres more land than the former Government. Well, you know we have a coral foundation. We had calculated coral at a certain depth. Until you get to that depth you cannot stop dredging. They may have miscalculated the amount of cubic yards that it would take to full up than they anticipated; and this is now being elevated into a stroke of genius on the part of the person who signed this new contract. You would not believe that this work started in August, because this is the new speech that I am hearing; because I believe that when there is a review every Sunday night and it is like when they have the Horse Guards Parade when the Queen sits sideways on a horse and the guard riders parade in front of her. So we see a parade of Government Ministers every Sunday night.

It is nothing to do with Barbadians achieving anything in Barbados, nothing to do with the achievements of our CARICOM partners, but speeches read by the Ministers and we have to look upon their countenances or we have to go and get a drink and hope that the programme finishes before you come back in. It is purely the Minister of Finance praising the Minister of Communications and Works for signing a contract for dredging the deep water harbour. I do not believe that I was in Barbados, and getting 13 more acres of land, which as I have said, if they could find somewhere....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it has taken me five minutes to understand what the hon. member is saying. I never said that the Minister of Communications and Works signed any contract. The hon. member is misquoting me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I wonder if the hon. member would tell us what he did say.

Mr. SPEAKER: He will have the opportunity to wind up the debate.
4.05 p.m.

I have written down what the hon. member said: "that as a result of the hon. Minister of Communications signing this contract." That is exactly what I have here on line 18.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I do not know whether the hon.

member has that written down or not, but I would ask him to look again and read his handwriting. He might have seen that I said I was praising the Minister for the way in which he was executing the contract. That is what I actually said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not know that it was his firm when I signed the contract. He is now the engineer. I would like to congratulate him myself. *(Asides.)* Mr. Aggregates Construction Limited. I will pass on because I think the hon. member has now said that it is the way he actually carried out the contract and not the way that he signed it. The Minister of Finance went on to say that the true development equation of Seafoods and Bath Plantation, as these two will cost the Government more than all of the other projects such as the Airport – I have already dealt with Seafoods, Sir. Let me come to Bath which is in my constituency. I would like to get the position clear. He made mention of friends. I do not have any friends when I am working for the Government. *(Asides.)* He said the true development equation is that these two projects will cost the Government in this Financial Year – it will not cost the Government anything, Sir. The Government had decided to take over Bath Plantation. The project did not come off. It was a $40 million development to take place in St. John with land settlement and jobs for about two or three thousand people. I make no apology for the guaranteeing of the loan for Bath Plantation, which the Government now had decided to own and turn over to my arch enemy, the gentleman who slaughters cows in St. John by the name of Mr. Nigel Reece. They decided to turn over Bath Plantation to him. It is all right with me.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I would draw to Your Honour's attention, and indeed I had better draw it to the attention of the hon. member, that his remarks about the slaughtering of cows in St. John may be *sub judice* because I understand that a defamation suit is being brought against the hon. member in respect of that remark by the gentleman to whom he refers. I would respectfully draw to Your Honour's attention that this is going on.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What is interesting about the hon. member and his defamation suits is that the person against whom the suits are to be brought is the last to know. You cannot stop me from speaking about Reece. You brought him on television in 1971.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must address his remarks to the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in 1971 the hon. member brought Mr. Reece on television; paraded him before the viewers to say that the Government was neglecting agriculture.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am submitting the hon. member is being irrelevant, Sir. Mr. Reece in 1971 has nothing to do with this debate, for the simple reason the hon. member is saying that something was turned over to Mr. Reece. It is a fact that the ADC is looking after that Plantation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to hear what he has to say.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This gentleman, who is now Chairman of the Agriculture Development Corporation, and who claimed that the Government was not spending any money on agriculture now, as Chairman he may not have seen the Estimates, but the amount put in for Agricultural Development is less than half of what we had put in in 1976–77. Let Mr. Reece bring his defamation suits. I would welcome.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not worry with the defamation suits. Let us get on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Something is *sub judice* when it is in court, and I can say in here.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. John get on with the debate, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is part of the debate. Barbados has been pushed back for at least 40 years when you have people like David Seale and Nigel Reece presiding over our destiny – people who have been rejected by the people of St. John a long time ago either as representatives or anything else.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not try to be irrelevant now.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not trying, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are succeeding.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: In so far as the Inter-American Development Bank is concerned, the hon. member for St. Thomas said that the Bank had made funds available for three projects, two of them educational: the Polytechnic and the Community College. Again, this facility which the hon. member has for quoting people who are not there to represent themselves. He said that he had been informed that our educational planning is overbalanced; that 70% of our funds are allocated for educational purposes while it should be the other way round. I want to take the hon. member up on that. This is an argument I have heard before. In 1962 I went up to London and I had a discussion with Mr. Duncan Sands, son-in-law of Sir Winston Churchill who was then Secretary of States for the Colonies. *(Asides.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order on the Government benches.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not see anything to cheer about that. I do not have any respect for Mr. Duncan Sands or any Conservative but I .....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please continue with the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The subject of the discussion was exchequer loans for developing countries like Barbados. What I was trying to persuade Mr. Duncan Sands to do at that time was to get his colleagues to agree that developing countries like Barbados should not have to go on the London money market to compete for loans at a time when it was getting very difficult, but that the British Government should make loans available in the same way that the IADB and the Canadian Government make loans now directly available to the Government of Barbados. I was trying to persuade the Conservative Government in England to make Government to Government loans directly available. Mr. Duncan Sands picked up our Estimates which somebody had sent in to him obviously before the interview and said that we were spending too much money on education, and that if we could afford to spend so much money on education he could not recommend to his colleagues that Barbados needed any development money.

Now here is the Minister of Finance for Barbados telling us today not only that people in the IADB, who have already approved the loans and who did not have to approve them, say 70% of their total project loans are for education and it should be the other way around. But in his furtherance of his policy of trying to run down everything even by officials far less the Ministers in the Planning Unit in the Ministry of Education, I get the impression, and I do not want to put it higher than that, that he agrees. If this is what they said and it is not a figment of his own imagination, that he agrees that 70% of the project loans should not be for education and that it should be the other way around.

Now, the point I wish to make is this: If you have projects you will decide on your priorities. If the Inter-American Bank does not agree with your priorities, the Inter-American Bank is free to say that we do not agree with your priorities.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. Duncan Sands did not agree with our priorities and the result was, like before I had tried to get the Exchequer loan, I went back on the market and raised the money in five minutes. Mr. Duncan Sands said we were spending too much money on education, and I proceeded to tell Mr. Duncan Sands that we had human beings in Barbados and that our people were able to go all over the world and get professionally qualified, and it was because of our educational system which I claimed no credit for at that time or at all. I used this word – I do not even know if it is a word in the English language – but I said "Mr. Secretary of State, are you then suggesting to me that before we get an Exchequer loan that I must start a policy of illiteratisation of the people of Barbados." In other words, put the whole education process in reverse. Whatever you understand by it is what I mean. That is what I told Mr. Duncan Sands, and Sir John Stow the then Governor of Barbados was present at the meeting, and the result is that Mr. Duncan Sands set up his face and we did not hear anything more about any Exchequer loan and none of us in the Caribbean have ever been the recipient of an Exchequer loan except Montserrat; but I felt in the same way the Canadian Government could make a direct Government to Government loan available for development, the British Government should have done, and they have never done it, but here it is today the Minister of Finance in Barbados is saying that he has been told by an international institution to which we pay subscriptions that

our emphasis is wrong, that we should not have 70 percent of our loans devoted to education.

Now let us look at it another way, Mr. Speaker. Quite apart from the fact that they approve the loans for the Community College and for the Polytechnic, and I think most of us in here are agreed probably with the exception of the Minister of Finance and Planning that we have got to do something about technical education in Barbados; but they approved them, so if we had other projects that would have given the kind of relationship or ratio, all they had to do was to approve the other projects and cut down on them. *(Asides)* You are asking them to cut down on education.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member is leading himself further and further down the path of misrepresenting my motives.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please state the point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He is reflecting on my motives by misrepresenting what I said. I have said that we are aiming to get loans to bring other developments up to 70 percent of the total amount, not that I am cutting down the educational loan to bring that down to 30 percent. That is what I carefully said in my speech and if he was as careful a note taker as he pretends, he would have it there.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: So he is going to have 70% + 70% which is 140 percent. Let me try and understand the hon. member. The point I am making is that. Why does he make the point at all? Now we have a sewage project which is I.A.D.B.; we have the Harbour which is I.A.D.B., then we have the Community College and the Polytechnic. Now I do not necessarily accept his figures that the two educational projects represent 70 percent of our total loans, but are you going to inflate the cost of the Harbour and the cost of the Bridgetown sewage project just so that it would get 70 percent or would you have new projects? He said he has new projects. What is the magic in that kind of percentage? You get your loans according to your priorities and towards your accepted priorities, not that there is any magic formula between education and anything else, and I personally consider education, particularly education of the nature which we will be providing in the Polytechnic and in the Community College of much more importance than the sort of physical increase in the 106,000 acres of Barbados by some 33 acres, because we could probably hold strain there for another two years so far as our shipping accommodation is concerned. It is necessary to do it now so that it does not cost us more later on, but what about all the young people leaving the primary schools and so on who are only half educated that we are trying now to make them more adaptable and give them a greater currency at the work place and have more flexibility in the kind of jobs they can choose and their earning capacity. So to trot our figures about the I.A.D.B. saying that we have put 70 percent, it is not that they say, here is $50 million, do what you like with it. Project after project has to be critically examined and between the date of submission of your application for something to be done in a country such as Barbados, a member country of the Organisation of American States and the Inter-American Development Bank and the actual signing of the agreement is something like three to four years; and they send down teams and reams of people and paper backwards and forwards between Barbados and Washington before you begin to see any kind of implementation of those projects. Now you are going to tell us that you had 70 percent on education as if they said here is $100 million and we decided to spend $70 million on education and $30 million on the Deep Water Harbour and the Bridgetown sewage plant. It is a joke. It is the kind of unnecessary statement which means nothing to say that you would like to see it 70:30. I would like to see it at probably 100:10, if we have $30 million allocated to education and we can get another $300 million for other development. Why pick on 70:30 and twist the figures around and reverse them just as if you are playing some kind of domino game? This is not dominoes; this is serious business. This is not poker or dominoes or any kind of gambling industry; this is serious Government business we are doing and to trot out these figures because it sounds good on a public platform is not good enough for us in here. We are thinking people and I make no apology for the policy of the Government of which I happened to have been the Chairman of the Cabinet for spending that kind of money or that proportion of the loan on educational purposes because I consider that that is the best kind of investment we have ever had in the Island of Barbados.

I come now to location. There are a few unenlightened people in the Ministry of Communications and Works who shall be nameless. I think the Rules of this House provide that you should write to the Speaker if you want to criticise. I am not like the hon. member criticising the Commissioner of Police; I am not

naming anybody. We have people in Barbados when we got the team down from Washington who are responsible for holding up the scheme that should have been implemented about three years ago, because they told the people from I.A.D.B. who come off desk up there that you could not build in Martindales Road because it was a swamp and it was subject to flooding. They went all over the Island looking for alternative sites and wasting a lot of time and eventually I.A.D.B. experts came back and agree with us that for sociological, economic, transportation and other reasons the Martindales Road site, although it would cost for pile driving in their opinion $200,000 or $300,000 more, if you were prepared to pay, – you had to consider people catching two lots of buses with night classes and that kind of thing – that the Polytechnic should be built there. A model was actually prepared and the hon. member must have that model in his possession or somewhere at Government headquarters, but do not forget that there were some of our people who probably would not like to see a Polytechnic at all, some of them carrying members of the hon. member's party; some of them attend executive meetings. *(Asides)* Sandiford is a car carrying members of your party?

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let us have any cross talk.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You know who I mean too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. John address the Chair?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir. People who are not qualified for the positions which they now hold. We have too many jobs in Barbados that have been vacant with people sitting down in the chairs for a long time. That is the problem.
4.25 p.m.

That is the problem. Now after approving that, approving the loan, approving the site, doing the architecture, producing the model, because there is somebody in the public service whose original ideas were not accepted, the hon. member tells me that he is carrying the polytechnic up to Wildey, just to show that they had a different site, and I maintain that until you build this polytechnic in St. Peter or St. Lucy, and in Christ Church or St. Philip, that you are going to have young people travelling 10 and 11 o'clock in the night from all over this country, and if you can go and put a polytechnic up in Wildey you will have people 'thumbing' at your car, Sir, and you would not be able to help them, although you might want to accommodate them, but they would have already missed the bus, so from sociological and economical reasons I think the polytechnic should remain in town.

Where is the University Polytechnic? In Holder's Green? The most important polytechnic in the United Kingdom is situated right next to Oxford Street, next to the transportation centre; Northampton Polytechnic the same thing, nobody takes a polytechnic and puts it out in the outlying States of Bridgetown, or London, or New York. You do not put it in Westchester County or across the Hudson River, your educational institutions especially for young people who are not residential should be situated near your transportation facilities, but I can only come to the conclusion that this is another of the ploys of the Minister of Finance that whatever the Democratic Labour Party recommended they wish to do it differently so they will say now this is a new contract, a different polytechnic, so they will have to redesign the whole thing. It means that we will have to wait until the year Kingdom Comes before getting that educational institution.

There has already been too much delay in the construction of the polytechnic, far too much delay, and it is due to the inefficiency and the ineptitude of the pure, crass ignorance of some of the people in the public service who were giving the experts from Washington wrong time all the time for reasons best known to themselves, and I make no apology for saying that, and we know it is so and they are not fooling anybody. I am maintaining that that is a bad concept to put the polytechnic at Wildey unless you are going to have one in Bridgetown as well, as to say you are going to put it down in Martins Bay. I do not want any polytechnic in Martins Bay, we need a secondary school, we do not need any polytechnic in St. John, we need a secondary school. *(Asides).* The people of St. John will get a representative of a different calibre from the member for St. Thomas when they are ready. I am saying, Sir, that this is another bad concept. It is going to delay the implementation of the project even though it has been deliberately delayed already, and it is going to enure to the disadvantage of the students who will attend for very obvious reasons. The only people who can profit from the proximity of the polytechnic are people who will be living in Clapham and in Pinelands, but they are only a small percentage of the population, and they will find it much easier to get home from Martindales Road or Constitution Road than the people who live in

St. Peter, St. Philip or Christ Church will find it to get even from that first chosen location.

I now turn, Sir, to Communications and Works. The Minister said that there were two major developments, both associated with overseas aid, one, the Bridgetown Harbour Road – he said along the line of the old Spine Road – two major new developments, and then the member for St. Thomas explained how he and some of the other Ministers and some of the public officials had walked from Brandons to Black Rock along this supposed new road. Sir, he said it was along the line, he does not mean the physical line, but along the line, I suppose, of the old Spine Road, and this is supposed to be a new development, and that they have international finance for this project.

I think that there ought to be a little more communication between the Ministers of the present Government and their officials, unless all of a sudden they have been struck dumb. If they would only communicate with them and ask them what had been happening they would save themselves a lot of walking and a lot of trouble, and they would probably save the people of this country a lot of money.

The Physical Development Plan was presented in July, 1976, and in the Physical Development Plan at page 80 we deal with Phased Road Works Programme, and the road works proposed for Phase I, the first five-year period as shown in Drawing No. 8.3 and in Appendix 8.4 are: 1, 2, and I am going to 3: "Acquire the necessary land and construct a Link Road from Fontabelle Road – Dead End to Deacons Road." That has been done, just completed. The Minister was able to walk along it, so he does not need any international finance for that.

Let us go on now to page 81. The road works proposed for Phase 4, "Construct a second carriageway (2 lanes in each direction) of spine road from President Kennedy Drive to Black Rock, and extend as a 2–lane road to Thorpes." (Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: You abandoned that). No, we abandoned the Spine Road coming through Bayville, coming through James Street and coming through here, but my Ministers and I, the Minister of Lands, the Minister of Trade, we also traversed this comparatively recently, just over a year ago, and we asked the Crown Solicitor to open negotiations with either Shell or Texaco for the acquisition of approximately 35 acres of land, which is all in the Development Plan, to site a new industrial estate off the harbour. Now I see that this is a new project. We have never at any time abandoned the road from Lands End to Black Rock; at no time. Furthermore, they can check with the Crown Solicitor who was present on all occasions and he would inform them that he was given instructions for the acquisition of the land.

I have heard the criticism here today that we did not carry out this or carry out that. The road to Warrens had been surveyed during our regime and we got some of the land owners to agree to give up the land for nothing. The improvements from St. Barnabas as a Ring Road are all in the Development Plan, but I just want to explain something that they must know. We initiate action on these things, they do not all come to fruition at one and the same time because negotiations have to be conducted, as the hon. member for Christ Church would know – which part of Christ Church I am not sure, the one that embraces Oistins – but we have been trying to get acquisition of all the houses on the sea front for the Oistins improvement for months now. When I read in the papers that we had set up a committee and had done nothing that was a big joke, because Mr. Maurice Foley, the Commissioner for the European Economic Community Development Fund came down to Barbados and decided that funding of the Oistins development was one of the priorities which he would recommend to the Fund, and it was approved.
4.35 p.m.

But everyday is the beginning of creation as far as they are concerned. Nothing happened in Barbados before them. So now they say that we did not do anything. The hon. member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Finance, accuses us of not being able to get through the amount of money which he himself also admits that he cannot get through in one year. He says that it is $102 million and he can only spend $65 million. I have already explained that there is no point having a big flurry of activities when you have to have engineering studies and all that kind of thing and unless you have the technical man power and the technical personnel available to make sure that your money is not wasted.

They said that we did not do anything at the Airport or at the Port. They say that because we did not start bulldozing and knocking down the tanks at Texaco. Therefore, we did not do anything down there. We bought that land long before they imagined when they were in the Opposition that that land could be developed. When they were in the Opposition they never

came forward with a Development Plan of their own; but for the last 15 years the Opposition never made one suggestion on any Development Plan that we have produced and they never voted against it. All the development planning which was done over the years was done by the Ministry over which I had control, and there was no development planning before that, absolutely none. There was not even a Ministry of Finance and there was not a Ministry of Development.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to go through item by item all the things that we will be dealing with during the course of the debate in Committee stage. I just want to say this in conclusion. I understand that a letter was written to the Leader of the Opposition, very kindly inviting him to name the items or the particular Heads of the Estimates that we want to discuss. *(Aside).* Oh, it was said in the House; but that is how it was in the newspaper. Imagine me making that offer to you, Sir, as the hon. member for St. Peter, and tell me what your reply would be.

We want to discuss them as we come to them. If you do not want to discuss all, then they can pass on; but because they have not done their homework, they want us to give them 24 hours notice. I have no apology to make. For the last 15 years public servants had to present themselves whenever they thought that it was likely that a Head for which they were responsible would come up. They can continue that way. I am not misled by the generosity about telling them what we want to discuss and that we must give them 24 hours notice. They have never learned about Government and they will have to learn it the hard way.

They will have to answer our questions as they come up during the course of the debate and they will have to have their information ready, accurate and correct.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with many things as a result of what has been said so far both by the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. member who has just sat down. The first thing that attracted my attention and caused me considerable concern was the revelation made by the Prime Minister of the fact that we will only be spending about $65 million out of the $102 million which he has estimated for capital projects in the year ahead and that this is an unsatisfactory state of affairs.

He has given the reason that the country does not have enough technical manpower in order for the economy to be able to absorb that sort of money within the year ahead. For too long we in this country have been hearing, like many developing countries, that Barbados does not have enough technical manpower, enough administrative and technical expertise in order to implement development projects at a great pace; and it seems to me that listening to the two former speakers, that it has been accepted on both sides as a state of affairs about which we can do nothing.

I feel that the time has come for us in this country to revise the whole manpower training scheme to cover the next 15 years. It should have been done a long time ago so that we could plan securely for the next 15 or 20 years in this country without having to concern ourselves too much with whether we have para-engineering, para-medical or para-legal skills and that we have the requisite number of technicians in order to allow us to implement our development programme.

This, Mr. Speaker, reflects on our educational programme over the last many years. The Democratic Labour Party, it seems to me, was quantity orientated as far as Education is concerned. They gave more, but the more was neither relevant nor better and to a large extent the urgent requirement seems to be to see that in the future our Education is more and more relevant to our development goals to the point where in future we can plan securely with the knowledge that the plan can be implemented because we have the administrative and technical expertise to carry through the programmes.

This brings me to focus on the training programme for the year ahead; and I see that we only intend to spend about $95,000 more on training. I have never been so impressed in the past by the training programme, but it seems to me that in terms of the development programme in the years ahead we are going to have to restructure the priorities of the training programme and make sure that we have the necessary trained manpower to carry out these schemes to the point where we will not be coming and hearing the Hon. Prime Minister as we heard the hon. member for St. John repeating with composure and complacency that the economy just does not have the absorbtive capacity to implement proposals voted for.

I have heard that from the time I was a boy, and now I am an old boy; and it seems to me that if we are not careful my generation will pass away and a lot of things in this country will not

be achieved; because it seems to me to be almost a conspiracy to accept certain situations as though it is impossible to change them.

I am concerned, too, with the fact that only $4 million has been provided for Housing in the Estimates. Ever since I started speaking on public platforms in this country, way back in 1971, I made it clear that Housing, as far as I was concerned – and I think that my party has supported that, and the Barbados Workers' Union has supported that – Housing is an urgent social priority in this country.

This administration has the responsibility. This generation too has the responsibility to see to it that about 50,000 people of this country are rehoused in the next 10 years. That is the sort of social priority that must be pursued in this country with the zeal of a religious crusade. I have made that clear in the last six years, and I have been disappointed to see the sort of modest funds that have been provided for Housing under the last administration and now at the beginning of this administration.
4.45 p.m.

But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is really a more fundamental one, and it relates to the methodology of public financing in this country. It makes no sense continuing the discussion in traditional terms. I believe that a large majority of the people in this country, who are under 25 years, are anxious to see it in their time, and indeed before the turn of the century, that we have a National Pension Scheme in this country, that we have adequate and free Health Services, that we have an expanded National Insurance Scheme, that we have proper housing, and not the sub-standard units in which it has been the misfortune of many a fellow Barbadian to live. These things can only be done if new techniques of public financing are found in this country. What then are we going to do? Looking ahead and taking a prospective view, it seems to me that in the next three or four years we will either have to increase taxation, which has already reached a penal level in this country severely, or alternatively that we will have to borrow if, indeed, there will be anyone to lend us, or we will have to take other steps which I do not want to mention and which are clearly undesirable.

Now, if we are to maintain our limited sovereignty, it seems to me that we are going to have to devise ways and means from within of financing these Welfare Schemes and projects which I have mentioned a minute or two ago. Clearly, the International Lending Institutions are not going to lend at all, unless they are able to order the priorities for you. I think that this has been hinted at when the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister mentioned that he has been told by IADB that 70% of their lending has been spent on education and that this represents a sort of imbalance. The IMF is lending to Great Britain and Great Britain is paying a tremendous price for borrowing because of the fact that they are telling Callaghan and the British Labour Party administration the sort of priorities that they will have to follow. Increasingly as we borrow, we will be told by these International Agencies what we will have to spend the money on and what they will lend us for. I believe it has already been said by one such International Agency that Barbados does not need any housing, and we do not need any money for housing.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, our people are not going to accept people from overseas determining our priorities for us and telling us the sort of goals that we should set ourselves and the pace at which we should implement those goals. What I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker is that we ought to consider in this country quite seriously the idea that there ought to be three funds in this country contributed to both by employers and employees. In the same way as we have a National Insurance Fund and that Fund has given us several millions of dollars over the years to point where we have been able to use some of that money for other development projects, and in the same way as the people have come to accept making a contribution every week to the National Insurance Fund as a way of life, I believe that the people of this country, too, will come to accept making a contribution.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was making the point before you ascended the throne, as it were, that in the same way as the people of this country come to accept making a contribution when the week comes on an employer/employee basis to the National Insurance Fund, in the same way, I believe, they will come to accept making a contribution on an employer/employee basis to a Housing Fund, and they will further come to accept making a contribution on a employer/employee basis to a Health Fund. I believe that these techniques of public financing are utterly saleable. The Public Relations of that are not beyond the reaches of this administration or, indeed, any administration. In the same way as the National Insurance Fund, I believe, already

has provided us with over $85 million in a few years and with enough money that we have had some to lend to other sectors, I believe that the Housing Fund will give us enough money to carry through the re-housing Programme in the next 10 years – re-housing something like 50,000 people in the next 10 years. I believe, too, from that Fund we can have a surplus to attend to other areas of the economy.

This is a bit of different thinking. I do not want to talk of new things because the older you get the more you will find out that there is scarcely anything new under the sun, but it is certainly a bit of different thinking on public financing coming from poor savings. I believe, too, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it will only be saleable if we reduce the present penal levels of taxation, and revise the taxation system at the same time as you introduce the Fund so as to make sure that the present high rates do not continue.

It seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we need more planning and more consent in this country. More people have to be involved in the planning stages of the future of this economy. It seems to me to be a mistake, and I am glad that the last speaker mentioned that the former administration did not only consist of himself and his front bench and back bench, but also of the same Permanent Secretaries, the same Director of National Insurance, the same Governor of the Central Bank, and the same bureaucracy to which he sometimes refers in other language which I will not now repeat.
4.55 p.m.

It is an important point because in my respectful submission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is excessive reliance in this country on the civil service to fertilise the social and political process; the same civil servants who are at it day after day. If I may divert for a moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are fortunate in life if you have a single idea of any use. A man, any man, is fortunate if he has one single idea of any use, and assuming that several civil servants had ideas, I suspect that those ideas have long since been spent and we need to draw from a larger pool as far as the ideas to fertilise the social and political system in this country are concerned.

What I am proposing here is nothing new. I have from the early Sixties held the view, I would confess it is some little time after the Barbados Workers' Union expressed the same view, because if my memory serves me right it was about 1961 that the Barbados Workers' Union was calling for a broad-based national planning council, call it what you like – social economic planning council, national productivity council, it does not matter, but in calling for more planning and more consent and for a departure from the excessive reliance on the bureaucracy to carry the entire system, the time has come to set up a broad-based institution – I do not care what you call it – and allow more people to participate, and I am sure that more ideas are bound to get into circulation which can do nothing but help the country.

It seems to me that if we are to move towards the new technique of funding that I have spoken about, we will need the participation and indeed the approval, though it can always be forced down them, of employers, and at the point of planning it we can have them involved by way of having them sit on this broad-based Committee or commission or body which I have been talking about. In fact, they themselves might even be able to improve it or refine it, but certainly to make it more acceptable both to the employers and to the employees.

I just want, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to conclude by saying that my generation in this country will not be content to see the Seventies and the Eighties pass away and this piecemeal tinkering approach to social engineering continues. Bold steps will have to be taken in this country to satisfy my generation and the one behind me, and we have got to address our minds to new approaches of finding money, and it cannot come from direct taxation which has already reached penal levels, as I have said before, and we are going to have to think in terms of the creation of the several funds which I have spoken about. It is at this stage only an idea; clearly it will need refining perhaps, but that is no reason why some bright person from the other side or even some person not so bright should want to lick it out of the arena. What we need at this stage is to have the system fertilised; more and more ideas need to be thrown into the pool, and it can only be done if there is a departure from the already excessive reliance on a tired bureaucracy.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, whenever we have Estimates in this Honourable Chamber, there is a traditional approach to the presentation, and usually we find that explanations and excuses are offered for the increase in Government expenditure. It is interesting to recall that the present party in power during their campaign at election time and subsequent to that talked a lot about cutting out

wastage, increasing efficiency leading to a decrease in the cost of administration and eventually leading to a reduction in taxation. I would like to believe that the party in power has identified the areas where wastage and inefficiency have occurred and if that is so, I would also believe that they have omitted this type of expenditure thereby occurring from such areas. The fact that the Estimates have increases makes me think otherwise, and because they have increased, one has to look at one or two deductions. Either there has been no wastage or inefficiency needing the type of severe rectifications that have been promised, or they are perpetuating the same system of inefficiency and wastage that they have been so critical of.

When you look at the Estimates, it will cost the average person in this country on a per capita basis $1,104 on the Recurrent Estimates and on your Capital Estimates about $41 per person. What we are not being told and have not been told for some time are the benefits and the results we are going to get by the expenditure of this additional money. The Estimates all the time have sought to tell us what it is going to cost the people of this country for Government administration. Now, Sir, Government administration has a cost to the public. It has always had a cost and will always have a cost, and that cost will be borne out by the amount of taxation which will have to be levied to raise the amount of money to finance this type of administration or the amount of borrowing that we will have to indulge in at some other time to see these plans carried through.

Sir, when one looks at the Estimates of cost, there are two aspects. One is the sacrifice of output of privately produced goods due to transfer resources to Government production, and secondly, the effects of the collection of the revenue and particularly of taxes after factor supplies, incentives and economic developments, and when one looks further you find that marginal benefits to society from any activity declines as the expenditure on that activity is increased. Therefore I think it is very important from that point of view at this stage where we are concerned with the financial conditions of this country being not as benevolent as they should be, we should be particularly concerned in seeking to quantify the benefits or the results which we are going to get from the expenditure of this large amount of money. It is no point coming in here and talking about the Estimates have increased and this is a record, that this is the highest amount of money in the history of Barbados that it has been called upon to spend, because next year you will find the same remarks being repeated and the following years because every year the Estimates are going to go up.

There are reasons which when we analyse are good and sufficient to explain to some extent why the Estimates have gone up, but I think one has to be serious about Government expenditure, because every time Government expenditure goes up, it means you have to look for more money, and as the preceding speaker has stated, taxation in this country has risen to penal level or a level at which many people are concerned, and every time Government expenditure goes up, it means that the public are called upon to pay more taxes and as a result of having to pay more taxes you find they have a little less left to look after their needs, and there is the very strong possibility that a decline in the standard of living of the people can ensure as a result of the increase in taxation. The alternative to that is to borrow more money, and you will find that as you borrow more money it becomes difficult on each succeeding occasion to be able to get the additional money for the purposes for which you want it.
5.05 p.m.

I would believe that any person – and I am not talking in political terms, because I feel we have to look seriously at the country and this is not the time for us to be indulging in adversary politics – but I would believe that any person who is concerned with the future of this country must look seriously at Government expenditure to see in what way it can be contained or prevented from increasing at the alarming rates which happen to fall on us in recent times.

One of the areas in which there is a large amount of expenditure is for the salaries and other benefits which the civil servants get, and although we are not called upon to discuss the civil service as such in the presentation of the Estimates, I think we cannot go on all the time burying our heads in the sand and being reluctant to make a critical analysis of the civil service and the amount of money which a certain privileged group carry away, because the amount of money which they carried away from the total cost of the Estimates is nearly 50%, and when you try to look at the people outside of that selected group in this country who are still fighting, who are still aspiring to certain levels of achievement, you find they are at a very great disadvantage when compared with many of the people in the civil service.

There is no doubt in my mind that some structural modification and re-organisation of the civil service is imminent, and when you

look at the performance of the civil servants you will find that they are more concerned with the public relations development than with public development. This is one of the serious handicaps under which the previous Government has been acting, and this is the handicap under which the present Government will be acting. People are more concerned with public relations. Somebody writes a letter and makes a complaint, therefore a reply or something has to be done to contain that complaint, and the people in the civil service are not so concerned about the development of people and of the country as such, and because of that we find that the cost which we are paying for development in this country worked out far too high in relation to the type of benefit or results that we are obtaining.

It is not going to be easy to do something about the civil service, but I would have to point out, as the previous speaker stated, we are going to have to make up our minds at some time to do something about it, because we cannot think that the answer to every problem that Barbados has is an increase in the number of civil servants or an increase in the salaries and conditions or fringe benefits for a particular group of people. One must look carefully at the re-organisation of the active structure to eliminate such a small Government unit. One must want to look at the internal re-organisation within Government to ensure more satisfactory lines of responsibility, one must also look at personal problems, and one must also look at the financial control and the purchasing policy of Government as carried out and effected by the civil service.

It is no achievement to talk about how much money is being spent and use that or try to suggest that that is a sort of advantage when compared with what the previous Government spent. It is also no achievement to suggest that because you are doing something differently that you are doing better. What we have to be concerned about, and I would like to stress this repeatedly, we have to be concerned about the benefits that the people outside there are getting, and I would like, seriously, for anyone to get up at some time and indicate to the people outside, not to me, especially the under privileged masses that there are any definitive benefits to accrue to them by the mere passing of this large sum of money in the Estimates.

As the previous speaker has stated, a lot has to be done about housing in this country. This is one of the benefits which will go a very far way in meeting the welfare of the under privileged people, and I would like to say this to the hon. member who spoke before me – he is not here – but I would like to tell him that Mexico has such a system in operation. It is nothing new and it is not a suggestion which I believe any sensible person will criticise at all. Mexico has such a system in operation and because of that they have been able to accumulate large sums of money for housing development, and I have just been told here that Jamaica also has such a system, so it is nothing new, but it is something that needs to be examined, because we have to be concerned in ensuring that Government activity really brings benefits and tangible results of the people for whom we say are doing these things.

In other areas in the Estimates I have observed that while the present party in power has been talking a lot about cutting out wastage and improving efficiency, the Estimates do not reflect that they have been more serious about this aspect. Chances are that they are going to get up and tell us that they have only been in power for six months. They are playing for time, but I would also like to point out that it is quite likely that one can deduce that winning the Government was quite a surprise to them. If you have been seriously following what has been going on in this country and had aspired at some stage to win the Government and run the affairs of this country, you would have prepared your plans and would have been ready to put them into operation any time you won the Government, so it is no satisfactory excuse, at least to me, to get up and say that you have only been there for six months and therefore you cannot do all the things that you have been doing, or you said you would do, because I would like to come back and say that unless you are saying certain things for purely political reasons, the type of criticisms you have made against the Democratic Labour Party Government, about inefficiency and wastage, when one looks seriously at what you are doing nowadays you are perpetuating the same system, and therefore if to you it is no longer one of wastage and inefficiency, then it cannot be seriously stated that for us it was one of wastage and inefficiency.

Sir, when we look at the question of the Capital Estimates in this country we find that we have stated in the past that the capacity of this country, the personnel and the other resources that we have here to take care of a certain amount of money, is very limited. This is nothing new, and it is refreshing to find out that the Minister of Finance has suddenly awakened to this. It has been very easy in the

past to get up and say that the Government should do more, but one has to bear in mind that in saying that the Government has to do more the Ministers have to rely on the civil service. They have always and will continue to rely on civil servants, and it is very often the responsibility of the civil servants to discharge or to put into operation any proposal or plan that may evolve or be enunciated by Ministers. That has been true for us and it is also true for you. When you have already enunciated your plans it is left to the civil servants and other Government employees to implement them, and there is where you are likely to get your problems.

Capital development in this country is very important, but at the same time a lot of what may be considered as Capital development may not go very far in promoting or developing the economy of this country to any satisfactory extent, it may just be an exercise or exchange of one nuisance which you may criticise for another nuisance which you prefer or consider to be a better one.

5.15 p.m.

We have to look very seriously at ways and means of generating more employment in this country, and one of the things that will continue to hound people of this country is unemployment because it leads to a lot of social uneasiness; and when you look carefully at these Estimates before us – and we know that you have promised to establish a lot of jobs in a short space of time, we would like you to say very clearly how many more people we can expect to see employed in Barbados as a result of this increase. If you are going to spend money and not set about to relate this spending of money to the needs and aspirations, especially of the under privileged of this country, I think that it is unfair to come and say that you are doing more than your predecessors in office.

Workers of this country are expecting and have a right to expect that out of the activities of the Government this year, all or nearly all of them will find suitable employment. When you look at the Estimates it is difficult to come to any conclusion that any important section of the unemployed youth of this country will benefit by the exercise now before us.

Particularly I would like to stress again that whenever Government expenditure goes up this is a cost that has to be paid, and that cost is transferred from private producers to Government production. It is as simple as that whenever blocks are used for Government building, those blocks are no longer obtainable for building houses for the people of the country who may want to. There are occasions when Government expenditure has a right to go up, and when these expenditures are not taken up in the private sector the Government has a role to come out and take them up.

Since October 1973, as a result of certain financial problems facing this country, the Government has had to come in and employ more people because the private sector could not. There is also another side to this, and it is that there is a limit to which the Government should go in increasing expenditure in a community such as Barbados because every increase in expenditure must mean either an increase in borrowing or an increase in taxation; and as we increase taxation in this country the standard of living, especially of the under privileged section of this community will fall, because you will be taking more money away from them; and as you take more money away from them they will not be able to maintain the standard of living which they should enjoy.

It is no achievement to come here and talk about the interesting and significant increase in Government expenditure. What we must be taking into consideration now is the way in which we can contain that expenditure without as a result having to increase taxation and running the risk of increasing the cost of living. We have to find other measures for financing some of the projects in this country. We may have to look very seriously at reducing some of the Government's expenditure in certain areas; and we will have to look very earnestly at the cost benefits and cost analysis in some areas.

In passing I would like to revert to the building of the Polytechnic. There has been a lot of criticism about the site; but one must do a cost efficiency analysis before one comes down and castigates people about the decision that they have taken, because when you look at the total cost, I want to say for the benefit of the member of Christ Church East and emphasise that we have looked at it. You have to look at the cost efficiency and cost benefits of your projects before you can set about criticising people for the decision that they have taken.

This is reasonable because people do not always interpret the same facts in the same way; but to suggest that people did not have any sense when they made certain deductions or certain conclusions is a very unkind way of

dealing with people who previously were responsible for running the affairs of the country; and I am certain that when the time comes they will also find that they will make mistakes. They will make mistakes in earnest, and when the time comes and people criticise them for their mistakes they will not feel happy when they know that they were looking for the most benefit of the greatest number of people.

It is unkind to get up now and try to suggest that decisions made by your predecessors were made for any other reason or motive than for the benefit of the large majority of the people of this country. I am only repeating what I have said, that we will have to look very clearly at the cost efficiency or cost analysis in our efforts to contain the estimates or the cost of Government expenditure. That is very important.

You cannot go on trying to make excuses every year for the increase in Government expenditure and believe that because you make excuses that the people outside will believe that they will benefit from a higher standard of living. It will take a much more serious approach; and I think that Barbados is now at the time when new administrative measures are necessary to deal with the problems of this country and which are likely to produce better results than the traditional approaches that have gone on in this country.

As the previous speaker has said, there are certain people who "submerge to the top" not by virtue of their ability or by virtue of their production. If they remain in a post long enough eventually they will get to the top. This has been a serious handicap to the Democratic Labour Party Government and it will be a serious handicap to you also.

Barbados is ripe for new imaginative approaches to the problems of this country and one of the things that people will be asking after looking at the performance of the luminaries on that side is are you capable of producing these new approaches. We have to look very seriously at our planning. Not planning now for 1977–78. We must be able to plan for the next 25 years because a lot of the things that we do now will have severe consequences or cause things that need to be done in the years ahead. That is one of the problems when you deal with people who are not concerned with public development, but are primarily so concerned with the public relations aspect that they are not concerned with what will be the effects tomorrow.

This is a serious handicap under which the Civil Service has laboured for too long. It is high time that people realise that the public relations aspect of their job which may have done this country a lot of good in the past now has no real relevance and is no longer pertinent. What are we doing to help people achieve a better standard of living and achieve the goals and objectives that they have in life? That is what people are interested in. People are no longer concerned with seeing the differences between the under privileged and the privileged. It is high time that in our effort to contain Government expenditure that we start giving serious consideration to a structural reorganisation of the Civil Service for greater efficiency in the administration and a reduction of the cost.

5.25 p.m.

In lieu of doing that we may have to look at some of the methods or some of the machines which are being used in other business places effectively and efficiently to help improve the output of the civil servants. Unless you are going to improve the output of civil servants you will find that things will take long and in economics time means money. The longer something takes the more it will cost. You will find in Barbados that a lot of the projects take too long. I have been a Minister and I am aware of that. When you try to explain to a person that you are going to do so and so this year, in another three or four years you have not been able to do it. It is difficult for you to go out and try to make him understand why you have not been able to do what you had promised him three years previously. It is the machinery which very often puts in a lot of time and a lot of delays, and as the delays ensue the cost of everything goes up, and we have to look at this aspect.

In this respect, while all of you have been saying that you have more luminaries, you have better debaters, and you have so many things better than this side, we observe that you are coming here with the same traditional approaches, and obviously you are going to have the same traditional results. This is not going to do Barbados much good at this particular time. *(Asides.)* My hon. Friend over there may be talking about 15 years, but he must realise that consequences accelerate like a snowball, and the consequences of your action will accelerate at such a fast rate that you would not be around at the time which you have in mind.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply on the Estimates.

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

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

HEAD 1 – GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Head 1 – Governor-General – in the sum of $119,635 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $119,635 under Head 1 – Governor-General – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister one question. *(Asides.)* If you did not want to be Prime Minister, you would not want to be a Privy Councillor. You are the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister just as the member for St. John is the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John. I am giving you what you are entitled to. Under Item 15 you will see, Mr. Chairman, that it provides for the balance of purchase price of one car. Will the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance say what was the total cost of this particular car for the Governor-General? When was it ordered? There was some paper which said it was ordered for the President of the Republic. I would really like him to tell us when it was ordered, who ordered it, and what is the total cost for this particular car. It was said that it was for $183,000; it was bulletproof; it had T.V. and all sorts of things. Let him give the public the facts about this car. The public wants to know the facts about this car. It was also said that there was a refrigerator in the trunk, Chivas Regal and so on.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that is least attractive about attending school is that in every class room there are children who get up and they ask the teacher questions the answer to which they already know. It is my belief that the former Cabinet contained not one or two but, perhaps, 10 people better qualified to answer the questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition than I am. I can send, as I have sent, to ask the cost of the motor car. I can also speculate, and since I read here that in the Approved Estimates there is a sum of $15,500, and in the Current Estimates there is a sum of $22,700, I can speculate that the whole cost is $38,255. Having done that I can then compare the results which I have achieved, and the teacher will tell me to go to the top of the class because the cost of the car is $38,255, a fact which can be deduced from adding the two sums there altogether.

With regard to who ordered the car I do not know. I believe that it was intended to replace a smaller motor car and this is why the amount of $15,500 was voted last year. I believe that the previous Governor-General made successful representations that the car that needed replacing was the Daimler, the large car, rather than the small car. I believe that the large car was ordered, and its total purchase price, of course, exceeded what has been voted and that the amount now voted is the balance. Whether it was addressed to the President of Barbados and it had then to be stencilled out and addressed to the consignees I do not know. I did not see the case when it was in England. I do not believe that any public officer or Minister of Government is qualified to say something on this particular matter. Perhaps I would have to take the answer of the Press. I am quite prepared to believe it was addressed to the President and then had to be stencilled out. That is neither here nor there, as far as I am concerned. What I would regret is the return to the motor car politics that characterised the late 1950s when the hon. senior member for St. George, as he then was, had lost his seat – that was before he became the junior member for St. John – and when the hon. junior member for St. Andrew as he then was had gained a seat even though he was unable to retain the confidence of his colleagues then any more than now. In those days motor cars at Government House could keep up the House of Assembly debate for two days. I sincerely hope they are not going to detain this for any longer than two or three minutes. I saw the hon. member for St. John rising, and I am sure he can give some elucidation on this matter. 5.35 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make my position abundantly clear. I am extremely suspicious that the hon. member for St. Thomas does not want any debate on this. You cannot come in here after an organ of the Government party has attempted to slander the former administration meaning the Ministers of Government and say that you do not know, because the hon. member has unearthed private correspondence addressed to his predecessor in office, but he cannot unearth the truth about this car. I want to make my position clear. He does not care, but I care. The House voted $15,500 for a motor car and that is the last that I heard

of it. Somebody went and ordered the car which cost more than $15,000 and I want to know who ordered it. This is what I want the hon. member to answer, because after the House voted that money.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, the hon. member for St. John was the last Minister of Finance who as I know was responsible for finance and planning, and any file must pass from the public servant to the Minister. The car was ordered as far as we know during the time that he was Minister responsible for that section of Government. Is he now saying (1) that he is in dereliction of his duty or (2) that the civil servants did something contrary to his advice. He must not beat around the question. He must come straight and say he is accusing the civil servants of breach of his order or something.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is precisely what I am doing. What I am saying is that if you read the Constitution of Barbados, it says that monies voted by Parliament must be spent in the way voted and not otherwise. Now this is what I am saying. The last thing that I know after the Estimates Committee passed Head 1 – Governor-General was to read in the newspaper that a car had arrived in Barbados costing $168,000 if there is ever such a motor car. I then went to the Estimates and noticed that there was a replacement for the old car which all of us including the hon. member who has just interrupted me – I would not like to say who has just sat down – sat in here and approved. We all approved a new vehicle at Government House for $15,500. What I am asking the Minister of Finance, and I find it difficult knowing him and the way in which he goes ferreting out people's private business that something had happened during his regime – the arrival of a car in Barbados during his regime and that with all the newspaper publicity – how it is that anybody in the Purchasing Department or anybody up at the Governor-General's residence could take it upon themselves to exceed a vote without coming back and asking for a change of note, for part purchase or something like that, because the last thing that I know about this car was in March 1976 when we approved a replacement, and now we have a supplementary which is bigger than the original vote, and then they throw out this propaganda and then say they do not want any motor car politics, do not let us worry about that. We have to be worried on a matter of principle because if Cabinet has approved of the purchase of a $37,000 or $38,000 car, I simply want to know when it happened because it must have happened in my absence, but none of my Ministers have any recollection of any such thing happening.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I must say the hon. member for St. John's indignation waxes so strongly on this matter, to hear that the Minister of Finance ferrets into private business, of all this about the actions of Sir Winston Scott now deceased in his grave, buried with honour. He could not be criticising us; the car was already ordered if not in Barbados when we took office. Just in passing, because I would not like this to become a big issue, all this business about ferreting out private correspondence come very strange from a man who can tell me what happened, untruthfully of course, the night that Vic Patterson beat me. I had always been under the impression that I beat Vic Patterson, but never mind that; a man who can ferret out all this, it comes.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That took place in a public place right after the polls when all the students were present. How could that be private information; then you said the students did not know you were the son of the former Prime Minister and how could they vote for Vic Patterson!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well I have the good fortune that the hon. member for Christ Church West was present. Also this is a slightly different beating about which he is talking. The hon. member for Christ Church West was present and could tell the hon. member for St. John the truth if he cares to hear it. I have never had to draw to anybody's attention whose son I was. It was drawn to too many people's attention when I did not want it drawn especially in England. I have suffered from people seeking to visit on the son the imagined sins of the father. I have never had to draw that to anybody's attention. The then Opposition in Barbados made poor Sir Grantley Adams sufficiently unpopular among Jamaicans and so on for there to be no question of seeking to capitalise on his popularity by claiming relationship with him. Just in passing, all this business about ferreting out private correspondence, I have not ferreted into this. As far as I can remember it appeared in the newspaper. I was down at a certain gentleman.....

5.45 p.m.

I am reminded by the hon. member for St. James – I would like to say all that we know of it – that the first we knew of this car was when we were approached by a journalist on the day that Sir Grantley Adams' bust was unveiled, he even had a snide remark about that, in front of Government Headquarters. I recall the Permanent Secretary, Finance mentioning to me – the facts which I have given he gave to me quite

voluntarily, I did not have to ferret it – he called me aside one day and said to me that Government House did intend to replace the Ford car but it had decided to replace the Daimler, and he indicated that there would be a balance to pay. I think that was after the newspaper report. There has never been until today any suggestion that I have heard of impropriety, I have made none, we gave none to the Press, if there was ever a front bench that is innocent it is this one and yet we are being beset by all the vehemence.

If what the hon. member for St. John says is true, it would appear that at Government House, perhaps unfamiliar and from other knowledge which I have acquired even recently, it would appear that Government House, perhaps due to unfamiliarity with the nature of accounting, the former Governor General may have decided not to replace the Ford and decided to replace the Daimler without asking for an alteration in the note. That is only what I can speculate. Another gentleman told me an elaborate story about being asked to quote for a car from one garage and being promised it, and then another garage gave a better quote. All these things I have heard, but to some extent I think it is actually unseemly, because the finger of impropriety which the hon. member for St. John is seeking to point can only be pointed at the late Governor General. Who else can it be pointed at?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I just want to make my position clear. It is very obvious to us on this side that the organ of the Government Party was putting out malicious rumours that we had ordered a car, costing $198,000, for the President of a Republic that we wanted to establish, and that is why I challenged the hon. member. Up to now he has not given me a positive statement, he said it is possible the Governor General decided to order a different car. I want to make it clear, not that I am saying that they ordered it, that with the ordering of this car the Central Purchasing Department must take the full responsibility for breaking the financial rules. They had absolutely no right to order a car that cost more than $15,000 landed in Barbados, because this was the amount of money which was voted by Parliament.

I am not saying that it is not competent for the A.D.C. or the Governor General to say, let us get a different car, because we did not specify what kind of car, but what Parliament did specify was that they were to have a car for $15,000, and I want to inform the hon. member who has just sat down, the Prime Minister, that this is not the first year they came for a car, this was the fourth year they came for a car or was turned down, so when a car was put in there for $15,000 Government House was entitled to a $15,000 car and therefore the officer in the Central Purchasing Department who is responsible for going out for invitations to quote and that kind of thing, they should start an enquiry now under the Financial Administration and Audit Rules to find out how it is that they can breach not only the Financial Rules but the Constitution of Barbados, and stop slandering members of the Democratic Labour Party.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I really want to begin where the hon. member has left off. The first point I would like to make is that the hon. member has had the benefit of your latitude in being allowed to speak twice on this Item.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. On the question of speaking once or twice, very early when I came in here I heard the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister state, and it was agreed by the Chair, that whenever we are in Committee of Supply we will speak more than once if it is considered necessary. Let us not have this question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see your point is necessary at all.

Mr. TAITT: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I would like you to rule whether it is a proper point or not, you cannot say that my point is unnecessary, it is very necessary. We have to understand how we are going to be functioning during these Estimates.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will draw the hon. member's attention to 66(8): "A member may speak for 15 minutes at any one time, provided that the time limit of the speech of the Minister when moving a Head of Expenditure, or replying to the debate on the Head, or of a Member when moving an amendment to reduce the sum to be allotted for any Head of Expenditure in respect of any sub-head or item thereof or replying to the debate on the amendment, shall not exceed 30 minutes."

Mr. TAITT: So you can speak any amount of times from time to time. Thank you.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I do not think that is all right because there was a former rule on this matter, and I do not mind what ruling you give, as far as I know the last ruling was that you got up and spoke, and if you spoke for 15

minutes all right, if you spoke for less than 15 minutes that was the end of the matter. If the Chair wants to rule otherwise I am prepared to accept that rule as well, but we argued at the time what the hon. member is now arguing and the Chairman, who belonged to his party, with the concurrence of the now member for St. John, said that we were wrong and that their contention was right. Now you are hearing the other side, since they have become the Opposition, they are right and we are wrong.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, again I merely get up to point out that it was his Prime Minister who had indicated that he had no objection to persons speaking more than once and the Chair agreed with that; that is all I did.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the Committee one thing, that when these new Standing Orders came before the House we were in Opposition and I challenged the interpretation of the Standing Orders, and I well remember the Chairman of Committees than saying "when I rule, I rule, this is the highest court in the land." And we have always contended that you can speak as many times as you like, provided that you did not speak more than 15 minutes at any one time, and the Chairman, urged on by Mr. Frank Walcott who was than the member for St. Michael West, said that when you speak once your time expired, and that is what happened, as far as I can understand it.

We do not object to the Opposition speaking as many times as they like, as long as they keep within the 15 minute rule, and that is all I see it to be. We will not take up the position of "when I rule, I rule" and "this is the highest court in the land."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Attorney General please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, one of the things that I have learnt about observing some of the older methods of Parliament is that certain debates were introduced or inspired for the reason of getting things off their chest and probably attacking a few people and that sort of thing. I would have expected that if the information for which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition asked resided in the breast of the hon. member for St. John, as he has now let off his steam, that within their party that information would have been made available to him.

The hon. member has just got up and said that some member of the Central Purchasing Department had ordered it. The point is that he must know it was ordered during his regime, he must have known that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When the hon. member has been in Government a little longer he will realise that the people in Central Purchasing do not run up to the Minister of Finance every day and say they want to telephone Detco Motors about a motor car or order something. Once it is approved by Parliament and we do not have an embargo they go ahead. I do not know what is ordered for the hospital, the mental institution, the Police Force, or anything like that, provided they stick within the financial rules and do not burst the vote. That is not a ministerial function, but they should not exceed their authority. *(Aside).* Even if it was approved by me it would be wrong, because I would have to come back in here and ask for a change of note and say that the car could not be purchased for $15,000 and I would like a supplementary or permission to order something more.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: My information from the people in the Department is that the then Minister of Finance authorised the ordering of a bigger car. This is my information.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Will you produce that information, or is this something putting up to you now? Whoever told you so is a diabolical liar. I just want to tell you that I challenge you to produce the person who made any such statement.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He can challenge as many times as he likes, the point is that if I had to choose between the word of the civil servant and his I would take the civil servant's word. That is the point.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like the name or description of that civil servant.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not going to be interrupted by you in the future, you either will get up properly in this Parliament or I will ask for you to be sent outside.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am rising on a point of order. Did I hear the Attorney General say he would ask that somebody be sent outside? Is he in a position to ask that somebody be sent outside? What kind of Parliament is this?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please be seated? That is not a point of order, what Standing Order has been breached?

Mr. TAITT: The Attorney General is usurping the powers of the Chair and casting aspersions on the Chair by indicating that he is to a position to ask the Chair to send someone outside.
5.55 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Michael South West has again displayed his lack of legal knowledge in this Chamber today. The point I am making is that I have understood from the Civil Service that not only was it ordered during the regime of the last administration, but the change was authorised by the Minister of Finance. And in those circumstances I would expect that the Government should know if the hon. member is going to say that that is an incorrect statement they can say so. May be it was incorrect. *(Asides).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Your voices are becoming irritating to my ears. Do not over do it, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, because of a commitment during the last administration we have to ask for $22,000 more than we would have normally asked for; and that is the position as far as I can see under this particular Head.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We are hearing so many challenges from the hon. member for St. John, that I think we will have to avoid trying to take him on. First of all we had the Press Conference about the button showing Mr. Britton himself that was reproduce on T.V. Then we had a challenge about Mr. Willie Demas being asked to fire somebody, and Mr. Demas had to deny that. We had a challenge today about it being a diabolical lie.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, ...

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I must object to the hon. member getting up without addressing the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Willie Demas did not contradict me. He merely said that he was not pressurised by any member of the Government but it was a very cleverly worded letter. I object to the hon. member flying up and embarrassing public officers in trying to get information that he knows to be incorrect. I am on a point of order and I am saying that if the hon. member for Christ Church West – I am saying that if a public officer ever told him that I, as Minister of Finance approved the exceeding of this expenditure and the purchase of a different car or a car exceeding the amount – because I did not approve any particular car – that public officer is a diabolical liar.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not like the word.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is an unspecified person. There is no rule to prevent me from saying that any person not named by me or the member for Christ Church West is a diabolical liar. I cannot withdraw that.

I am saying that it is an unspecified person and that there is no rule in the Standing Orders of this House which would prevent me from saying that a person made a statement which I say is untrue; and if that person is not a member of this House, and has not been named by me or by the member for Christ Church West to be a diabolical liar. So I cannot withdraw that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have been hearing too many of these challenges. As far as Mr. Demas is concerned, if the hon. member thinks that Mr. Demas did not contradict him, he is alone in the whole population of Barbados who thinks so. He said that Dr. Courtney Blackman would be a diabolical liar if he asked him not to produce something. I went to the trouble of getting the file with a letter dated the 8th March, 1976 signed, Errol W. Barrow, Prime Minister, addressed to Dr. Courtney Blackman referring to a report on the economy in 1975 and it referred to other things as well; and the comment is that it is not clear whether this is an initial paper or not. If it had been made available for publication, then I must point out that the recommendations are hardly such as to be given currency in the public domain before the views of Government have been canvassed and made known. Well, if you are going to tell me that that is not a direction to Dr. Courtney Blackman not to publish the contents of a paper, I will have to tell you that I do not know how the English Language is to be construed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Was that before the speech on T.V.? Even the World Bank experts are prohibited from publishing reports before they get approval from the World Bank. Now they are giving the impression that I was preventing Dr. Blackman from publishing something about cutting down on themselves – pure unadulterated drivel.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That statement is a matter of opinion; if the hon.

member wanted to know what I said, he should have come to the meeting and listened; but even if what was in the Advocate was what I said, it was supported by that letter signed by the hon. member. It is not private correspondence that belongs to the Ministry of Finance. It belongs to the Prime Minister's office addressed to the Central Bank.

Apart from that, far from embarrassing the man and saying that he is a diabolical liar, the hon. member should go back in his memory and decide that he did not like the Central Bank Review for 1975, and if you look carefully at the file you will see that the review was never published but that a review more in favour of the Government was published in 1976. I warned the hon. member that he does himself and his party no service by these constant denials.

Now as far as the car is concerned, I understand that there is a file in the Ministry of Finance in which all these matters are canvassed of buying a $15,000 car and buying a $38,000 car. I have repeated this over and over again and I would like to see in writing exactly who authorised the additional increase, and whether the Central Purchasing Department deserves the strictures made on it by the hon. member for St. John.

I must say that he brought in the name of the A.D.C., and the A.D.C. said that he made no choice of any car, but he was told that it would not be a replacement for the Ford, but a replacement for the Daimler, and I accept what he said without reservation. I do not think in any way that he should be made responsible or have his name canvassed as the possibly responsible person in this matter. Until the file arrives, I think that the best thing to do in the interest of all of us is to ask that this Head be postponed. That I so beg to move.

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

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

Head 2 – Parliament in the sum of $590,001 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 2 stand part.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on the question of Parliament, one of the things which we on this side would like to know is whether in fact the Debates Committee has jurisdiction over the amenities of Parliament because I seem to understand from the notes that provision is being made for certain renovations. To the best of my knowledge these renovations have never been discussed in any detail at any meeting of the Debates Committee which I have attended. I am not now about to comment on the desirability or otherwise of the improvements or renovations that will be made.
6.05 p.m.

I think that something very strange is beginning to happen with regard to the Debates Committee. We have seen on one occasion already the Debates Committee being by-passed in discussions.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The expenditure to which the hon. member is referring is contained in Head 105 and not in this Head. Head 105, Item 1, contains the vote which he is now discussing.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, as far as I know this vote contains provision for a Library. Is there not provision for a Library in this? Supplies and materials, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What item is that? To which item are you referring?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the whole of Part 2.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: They go by numbers. One, two, three, four, five and six.

Mr. TAITT: What goes by one?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The number of the Items.

Mr. TAITT: I am speaking about Head 2 – Parliament – generally, Mr. Chairman. Am I not able to speak on Parliament generally?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It has been pointed out that what the hon. member is referring to can properly be discussed under another Head.

Mr. TAITT: No, Sir. The Prime Minister cannot decide what I am referring to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member for St. Michael West to inform the Chair.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on page 2 it says Head 2 – Parliament. I am speaking on

Parliament and matters connected with Parliament: Supplies and Materials, Maintenance of Property, Operating Expenses.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be seated for a while, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is in his first Estimates and, therefore, I do not think he is aware that when you are challenged on the ground of relevancy, invariably you inform the Chairman of which item you are speaking on. Anybody who has been in Parliament – the hon. member for St. John, the hon. member for Christ Church, and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central will, I think, bring the hon. member to the point. Now that he has sat down, if he will look at Head 105 he will see that he will have an abundant opportunity there, because I will challenge him on any of these items. There is no item in this vote for construction of anything. On any item he is going to be challenged on.

Hon. Members who are in the first Estimates will, in any case, want to be aware that when the Chairman asks on what you are speaking you will say which item. This is the old history of Parliament, and if you do not get the right item – When I was first in here I remember that if you could not find the right item, Mr. John Yearwood used to tell you to sit down, and that was the end of the matter.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, for as long as I am in this Parliament, the Prime Minister has been seeking to give me gratuitous advice. I would like you to let him know that I do not wish any gratuitous advice from him now or in the future. I have been in here for the first time, and all hon. members come into Parliament for the first time. There has been a concerted attempt on their part to try, if they can, to demoralise me only because this is my first time in here. I wish to let them know, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister is not in a position to give me gratuitous advice because if I saw him coming to me with the last drop of milk, and I knew that the doctor has said I should take milk to live, I would refuse it because I fear him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is this part of your speech?

Mr. TAITT: I fear him, Mr. Chairman. Even with the best intentions I cannot take his advice because I am afraid of him. I am speaking on Item 9 – Supplies and Materials – Head 2. Mr. Chairman, one of the things which I find particularly disturbing is the situation with regard to a Library in Parliament. Time and time again when one is trying to find materials for use in Parliament, when one is trying to find information to counteract some of the statements made by the Government sometimes without foundation, time and time again when one walks outside one takes nothing more than a soiree, there is (a) no one out there to advise one where to find the information and, (b), there is nothing in what is now described as a Library that can be of any real assistance to a Parliamentarian who takes his work seriously.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come when some serious step should be taken to turn the Library of Parliament into a real Parliamentary Library. Steps have to be taken so that when one wishes to do research; when one wishes to look at debates one would find no difficulty. I have gone out there, Mr. Chairman, on one or two occasions and asked for a Debate and they have told me that they are in the Archives. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for anyone to do any proper research within these environs under the present circumstances. I think the time has come for us to look very seriously at (a) the kind of materials which we have in the Library of Parliament, and (b).....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member drew to your attention the fact that he is dealing with Item 2 – Personal Emoluments, and he is now talking about fixtures, furniture, and so on. He said Item 2.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He obviously meant Item 9.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I said 9. I did not say 2. If you know the hon. member for St. James well, you ought not to have accepted that attempt at interruption, Sir. I know him well. That is the kind of thing he does extremely well.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I can interrupt him because he knows me well. Just like I know Graffie Pilgrim and Hutson!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. TAITT: That kind of gutter-hole approach that he has is good enough for the place he goes. It will not suit me. I will not go down in the gutter with the hon. member for St. James no matter how much he beckons me.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am going to ask the hon. member to withdraw the remarks. We are going to be in here for five days. I am asking you to withdraw the remarks in your very own interest. I am not putting you wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What remarks are you talking about?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: "Would not go down in the gutter-hole with me." There is no gutter-hole in here.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet. Be seated, please. Will both hon. members take their seats! Will you, please, withdraw the remarks.

Mr. TAITT: Which remarks, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Gutter-hole.

Mr. TAITT: Withdraw gutter-hole, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Right.

Mr. TAITT: Do you mean that in here you cannot speak metaphorically?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you use language that is more appropriate to Parliament.

Mr. TAITT: I can only use the language to which I have become accustomed, Sir. If he does not understand gutter-hole.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Did you hear the ruling of the Chair? I am asking you to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. TAITT: I will withdraw "gutter-hole". Might I now say, Sir, that it is not my intention at any time to condescend to go into the gutter with any hon. member. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, as we go out of in here and try to do research, I have found, as a new member,.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is obviously mistaken as to how the Estimates are prepared, and I do not believe he has prepared his homework if he wants to speak on these Estimates. Item 9, Mr. Chairman, provides for photo copying paper, stationery, books and publications, first aid supplies and incidentals for Parliament and the office of the Leader of the Opposition.
6.15 p.m.

If the hon. member wants to speak about records of Parliament, Parliamentary debates and so on, he has to wait until another Head comes before this Committee. This item deals with incidentals, stationery etc., for the servicing of books from England etc. This is not to deal with the records of Parliament, and if the hon. member would only spend a few minutes looking at the Estimates and understanding what they are about and look at the respective Heads, then he can make some sort of contribution, but at this point he is criticising the Leader of the Opposition, not us.

Mr. TAITT: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that even you were struck by the absolute idiocy of the statement made by the last hon. member who has just sat down. That he could suggest that research can only be done from old debates is a complete and total monument to his ignorance. He himself read out "books and publications". Surely the Attorney General would have told him that books and periodicals are things from which you take information for research. Why should the hon. member, my friend, put himself in that position for me to say these true things about him? I do not wish to get involved in that kind of thing. Mr. Chairman, I am getting on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am still Minister responsible for Parliament and I do not want to get in all these little things, but the hon. member for St. Michael South West thinks he is very clever because he reads "books and publications" and then proceeds to talk about records of Parliament. He does not realise that when we spoke on Item 2 that in fact he will have to talk under Item 2 about the records of Parliament, because the books and publications under Item 9 are the books which you buy for the Library and the newspapers. If he wants to talk about the records, he will have to talk about the Reporters and the people who take the records and the people who file the records, and Item 2 will be the correct Item, not Item 9. He was so insistent that he said Item 9 and not Item 2, and all along Item 2 is the right item if this is what he wants to talk about, because Item 2 is where you get the Typists, Clerical Officer and the Reporters.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have seen on a number of occasions when persons on that side have made fools of themselves the Prime Minister in what I consider to be an act of grace will always rise up and say as he did once for the hon. member for St. Michael South East that it was one of the greatest speeches he has ever heard, and at that time all of us in here knew that he could only have had his tongue stuck very fast up in his cheek. Similarly now he sees his colleague getting into trouble, he jumps up with that, I almost said feline approach of his, and he tries to give the gallery, the impression that I am talking about Item 9 when I mean Item 2. Mr. Chairman, Item 2 is "Other Personal Emoluments". Why is he going to tell me that I should talk about the money which people get for working in here when I wish to talk about the Library and books and periodicals and things I cannot find when I come in here? He wants to tell them that I am speaking about Item 2 when I should be speaking on Item 9. I am speaking about Item 9 – books and publications.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that the items which the hon. member indicates he wants to talk about can be properly dealt with under Head 105. You are therefore out of order. Please discontinue.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have no alternative under the Rules of this House but to bow to you interpretation, but I have to tell you that I believe you are wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair thinks that is a reflection on the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member cannot look at the Chair and says he thinks the Chair is wrong.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be long on this Head, because I think you know that I am one person who has a very high regard for parliamentary democracy, and I certainly, whatever my shortcomings, may be, do enjoy my visits to this ancient institution on Tuesdays.

Now talking on the question of Emoluments under Item 2, I received a letter from the Cabinet Secretary to the effect, and I will quote from it since it was not confidential or under or without prejudice, and it clearly says that a Committee has been established to deal with the salaries and pensions of Parliament.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, if the hon. member is talking about Item 1 which is one of the Statutory emoluments which is charged on the Consolidated Fund and for which we do not have to vote specifically, as I understand it, it is not debated in Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition called Item 2, but he was advised by the hon. member for St. Lucy that it was Item 1, so he automatically changed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I said Item 2 didn't I.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And then you said Item 1.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Well it is Item 2. I was informed, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee has been set up to review the remuneration and pension scheme of Parliamentarians and to make recommendations for such revisions as might be considered appropriate. With the idea of a Review Committee one can find no fault since in this sense it is part and parcel of the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. That manifesto on page 3 says "Again as a matter of principle no salary increases will be voted by members of the House of Assembly except after an independent review by a properly qualified out side body." Now that is honouring one of their promises. I personally and my party certainly expected if the general public is to accept that either members or Ministers or members of Parliament generally are entitled to an increase, that some more high-powered commission would have been appointed. I want it to be clear that I am not casting any aspersions, but as far as I know most of them, if not all, are employees; they do not handle a lot of money; they are not responsible for running a big organisation where there is a lot involved in the private sector in contra-distinction to the public sector. They are members of our community who I suppose were appointed in order to span a certain spectrum of the community, but I do not think in terms of knowing what happens in the private sector you can add to them a great deal of experience, since they are not running a big organisation knowing what is involved in such an organisation in order to compare it with the Government that is spending $378 million. I do not want to say any more on that except that I would have expected a different type of Committee to deal with this matter.

Also in their manifesto, Mr. Chairman, on the same page there are other matters connected with increases, and I want to know whether it is a whole package or whether it is a piecemeal package because that same manifesto says "After long debate in the last session, Parliament agreed to appoint a Select Committee on the Leader of

the Opposition's Resolution calling for the introduction of integrity legislation for Ministers and members of Parliament. However except for the Speaker the Democratic Labour Party members failed to attend the Committee's meetings and it was unable to form a quorum. The Barbados Labour Party thus remains alone as giving wholehearted support to the principle of such legislation which is increasingly being passed in other Commonwealth countries. The Party therefore repeats and expands the pledge contained in the 1971 manifesto to pass legislation providing for members of Parliament, Senators and politically appointed members of Statutory Corporations to disclose their financial assets and later on assuming office, periodically during office and on termination.
6.25 p.m.

I would like to know whether this is a complete packet since this legislation naturally has not been implemented on the new Government assuming office, so six months have passed. I would like to know whether new salaries for anybody is contingent on or depends on the passage of integrity legislation in Parliament, or whether a separate and distinct exercise honouring separate aspects of the Manifesto at any given time.

Of course, the third aspect of it is "A code of proper conduct will be laid down for Ministers, senior Civil Servants and political appointees to Statutory Corporations." I want to know from the Government whether this Committee which has been established is going to be part of the entire package under their Manifesto headed "Integrity and Morality in Government" and I just want to know, I am just saying that I would have preferred a different committee myself. I would have preferred members who have handled a lot of money and run big organisations, not that there would not be room for small people on it, do not misunderstand me, I am not arguing for the small man or the Trade Union or people who know what workers do, as I say, my personal view would be that I would have expected a different committee.

Under Cabinet I will have something more to say about it, but the Government must let me know whether integrity legislation will be enacted in this Parliament before any thought is given, depending on the recommendations of this committee for an increase in salaries for members of Parliament, and whether this code of conduct will be laid down for Ministers, civil servants and political appointees to Statutory Corporations at the same time, so it will be a matter preceding any increase of salaries to anybody in this Hon. Parliament because you just cannot blow hot and cold. I think you have to honour what you promised, I just want to know what is the order. The committee reports, but before you get cent one integrity legislation, code of conduct.

I am asking a question based on my concern for morality in Government; that is all I am asking.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak about the Library for Parliament.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give me a chance, because I know the hon. member perhaps can speak authoritively on these library matters as any of us, but I would like to deal with the last point.

I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on a reasoned, if in my opinion a slightly mistaken, speech about the Commission on the terms of service of parliamentarians. First of all, I would just like to say, without being over critical of the Press, that the manner of presentation in the Press is really very unfortunate. This matter has been in the hands of the Cabinet for some months, not one or two weeks, while the bumps are straightened out, so to speak, the terms of reference are worked out and so on. No member of the Cabinet could be found, as far as I can judge, even to hint in the slightest possible way since last November when this was first discussed, because we have not treated alterations of members' salaries as a priority, we have been content to let it stay on ice, and no member of the Cabinet in all that time has been hinting to the Press, there has been no hint of a leak to the Press, but last Thursday we decided to go ahead with it and to inform the Leader of the Opposition, and today now we read it big in the newspapers, and presented with a malice in the Advocate, presented with spite in the Advocate, when a telephone call to the Government Information Officer might have occasioned him getting in touch with the Minister responsible for parliamentary affairs and so on, but instead we have there in the Advocate – and it is significant I think today that the hon. member for St. John describes the Nation as the organ of the Barbados Labour Party, I think he was really intending to draw a contrast with the Advocate – it is significant that the Advocate should come out with the same arguments as the Leader of the Opposition.

I am not in any way accusing the Leader of the Opposition of anything, because I do not believe that the letter indicated that there was

any confidentiality. It is our fault for not releasing the news so that the Press could get it from the main spring rather than a source that might turn out to be as tainted perhaps as the milk the hon. member for St. Michael South West would be afraid to drink if it came from my hand. I would suggest that the good friend of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, the News Editor of the Advocate, who canvassed for him so indefatigably although he had resigned from the Democratic Labour Party, in which he brought back his contacts and his talents to bear on the campaign of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, and has brought his own inconsiderable talents for writing ignorance to bear on the views of the Barbados Labour Party on several occasions, it really would have been of assistance to him if he had had the benefit of a Government Information Service Release and could then have made his contacts with whoever inside the Democratic Labour Party could give an opposite point of view.

I see something there about my Cabinet colleagues have pressurised me into doing this, but this was promised by me in a debate in 1973 in here right down to the Chairman of the Public Service Commission being the Chairman of a review body, and I remember Mr. Talma said that the Democratic Labour Party could never accept that, they would not expose parliamentary salaries to any outside body. Well the tune has changed and it has changed for the better, it is a sweeter tune. The piano lessons are obviously having some sweetening effect on the songs being sung on the Opposition benches.

It is necessary for an Opposition to criticise and therefore we have criticisms of the personnel of the Commission. I am in a position to say, Mr. Chairman, that the personnel of the Commission are as published in the Advocate this morning. The Chairman will be Mr. Neville Nicholls, Chairman of the Public Service Commission, Vice President of the Caribbean Development Bank; the members will be Mr. Lester Green, a former Assistant General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and Mr. Donald Wiles, former Governor of Montserrat and now an Executive of the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company, and I have lived to hear that three men like that chosen, a criticism made that they are not representative of business or the workers. That was the nonsense written in the Advocate this morning. It is well nigh defamatory, in my opinion, to tell Donald Wiles that he is not representative of business when he is a senior officer of perhaps the biggest trading company in Barbados. It is well night defamatory of Lester Green to say that the workers' interests have no representation when Lester Green is particularly well placed, having dealt to my knowledge with literally hundreds of wage negotiations, well aware of standards of wages in this country, and to say that he knows nothing of the workers' interests, the Personnel Officer at present, and this we hear in here now that you need somebody who deals with millions of dollars, not just people who do not know, when you have Mr. Neville Nicholls, the Chairman of the Public Service Commission and the Vice President of the Caribbean Development Bank and the Advocate in its News Editor is so ignorant as to describe those people as not qualified to sit on Parliamentarians' salaries.

How can you deal with this, Mr. Chairman? Is Neville Nicholls, apart from his position as Chairman of the Public Service Commission, we have always said that the Chairman of the Public Service Commission should be Chairman of the Review Commission.
6.35 p.m.

Is he not qualified – Neville Nicholls, a Barbados scholar, President of the Caribbean Development Corporation, a legal advisor to Government and vice president of a bank – and he is not qualified to estimate parliamentarians' service to the community? Lester Green, with all his years of labour negotiations, and now a personnel manager, is not qualified to say what the general interest of the public should be on wage levels? And Donald Wiles, working in a managerial position at Barbados Shipping and Trading, a man who was a former Governor of a Colony – not a Premier or a figure head Governor – but Governor of a colony with all the power in his hands and a former Chief Secretary of Barbados – that he is not qualified to pronounce on salary levels?

I can say no more on the personnel; but what I can say for the correction of the public is that never mind all the spiteful remarks made in the Advocate about priorities and so on, parliamentarians' salaries have not risen since 1973. Since 1973 sugar workers wages have doubled and public servants have had two salary rises and so on and so on. I am not justifying in advance if there should be an increase or anything. I am just saying that it is time for a review.

I do not know what the commission will report, but I do think that the pensions which we have contracted to pay ourselves are too generous. I think that you should have to spend longer in Parliament than six years to be able to qualify for a pension. But that is a purely

personal opinion. If the commission puts forward a contrary attitude, I will acquiesce or deal with it in Cabinet as the case may be.

If it decides to lower salaries we will lower them. If they decide to put them up, we will put them up. I should mention that the salary of the Governor General will also be a subject of this review. I do not know if that was in the letter that was written to the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps the letter was written on a slightly more narrow base. There is at least one person who is a public servant who enjoys a higher salary than the Governor-General, and at least one person who draws the same salary; and there are more than three people who operate within the Government context and who enjoy a higher salary than the Prime Minister; we are not worried about that. All of these things obviously need some kind of look to see whether these emoluments are justified or whether they are not justified. It is widely said that there are bank managers in excess of $100,000 a year. It may be wondered whether it is correct that salaries should exist at that level and Parliamentarians exist at the level at which they exist.

It is said that the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union enjoys emoluments of $6,000 a month and so on. I do not know. All of these are rumours going around, and the duty of this committee is to collect that kind of information, and will not only be looking at parliamentary salaries, but at the whole level of salaries in the society as a whole.

My memory of the last Inland Revenue report is that it is said that there were 129 people in Barbados who enjoyed salaries of more than $30,000 a year. I am sure that the number must be greater than that. This was in late 1975 and did not include self employed persons. All of this will come within the purview of the commission, and it is cheap, nasty, spiteful and malicious journalism to suggest that this is any kind of yard fowl commission set up to white wash decisions that are going to be taken. These are men of integrity on whom the public can rely to produce an honest and straightforward report.

I do not believe that political accusation can be pointed at any of these people. I think that if you search up and down Barbados you could find a more representative collection of persons to sit on this commission. I believe that the banks will take the view, and the hotels, that they are secure when they are asked to submit details of emoluments earned by their executives that these details will be kept private by the Commission.

The public can be sure that there will be no whitewashing either by the Government or the Leader of the Opposition to conspire or rather to join together on parliamentary salaries. I totally deplore the type of journalism which gave rise to the article which appeared in the Advocate this morning. That is just the sort of twist that you put in an article when you have an evil and perverted mind and want to publish something as spiteful as you possibly can about the particular exercise that we are carrying out.

I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition has given me the opportunity to say this, although I think that it would have been better said on a more reasoned and less tempered occasion by way of a Press Release. However, there is one other point that has been asked about— the point about integrity legislation. Now that point is very very welcome and is much appreciated.

There is one thing about the Leader of the Opposition. After some aberation he has shown some consistency on this matter of integrity legislation, because some time ago, outside Barbados – I used to have the press cutting, and may be I still have it now – he went abroad and said that there was a need for integrity legislation in this country and that he would support it. I am glad that he is now in a position to support it without other influences being brought to bear upon him.

The integrity legislation is not being dealt with as part of this exercise. The Attorney General's office has already produced a draft Bill, which I believe will soon be on its way to my office and soon be on its way to the Cabinet; but the very well made point that the integrity legislation before the report of any review commission will be taken into account by the Government, and I believe may very well be adopted.

There are one or two issues of principle. For example in Jamaica a number of persons did make the point that where you are elected in a context where no integrity legislation was in force, then it may be a little unfair to ask that you submit yourself to it. This is also a point that will be considered. I do not myself give it much weight; but there are a number of considerations to be taken into account. These are not easy matters, and you had better believe that I am not seeking any easy way out. My questions will be to the direction of the Leader of the Opposition as indicated in his observations in this matter.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be very long on this particular Head, Head 2 Parliament – Personal Emoluments. I rise partly because I find it difficult to understand that the Prime Minister in his intervention found it necessary to savage a person who anybody in this community knows is a man of indeed the highest integrity *(Asides).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: No matter what happens, he is my friend and I make no bones about that.
6.45 p.m.

I find it almost entirely unacceptable that a man, who is a Prime Minister, could get up in a Parliament and say those terrible and degenerate things about a person who has honour.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member cannot use the word "degenerate". That is insulting language.

Mr. TAITT: Insulting to who?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He says that he finds it impossible to believe that the Prime Minister would get up and say degenerate things. I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. TAITT: If he wants me to withdraw that I will withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have alleged that the Hon. Prime Minister.... *(Asides.)* Order, please!

Mr. TAITT: I said, Sir, that I found it impossible to believe that the Prime Minister could say degenerate things, and I withdraw "degenerate". I find it impossible that the Prime Minister could speak in a manner in which he spoke in here this evening about a person the integrity of whom has never been questioned in this country. It is clear that the News Editor of the *Advocate* will not be the Press Aide. That much is clear.

Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to defend the *Advocate* because God knows that the *Advocate* has done nothing for the Democratic Labour Party or done nothing for me.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman. I was in here when the hon. member said that I questioned the integrity of the News Editor at the *Advocate.* Perhaps the hon. member would like me to withdraw any questioning of integrity, and I would be quite happy to withdraw any question of his integrity. I have never attacked his integrity. In fact, whenever I have had cause to complain, people has explained to me that it is only that he is terribly ignorant and incompetent and that is all. That really is all I am going to question: competence, and the amount of sense he has in his head as well as his judgment. If there is any suggestion that I am questioning his integrity, perhaps I should withdraw that.

Mr. TAITT: Although giving all due respect to the ability, Mr. Chairman - I am reading from this note here, Sir: –

> "Although giving all due respect to the ability and quality of the composition of the Commission, sources expressed disappointment in terms of its size and narrow scope."

That is all I could find that the Prime Minister could mean as this wicked attempt. Surely the Prime Minister must know that a number of his Ministers have been walking around Barbados saying that they will not work for that paltry money that they get as Ministers. He knows that. They have told me that. One has told me, Sir, that he will not be working for that paltry money.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. I am asking the member to call one of the Minister's name.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, do you want me to call the Minister's name?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Call the Minister's name.

Mr. TAITT: One of the Ministers of that Government told me...

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Call the Minister's name, man! You nuisance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Call the Minister's name whether it be Miller, Tull, Brathwaite, Bolden, Forde, Adams, Craig, or St. John. You can call anybody's name.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, these challenges sometimes can lead to some very serious consequences.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. If a Minister told you that – I would not talk with you. I would beat you and not talk with you. That is a breach of confidence.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet!

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is precisely because I do not want to breach the confidence of the Minister that I will not call his name. He did not say it to me alone. He said it to a group. He said it when we were sitting at the Pelican drinking. More than one person heard it. They cannot bully me. Those kinds of Jack-in-the-box tactics will never bother me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be seated, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I happen to be a Minister of the Crown. The member said a Minister of the Government told him that he is not going to work for that paltry money. I am asking the hon. member to name the Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be seated, please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be seated, please.

The hon. Member for St. Michael South West. You have been challenged by the Hon. Ministers on the Government side. Would you care to call the name?

Mr. TAITT: No I do not care to call the name. It would be a breach of confidence between the Minister and me.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark, Sir. It is a matter of reflection on the other Ministers, Sir. He is misleading the House.

Mr. TAITT: It is not unparliamentary. Mr. Chairman, I give you my assurance, Sir, I am not misleading the House. I will write the name and give it to you, Sir. I speak with the greatest authority because I heard it with my own ears. The point is that I do not believe that this Government ought to get involved.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am asking you, Mr. Chairman, to rule and to ask the hon. member to withdraw the remarks. If the hon. member cannot call the name of the Minister, he must withdraw the remarks and have them expunged from the records.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be seated, please. The Chair will require that you refrain from the comments you have been making with reference to the Ministers, please, unless you can substantiate them, and I also would like to state that, according to my time, it is seven o'clock. The clock in the House says four minutes before seven.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am most unfortunate in respect of this question of time. The Clerks at the desk will confirm that almost each time there is a difficulty of time – *(Asides.)* At the table, Sir. The hon. member for St. James has corrected me. The Clerks at the table will confirm that each time a question of time comes up I seem to be, unfortunately, the person. I will not repeat that the Minister told me that he could not live on that salary, Sir. I will not repeat that. What I will say is that on this side we believe that the time has not come for Ministers and other persons to be given increased salaries. We feel that this should be delayed. After all, Sir, these are the same people who are calling upon the ordinary people of this community to hold strain.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. The member is in need of the money more than anybody else. He is the only one that is not working.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. There must be some rule of relevance to deal with this. It cannot possibly be a part of the Estimates to discuss whether Ministers should get more salaries. We have kept giving it some latitude, but the only possible item under this Head that deals with emoluments of anybody in here is Head 1 which is statutory.
6.55 p.m.

The only possible Item under this Head that deals with emoluments for anybody in here is Item 1 which is Statutory; all the other emoluments under Head 2 relate to the staff of Parliament, the Speaker, Your Honour's salary, and the others are dealt with under Item 1, and apart from the rule against anticipation, it would be most improper in my respectful submission to enter into a debate on members' salaries under this Head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is well taken.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with all respect, the Prime Minister himself went into great detail

and the Leader of the Opposition; they were given latitude. However, I will reserve the rest of my comments on this item for when we come to Cabinet. But I will say that there are certain back benchers in this House and other ordinary members of Parliament who can wait. There are a number of small people in this country who earn $30 and $40 a week and the Governor of the Central Bank on more than one occasion has said that those people working for $100 and $200 a week can hold strain. I am maintaining that the hon. member for St. Michael West taking home $4,300 a month can hold strain. I am very serious, Mr. Chairman. You can hold strain, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may be very much out of order. He knows a lot more about my personal affairs than I do. Would the hon. member for St. Michael South West avoid the discussion relating to salaries of Parliamentarians? It does not apply and nowhere under this Head is it really allowed except in reply to the Hon. Attorney General by the Prime Minister.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if you do not wish me to speak on those matters, I will not speak on those matters. What I would like to happen is that I can get a guideline on which matters they would like me to speak. If they would tell me what they do not wish me to speak on, then perhaps I would save the Chamber the trouble because it seems that almost everything I touch causes them to go into a frenzied activity akin to a tantrum. *(Asides)* If we wish to discuss ignorance, I am willing to discuss that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is to be no cross talk in here.

Mr. TAITT: I heard an aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you addressing the Chair?

Mr. TAITT: I am addressing the Chair, but I heard an aside from the King Know-all of everything in Barbados who sits on the other side. One of these days I will reach the level of knowledge which he has acquired. The problem is, Sir, that no one was able to arrange anything for me when I was young, and I have had to struggle for mine; so that in due course I will reach his level of knowledge, but I will deal with him at another time. I will sit down, Mr. Chairman, by merely saying this: I know that will upset you, because they do not like to hear the truth. They are not accustomed to truth, they are not purveyors of truth, and therefore when confronted with truth, they would constantly wince and wish people who speak it to sit down. I maintain that to give members of Parliament an increase or to have a commission set up to look at increasing the salaries of members of Parliament at this time is too early in the light of what has been said to other persons in this community, other persons who are working for much less.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are out of order.

Mr. TAITT: I am out of order! If you say so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be seated.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make a few comments under the Head of Parliament. I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition is not in his place since he raised some questions relating to the integrity of Parliamentarians, and since I have heard and read a lot of wild statements being made by members of the Democratic Labour Party. I am not surprised about the wildness of their statements because they are in Opposition and I have come to expect that one will get that sort of statements in an effort to regain power; but I would like to go on record as confirming what the Prime Minister has said, and that is, that the integrity legislation, the first Draft of the Bill, has been prepared and it will certainly so far as it is prepared encompass the integrity of members of Parliament. One of the reasons for the delay in the legislation has been that after the first draft was done by Mr. Errol Chase in my office and myself, we tried to collect the precedents from other Commonwealth countries, and the Parliament of Canada has recently been doing a detailed study of this whole question and a model draft Bill has been sent to us under confidential cover since it has not yet been discussed in that Parliament. We have also been able to collect the most up to date and recent reports from other Commonwealth Parliaments on the conflict of interests which must confront members of Parliament, and also other members of political parties.

I would hope that the Cabinet, when it considers the Draft Bill will give some consideration to extending the proposals to deal with members of so-called political parties who are paid by other people and have bank accounts, and that there will be powers to the Integrity Commission to examine the bank accounts and look at dummy companies set up by members of Parliament as well as other members in political

parties who might be outside the scope of the sort of legislation that has been current. I make this point very clearly now because I would really like people in Barbados to get accustomed to the fact that if one makes a solemn pledge in a manifesto as we have made, then we intend to honour that pledge and no amount of carping by members of the Democratic Labour Party including my good friend Mr. Keith Hunte from whom I would have expected a little better, is going to change that, because in a casual conversation apparently he doubts that we will ever bring integrity legislation. I would have expected a little different from him, but when I get members of Parliament saying the same thing, then I think they ought to be told now of the serious manner in which my department at the request of the Prime Minister as Minister responsible for Parliamentary affairs has tried to approach this whole question.

I would hope that when the Bill is ready that we will be able to discuss it in Select Committee and that members of my department will bring to bear on such a discussion all of the research they have done and all the assistance in fact they have had from Sir Robin Vanderfelt of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We would like to get a model Act which uses the best that is already in the Commonwealth and one which would safeguard the interests of the public at large.

I should only want briefly to make a statement about the Advocate. I normally do not complain about the newspapers, but since the question was raised I think I ought to make the position certainly of this Minister and the other Ministers clear. I believe that it is very bad journalism, the type of journalism which one really ought to get before Press Council, and I intend to write to the West Indies Press Council about that article, because the article certainly holds up to ridicule members who are Ministers of Government particularly and members of Parliament. I have written editorials for the Advocate in my younger days, and I always thought that the paper has tried under grave circumstances to maintain a certain standard. I regret very much when I see journalism of this standard being used deliberately, and I say deliberately because it was open to any member who wrote that article to telephone any of us as Ministers of Government and subject to the Official Secrets Act I am sure they would have had a reply on the issues raised there.

Now there are certain issues of fact and what I complain of is not the issues of fact. I complain very seriously about the areas of opinion expressed in that article. Firstly that any Cabinet colleague has placed pressure on the Prime Minister for pay hikes. If the people at the Advocate had done their home work they would have read our manifesto on this issue. Secondly, I complain of the statement which says that sources said that the appointment of the commission appears to be an attempt to justify the increases for members of Parliament and Government Ministers who have found that they are not as well paid as they believe and are now having second thoughts about continuing in Government at such salary levels. That is vicious reporting.
7.05 p.m.

That is vicious reporting; it is the worst type of reporting; I believe it even borders on defamation, and I really wish that if this type of reporting is going to be had, I am one of the strongest defenders of Press freedom, but it saddens me when I am in the process of drafting modern legislation to give freedom of expression, greater freedom of expression to the newspapers that operate in this island, that I must have to stand up to deal with such a thing. There is a representative of the Advocate in this Chamber at your request, and I am calling on the Advocate to carry a complete statement of the attitude that we have taken on this matter and our strong feelings about this matter, because if it is not done, not only am I going to report that newspaper to the Press, I am going to raise this matter with the Committee of Privileges. I am not going to remain in public life to have useless, sniping, nasty remarks about people like the Ministers of Government who have all made sacrifices, and let it be well known that none of us has come in here simply for the money that is being paid. I believe if you look at this front bench, for the first time you have a front bench that does not have to depend on the whims and fancies of a Prime Minister, men who have earned their living on the strength of their integrity and honesty, and this sort of carping, snide, nasty comment is undeserving of any newspaper that has the decency to hold itself forth as the leading newspaper in Barbados far less the Caribbean.

I feel strongly on this matter and I intend to write the Editor of the Advocate and see if they are going to be decent enough to retract that sort of article and statement, otherwise it will be myself, them, the Press Council, my lawyer and the Committee of Privileges, with you, Sir, and I want to make that quite straight, because this sort of thing must stop in the country. I think it is unfair to the members

of the Cabinet to be held up today to ridicule on this. I have walked down the streets and hear people saying that we are putting pressure on the Prime Minister and asking what sort of public men are we, that all we want is more money, and then when I hear the hon. member for St. Michael South West who has been a past journalist, I would expect him to get up in here and defend Cabinet colleagues, and he lends his voice to this cheap, dirty form of attacking people. I resent it most strongly and I am not going to remain in public life and be attacked in that way. Attack me on something on which one is justified, but it is unfair for a newspaper, it is unworthy of a newspaper, and if the Advocate does not want to be taken over.....*(asides)*.....Let me explain what I mean. If the Advocate does not want to be taken over and used for the people of Barbados, so that their public shares are spread among the people of Barbados instead of in the hands of Thomson, not run as a Government newspaper, but it would be localised as they have done under the New Zealand Act. We are not going to run any paper like you, but under the New Zealand legislation all newspapers are localised and the local people own the newspaper, and the Advocate had better be careful that they do not force some of us to bring down legislation saying that it is localised and we Barbadians can quarrel about ourselves.

I am not in favour of control of any Press by the Government, and I want to make that clear. When they are reporting they should report me correctly, but I have always advocated that it is better to have newspapers with a percentage of local ownership and the workers having a share in it, and greater worker participation than siphoning off a million dollars in profits and repatriating to Canada, because then we will be dealing with our own.

I have spoken very strongly on this, Mr. Chairman, because this article hurts, and if they have not got any sensitivity for people who make sacrifices in public life, then they should shut up and let the workers down there take over the press and run it and let Barbadian shareholders have share ownership in it. That is what I want and not Government control, and I want to make that clear, because they may misrepresent me on that too.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, little did I believe that this particular Head, Parliament, would generate the heat that it has. I had risen earlier and I deferred to the Prime Minister. I wanted to speak about a Library of Parliament.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this is the normal time that we retire.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the sitting was suspended until 8 o'clock.
7.15 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is now resumed. When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply, and to that it now reverts.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I did indicate just before the suspension that I was going to speak on Head 2, Parliament, and I do hope that I will not be inhibited in this regard, because I like to be on the side of the Standing Orders and of your ruling, Mr. Chairman and I am certain that I will be permitted to speak on this particular item.

However, I did not think that this particular item, Head 2, Parliament, would have generated as much heat as it has, and I would only wish to say in passing that in so far as the article to which so much reference has been made is concerned, I think that if the Government has found itself on the receiving end on this occasion, they in fact have themselves to blame, because we were told by the Prime Minister that discussions were going on, since, I believe November was the month – discussions on the matter of possible increases for members of Parliament, rather the terms of reference for the appointment of a Commission.

But discussions on these matters have been going on since November, and if the open government that this country has been promised has not seen it fit between November and March to take the people of this country into

its confidence, then if some enterprising journalist has been able to get a scoop – and the scoop is the traditional, and one of the many weapons in the armour of a journalist – if an enterprising and experienced journalist has been able to scoop on this particular matter, I think that the Government only has itself to blame; because they have been discussing these matters since November, and could easily have put out the type of information and in the terms that they wanted to, certainly some time between November last year and March of this year; and instead of criticising an experienced journalist on a matter such as this, I think that the competence of the journalist should have been applauded. First of all for getting the facts correct – and these have been confirmed by the Prime Minister here today that nothing is wrong with the facts. That the facts are all accurate; and apparently the comments, and the interpretation and the gloss put upon those facts, those are what have put some consternation in the minds of those opposite.

I think that what we have is a hard working journalist; and if he has been able to scoop, as I said, this is a traditional weapon of journalist everywhere; and far from being hauled over the coals when they cannot defend themselves, I think that they should be applauded on this particular matter. That is all I have to say about that. I must say that I had a glance at the newspaper this morning, and it was the first time that I knew that such a thing as this was going on; and this in fact brings me to the particular point.

The question of ministers' salaries or the salaries of parliamentarians has always been a political football in this country; and I do not think that it is a matter which should be a political football; and I am not going down that road because we are now in opposition – I am not going down that particular road of criticising the Government for setting up a commission or going into this particular matter; because I believe that periodically the salaries of those who work in the Public Service or serve the public interest should be reviewed; and it has always been a matter of concern to me that the salaries of members of Parliament have always been taken out and not given consideration at the same time that the salaries for other workers in the public Service and the public interest have been considered.

I think this is wrong because I believe that when the salaries of public servants are being considered, all of those, all of us who work or have worked for the public or in the public interest should be considered at that particular time. So you end up with anomalies. At this particular moment I believe that there are certain public officers, particularly in the category of Permanent Secretaries – whether they are super Permanent Secretaries or ordinary Permanent Secretaries – working for more money, drawing a higher salary than the Ministers who are supposed to be heads of the administration of those particular departments of the Public Service. I believe that is so.

I am not dealing with the back benchers over there. I do not know about that. I see that my friend from St. Michael West is smiling. I do not know about those matters. I do not know whether what has been said is true. I have no means of knowing that; but I think that these anomalies do arise because these matters are treated as a political football; and of course you will get an article of this type because you did not come straight out and take everybody into your confidence.

Bear this in mind. The matter has been going on since November; and then because a journalist who has been able to ferret out the information, displaying journalistic talents for which Reporters in other countries, get, I think, what is the Pulitzer Prize, for enterprising journalism we come and haul them over the coals here today; but I am not part of that. I think that this matter is being treated as a political football; and if you read the speeches coming from both sides of the House and intend to be impartial on this matter, if we went back and did some research we would find some interesting statements coming not only from this side when it was in Government, but from that side when they were in Opposition; and I believe that the Prime Minister knows what I am talking about; because he has spoken on the question of increasing salaries of Ministers and of Parliamentarians.

What he said has come true. He said that there should be a commission to study this matter and that it should be taken out of the purview of the members themselves; but if you go back and read these debates you will find, I believe, that the Prime Minister has gone on record as saying that there was no need for pressure to be placed on me by our own members because when we get over there there won't be any increase either; and he was trying to go one better than the then Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. *(Asides)* That brings me back to Parliament. If we had our debates here I would be able to go to the records and find it; but we do not have our own debates

here. (ASIDE: Yes we do). Not easily available.

The point that I am making, however, is that they try to outdo one another, instead of taking this matter and looking at it impartially and forgetting the politics of the situation which can be easily taken and shifted and you can do all kinds of dances around them; but if the then Minister of Finance said that there would be no increase, and then the Leader of the Opposition in order to outdo what the then Minister of Finance said, he then tries to show to the public that he is one better and that there would be no increase either and there need not be any pressure – I regret that I cannot quote the exact words – but members will understand what I am saying; and that is why I say that to generate this type of – I almost said righteous indignation, but I will not say that – but to generate this type of heat, and a feeling that one is offended by comments such as these is beside the point because when you go back and read the record you will see the type of statements which have been made on both sides.
8.05 p.m.

That is why I make my position quite clear. I am not going down the road on that. I believe that the salaries of members of Parliament including the salaries of Ministers should be reviewed from time to time, and that this should be done when – *(Asides.)* I say reviewed. The hon. members says I am hedging. Comrade Taitt is not in here now, and I was not down by the hedge. I do not know. I did not make any statement, but I want to speak about Parliament and the question of the Debates is what I am referring to. Parliament is supposed to be the Chamber in this country which debates and legislates for matters relating to the welfare and development of this country, and I think it is badly served at the moment as far as the resources that are available to Parliamentarians are concerned. This is a matter which has been referred to from time to time by members on both sides of the House. I recall on one previous occasion the member for St. Michael North Central and myself discussed this matter. We came to the conclusion that what was needed in this country was in fact a proper House and accommodation for Parliament. I am still of that view although I believe like most things this will be deferred for some future time, but as far as the Library is concerned, it is a source of regret to me that if you want to do research on the Debates of Parliament that we have to go to other places, whether the Public Library or the Archives, in order to find the Debates of this Chamber.

We have to do something about the Library, and I want to make this point. In some other part of the Estimates there are some proposals, I believe, for sums of money to do something about the Library. I want to make this clear, and I believe the point will be taken over there that there is a Library Committee which is a Standing Committee of this House, and as far as I can recall the Standing Orders state that that Committee is responsible for regulating all matters relating to the Library of Parliament, and to date that Committee has not been summoned for a meeting. I am hearing all types of proposals about external assistance, about going to Timbuctoo, or getting technical assistance from outside of this country to organise a few books and matters that we have inside of Parliament. I believe that, if we have Standing Committees of this House that when matters or new proposals are coming up, either new proposals to be put forward, or old proposals to be modified, the relevant Standing Committee of the House should be called into session to consider them before any new fangled or any proposals are put and come down merely for rubber-stamping. I believe the Committee should be set to work, and on those Tuesday that the House is not meeting, I believe that the Committees of this House should be called into session.

I would like to suggest that instead of going and asking for technical assistance from outside of this country on a matter on which I am certain that there is expertise inside of this country, I think we should call the relevant Committees into being, put the resources that we have within this country to work, and get some type of improvement for this Chamber and, indeed, for Parliament as a whole. Those are the comments which I wish to make on this particular matter.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, as one who has had experience in this House on previous occasions when matters of the remuneration of members of Parliament and Ministers of Parliament have come under consideration, I would like to restate some of the things that I said on those occasions shortly because it was as a result of the experience that I have had and the things that took place on that occasion that I gave serious consideration to a new formula in the event of my political party ever coming into power. As long ago as 1971 we stated, as a matter of principle, that the remuneration of Parliamentarians and their conditions of service, Ministers of the Crown, and important political

appointments, should be taken outside the sphere initially of Parliament. We had it in our Manifesto in 1971, and we put it again in the 1976 Manifesto. Between 1971 and 1976, as a reader of the Parliamentary Journals, which record the practice in other Parliaments in the Commonwealth as a keen follower of public affairs abroad, I am in a position to state that that point of view has been accepted by many of the Commonwealth Parliaments, and even by the United States of America. Not so long ago followers of *Time* and *News Week* would have seen the Commission's recommendations for review of important offices in the United States of America. I decided on that because, as the hon. member for St. Michael South has just said. there is nothing that produces greater hypocrisy in Barbados than the question of members of Parliament and Ministers pay. There is a lot of posing that comes along.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care what the *Advocate* publishes. I do not care what any newspaper in Barbados publishes. The fact of the matter is that people who occupy political office and who are Parliamentary people in this country are entitled, like anybody else, to receive adequate remuneration for their services. Until we put that in its proper context, until we are men enough to face up to the carping type of criticisms, and the malice, and the intellectual dishonesty that takes place among people who masquerade as journalists in this country whose background when you investigate it you will understand that their educational attainment is so low that in any other country in the world they would not even be cleaning the machine which produces the newspaper far less being able to write in the newspaper. So let us get our facts square on that.

It is very unfortunate that another attempt is being made to distort the true position. It is a matter of fact that in this country in the last three salary revisions the civil servants get their salary revision, the Judges get their salary revision, the Governor-General gets his salary revision, and the last of all is the Ministers and members of Parliament. That is a matter of historical record. All of those facts have taken place, as members have pointed out, from 1973 which was the last time when salary revision was given to members of Parliament.

8.20 p.m.

All these facts have taken place as members have pointed out from 1973 which was the last time when salaries revision was given to members of Parliament, and we decided that we were going to carry out the procedure which in 1971 and 1976 we put in our manifesto, and yet we can hear an hon. member over there say that the time is not ripe. That is nothing but sheer posing to try and catch a little temporary esteem, and I believe that the general man in the street believes that if you occupy these offices you should be correctly paid. I said in 1968, I think it was, that unless this thing was brought in its proper context that the standards of public morality in this country would decline, and I believe that by not putting it in its proper context in relation to work and in relation to remuneration in the other places that the standard of public morality in this country has declined. So that I have no fear of any journalist or any writer in the newspaper.

The second point I would like to make which illustrates the total intellectual dishonesty of the writer of the article is that the commission has been appointed and the commission has to make its report, but in the last resort this Parliament will be the one to sanction the report, disagree with the report or accept the report; so I cannot understand how we in this country can be expected to tolerate such a low standard of public education by the media. The media ought to conduct itself as one of the means of improving objectivity on public opinion, not lending itself to debasing public opinion. I hope that the Editor and those responsible for the management of that newspaper exercises some kind of disciplinary action against the person responsible for that kind of thing. If the media is to retain respect in the Caribbean as a whole, they have got to learn to discipline and demand certain standards of objectivity. If the person who has done the report had set out clearly the terms and reference of the Committee and then made his own conclusions, the public would have been able to say these are the facts, these are the conclusions of the writer. If the writer's conclusions were not in accordance with the facts, then the public would see that the real ignoramus is not the people who set up the Committee, but the people who commented and made the nasty insinuations in connection with that. That is what has incurred some wrath. Obviously once you are in Parliament you are going to get some criticism, but there has been no direction at all as is suggested; that is the intellectual dishonesty of the writer, to say it is believed that this Committee was set up to justify the increases. That is a statement which is patently intellectually dishonest. As a matter of fact, it is a direct reflection upon the character of the people who have been appointed to the Commission because it is a direct insinuation that they have been given directives, and they are

willing to carry them out. To tell me that such a person should not be subjected to disciplinary action is to tell me you are prepared to condone that kind of thing. That is all I have to say on that because I know that whether it is us that brought the Resolution or the other side, there are some people who are going to write and say we should not get any, although in their private employment they are asking week after week for 40% and 50% over a two year period. I know that is so, but when you have been in politics for as long as I have been and you know what it is to win and what it is to lose, you know that once you do what you feel is right, you decide to turn a deaf ear to what other people say.

Now, Sir, on the question of the Library, I agree with what the hon. member said. It is totally wrong that we must operate under the conditions under which we operate, and I hope that the Library Committee is summoned. A Library Committee has been established and it should be summoned because it is essential for members operating as we are doing in here as Parliamentarians in which a small number of people have to have knowledge of the broad spectrum of Government without any aids, without any research machinery in the political parties, and in all the Commonwealth now it is recognised that you have to have attached to Parliament if your members are to make an intelligent contribution on various subjects, specialisation or people who do the preliminary screening of the material and submitting it to you with suggestions. It can only function properly like that, and so I do hope that the Clerk summons the Committee and let it appoint its Chairman and get ahead with it, because I believe one of the faults of these Committees is that you appoint a Committee and nobody as convener of the Committee; so that I hope we get ahead with that and let us have a real Library in here and a little later we will have another opportunity to discuss some of the renovations for housing the Library.

On this question of experts, I could not agree with the hon. member more. This is an expert-from-outside society and I have always criticised it. There are a lot of Library skills in this country, but because of the fact that abroad people tell you that they will give you aid, people always feel automatically that you must not search in here, you must search abroad. I do not suffer from that mentality. I believe that the question of organisation of the Parliamentary Library can be done by people that there are in Barbados and what is more, I happen to know from reading the journals of Parliaments of the Commonwealth that they have already done for Commonwealth Parliaments and circulated as part of an annexe to one of the volumes, a list of all the books recommended for Parliament. I have seen it on more than one occasion. I have even tried previously to see how many of these books there were in the Library in Barbados; so a lot of original base work necessary for a proper Library has been decided already by a combination on the submissions to the Clerk in the House of Commons as a result of an invitation of Parliaments in the Commonwealth as to what books would be found useful.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will get these things going, and I do hope that this attempt to bring Parliamentary salaries once again into the arena and the attempt to divide the society between Parliamentarians and non-Parliamentarians is avoided because the Committee has to sit, it has to take evidence, it has to make recommendations, and then this Parliament will decide from what date and whether it accepts the recommendations or not. I give hon. members the assurance that the public will be able to discuss the report when it is published. We want the public opinion because it is our feeling that far from misleading the public we have a responsibility to educate the public to have respect for those people whom they appointed. We did not appoint ourselves; it is the public who appointed us and it is their business, and that is why we want to have an independent report. I am not making any reply to any suggestion that the Committee is a lightweight Committee. I do not believe that can be taken seriously. The careers and the experience of the members who have been appointed to the Committee are well known. Each and everyone of them in his own respective field in my opinion has demonstrated that he has made a solid contribution to Barbados and the Caribbean, so therefore any suggestion that you can belittle the achievements of that Committee is not one that I am going to take seriously. That is my contribution on this.

The question that the sum of $590,001 under Head 2 – Parliament – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 3 – JUDICIARY (1) SUPREME COURT

Head 3 – Judiciary (1) Supreme Court – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $253,692 under Head 3 – Judiciary (1) Supreme Court, stand part of the Schedule, and in so

moving, I wish to inform the House that the Head of Judiciary 3(1) and (2) have been removed from the Prime Minister's office into the office of the Attorney General.
8.30 p.m.

They appear printed in the Estimates in this position because the necessary documentation for the use of the Governor General was prepared at about the same time, or indeed after, the preparation of the Estimates. This step has been taken because the Attorney General's Office already deals with the Registration Department and matters relating to the administration of justice.

There has for a long time been an argument that since the Prime Minister appoints the judges that the Judiciary should be a part of the Prime Minister's Office. The argument had a certain attractiveness, and unfortunately, I think, I will say in the past too much weight was given to the personalities concerned and it proved probably insuperably difficult at certain points for this step to be taken. However, I have been persuaded by the example in the United States where the President appoints all the judges of the Federal Supreme Court as well as all Federal Judges of Appeal and all Federal Circuit and District judges, and yet the Attorney General is effectively the United States Minister of Justice and deals with the administration of the courts and takes all necessary initiatives in making the American Judiciary system work in its Federal aspect.

I have every belief that the present Attorney General will be able to bring his phenomenal talents to bear on these two Heads, Judiciary and Magistrates Courts, and to clear up some of the problems which have beset particularly perhaps Magistrates Courts rather than the Supreme Court, but have beset the administration of the Judiciary Department generally.

I have said all this as a preface to the decision that has been taken, but I should also say that as far as the preparation on the Estimates goes, Judiciary was in my Ministry at the time when the Estimates were prepared and therefore I will do my best to answer any questions which hon. members may have about this or the succeeding Head.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister on showing very good sense in placing these Heads under the Attorney General. I have always felt even when I had the honour to be Attorney General that these matters, if technically the Attorney General is the Minister of Justice for all practicable purposes, that he should be the one who should be constantly in touch with the running of the courts, the comfort of the courts, the comfort of litigants, witnesses and all persons connected with the Judiciary, and I am particularly glad for this reason that as First Vice President of the Barbados Bar Association I have had an opportunity to see the sterling contribution of the now Attorney General on the matters and reports about things he was complaining about when the Supreme Court was under other Heads, and the demands and the other requests he used to make, and now he can no longer, even if he can escape for this year, next year he cannot come down to us and say the Prime Minister had it and therefore he was only appointed subsequently. Therefore I want to warn him that whereas in truth and in fact the Estimates this year under Supreme Court show no startling departure in terms of the comfort of the barristers, in terms of the comfort of the litigants or the jurors, and although I have discovered that the courts are with slight exceptions the same courts I left 18 years ago, I am very glad to see that the Attorney General who had a distinguished practice in these courts over the years, has now got the responsibility direct within the Cabinet for amelioration of the conditions which still exist.

I have always wondered, and I have seen this in Jamaica and in Africa, where you have barristers as Ministers of Justice that the courts seem to be the worst places. I suppose it is like the shoemaker not wearing good shoes, or the carpenter living in a bad house, the tailor wearing patchy pants, and things like that. We have had in Jamaica lawyers as Prime Ministers, lawyers as Attorneys General, in the existing Government when the DLP was in power we had a lawyer as the Prime Minister, lawyers as Attorneys General, etc. etc., and yet the courts are the same courts, except for a chair here or there that you have seen over the years, and I am very glad to see that in the coming year, although reading the notes under this Head, Supreme Court, even the Capital Expenditure which will happen later, there are no startling changes in terms of improving the comfort of all those whose duty it is to attend the court. I am glad to see that he is now responsible.

While dealing with the Supreme Court, I am as a barrister who has returned to the Bar after all these years, I have absolute and complete sympathy for the young barristers who have to practise, and I would just like to ask

the Minister who is now responsible to do his utmost to see that the Rules of the Supreme Court are up to date. I have not been practising for a lot of years and of course I can bluff my way through, which a lot of young barristers cannot do. Of course the judges pay respect to 25 years at the Bar, there is no doubt about that, 25 years from one year is a different story, and when I find myself cornered I have the tact to back out, ask for an adjournment and so on so nicely that the judge thinks maybe he is at fault and not learned counsel. I had to tell a judge the other morning that the law resides in the bosoms of judges and not in the heads of counsel and therefore I would ask for an adjournment in order to apprise myself of the point to which His Lordship was so kindly referring to me.

Be that as it may, I think I can sympathise with the young barristers who find it extremely difficult to practise. I think if you ask a young barrister how to arrest a ship under admiralty or how to bring a constitutional case for an infringement of a right, I think the barrister – fortunately we have such a good camaraderie among our profession that he would get enlightenment from those who are able to assist him. Even here now, I have not practise here for a long time and if I want a point I am not very sure of I would ask my learned friend from St. Philip North. I believe if I asked the member for Christ Church East I am sure he would tell me what to do in the circumstances.

I have had the opportunity to read the reports and suggestions of the new Attorney General and I hope that now he has the opportunity of implementing so many of the things for which he fought and suggested that we would see an improvement in the administration of justice in the courts of this land. Of course as a practising barrister you know I will have nothing to say on Item 15 in these Estimates.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise with a little diffidence on this particular subject which is one on which the learned attorneys themselves normally speak. I cannot even claim any expertise or knowledge about these matters, the Supreme Court. I understand there is a No. 1 Court, a No. 2 Court, a No. 3 and that kind of thing.

I really rise to ask a question, and the Prime Minister did indicate that if there were any questions he would be prepared to give the answers, but I have looked through these Estimates and when comparing the figures in the Approved Estimates for the current year as contrasted with those for the coming year, 1977–78, I do not see very many changes to indicate that during this year the many problems which we have heard canvassed in previous years when the distinguished members were on this side of the House. I used to hear a lot of talk about the Law Library and other related matters.

8.40 p.m.

I do not see very much in these Estimates to indicate that having had an opportunity now to be in the seat of Government and knowing the conditions during their practice, and from the comments they have made during their term in Opposition, I have not seen very much on this. I know that the Prime Minister himself has spoken at length about the Law Library, which books should be retained, which should be taken out, about the Juby Reece Law Library and indeed about his own father's Library, what should be air-conditioned and what should not be, may be now that he is in a position to make decisions – I am not asking him to be too expansive because we want to get on to other heads, and when I look at the front bench there I see that there are eight Ministers and six of them barristers, I am very glad to see my friend from St. Andrew and St. James as well in that team. I know that they can hold their own in that team; but I think that they too will be glad to hear because you do not know when the pressures will drive them back to the Courts. *(Aside).* No, not financial pressures. We do not know if the love of private practice and the interest of maintaining justice in this country will bring them back to practice; and I am sure that they will wish to do something to ensure that these conditions about which they complained on previous occasions are put right.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, if no other hon. member wishes to speak, I think that the Prime Minister will be replying; but I wish to make a few comments. The decision to transfer responsibility for this subject was taken by the Prime Minister after canvassing various views. I would like to make it clear that I really never sought the responsibility for looking after the Judiciary. I do not think that the Prime Minister indicated for instance that in so far as conditions and tenure of service of the judges are concerned, he would consider it to be constitutionally appropriate to keep that subject in his office; and I would think that he is on very good constitutional grounds in those circumstances.

As the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the Leader of the Opposition has said, we are very conscious of certain of the problems which have been confronting the Courts, and I want to say that I certainly am looking forward to the whole-hearted support of members of the Legal Profession which I am sure I would get, despite any little impasses that have occurred, on the re-organisation that is necessary. The hon. member for St. Michael South asked what proposals we do have. I have already with the Prime Minister and the advisers in his office and the Registrar and the Solicitor General been reviewing the results of a conference which was held at the suggestion of the Bar and the report of which was sent to the then Prime Minister's office.

This called for looking at the Rules of Court which, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, are hardly purchaseable these days and are out of date. I have already asked the Chief Parliamentary Counsel to put the review of the Civil, as well as the Criminal and Court of Appeal Rules and the Magistrates' Court Rules at the very top of our legislative drafting programme for this year; and I would hope that some time before the end of this calendar year those Rules will be available to be passed to the Bar and the Judges especially for their comments, and if they are acceptable then to be made by the Judiciary Advisory Council, I believe, and promulgated as part of the Rules.

We are hoping in this exercise to have a look at all those Acts which call for a revision of the Rules. Now the Magistrates' Courts are also in need of urgent revision. I do not claim to be an expert on matters affecting the Magistrates' Courts; but there are several members at the Bar who are very knowledgeable in this field; and we will expect them to give us as much assistance in the redrafting of the Magistrates' Court Act increasing the Magistrates' jurisdiction particularly in civil matters and matters of the criminal side of the law, and also of course in getting a set of Court of Appeal Rules ready.

In so far as conditions in the Courts are concerned, part of the pressing problems in the Court relate to the Registry and the cramped conditions under which staff in the Registry have to work. It will be necessary for us either to acquire or to build for additional space for the Courts and particularly for the supporting staff in the Courts.

The Prime Minister has already, I believe, considered, and is going to seek Cabinet approval for removing the writservers from under the Police and having a Supreme Court and Magistrates' Court Marshall's Staff to deal with the whole question of the service of process. It would release added man-power to the Police Force, and at the same time bring the Marshalls and the Writ Servers under the jurisdiction of the Magistrates.

The Prime Minister has also indicated, subject to the approval of his colleagues in the Cabinet, and Parliament, that he would agree to the appointment of a Chief Magistrate; and it has been one of the strong recommendations coming from members of the Bar; and I hope that very soon I could attend to this and seek Parliament's approval on the matter.

Now we will have to proceed either in the current or in the next Financial Year with the renovation of the Synagogue building so as to get a land registry over there and to get additional space, or we will have to look rapidly for some other building to acquire. The Police themselves are contending that they are cramped. The Registry is very cramped. It is difficult to get documents properly kept. The staff are working under really adverse conditions; and I think that I will definitely have to ask Cabinet to do something about this urgently – para legal staff and supporting staff for the Registry.

I am hoping that the Chief Training Officer will together with the Ministry of the Attorney General work out a scheme for training para-legal staff, in service training as a matter of urgency, but in addition I have, together with the Solicitor General, been formulating a proposal for submission to the Inter-American Foundation for Funding to set up a para-legal course with external funding in the first instance, and I hope subsequently with some of our own funds when the economy improves, but to set up a para-legal course in which there will be an input from the University of the West Indies, the Bar and the Community College. The Community College at present, as I think the hon. member for St. Michael South knows, teaches a course in O' Level and A' Level Law.
8.50 p.m.

The Community College at present, I think, as the hon. member for St. Michael South knows, teaches a course in "A" level and "O" level law, and it is a natural development for that Institution to take over para-legal training. The head of the former Counsel of the Inter-American Foundation, who has been nominated by

President Carter to head the U.S. A.I.D. Latin American Caribbean, was in Barbados last week and I took the opportunity to discuss with him the US AID interest in this Scheme along with the Inter-American Foundation, and he himself was very keen in looking at the subject of the role of law as an instrument of social change. He considers that this is the type of Scheme that they would welcome funding because they would be people who were formerly Solicitors' Clerks who would be trained to an LLB level in the practical side of law to improve the quality of people who help in the Law Courts who service the private practitioners as well as the quality of staff in the Ministries who prepare proposals for legislation and they would have this input. I hope I can get that Scheme going to make some further contribution in this field. We are also proposing to establish a Family Court. I think hon. members will see a little later in the Capital Vote under Probation proposals for a Family Court, and I am sure during this debate other hon. members would give us their ideas on this. I would welcome any debate on this if time allows their suggestions for this, but we feel we will have to look at this area also.

So far as the Building Courts are concerned, the Prime Minister has already discussed, I think, the Bar's proposals and we hope to go back to the Bar on this. The Organisation & Management Division of his Ministry has looked at the Bar's proposals, and the recommendation now is that a Court will be constructed in Speightstown proper which will handle cases coming from St. Lucy, St. Peter, Holetown and St. Thomas. It is not in this year's Capital Estimates because we are looking for the plans for it, but it will be in next year's. It is hoped that we will have a Court at Oistins to take care of the Christ Church and St. Philip cases, and that part of the Speightstown Development of which we spoke in our Manifesto. Hon. members do not take this very seriously. The area at the junction of the Charles Rowe Bridge and the Church area will be considered in our future Development Plans for Barbados. We will have a Court to serve the St. George and St. John areas and there is a transportation reorganisation. There will be cross-country buses bringing the people to this area. These are part of the overall physical planning for the Courts. We will maintain the Court at Belleplaine and improve it. The Holetown Court will be moved to Speightstown in much more commodious proceedings. We would not be abandoning the Police Station though. We think that some of the St. James cases will come to Bridgetown which is nearer, and the others will go to Speightstown which is nearer. I think it will be a much tidier arrangement. Those are the physical plans which we have.

I trust that the Magistrates themselves will get better physical conditions and Library conditions under which to operate. I can disclose to hon. members that Mr. Dyruk and Mrs. Newton of the University of the West Indies are already looking at the Library needs of the Government Legal Department, and they have forecast that it will cost us $150,000 to get an acceptable Library. I am asking them to extend their study to deal with the Courts themselves and the Law Library proper. I am led to believe, and I am not saying this is a set promise, that my initial talking to people connected with the Lily Foundation and the Forde Foundation gives me some hope that part of that capital cost may be funded from external sources as a grant to the country.

I will try wherever possible within the time that I am available on the Government benches in the capacity of a Ministry for 5 years, 10 years, 2 years, 15 years, or whatever limited time it may be, I will try to see if I can make any contribution in this sphere whatsoever.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, before the Prime Minister replies. I was under the impression that the Government had every intention of establishing a Court at Six Roads, and I believe the Minister mistakenly said Oistins to cover St. Philip. If I am wrong in my assumption that there is to be a Court at Six Roads, then I would wish this matter cleared up. I understood, when we were talking about this as a Party, that District "C" would no longer exist on top of the hill for a Court, but that Six Roads would be developed and a Court would be sited there. That is how I understood it. If there has been a change of plan the Cabinet can review that, but that was my impression.

Secondly, under Item 12 – Expenses of Marshals and Jurors in Criminal and Civil cases.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. Is the hon. member dealing with the Magistrate's Court or the Supreme Court? My colleague here says that he does not know much about the Magistrate's Court, but he knows about the upstairs Court.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, these non-lawyers want to intervene at all cost. He is happy now. Mr. Chairman, in respect of the Marshal, I would wish the Attorney-General,

whose new responsibility Head 3(1) is, to ensure in collaboration with the Registrar that within the next two weeks the Marshal of the Supreme Court be given some Crash Course in the basic service of documents. Only this morning there was a matter in the High Court before Mr. Justice Husbands and the Marshal endorsed on the writ that he had served the defendant Company personally. The Judge refused to accept it and the case has now been adjourned for two weeks.

Now you had a man like Mr. Inniss – I do not think it was Mr. Inniss in this case-who used to be Librarian and all of a sudden he finds himself transferred to being Deputy Marshal. I may be wrong, but it appears to me that he is not being instructed in all of the duties of a Marshal and the ramifications of the job. It is a hard thing for a Marshal to understand, for example, that a company is a separate legal persona from the human agents who make up the shareholders of the company, and he does not understand how he has to serve the writ. I would wish this matter to be looked at as a matter of urgency because it has come up from time to time. When Mr. Justice Ward was a Judge he used to be very particular on the question of the service of writs especially on companies, and there does not seem to be any change. That is all I want to say on this because the Government's plans have been sufficiently outlined.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, it is only the speech of the last hon. member that I would like to deal with, although, I would also like to thank the hon. member for St. Michael South. How I regret that he does not live in my constituency, Sir. He never gets up unless he says something good about me which indicates his view of my judgement. It indicates his appreciation of my speeches, and I really felt sweet to sit down here, Sir, and listen to his careful analysis of the speeches I have made for the past five years under this Head. As he was repeating my words they were coming back to me, and his eloquence was lending them weight. I hope that I will never disappoint the hon. member for St. Michael South, and when his hairs are grey in his head he will be able to tell his grand children: "I remember the day when Tom Adams spoke on whatever the subject was in the House of Assembly." But the hon. member for St. Philip North did mention by name a public officer. I do not think that he deliberately means to attack or to reflect on a public officer.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order. The Hon. Prime Minister should know that I was only using Mr. Inniss as an example of a person who has been transferred from one Department to being a Deputy Marshal without, as I understood it, the necessary connecting in-service training to fit him for the job, but he was a very competent Librarian. I was not reflecting on him at all.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad that the hon. member has taken the opportunity to make the same point I would have made.
9.00 p.m.

This happens to be an unfortunate anomaly. Mr. Inniss is an extremely competent Library Attendant; I think that is the official title, but the Library Attendant's job is graded at too low a level to keep a competent officer there; it is treated as no more than being a messenger's post. The post of Deputy Marshal carries more responsibility, so in order to give Mr. Inniss some promotion, he was transferred to being Deputy Marshal so as to improve his salary, but I have asked the Registrar certainly and I think also the Chief Establishments Officer to consider the regrading of the post so that this particular officer can go back to being Library Attendant where he was competent and where I think the responsibilities of the post are at least as great as those of Deputy Marshal, because a Library Attendant has to have some knowledge of the Law Library, Mr. Reece's books and the other books and some knowledge of the rooms where they are and more important he has to be able to keep tabs on the barristers who have taken the books away from the Library and who have failed to return them, and I can testify that Mr. Inniss showed an exceptional competence in all these departments. It is just one of the misfortunes that sometimes you get a very specialised department and if a person shows great competence in it, there is no room to promote him within that department and Mr. Inniss is in a department of one where there was no room for him to go except outside. I hope the Chief Establishments Officer and the Registrar will soon be restoring the situation. It is only a small point, but I would not like a public officer to think that he has been even accidentally reflected on in the course of debate.

The question that the sum of $253,692 under Head 3 – Judiciary (1) Supreme Court – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 3 – JUDICIARY (2) MAGISTRATES COURTS

Head 3 – Judiciary (2) Magistrates Courts – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of

$114,690 under Head 3 – Judiciary (2) Magistrates Courts – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 4 – PUBLIC SERVICE DIVISIONS
(1) SERVICES COMMISSIONS

Head 4 – Public Service Divisions (1) Services Commissions – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $300,668 under Head 4 – Public Service Divisions (1) Services Commissions, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should like to throw out to the Hon. Prime Minister that we have been independent for ten years and I have been in the Government for that period and I think that the time has come when we should establish a commission – now this is a worthwhile commission – to try to devise a civil service for an independent Barbados, a small country, a country with its special problems, with its limited manpower. For too long we have been operating on a colonial type of civil service with increments as a matter of course, with promotion as a matter of course, with our being unable to recruit top notch people for the first time at high levels because it is somebody's turn to step into that post. I have known that in Government we have suffered severely from the fact that it is very often difficult to recruit top notch persons at the highest level of the civil service because of the structure. In days gone by we would bring a Chief Justice from Hong Kong, or a Chief Secretary, a Chief Medical Officer or a Chief Education Officer, and even although we have our own people we have continued with this type of advancement in the civil service, and we have suffered severely from this.

Again if you look at the thinking of the civil service and you look even at the personal emoluments of the civil service, you will again find that because of our history and colonial past we have not in the emoluments paid to people been able to assess the value of an officer who is highly qualified to the work he has to do.

I can give you an example in the personal emoluments. If you look at the salary scales in A, B, C and D, you will find certain anomalies; you will find that a Registrar at the Hospital, a doctor, will get less than some people in the civil service. He may even get less than some people on Statutory Boards who have no special qualifications. I can think of some people at C.B.C. today who are working for more money than some of the doctors at the hospital, people who are without all these years of experience or skill or training at these Statutory Boards. I think the Prime Minister will now see the sense in giving a Prime Minister who is Minister of Finance the right to decide who his Controller of Customs should be or have a say in it if he does not hand pick him. The main bodies through which you get your revenue are Customs and Inland Revenue. The Minister of Finance should have a say in who should head these top posts or be consulted rather than by a war of attrition somebody is appointed Controller of Customs or Head of the Inland Revenue Department.

Again I personally feel that these two departments should be made career departments. I can give an example. I am not bringing names because no complaints have been made to me. Take the Commissioner of Inland Revenue who has been in the civil service for donkeys' years; he has been passed over by juniors in the service who are now Permanent Secretaries. He is competent, he is specialist, that is his field, but he cannot get a Permanent Secretary's salary. If you look you will see that his salary scale is $23,592, but yet in the Permanent Secretary's scale you will find officers who are junior to him, younger men who are no more qualified. This is something the Prime Minister will have to look at. If you have specialist people in agriculture, in the Inland Revenue Department or in the Customs you should make the promotional aspects in these departments so attractive that a person who has acquired specialist skills might not want to get out of these particular areas into administration where the plums are riper. We have got to have a service where you can pay tribute in monetary terms, because this is what they are looking forward to, to persons who need and who possess qualifications in these areas. I have been saying this when I was in Cabinet. We have been going along with the increments. Once he comes in and sits down at the desk, gets in at 8.30 a.m., does not offend anybody, looks busy doing nothing, he will get promotion; he will move on and if he does not get promotion he can complain to the Public Service Commission that somebody junior to him has been promoted. It is true that all these yearly reports mean nothing. You find, like school reports, "fair, quite good, not bad", and when I was Minister of Education I used to ask parents because some parents did

not know what "quite good" meant in terms of marks, or "fair" or "very fair", and it was not referring to complexion. You get this same sort of thing in the civil service.

The head of the department when November comes writes down "not bad" which means nothing, and I think you will find there is a strong argument for making Permanent Secretaries contract people too. This is something we can look at because they would have a vested interest in seeing that the Ministry progresses, because he is going out with you. So he cannot like Old Man River go merrily along while you get spoilt, because he would get spoilt too if the people say you are not producing. There are a lot of ways and a lot of areas where I think we should seriously give consideration to the fact that we have been operating in this way. I am not quarrelling with the civil service because this is how they have been brought up and have existed in those colonial years, some have got in 30 or 35 years; so they have come up in the colonial stream and as is always said, you can take a man out of colonialism but you cannot take colonialism out of a man, and you get this stereotype thinking, no new ideas, no new initiative, no putting forward of any ideas.
9.10 p.m.

I used to find that if there was a conference in Timbuctoo the civil servants would get that on my desk quicker than to put up a bath where a little district would get some water to bathe. Somebody getting a trip, to him that was priority and those things would reach the Minister's desk. You will find it too, probably not so bad, that if somebody invites you to a flee judging contest in Peru, Turkey or Thailand that file would reach you more quickly than the file on fixing a road for 20 people in St. Philip North or St. Michael South Central, so we have in our limited manpower situation, and especially when we are spending in Personal Emoluments $117 million – that is a vast amount of money – we can no longer continue every three years progressively, we have to get value for it, and I know that if we could get, not necessarily outside, within the region a high powered commission to look into it, we do not have to accept their recommendations, but I think the time has come for us seriously to establish a commission with wide terms of reference to enable us to devise a civil service for a small country like Barbados after 10 years.

It is time to review the whole civil service structure to enable us in an area, as the hon. member for Christ Church East says, where we are lacking in manpower, where we can no longer carry out the developmental budget of 100, because we have not got the manpower resources, we have not got the knowhow, the expertise, the time is now. I think you should do it early in your term of office, to establish this commission not to fire anybody but to enable us to see in what areas and what type of civil service we should have, so that in the years to come we can make more rapid progress. This is all I want, I am not criticising civil servants, I am talking from my personal experience having been a Minister for 10 years in Government.

The Attorney General is a very lucky man. He has a right hand man in the Solicitor General, I know he is a giant, so where you can get that type of person all right, and you get some good Permanent Secretaries, but you still have this colonial approach, this attitude which I think the time has come to change. The time has come now for a change in the operation of the Barbados Civil Service. I think that the money spent on this type of Commission, with people properly chosen in Government, in civil service procedures within the region, I think you could get a lot of mileage from it. Whatever you say about Guyana, Guyana did this, Dr. Collins came up with a report and this enabled Guyana, apart from the economic problems, to devise civil service, because our needs are not the needs of the pre-colonial period, we are a young country with limited resources and emphasis on various aspects of our development, our own plans for our own development, and we want people, not high bound by the colonial past, not schooled in that particular colonial thinking in their attitudes towards development, and all the seminars you run, all the courses you run, all the money you spend on training, unless you go to bright young Barbadians by laying down all the criteria you want for certain parts of your service, then you will always get the type of Estimates increasing in Personal Emoluments, three years from now you are going to come down increasing Personal Emoluments, and just as I think the Minister of Education will agree with me, we are not getting the results for the money we are spending, and if we do not get results for the amount of money we are spending either in the civil service or on education the time has come for a serious review of that particular project, and I think that ten years now that we have gained experience, especially now a new administration is in power, I think the time has now come for us to take the bull by the horns, establish the Commission to design and recommend to the Government a civil service for a young independent nation that has struggled along for ten years.

I hope the Prime Minister does not think that this is presumptuous or an attempt to usurp

his authority, but I feel very strongly and I am speaking from my experience in Government. I know of a case in Finance of a man who was with me in Africa, a Senior Assistant Secretary in the Vice President's Office, qualified, a B.Sc., and M.Sc. He comes here for a job, applies, and they tell him he may have an M.Sc. but he will have to come in as an Administrative Assistant. He has worked in Africa in the Vice President's Office, he knew administration but he could not be absorbed in our service because he would be coming in higher than somebody who was waiting his turn to climb the ladder by the war of attrition, and I think this is an excellent suggestion and I hope the Government will take me up on it. This is not a criticism of the civil service, this is a question that if you are in a new administration and you want new dynamism, this is no reflection on civil servants, you want to know from experts within the region, as the Hon. Leader says, whether the civil service you have to rely on is a civil service suited for the type of dynamism and the new approach that you plan to give to this country.

That is all I have to say. You have good civil servants, as I say you can take a man out of colonialism but you cannot take colonialism out of a man if it is entrenched.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, there is just one small point I would like to make, and before doing that I would like to suggest that the post of Chairman of the Public Service Commission be a full time one. I think that some of the problems we have in the civil service stem from the fact that as another Chairman of Commissions these are things where people come in and do some time in the month with the result that you get part time results. The problems of the civil service have grown over the years because it has increased in size, and the demands which the public put upon it have also increased, and unless you are going to have someone who will be available every day to address themselves to the problems, whether these be of discipline or of re-organisation or whatever it may be, unless you are going to have someone who is going to be there on a day to day basis to address themselves to these problems you are likely to find that with the present arrangement the problems remain there too long before they are solved.

If you take the case of discipline, you find that sometimes it takes so long to have a decision on whether or not to discipline an individual that when the actual case is heard many of the people who would have been willing to give evidence cannot be found, they have either forgotten most of what occurred on the particular occasion or they have gone out of the island, with the result that you find that very often the discipline which one thought would have been swift and very effective was no longer so and the person got away with it, and that could very well lead to the situation where people continue to behave in the old conformed ways, because they know that the course of discipline is slow and tedious, and very often have no result at all.

There has been one particular case where an individual was suspended for about seven years, and when the case was eventually heard nobody was available to give the evidence, the person had to be reinstated and given back his money which he had lost over the seven years.
9.20 p.m.

So I think that there is some question of making the Chairman of the Public Services Commission a full time job where he will be available on a day to day basis to address himself to the problems which continue and will continue because we are human beings; and as long as you are a human being you will continue to have these problems because people interpret things differently according to a given situation; and unless something is done, it is likely that the problem of ineffective discipline in the Civil Service will continue and some other problems of which we have complained in the past will continue.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, first, Sir, I would like to associate myself with the member for Christ Church East, endorsing what the member for St. Michael North Central has said, Sir; but it seems to me to be all tied up with the suggestion coming from the Leader of the Opposition; but when the member for St. John was here earlier today he was using the phrase "self congratulatory" in reference to the Prime Minister with great rapidity and repetition throughout the course of his two hours speech; and I was very pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that he thought that what he was doing was an excellent suggestion.

He said it about himself, and the kind of bold stand that the Leader of the Opposition has taken now, having been in Government for 10 years and not having adopted those postures during the ten years lead to the inescapable conclusion that this is his last term in here; because he is making some serious suggestions about the establishment of a Civil Service to cope with the problem of postindependence for a third world black country; and the details of his scheme or his idea, I think, need to be examined closely by the Government.

Obviously it is not provided for in the Estimates for the coming Financial Year; but not only must we look at the Civil Service, but with a view to future planning as a socialist party, not only must we plan the economy for the next 10 or 15 years, but we must also plan the subsidiary services and the services which put into fruition the plans which we have to transform this society.

I think that we all will accept that we want to see some significant mark made to transform not only the structure of ownership, but every fact in this society. I am not prepared to sit down forever and ever or even for ten years, as the Leader of the Opposition sat down when he was Minister, until my turn comes that they want to toss me out or I decide to go. I am going to give a certain period of time for the settling in and then I want to see this party take this country into a different system. *(Aside).* Yes, the Attorney General always picks his words, he and the member for Christ Church East, reminding me of my words about a radical opposition.

I do not mean radical in the sense that Barbadians are accustomed to use the term "radical", because if you get up and keep noise and become rumbuctious, they do call you a radical. I am talking in terms of political philosophy; and I am sure that the next two years this country will see the Barbados Labour Party has programmes which will show a significant difference between ours and the Democratic Labour Party.

We must remember that there was some criticism today, or if it was not criticism it was a repeated comment by the former Prime Minister that these were their plans and we supported them. What do you expect? We started the harbour and they continued it. Must we just abandon that and leave a whole mass of rubble there? Government is like a corporation, almost having perpetual succession. They started things and we will carry them out and conclude them; but do not forget that we have our own to introduce, and where it is possible for us to make a break with what they have done and have the opportunity to conclude our own initiatives then we will do that.

My position on the Service Commission is a simple point that it appears to me that a number of people register at the Service Commission at Maxwelton in Collymore Rock; and they register two or three years and then their applications cannot be found. I know the case of a chap who registered for the job of security guard since February, 1976, and in January, 1977 he came to me. I took it up and there was no trace of his application; and it was only after speaking to the Permanent Secretary of Defence and Security that he was told to make a new application; but he had evidence that he had made the application since 1976.

Now, there must be a better system of the keeping of records. This is not the only case that has most recently come to my attention. In addition to that, there are cases of people with seven or eight O Levels who have been registered for years and have suddenly found that someone with three or four who has registered after them is given an opportunity or a "break" to join the Public Service before them. I think that there must be a better attempt to ferret out the oldest applications and those with the most merit, and when opportunity arises to give those persons with their ability an opportunity to join the Public Service. There will be other considerations, but these in my submission are the basic guidelines along which the people at Maxwelton should function.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the call for a full time Chairman of the Public Service Commission. Although I do not think that my few comments will need considerable worry to get support, I would like to make one or two observations in conjunction with those made in support of the idea thus far.

When I was in the Civil Service many years ago, it was my view that there was a considerable feeling of injustice among Civil Servants in the two or three departments in which I worked. Over the years I have come to realise that it is not without justification that a lot of people in the Barbados Civil Service feel that they have been ill treated; and part of the reason why this is so is not only because some of the yearly reports are quite often very biassed, but because the Chief Personnel Officer and the staff have to wield a disproportionate power in the Civil Service when you do not have a full time Chairman whose interest and style would be that when he is given the names of three people in the whole Service who have been short listed for a particular post, he says oh no. Give me all the files dealing with the officers who qualify and I, sitting as Chairman, will make my own short list and put them before the Committee.

I want to say with great respect to the Chief Personnel Officer who is here and to the department that he wields disproportionate power in the Civil Service and that is bound to be so if you have a part time Chairman who has got to rely on the Personnel Department to do the short

listing, and to do the processing in relation to candidates.

The bureaucracy is now too vast for us to continue with a part time Chairman; and even though I believe that the present holder of the post is doing his utmost and using his own Civil Service experience to depart from the idea of the personnel officer telling him who are the candidates in the running, he still cannot succeed. In the end he will be over-whelmed by a system that is far too large now to be serviced by a part time chairman of the Public Service Commission.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way. I think we have reached the agreed time. I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the time to which we have agreed to work. I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

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

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, when the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply, and I presume, Sir, that to that it now reverts. I have just look at the rules, and I think that I know that Your Honour is worried. If I can draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 9(3), if after a quarter of an hour, no quorum is present, or if at any time during a sitting any member draws the attention of the Speaker ...

Mr. SPEAKER: About what? When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it now reverts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair.

Head 4(1) – Service Commissions for the sum of $300,668 was resumed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Christ Church East was on his feet. He may continue.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet making the point that in my humble submission the time has come in Barbados when there should be a full time Chairman of the Public Service Commission. I was supporting that submission with the argument that bureaucracy was growing so big, and the amount of cases of injustice in the Civil Service was so large, that there was need for a Chamber with more time to investigate these matters.

I was also making the point that the Chief Personnel Officer's Department was exercising a disproportionate power in the Service by virtue of the fact that the Public Service Commission did not have enough time to be in on the ground floor in the processing and short listing for appointments.

Subsequent to the adjournment I have been exposed to the view that my observation was somewhat dated in that it related to an earlier period when this practice existed; but I am sure that the more the Public Service Commission gets itself involved in the short list protest the better even though the strong statements that I made are not accurate. As I understand it, recently the practice has grown up where the Public Service Commission has more time to deal with other matters because of the fact that acting appointments do not now concern them in the same manner as they used to concern them in the past. Because they have been shedding some of the routine work.

I would caution that while it is necessary to shed the Commission of some of the routine work, we have got to be very careful that Heads of Departments instead of favouring Mr. P or Mr. C do not give Mr. P two or three short term acting appointments and then use the argument that because he has acted on two occasions and acted well, that he is entitled to permanent appointment over the person who was overlooked and who deserved it by giving short term acting appointments.

The point that I am making is that in a small community you cannot deny the fact that very often there are considerations other than merit in appointments, promotions transfers etc., in which there are Heads of Departments who have cousins, they have brothers, they have aunts, they have friends, they have girl friends and all sorts of relationships which they may find it necessary to reward and to do it by favouring one person as opposed to another; and the Public Service Commission has got to be ever watchful and exercise a supervisory role so as to ensure that a lot of the cases of personal injustice in the Civil Service do not occur with the frequency with which they occurred in the past.

I concede that a lot of the cases have been unjustified. It is part of our society that you have people going around saying that they have been unfairly dealt with when there is no justification for that. That is one of the features of our society. All sorts of people walk around feeling that they have been unfairly treated when in a lot of the cases it is not so; but in 15% to 20% of the cases which are carefully investigated there are good grounds for holding that individual persons have been unfaired and ill served; and the Public Service Commission has got increasingly to pay attention to these cases of personal injustice. The point is whether or not we have a full time Chairman of the Public Service Commission in the future which will depend to a large extent on whether the Teaching Service should have its own Commission or continue to be part of the general public service with the Public Service Commissions having responsibility for all of their personal matters.

I would like the Prime Minister to tell us in the course of his reply whether we are likely in a very short while to have a separate Teaching Service Commission or otherwise. The other point I want to make before I sit relates to the annual reports of the Public Service. It is clear that something is wrong with the system of annual reporting. There is no uniformity and there is scope for considerable improvement. All of that is part of what is wrong with the annual reports of the Civil Service and I trust that we will see very clearly the Personnel Department giving serious consideration to the working of the system so that there will be less dissatisfaction with the system of annual reporting that presently exists.

Just one point in regard to the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the note that the Commission should look at the whole system of recruitment, transfers, promotions and generally the sort of values which should be the inthinking behaviour of the public service in an age of independence. Trinidad, immediately after independence found that it was necessary to do such a thing. I do not know if fifteen years after what would be the observation of the success of the effort. Sir Lewis did sit as Chairman of the Commission that looked in the very question of the role of the Civil Service in an age of independence. The reason why that was found necessary is because the civil service in Colonial times was concerned in playing a regulatory role, holding the reins and maintaining law and order.
12.10 p.m.

They are not organised to meet the Independent goals of an Independent country, so that without using the self-serving words which the Leader of the Opposition used, that it was an excellent idea or an excellent suggestion, I think there is some merit in it. I am not too sure that we need to resort to the heavy-handed mechanism of having a Commission, but, certainly, I believe that we should begin to have a look at the fashioning of bureaucracy to serve the developmental goals of this country in an age of Independence.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to add just a few words to what has already been said on this debate. I think the last speaker did offer some constructive suggestions which Government may very well take into consideration and, indeed, some similar constructive suggestions have come from this side. Some people will argue for a full-time Chairman. There is a school of thought which will argue that there ought to be a Public Service Ministry. Which ever is the prevailing view could lead to a discussion of a series of moot points.

Mr. Chairman, civil servants are from time to time and from season to season maligned by both sides of the House. I myself do not share in the general view that civil servants are a lazy lot and are not interested in doing anything but receiving money. Sometimes when persons go to be served by the Civil Service and are treated in a particular way by a particular civil servant, they will form a view which they might express on the spur of the moment that these people are a lazy lot, but by and large, Mr. Chairman, I believe, that some of the best brains available in this country reside in the Civil Service of this country. I think that one of the problems of the Service is the organisation of the service. Obviously, no Government is going to be able to reorganise the Civil Service in one fell swoop or by any series of legislation, but what has to

happen, in my view, is that there must be a will to reorient the Service towards management in a developing society. It is completely different when you have a country like Barbados, which is a developing society, from when you are in a Civil Service in one of the more settled and developed countries like the United States and the United Kingdom, etc.

Now, there is a lot to be said about streamlining all of the Services into a Public Service Ministry, and the Government of the day has the right to decide what kind of arrangements it will make for the proper carrying out of its functions. There are those who feel strongly that if there were a Public Service Ministry that a number of the services which are now performed in a piecemeal way could be consolidated and, as a result, there would be a higher measure of efficiency. I think myself that what is of much more importance is the need to look at the basic structure of the Service.

Mr. Chairman, it is my view a little behind the time for us, constantly, to continue with what can only be described as a series of line organisations in the various Ministries. It seems to me that if we continue in Barbados to have everyone, regardless of his expertise, being considered in terms of either the length of time he has been in the Service, or the position he holds within the hierarchy, what tends to happen now, and will continue to happen, is that persons with extra-ordinary expertise and ability, or even extraordinary will power, will feel that there is no scope for them for rapid development, either as a person or for their careers within the Civil Service, the result of which is that the Civil Service over a period of time will find itself recruiting what, in effect, will be the mediocre part of the work force coming in at any given time.

I believe that the Service will have to organise itself in terms of line organisations and staff organisation. I do not believe that there is any sacrosanct principle that no one working in a Department or Ministry should earn more than the Permanent Secretary in that Ministry. Of course, I believe that Permanent Secretaries should be properly paid, but by the same token if you have persons in, say, the Ministry of Finance, the requirements of a person to assist in bringing in large quantities of Income Tax is, say, a chartered accountant's qualification, if chartered accountants outside of the Service are earning $70,000 or $80,000 a year practising, if a Government wishes to introduce a chartered accountant to work for the Government, the Government would have to make different arrangements for the chartered accountant. The chartered accountant is only one example of what I am talking about. In most of the progressive countries in the world there are two lines of Civil Service entry into the Service. One line is that you come in and work your way up to the top by your ability and your capacity. The other line is that you acquire a specialised expertise, and because of that expertise you are able to almost command within a certain sphere the kind of emoluments and conditions of work you will have.

Now, we cannot gainsay the physic reward which persons get from working within a Government. After all there must be some Civil Servants who work for the Service because they like it, and that cannot be gainsaid. All in all, Sir, one of the things which I would like to see this Government, or any Government, do is to take a very serious look of this question of separating out the experts in all of the Departments. Another thing, Mr. Chairman, the approach to work on a Ministry basis can be baulked precisely because of hierarchial structure in various Ministries. I think what developing countries must do is to take a look at the task force approach. If we are going to be constructing houses, let us have a task force which would include the administrator, will include the sociologist, will include the economist, but you will have a team cut across the Civil Service from the various Departments, and that team would be responsible for the building of houses in the community, the projection of new and different types of housing, and if one takes into account what my friend from Christ Church East said about housing being a very important section in the community, then you should have a task force on which the Government could call at any time and at short notice to prepare feasibility surveys and to go out into the field and to make sure if we are, for example creating a community that we do not build only houses and leave out playing fields; that we do not have the roads co-ordinate in such a way that the traffic cannot be functioning even 20 years after the housing project has been completed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have to belabour the point except to say that the kind of model Barbados has used for the development of the Civil Service is a model which even those who created it has started to throw out. The Westminster model as a model for the administration of the Civil Service has been proved to be unsuitable for a developing country. That is not to say that there is nothing in that model that would be acceptable

to Barbados, but I am saying that there are newer models in developing countries as well as developed countries which can be applied in our Service to the advantage of the country and, indeed, to the advantage of the Government and at not more cost.
12.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, you will find that we will vote for X amount of money for salaries and wages and at the end of the given year, due to the vacancies which would occur we may not in fact use all that money and yet it would have appeared as if the Government spent a large quantity of money for these services. It would be better if we had a system where the Personnel Department was able without let or hindrance to utilise persons from one department or another and to bring in new persons for short-term periods even at the very highest levels including the level of management. This system that I am advocating is not new; it is available for almost any one to look at it. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that I think the time has come for us in Barbados to pay some attention to this newer, different and in some ways better system of administration.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I will not be very long on this particular matter. I merely rise to support the call by the Leader of the Opposition, my colleague and friend, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central for a study of the public service in this country. The type of study which he has in mind and that we have in mind is one which is different from the studies we have had. What we have had in the past have tended to emerge out of investigations into relativaties of salaries and other anomalies in the public service, and we have also had one Wiseman looking at the organisation and methods employed in the public service, but the type of report I am thinking of would go into the whole rationale, structure, procedures, indeed the total method by which the civil service organises itself, goes about its work and tries to achieve its objectives. I believe that that type of study would repay dividends.

From time to time we have heard of the Westminster models and other models. Whenever the Westminster model is referred to of course it is in respect of its unsuitability to our purposes, and I think it should be pointed out that that model is changing from time to time and is refreshed and renewed through studies of the public service in Britain. We have never had that type of indepth study of the service here. We have had internal organisations or re-organisations of separate Ministries; we have had a hiving off of subjects from one department to another department, but the total examination of the service in terms of what it should be doing in an independent Barbados, how it has developed and how it should be developed and how it can achieve maximum efficiency is the type of study that we have not had. I am not at this stage recommending any full time Chairman of the Public Service Commission, because I think any such recommendation would of course arise out of a study of the work load involved in new developments which may be proposed, and I think such a proposal itself might arise from a main examination to which I am referring.

I think the hon. member for Christ Church East was quite right when he said that the need for a full time Chairman of the Public Service Commission might in fact depend on other developments. I see in the notes to Item 13 under Head 4(1) reference to the Teaching Service Commission. Maybe I missed it but I have not so far heard of the proposals for bringing that particular Commission into being as this would take off a considerable amount of the work load from the Public Service Commission for those public employees who fall within the scope of the Public Service Commission now. I am referring to those in the teaching profession coming under their own commission as was envisaged. This would put the matter into a different relationship altogether.

We would certainly like to hear what are the proposals in as much as it is mentioned here about the teaching service commission for bringing this particular Commission into being. We are certainly looking forward to hearing something about it. Maybe we could also hear something about the Statutory Boards Service Commission and whether the work load for that particular Commission is increasing or decreasing. I am not certain whether this particular Commission deals with the firing of persons, but there have been a number of persons from statutory bodies who have been fired. *(Asides)* They are not fire-proof. They have been fired and I am not certain what is the relationship of the Statutory Boards Service Commission in this particular exercise. We know that the Services Commission deals with the question of recruitment, appointment, promotion, transfer and discipline of the workers in the several services, and I think in these areas you will always get problems

because when you are dealing with personnel matters, problems arise. But by and large I believe that this country has been well served by its public service, but having said that, I believe that the time has come when we could look into that service in order to see how it could perform even better in independent Barbados. I do not wish to say anything more on this particular Head at this time. Maybe we could get some response to those matters which we have raised.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I really was heartened by the standard at which the debate under this Item had reached, and were it not for the fluent style of the hon. member for St. Michael South being diverted by an aside by the hon. member for St. Lucy who never misses an opportunity to fire a political arrow, I think that the debate would have gone even more smoothly. I would like to say that whilst commending the ideas being expressed by hon. members, that there have been ideas, as the hon. member for Christ Church East knows which have been occupying the attention of the Barbados Labour Party. Indeed the hon. member for Christ Church East has been consistent in the stand which he has taken on such matters both within the Labour Party's hierarchy discussion group on consideration and execution of policy and the views which he has expressed sitting as a member of the Government's party. I am a bit surprised however that the other members who have spoken on the side of the Opposition have not adverted to the occasions on which, while I sat on the Opposition, I made similar calls for a review of the civil service structure in this country.
12.30 p.m.

Indeed last year on 16th March, Mr. Chairman, I began debate on that subject – and I believe that there were only two of us who spoke on the subject, Mr. Frank Walcott and myself – and I began the debate by saying that it is not often we have debate in this House on the functions of the various commissions since of course when once they have been appointed one tends to leave them alone for fear of the allegation of political interference. I want to say that I said before in Supplementary Estimates, and I wanted to repeat it then in that debate, that the time has come for a review of the regulations and procedures which govern the civil service. I pointed out then, as I again point out, that not only has a study of the re-organisation of the civil service in a developing country been done both at the University of the West Indies by professor Gladstone Mills who has done a lot of work on this and by my friend Mr. Bertram Collins of Guyana, but there has been a tremendous amount of work undertaken by UNESCO and its panel of experts, and the benefits of their studies have been available for the past Government to have followed.

It seems as though now we have formed the Government of the country we are being given an opportunity to implement ideas which have been thrown out by us whilst we were in Opposition but which had been ignored during the time we sat on the Opposition benches. For instance, Mr. Chairman, I was making the point forcibly, as I made the point on several occasions, that there is too much distinction in the civil service between the established and the unestablished staff in their conditions of employment. I made the point then and I make the point again that the system of dealing with disciplinary offences, as the member for Christ Church East has said, leaves a lot to be desired and we are not often satisfied that administrative justice is being achieved. I made the point then and I repeat again for the benefit of hon. members that New Zealand has a system that is very attractive and indeed very worthwhile, a model that we could adapt, and I would like to inform hon. members that already within the Attorney General's Department one officer, Mr. Carlisle Payne, has begun to undertake a study of the whole issue of administrative justice, how it is meted out by administrative tribunals, including the Public Service Commission, the *ad hoc* tribunals which it sets up, and of course the Privy Council.

I had an instance of making an appeal to the Privy Council in a case and asking for the reasons to be given and I was told that one does not have access to those sort of documents nor should the Privy Council have to give any reasons or make the Public Service Commission give reasons. These are things that we have culled from the United Kingdom and we have followed them in some respects rather slavishly. I remind hon. members on the other side and inform those who are new on this side that at page 6146 of the debate on the last Estimates I said then "there is no reason why we must continue the archaic system which was culled from the United Kingdom and existed in certain areas of the United Kingdom as to the Public Service." I am hammering this point to show that the Barbados Labour Party, and if I may score one political point to neutralise my friend, has been conscious in Opposition as it will be in Government of the necessity for the review of the civil service, and we will certainly not only on the side of administrative justice, but I believe the Prime Minister will speak more deeply on this matter, but one of the terms of reference we

trust of the constitutional commission will be to have a look at the whole area of the civil service, not only to shield it from direct partisan political control but to make it more efficient and effective to answer the urgent needs of a developing country. The civil service will be included.

I hope that both of the major political parties will approach their task on that commission, assuming that they both accept the Government's invitation in a non-partisan manner, and that we should look ten years after independence in finding a constitution not only affecting the Public Service but a constitution which will give greater impetus to the pace of development in Barbados. That is why we have been insisting on a review of the Constitution, and I am glad to hear three hon. members on the other side who are very high up in the hierarchy of the Democratic Labour Party, a party which has after all had 21 years so far, 15 of which were spent in Government, a party which one must concede is now part of the historical process of this country, and a party which ought to acknowledge that it has played some role and that some time in the distant future might have another more effective role to play, but that is only part of the aside of politics.

Seriously I would hope that we can on this issue of a review of our Constitution really rise above the interest of the immediate election gambit and have a look at the long term interest of Barbados as a whole. As I said, this debate is refreshing, rewarding and it says a lot for the standard of debate which I am sure this House can always maintain if we set out to maintain the standard.

I want to make one point which the hon. member has clarified, and I think he has done it very well, the hon. member for Christ Church East. It is a fact that of all the members in the House I was the only one who has had the privilege and the honour to have served on the Public Service Commission in the capacity of its Deputy Chairman. I think even then the Democratic Labour Party recognised my independence of views at that stage on matters of this nature and even now too, but I served them and recognised even then that there was certain bottle necks in the service. I will say this for Mr. Gittens who has since retired. I happen to have served under him as Chairman and he was a person who displayed the qualities of looking to help the under-dog in the civil service. Very often he would send for files and look to see that the man who ostensibly may have been passed over got his case properly aired and ventilated and was given an opportunity. I know of several instances promotion-wise where people who may not even have been on the short list were promoted because of his ability to dig and to insist and to enquire. I have every reason to believe that a similar system is now being followed in the service as a whole.

It is true to say that we have some very good civil servants. My own view is that we are becoming probably a little bit like as in the top hierarchy of the civil service. Part of this is no doubt due to the fact that some officers have gone abroad, have gone out into private life, and part is due to the fact that because of the nature of the civil service that we have inherited it takes a long time for some young men and young women to come to the fore. I am happy to say that within my Ministry one of the brilliant young men of the future in the Civil Service has recently been appointed as Permanent Secretary and Ambassador to Caracas, and will be our Ambassador and is our Ambassador designate to Guyana, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, and in due course Surinam. At 38 years of age he has reached the top of the service, he is well reported on throughout and is a brilliant person. *(Aside)* I speak of Mr. Brazane Babb, a man whom I had the privilege to teach as a student, and I taught the hon. member for St. Lucy as well.
12.40 p.m.

I am hoping that the accent on promoting young people will be emphasised more and more in the Service. I made a strong plea at the United Nations for the promotion of youth and women in the International Civil Services, and it is a plea which I repeat in this House for the promotion of women likewise. We have a lot of brilliant, young and capable women in the Civil Service; and I would like to see some of them moving into the rank of Permanent Secretaries much faster than has been done before and even accelerated; and that is one of the reasons why we set up a Commission on the Status of Women to look into this part of the Civil Service so that we could accelerate the pace of women's promotion.

Now there is a point which I think is a good point, raised by honourable members, about technical experts in various fields. If I may say so, since I have been more closely connected with the day to day operations of the Government, one of the things that has struck me most forcibly is the lack of a think tank group of people in the Civil Service. The hon. member calls it a task force; I will say a think tank plus a task force – a combination of both.

It beats me how very busy Permanent Secretaries particularly in Planning and Finance – let us face it. We after all carry along with the Cabinet Secretary and probably the Head of the Civil Service in planning to keep Barbados on an even keel, and still push it ahead. It amazes me how they can find time to think about the future plans and proposals and at the same time deal with the day to day administration of the service and of their departments and running from one meeting to the next.

It is a tremendous grind on their intellectual and other capabilities. I do not think it is a question of having run out of ideas. Sometimes I think it is a question that they do not have time to think out or formulate their ideas properly; and it seems to me that in the establishment structure we must demand a look at this group of experts who are looking for new policies and taking the Manifestoes of the Parties – if you like – they know them well, and bringing a fresh breath of air into the corridors of Government.

In the international field, one of the things that I regret to say is that where one is formulating policies for the country you either have to do it yourself as a Minister or ask officers to take home the work and do it in their spare time; and there seems to be a hesitancy in getting consulting services of experts in Barbados outside of the Civil Service. As I said earlier, this must of necessity, slow up development and the absorptive capacity of the Government to perform.

So I think that both the Honourable member for St. John, in one of his good moments yesterday – and there were not many of them – the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, and again the hon. member for St. Michael South West and the hon. member for Christ Church East made good contributions. I think that both sides of the House will have to confess – I think that the Prime Minister said this because he is conscious of it – we must admit that it is difficult for either the Civil Service structure or indeed the whole structure of the country as presently organized, to spend the money to push the country forward within the time.

It is a serious thing confronting both of the major political parties in the country. In my view the minor political parties have no immediate answer to this at all. It is bound up with the whole educational structure, and I am hoping that the member for St. George South will be able to push along the curriculum development which was started, not under the first Minister of Education of the Democratic Labour Party Government, but I believe under the second Minister – that he will be able to push it along rapidly; because I believe that if one re-organizes the educational structure of this country so that it is responsive to the economic and social problems, the economic problems of Barbados can be easily solved. What we must try to tell children is that there is no harm in looking at models other than you find in some western democracies.

There seems to be a fear sometimes for us to see how something is done in Eastern Asia, Africa or other parts of the Globe and done more rapidly. One of the countries which has pushed development rapidly in recent years has been the People's Republic of China; and yet when I struck out to re-orient our thinking and views I am told that I am posing on the big stage of world affairs. (ASIDE: Communist?) I never said that. What I am saying is that where we find models that are relevant to our circumstances we must not get into all of these various "isms" and decide not to use the models. If they are proper models use them.

As I have said already our Party has had a great debate on this before we became the Great Combination in Government. When we were a Great Combination in Opposition we had a great debate on this matter. The hon. member for Christ Church East has articulated some of our findings and our views in the finest language I have heard spoken in this House, and I congratulate him on his fluency and his choice of words. I hope that we can improve the standard of debate and the public at large can benefit from this type of criticism, constructive and useful, heard from both sides of the House on the question of the Service Commissions. I am very grateful for the idea which has been thrown out, and for having been able to participate in a debate which I think reached standards better than one finds in Congress or indeed in many of the other Parliaments of the world.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I only want to speak on two points which have emerged in the course of this debate. I believe that for a very long period of time when I was sitting over there between 1966 and 1971 I advocated that there should be a free exchange between the private sector and the Civil Service; and I believe that this is still a valid proposition to make today.

In addition to that, the last speaker mentioned the point about the use by the public sector of some of the private sector to carry out development programmes. I have given a lot of

study to this aspect, and it is indeed a matter which should be taken up; because I happen to know, not only in my own profession, but in many other professions and technical vocations in this country, that there are a number of people who are under employed for certain period of time in their professional career. I am sure that their services could be utilised in getting the development programme going.

We have a problem here, which is a very serious problem. The problem is that people who do these services have an exaggerated idea of their work particularly in those professions which have adopted scale fees; and problems will arise in Government using these services. I remember not so long ago addressing the Caribbean Association of Engineers, and one of the points I specifically raised with them was that if we are operating in communities right through the Caribbean in which Governments were being called upon to be the prime movers in changing the social conditions under which people live, and engineers had a great part to play in changing these conditions, it would be unreasonable to expect that Government projects could be financed on fees charged upon the basis of scale fees. The reason is simple. The Government involvement involves a much larger sum than the private sector as a general rule.
12.50 p.m.

I feel that these Associations and these technical people should get together and decide that, for repetitive work, Government should be given special consideration just as in other countries in the world. If you go to an architect, whether he is working for the local Government or for the Engineers, and you ask him to do a design for 50 houses of basically the same prototypes – because he will only have two or three different ones – you get a basic fee and then you have a reduction in the scale for repetitive fees. When we hear about this lack of manpower coming particularly from the former Minister of Finance, who had all aspects of development under his control, I remember always wondering why it was that 42 Departments could be controlled by one person.

The position is that this issue has to be faced by the Professional Associations. As the member for Christ Church East has said, we cannot continue to make the excuse that programmes are held up because of the fact that we do not have the manpower to carry them out. I am sure that all of the time of most of the professionals in private practise, whatever the profession is, is not so taken up that they cannot lend aid to Government, but this is a bridge that we have to cross. I hope that, during the time we are in power, something will be done to ensure that we can utilise them on scales other than scale costs.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Does any hon. member wish to speak again? Mr. Chairman, I have taken note of all the matters raised during the course of the day. They were very thoughtful contributions by hon. members on both sides. The point relating to the future organisation of the Civil Service will, as has been mentioned by the Attorney General, be referred to the Constitutional Committee that the Government intends to set up in the relatively near future. The points which were made by the hon. member for Christ Church East, I am glad to say that he has answered them himself this morning upon a more matured consideration of the matter.

I am glad to see that the hon. member for St. Michael South West repudiated the concept of the Civil Service as an army of occupation, and I congratulate him also on a maturity which, perhaps, he is better able to find in these matters in Opposition than when he lay under the more immediate and heavy hands of his controller. The idea of a Public Service Ministry, I have never quite understood. As far as I can judge, the Prime Minister's Office, and before that the Premier's Officer, has always fulfilled the functions of a Public Service Ministry, since all of the Public Service Department are under its immediate wing. If it is intended that there should be a Public Service Ministry with a single Permanent Secretary, in other words, combining the positions of Chief Establishment Officer, Chief Personnel Officer, and Chief Training Officer into one, I have no doubt that the Constitutional Commission will, in due course, examine that possibility. There are, to my mind, undoubtedly too many Permanent Secretaries in the Government of Barbados. I believe that the Government of Great Britain gets by, I think, with 43. I will give way to the hon. member.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw to the attention of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister that the Sorum Report – I do not know if he had an opportunity to read it – did go into great depth into this whole question and it might, perhaps, provide the rationale for the Public Service Ministry, which I am not necessarily allocating.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the hon. member. I was going to say that in Great Britain, I believe, that 43 Permanent Secretaries of whom 4 deals with Defence matters: There is a Permanent Secretary of Defence, and then one for each of

the Service Ministries. At least three of those are redundant in Barbadian terms. Indeed, I am not so sure that all four of them are not redundant in Barbadian terms, but this means that the administration of the Public Service of Great Britain is carried on effectively with fewer than twice as many Permanent Secretaries as exist in Barbados.

I think that in the United States there are only 8 Departments in the Federal Government headed by Civil Service Under Secretaries with full charge. There are numerous other Deputy Assistant Secretaries and persons with various titles who are not at the top of the Civil Service administration there in the Departments. Even if one wants to go to extremes, I believe that in the Soviet Union there are by some fortunate coincidence, only 23 officials as near to Barbados of Permanent Secretary status, but in Barbados we have these officials. This is a matter which will take some looking at. Clearly the solution can only be a long-term one, since we already have this number. I must say that without in any way seeking to derogate from the quality of the officers concerned. I must say that I have got nothing but co-operation and assistance from all of the Heads of Departments in the Prime Minister's Office. I really do think that, even granted the responsibilities of the Prime Minister's Office, 9 Permanent Secretaries is a large number of senior posts to be carried under one Minister. There are 9 Permanent Secretaries, at present, who exists in the Prime Minister's Office. I think that there is all sorts of room for reorganisation and reassessment of the need of Government. In the next few years we hope we will be able to give to these needs some of the new ideas that we think we are bringing to bear on other aspects of running the Government of this country.

With regard to the Teaching Service Commission, I was specially asked about that. In its nature the Teaching Service Commission is not yet ready to be set up because there are parts of the Education Act which have not yet been brought into force, and the operation of the Commission will depend on that. Therefore, it is true to say that there are not active plans for bringing into force a Teaching Service Commission at the present time, but the entire matter is under review. If hon. members have noted that Item 13 refers to the Teaching Service Commission, that is merely a precautionary note rather than an active note.

Other points which have been raised appear to me to have been very fully dealt with in the speech of the Attorney General, but I would just like to add my quota very briefly on the question of a full-time Chairman of the Public Service Commission.

1 p.m.

This used to be a part of the policy of the Barbados Labour Party. It no longer is an active part of our policy. The fact that it has been dropped between elections can be taken to mean that we do not have the same views. I do not put that to mean that we are against a full time Chairman; I merely mean that it seems to us that the need for a full-time Chairman is no longer so vital as it was certainly before the Constitution was changed in 1974. The volume of work being carried out by the Public Service Commission is of necessity less because a good deal of it has been shifted on to the hard-working shoulders of the Chief Personnel Officer, and indeed there is some spin off in the direction of the Chief Establishments Officer also because the work the Personnel Office might normally be expected to do is at present done by Establishments Division. At the present time with some of the responsibilities of the Public Service Commission having been taken away by a constitutional amendment, I do not think that it would be right to over extend its establishment. The Constitutional Commission will of course go into the previous constitutional amendments and will decide whether it may not be better to shift back on to the shoulders of the Public Service Commission some of the appointments which are now carried out in the Prime Minister's office.

I myself, although I have the responsibility, felt some abhorrence when I saw in the first couple of weeks in September minutes arriving on my desk asking that I approve the appointment of a temporary gardener at Enmore Health Centre. What I have done is to re-centralise in the Chief Personnel Office all these appointments so that the volume of the work can be observed, as he is the person who in my view is best qualified to deal with it anyhow; he can supervise it and the volume of work can be collected and collated so that the Constitutional Commission when it sits will be able to deal with one officer, the Chief Personnel Officer, and take evidence from him and the amount of unestablished and temporary staff in the Public Service and the work involved in servicing it. That is the reason why it has been centralised, but I should not like anyone to think that the job of appointing school meals supervisors, servers, assistants, porters, temporary gardeners, temporary nursing assistants and so on is one which is relished in the Prime Minister's office. It is dealt with now, I believe, by the Permanent Secretary to the Prime Minister. Much of the background work is done at that level, but I do not know if I would be

gladdening the heart of the Chief Personnel Officer to tell him that I would much rather that a lot of it be done by the Public Service Commission operating through the same channels as it operates through in the case of established officers. All of this will have to come and then we will be able to take another look at whether a full-time Chairman of the Public Service Commission will be necessary in those circumstances.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If the Prime Minister would give way, I did not quite understand that point. Was the Prime Minister actually saying that the category of appointments which he has just read out are all done in the Prime Minister's Office by the Permanent Secretary and not in the Ministries themselves by the separate Ministers.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is a loaded question, Mr. Chairman, and I will therefore have to answer it "yes" without qualification, but I would just have to add the rider, especially for the benefit of the Press and so on, that the work is done by the Chief Personnel Officer who in the course of carrying out his duties is subject to such ministerial directions and policy, and I fear in some cases, and detail as is the normal civil service to Minister policy activity. What is true is that the work of these appointments has been removed from the Ministries.

We have not been contentious in this debate, but I will just say without putting any bells on it that I do not want ever again to see a Minister collect a list of names of persons who had never applied for or had applied and had been rejected to the school meals service and say that these people must be employed, and then justify his winning a seat by 20 votes in terms of saying that is the 32 people that he gave the jobs to in the school meals service in his constituency. I do not want that to happen again. I think that in the Ministry of Education the power to appoint school meals officers was abused, if you want me to be contentious. I think it was abused from the days of Mr. Cameron Tudor, and it was abused down to August, 1976, and it should be handled at the personnel officer's level with whatever relationship he has between his political Ministers and himself contributing in the normal and ordinary way as it does with his other appointments to the appointing process.

Hon. members as they settle in opposition will realise that this will be a better Barbados when nobody can go to a Minister and ask for a job. Do not catch at the 12 or 20 votes that you got in by; look at the fact that although you were able to give 32 people a job in August in the school meals programme, that you nearly got beaten. Look at the fact that those 32 people may have had families embracing 200 or 300. For what it is worth to the Leader of the Opposition, a little survey was done relating to people's reactions to certain things and one of the comments was, concerned with the Leader of the Opposition, he gave those 32 people a job but he didn't even count to see how many of them were Charlie's. Those are the things to look at, that we will be able to do our jobs as Ministers better when people do not look to a Minister to give employment. Bear in mind that the United States tried this; the spoil system was invented by Andrew Jackson in 1832; be declared, to the victors belong the spoil, and this went on for 80, 90, 100 years and they are only now getting out from under it because they realise the danger.

President Wilson had to refuse his brother a job as a postmaster in a town in Kansas somewhere, I believe, and when you get down to the point that in the middle of deciding whether America was to enter the First World War, President Wilson had to be dealing with a minute and an application from his brother to be a district postmaster in a town of a few hundred people in the middle of the United States, you will realise the triviality and the waste of a Minister's time when it is to be taken up dealing with jobs at those levels of which he is speaking.

The question that the sum of $300,668 under Head 4 – Public Service Divisions (1) Service Commissions, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk calls the next Head, Head 1 was postponed. I now have the information relevant to Head 1, but since it shows the hon. member for St. John in a very bad light and I will have to make certain statements exonerating those whom he suggested were diabolical liars and perhaps pointing the finger of diabolical lies in a different direction, I wonder if hon. members of the Opposition present would indicate if they want Head 1 to be resumed now or if they would like the hon. member for St. John to be brought back into the House to take his licks.
1.10 p.m.

He may not come back, I cannot wait forever. I want to hear from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, in the light of the fact that the question was asked by the Rt. Hon. member for St. John I am sure that the Prime Minister would wish to wait until he is here to give the answer, but if he wishes to give it now he can do so, it is no big thing.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not know if the Rt. Hon. member for St. John is coming back in here. Indeed having asked the questions I have asked I now think I could as well go ahead because I think that will keep him out too. In the absence of any comment from the Leader of the Opposition I am going to go ahead. The hon. member for St. Michael South West must not be too previous, he must not attempt to usurp the functions of the Leader of the Opposition, and he should be advised that there are at least two in the queue before him more able and more likely even if not more willing.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the Prime Minister will give way, as he knows very well he was not always the most willing, the most likely or the most able, but he made it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Those remarks should be addressed to the General Council of the Democratic Labour Party and to the hon. member's colleagues.

I move then that Head 1 be recommitted.

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

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

HEAD 1 – GOVERNOR GENERAL

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yesterday, Sir, when Head 1 was called questions were asked about Item 15 relating to the purchase of a car for the Governor General. In his contribution to the debate the hon. member for St. John raised a question as to whether $15,500 had been voted in 1976–77 for the purchase of a car yet a car had been purchased that cost $38,000 and therefore the Estimates required that in this year an amount be voted for the balance of the purchase price of one car. In the course of his remarks he indicated that some public officer must have been guilty of breaking the financial rules in that $15,500 was provided for the purchase of a car but he authorised the purchase of a car costing more and therefore would have burst the vote.

A little later on when challenged on this he made certain remarks about public officers. In particular the hon. member for St. John challenged the Attorney General who said that he had been informed by a public officer that the buying of a more expensive car had been authorised by the then Prime Minister. The hon. member for St. John, who was the then Prime Minister referred to, asked for the name or the office of this public officer and said that he would have to produce an affidavit otherwise be branded as a most diabolical liar. I can report that the public officer concerned was the Permanent Secretary, Finance who was Permanent Secretary, Finance, Finance also in the Ministry of Finance and Planning when the hon. member for St. John was Prime Minister. I can report also that the Permanent Secretary, Finance – I will call his name, because undoubtedly it has gone abroad that the former Prime Minister said that one of his Permanent Secretaries was a diabolical liar – the Permanent Secretary, Finance is Mr. Harcourt Lewis, a Permanent Secretary whose integrity *vis-a-vis* the Estimates has not been challenged in my hearing and to my knowledge, and it is this person whom the Rt. Hon. member for St. John sought to characterise as a most diabolical liar.

Before I demonstrate who is the diabolical liar in this matter I want to say this. Repeatedly over the last six months the hon. member for St. John has made categorical statements contradicting a number of persons, chiefly his political opponents, but also involving public servants or persons in the position of public servants. He has contradicted me in respect of a matter of a medallion purchased for election purposes showing himself and the American Ambassador. That was contained in a speech which I believe I made in here; that turned out to be untrue. He said in the House such a medal did not exist, and as some members of the Opposition will agree I specifically showed the medal to the hon. member for St. Michael South and it was subsequently produced on television. I am only taking out the most significant examples. Later on he said that Mr. William Demas, the President of the Caribbean Development Bank, had been asked by me to dismiss an officer of the Bank. Mr. Demas had to contradict him in this, and this was another case where in the popular view they were trying to tell a lie on a public officer. Now he has indicated that an officer who could easily be identified by the traffic in here would have been a most diabolical liar in saying that he, the hon. member for St. John, had agreed to the purchase of the more expensive car rather than the cheaper. The facts are quite to the contrary. It was the hon. member who specifically authorised the purchase of a more expensive car.

During January, shortly before January 23, 1976, there was a discussion between the late Sir Arleigh Winston Scott and the then Prime Minister, who was the Rt. Hon. member for St. John. At this discussion it appears from the existing notes that the then Prime Minister authorised the purchase of a Daimler limousine costing approximately $39,500 (Bds.) to replace the Austin Princess limousine which was then 10 years. I will read from a Minute which was sent to the Cabinet Secretary by the Private Secretary to the Governor General on 23rd January, 1976, and it reads:

"Cabinet Secretary,

I am directed to inform you that consequent on representations made by the Governor General, the Prime Minister has today authorised the purchase of a new State Car, a Daimler limousine, costing approximately $39,500 (Bds.) to replace the Austin Princess limousine which is now ten years old. The Prime Minister today further authorised the purchase of 50 stacking metal chairs and 12 metal tables at an approximate cost of $3,000 (Bds.)."

There is a second paragraph which states –

"I am further directed to request you to inform the Aide-de-Camp in due course as to the vote to which the cost of the above items should be charged."

The copy in the Governor General's file of this Minute is initiated as correct by the late Sir Arleigh Winston Scott. He is not here to give us his testimony in person but that should not justify anybody telling a lie on him. He has initialled it as correct and I believe that the Attorney General will indicate that this would be the exemption of the rule against hearsay, a statement by a deceased person, indeed made against his interest since the vote was only $15,000 and he was asking for a car for $39,000. It is probably admissible in court.
1.20 p.m.

Now, there is a good deal of correspondence by the same Permanent Secretary of Finance who is implicitly described as a diabolical liar who questioned that decision on the 27th January in a Minute relating at that stage to the question whether it was intended that there should buy two cars. That is the purport of his Minute which makes it quite clear that he was aware of what the money was being asked for, the replacement of a cheaper car. That is implicitly what was meant by that Minute.

We go on then to find that this two-car business was canvassed. It went to the Cabinet. The question of chairs went to the Cabinet. I believe that there is a supplementary vote for the chair, but the question of the car at this stage had not be pursued. Again, now, on the 16th March, 1976, the then Permanent Secretary to the Prime Minister, Mr. Corbin, minuted and asked whether two cars were to be bought or only one; and on the 18th March, 1976, E. W. B. whom I took to be the hon. member for St. John minuted: "I have no information on the purchase of a second car. Please see 90". "90" is the Minute which I have read out to the House which said that the Prime Minister has today authorized the purchase of a new State car, a Daimler limousine costing approximately $39,500. He himself refers his officials to the very Minute that says that he was the person who authorized the expensive car.

I very much hope that in the interest of letting the public of Barbados see that these remarks about people being diabolical liars is seeking to contradict provable facts, and the hon. member for St. John should be treated with the contempt that these facts deserve. The Press has a duty to tell the public how to regard statements by the former Prime Minister of this country when he seeks to attack and castigate decent people and public servants.

I do not mind if he does that to me. I can contradict him and I contradicted him yesterday on the Central Bank matter; but this expression "diabolical liar" is recurring in his parania. He said that he telephoned Dr. Courtney Blackman and told Dr. Courtney Blackman that he would be a diabolical liar. I have the file proving that he did tell Dr. Courtney Blackman what he denied saying. Now I have the file proving that he did authorize the purchase of the expensive car.

I will say no more, Sir. I beg to move that Head 1 stand part.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Prime Minister would be kind enough to let us have a copy of the relevant Minute for consideration. I am serious because the hon. member for St. John is not here and he may wish to refer to it. So I am just wondering if a copy of the Minute could be made available. I am merely asking.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I can take the hon. member for St.

Michael South seriously. This is the most diabolitical aspersion on the character and integrity of our Prime Minister when he read from a Government document indicating that the hon. member for St. John yesterday lied in a most bold...

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like to point out that there was nothing in my statement indicating that it was a diabolitical aspersion on a member of Parliament which would be indeed a breach of our Standing Orders. There was nothing at all diabolitical in what I said. I was merely asking whether the Prime Minister would be willing to make available a copy of the relevant Minutes that he read out so that if the member for St. John wishes to reply he would have the full text before him. This was no aspersion.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. As I understand it the member who has just taken his seat doubts what the Prime Minister of Barbados read from that document. He is now asking the Prime Minister to let them see a Government file because he does not trust or believe the Prime Minister of Barbados. That is what he is inferring. In the mean time I can advise him what he can do. The debates will have to be printed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member thinks that just asking for the file is not an aspersion on me I can only assume that there are two indications – that he is tactless and a very ignorant person who does not realize that when one reads out something and you say you want to see it you are insulting them. For what it is worth...

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order. This was a very simple request. The hon. member for St. Thomas may say that I may be ignorant. He can always say that about anybody including the member for St. Thomas. I did not ask to see any file. *(Aside)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I would like with your permission just to put the matter straight so that there can be no doubt about it. There was a debate, and the hon. member for St. Thomas asked whether he could proceed or whether this matter should be deferred. It was precisely within the context that the member for St. John was not present and would not be here to reply. The member for St. Michael South West did indicate that the matter would be deferred, but the Prime Minister did not take that particular line. All that I am saying is that the hon. member for St. John is not present. I would like to assure this Honourable Chamber that there was no intention on my part to cast any aspersion on any member of this Chamber, least of all the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Prime Minister.
1.30 p.m.

All that happened was that the former Prime Minister is not here, and that some very damaging remarks have been made. If any aspersions have been made they are against the member for St. John, and inasmuch as the Prime Minister did read out the relevant minute, all I was asking was whether those minutes that he read out and made public could be made available by copying so that the member could have access to them as soon as possible. We do not wish to refer to our own hearsay and record of it. If the Prime Minister is not so minded, I think he can say: "No that request cannot be granted." I do not think there is need for any long debate on this. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Please! Cross-talk must stop!

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the request of the hon. member for St. Michael South may have been loaded, but really if I were the Prime Minister I would have no objection to giving him a copy of it, Sir, because he wants to be armed with the documentary proof to satisfy his Party colleagues that the Chairman of the Democratic Labour Party – I am not calling him a liar at all. The Standing Orders say I cannot call him a liar – that he has been contradicted by his own writing in circumstances when all of us sat in here yesterday and heard the member for St. John say: "Who ordered the car? Who ordered it." The document here has contradicted him. The member for St. Michael North Central, ever since the last election, has called on the hon. member for St. John to retire and get out of public life before he disgraces himself, and now today the member for St. Michael South wants the documentary proof. I do not know why the Prime Minister does not give him. Furthermore, he has come in here and he knows that it is a grievous wrong to cast aspersions on the character of a public servant. He takes Mr. Lewis, who is one of the most senior members in the Civil Service, and drags him about in here by all kinds of innuendo and embarrasses the man in the presence of other civil servants, and all of you will sit down in here and have meetings at Eagle Hall, or wherever you are going to have the next one under him, and carry him on a platform! That kind of person?

The former Prime Minister told Franklyn last year that he lost the election against me because he associated with a man whom the public did not like. Do you want anything more vicious? Let them get rid of him from public life once and for all.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I sat here and listened to the various remarks, and I am appealing to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues to defer this matter. We must take into consideration the fact that the former Prime Minister is not here, and I consider this as a very important matter. It is my own opinion that the air should be cleared about it; therefore, I feel that justice should be done. I am again appealing and requesting the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to defer this matter and let us hear both sides of the story. Every story has two sides and, therefore, we as members of the Opposition and, especially myself, feel that we should hear all of the facts concerning this matter to know who is a diabolical liar or who is not one. We must hear the pros and cons of this important issue. I am, therefore, very perturbed, having listened to the Prime Minister and having no one here to reply; therefore, I am appealing, again, to the Prime Minister to have this matter deferred. I shall take the responsibility upon myself to ask the former Prime Minister to find himself in here in this House of Assembly and defend himself.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I have never been Prime Minister and never likely to be; so there will never be any attempt to prove that the other one was as bad or worst than somebody else. That is all it is. The amount involved in this is $38,000. The former Prime Minister, the member for St. John, who has run this country for 15 years, is definitely wrong to be so dogmatic and so categorical that he did not order or did not change the car. Do you think I would swear to something in the Ministry of Education? There are a million and one files to deal with. I know that this Prime Minister will never make that mistake. The former Prime Minister was wrong. I do not think he was out to prove that he was infallible. Now $38,000 is for a car. The Estimates have in $15,000. During the course of negotiations with the Governor-General they had a conversation, he did not have the file before him, and they decided to change and buy a Daimler. He, as Minister of Finance, knows that he should not give those instructions, or he should come to Parliament if he has changed the allotment, and he does not remember – we are all lawyers – that he gave or wrote .....

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order. How, as a lawyer, can the Leader of the Opposition say for the absent member for St. John, that he does not remember?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am satisfied that if he remembered he would not have been so dogmatic and emphatic in saying that anybody who said so was a diabolical liar. This is purely destroying a reputation. That is all it is. To the extent that the member for St. John said that the person who said so is a liar, he is wrong. But to the other extent that a Prime Minister who has run Barbados for 15 years, in dealing with a little motor car for the Governor-General, can he remember every minute he has written?
1.40 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition forgets that the former Prime Minister said that every year the Governor-General's people used to come asking for a car. You don't forget that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Why would a Prime Minister who has run a country lie about a $38,000 car for a Governor-General? *(Asides)* If that is how you feel, there is no argument I can put up that can pass through your head. I am not defending him. I could find myself in the position tomorrow where in all the Ministries I have held my colleagues can come out and say I wrote something. If I am foolish enough to get up and say "no", they can produce the file and say "here is such and such a thing", and I would be a liar diabolical or otherwise. The former Prime Minister was wrong to have been emphatic in a matter like this, because I am sure there are a lot of other issues where he should never dare, unless he has a file to refresh his memory, to tell this House categorically that such and such is the case, and if you showed him that minute I am sure he would be the first to say "I do not remember writing it, if you have it there, then I wrote it and I authorised it"; but this idea of trying to tear down people who have made a contribution is something I have never been a party to. I have contributed to the Sir Grantley Adams Fund. I attended the unveiling because I like to pay tribute to people in this community who have made a significant contribution, but we have reached a stage in Barbados today where one is out to tear down the other, or I am out to prove that you are not as good as he is. Let us in our way make our contribution and let us for heaven sake remember, that whatever you say about the hon. member for St. John, in the Caribbean and in Barbados he has made a contribution. *(Asides)* Do not mind where he is making it. There is nobody in Barbados, if you

have any respect for history, who can say that for fifteen years guiding the destinies of Barbados he has not made a contribution. Do not let us get on like this because of a little thing like a car for the Governor-General. He is so sure that he is sticking to the financial rules that he knows as Minister of Finance X dollars are voted, but he cannot remember and this can happen to any of us. He cannot remember that he did authorise either as a result of conversations with the Governor-General or in conversation with the Ministry of Finance the buying of this car. It is human to forget, it is human to err and it is divine to forgive. I am not defending him because I am the first to admit that having been so emphatic and dogmatic he should have had the file or he should be in a position to deny it. Therefore to that extent he is wrong. I have been in court long enough to know that a witness can genuinely forget. A witness can very well make statements which if he is reminded will remember. Policemen do it. Sometimes if their minds are refreshed they will turn around and deny the very thing. All the lawyers over there know that you go into the Assizes, a witness tells you something, you take up the deposition and ask: "Did you give evidence in the court below?" You get the answer "yes". "Do you remember who was the magistrate?" So when you put all the evidence to the witness he would say "Oh, yes, I forgot" or "I now remember". This is human; it happens every day in the courts of law, so why can't it happen in politics?

Mr. Chairman, when my days come to walk out of in here I would not be shedding any tears because we have reached the point where we are not prepared to be kind and charitable to each other; we are out still electioneering, still campaigning and one is out to prove that this man has not done anything, I will do better. From the records it is not true and clear that he did authorise the buying of this car at that price, but you want to say he is a diabolical liar, he should be disgraced and nobody in Barbados should listen to him.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, I believe the Leader of the Opposition is getting confused with two words. One is a diabolical liar and the other is a biological liar.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: When you get these stupid interruptions, what do you do? All I am saying is that to the extent that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has read out from a file, he is right. The hon. member for St. Michael South was not doubting his integrity. He has said that since the Government benches feel so strongly after the strong words of the hon. member for St. John, in fairness to the hon. member for St. John you should let him see his own minute so that he can prove to himself that the strong words which he used against the civil servant were misdirected. As a matter of fact, if it were me and the Prime Minister had said that to me after I had made those strong statements and he had handed me these notes, I as the member for St. John would apologise to the civil servant whom I had said it about; therefore all this hullabaloo is only to try and destroy the hon. member. I am not a party to that. You have to be charitable in this House. It was wrong to have been emphatic in the absence of the file. Now that the file shows he is wrong, all the hon. member for St. Michael South is saying is that you should give him an opportunity to see if he is man enough to apologise to the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Finance. If that minute is shown to him where he authorised the buying of this car and the hon. member does not say so, then of course I would be the first to disagree.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, my colleague the hon. member for St. Philip South made a request asking the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to defer this item. I am joining with him so that we can get on with the business before us. He says he intended it as a motion, and I am asking the Prime Minister to let us defer this item until some time in the future and let us get on with the business. If the Prime Minister is not going to defer the item, I would like him to say so that the question can be put and let us go on. I think that we are wasting a lot of precious time over a matter the points of which have been made, and I would like to get on with the business of the people.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: With respect, this is not a question of wasting of time and no attempt to gloss over what has occurred should be allowed. What we are dealing with is Parliament, an institution which according to our constitution enacts laws in Barbados. What we are dealing with here is a high principle of ethical standards. Do not let us try to get away from that fact. Whoever the personality involved is, to come and tell a lie to Parliament is a very serious thing, and that is the issue at stake. No attempt by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to try to exculpate the former Prime Minister from the deed he has committed should be tolerated. We have had many instances of people who have risen to the top and made

outstanding contributions to their country and yet still have been called upon because of their falling from their high ethical standard that the nation has demanded of people who have that position. It happened to Nixon, it happened to Profumo. This is the seriousness of the matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I have heard various speeches. I think I must now concede that the hon. member for St. Michael South was not indulging in the usual snide tactics of the Democratic Labour Party and suggesting that I was reading something and leaving out words. I have heard the former Prime Minister say that more than once. *(Asides)* I have never heard the hon. member say so, that is why I concede that is not what he meant. For what it is worth, as I came in here this morning, I showed the file to the Attorney General and drew his attention to the two portions concerned.
1.50 p.m.

For what it is further worth the file was put in my hands this morning by the Head of the Civil Service in the presence of the Cabinet Secretary, and we were subsequently joined by the Permanent Secretary, Finance and I have discussed it with the ADC at Government House and therefore I am satisfied that there has been no forgery of the file, and I believe that they are all satisfied that I have read out what is in the file, therefore I cannot quite understand why what is here is of all that importance, what is actually in the file is of all that importance. If the hon. member was asking for the whole file to see whether there was something else that could qualify those statements I would say, well this is something that is perhaps a reflection on me. I could understand that but he is saying he wants to see the actual Minutes. He had a duty to take note of them; they exist, and as far as I am concerned that is that.

If the Leader of the Opposition perhaps had asked for them to be read again or something I might have read them again. Certain issues have been raised in this debate of the nature outlined by the Leader of the House and of the nature indicated. There are 23 of us present in this House today and the Opposition is still so full of the importance of the hon. member for St. John that it is pressing on us that we must defer the business of the people for which 23 out of the 24 of us are assembled here in the interest of the 24. Some of the Opposition members are asking for it to be deferred.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Any request from the Opposition should come from me. I am the Leader of the Opposition whether you believe it or not, whether you feel so or whether there are people at my heels or yapping at my heels I am still the Leader of the Opposition and you must look for requests coming from this side from me as the official spokesman.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition has said that, and I hope he understood what I meant when I told the hon. member for St. Michael South West that I was not taking the request from him. You may recall that I said that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is still there and that there are several in the queue before the hon. member for St. Michael South West. That is exactly what I meant, but that members of the Opposition – I mean the sincere, good-hearted but totally and misplaced intervention of the hon. member for St. Philip South, he still is so obsessed by the member for St. John that he cannot see that the 23 of us must leave that behind. The member for St. John belongs to a closed chapter in the history of Barbados; that is what the hon. member for St. Philip South cannot understand, that his 15 years of service will be seen in a year or two years in a historical light.

We are still in the aftermath of the election. The election of 1976 is one of the historical watersheds of Barbadian politics. In many ways the election of 1961 was a watershed. It marked the demise as a governing influence of Sir Grantley Adams in exactly the same way the election of 1976 marks the demise of a governing influence of the hon. member for St. John, and we cannot go on in here being obsessed by the hon. member for St. John. We are forced because his reign is so recent to pay more attention to his remarks than the inherent quality that those remarks justify. For approximately four or five years in my view the hon. member for St. John has been effectively a spent force. He was *de facto* a spent force from about 1972-76 and he is *de jure* a spent force now. The reason why we should dwell in this debate, notwithstanding what the Leader of the Opposition has said, is that a great deal of attention is still being given to remarks made by the hon. member for St. John as though they had some merit or represented some power of thought which has been obviously absent for many years.

I think it is nonsense in the advocacy of the Leader of the Opposition for him to say we should give the hon. member for St. John a

chance to apologise. The hon. member for St. John does not apologise for anything. If the hon. member for St. John had been in the position of the Leader of the Opposition on a certain occasion, which I am sure he regrets as indeed as much as I regret it, there is no possibility that he would ever had apologised. He does not know what it is to apologise, this is in the man and therefore it is a waste of time whether he is a spent force or not to speak of apologies. Mr. William Demas contradicted him and he yet got in here and said something to suggest that Mr. Demas had not contradicted him, instead of apologising to him for lying on me, to put it crudely. His own Minute contradicted him.

I have not emphasised about the diabolical liar. He got up on the platform and said I am a diabolical liar, Tom Adams is a diabolical liar. If he says that I wrote to Courtenay Blackman about those matters, when I produced that letter he wrote his answer, 'did I not say the right thing? How could Courtenay Blackman publish that without the Government agreeing?' In other words, that would be not a concession and avoidance, not an apology. You see, he shifted ground from my being a diabolical liar, or that I was telling the truth, but that he was right to make a contradiction. This is going on and it is having an unfortunate effect on politics in this country.

We see the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. It is still so obsessed with the image of the picture of the hon. member for St. John that when he got up yesterday and talked outright thorough-going nonsense about the polytechnic that has been rejected by everybody who has anything to do with it, the former Minister of Education, the further former Minister of Education, the present Minister of Education, the Inter American Development Bank, the Prime Minister, everybody who has anything to do with the polytechnic knows that it should not have been in Martindales Road, but in the course of giving greater coverage to what the hon. member for St. John said than what the Prime Minister, the hon. member for Christ Church East, and everybody who spoke yesterday, CBC gave much greater coverage to the hon. member for St. John's speech. In the course of that they repeated the nonsensical arguments that were rejected by the hon. member's colleagues some years ago and were substantiated only by the force of his personality even in his declining years, and we have to drive out of people's minds, and most of all out of the mind of the hon. member for St. John himself, this belief that something merely has to be said by him to achieve importance, and it is true.

I recall that there was, in my opinion, an international incident or inter-CARICOM incident, fomented between Mr. Burnham and myself partly by the mischievous statements of the hon. member for St. John, that he was on the beach at Paradise and he knew it was not three miles out, the pilot told him that. Had it not been for the communications between the hon. member for St. John, which were conveyed to Mr. Burnham, I do not believe that Mr. Burnham would have taken upon himself to disturb the good relations between Guyana and Barbados by insulting the Prime Minister of Barbados in the way that he did.

We have another instance where the hon. member for St. John clearly, because of the irresponsible patterns of speech and habits of speech into which he has fallen, has embarrassed the Ministers in Guyana where he talks outright nonsense about Mr. Burnham is sick, so they invited him down there and he is going to get $3 billion in development for them. All that is true in that entire episode is that Mr. Burnham is ill; that is all. And this goes on and on and on, and until we nail these things we will not persuade either the hon. member for St. John to refrain from these statements, refrain from irresponsibility in his speech, or will we persuade his colleagues and his erstwhile followers that a tactful indication should be given that he is no longer to be regarded as a major spokesman. Perhaps he will come back, 57 or whatever it is, is not old, but he is worn out by those very same 15 years and that is what the Leader of the Opposition should understand. That is exactly what has to be appreciated.

2.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any useful purpose will be served by deferring this Head. I am glad that it has been brought to this House. It does not seem to matter how often the hon. member has contradicted himself; but it is about time that we stop this kind of thing. I do not want to destroy anybody. I feel sorry for the hon. member. I said so on the platform in Carlisle Square and I say so now. I was a witness to the declining powers of my father, if it comes to that, and I see the same declining powers in the hon. member for St. John, and so do people who are in a position to judge and understand even if his colleagues are not; and it is time that Barbados is saved the embarrassment, that the House of Assembly

is saved the embarrassment and that the political life of this country is saved the embarrassment by the continued irresponsibility of the hon. member.

In the whole fifteen years the hon. member achieved a position of regard in this country despite what many people saw as a certain untruthfullness; but at this stage his error in reporting facts – I should not say untruthfullness is taking over from the other qualities which placed him at the pinnacle of public life in this country; and we are making the mistake of paying as much attention to the irresponsibility as to the responsibility.

I cannot accept any further deference of this matter. If he wants to come back and deal with it he can ask that it be recommitted and he could probably find something to say; but he knew that the file was coming. He knew that he should be in here. He was not in here. I am sorry that this was done behind his back. I am sorry in many ways; but it is he who has turned his back and keeps turning his back on the House of Assembly. We can no longer make allowance for this sort of thing. I therefore beg to move that Head 1 do now pass.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock p.m., today.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
2.05 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When the Sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it now reverts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair.

Head 4(2) – Establishments in the sum of $1,720,928 was called.

Hon. H. B. ST.JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 4(2) in the sum of $1,720,928 stand part.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on the question of Establishments. The Barbados Labour Party in their Manifesto which they have pledged to honour mentioned the establishment of the post of Ombudsman. That can fall under Parliament or under unestablish post which will be a new post and therefore I am in order. Can the Government tell this Honourable House if what they said in their Manifesto – I would just like to read it out to remind them: "It is the view of the Barbados Labour Party that Government should be as open as possible. With this in view, the party proposes to establish the office of Ombudsman or Parliamentary Commissioner with powers and duties to investigate alleged official abuses against the citizen, to report publicly on his findings and to take steps to alleviate particular grievances and or to obtain satisfaction for the citizen. The party will establish more adequate machinery to see that fundamental rights and liberties are enforced and citizens are given legal aid at the State's expense to defend their rights."

Will the Prime Minister or the Attorney General say whether any action in this direction have been taken and how soon any proposed action can be expected in establishing this post?

Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Hon. Prime Minister I shall endeavour to answer this question. In respect of the creation of the office of Ombudsman the party remains committed to its statement in the Manifesto. I know that we have been collecting legislation from those countries, Commonwealth and otherwise, who have this office, with a view to studying the various patterns of legislative positions which have already been enacted by various Governments.

In addition to that, the Government itself in the interim has taken a decision to establish certain review Committees so that the citizen has an appeal from an alleged unlawful exercise of the discretion of a particular Minister. It must be appreciated that much of the dissatisfaction does occur in respect of the exercise of discretion relating to matters of trade and things of that kind; and we have taken the decision to establish a review committee in respect of the exercise of the discretion of the Minister in relation to these things.

That has been published, and it is also in consonance with our policy. This matter will of course also be one of the matters which will be referred to the Constitutional commission, so that it is not possible to say that it will be implemented today or tomorrow; but nevertheless, a principle and the reasons for the establishment of the post Ombudsman still remain.

Perhaps the Honourable Attorney General will be able to amplify the Government's position in this respect. I know that he has already applied to the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Assistance in getting to Barbados an expert on administrative law, and particularly the provisions that are made in other countries for a review of certain administrative decisions. These decisions will possibly relate to what one would call quaisy judicial decisions, administrative decisions as opposed to those of which I spoke which relate to an exercise of pure administrative discretion which is only theoretically challengeable – as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will remember – is only theoretically challengeable on the ground of *mala fides* which is extremely difficult to prove unless one has access to the Government files. Hence the necessity for having an Ombudsman. 3.05 p.m.

It is really a three-pronged attack at the problem.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I notice under the personal emoluments part of the Head that there are now 4 Permanent Secretaries attached to the Establishment Division, and I assume that these are not only attached to the Establishment Division, but that they are functioning in other parts of the administration. Assuming that that is correct, I merely wish to make the point that this concept of having a Personnel Division and an Establishment Division, as you will soon see a Training Division all separate from each other, must in some way diminish the efficiency of the general Personnel System within the Bureaucracy. I believe that these three Departments were separated some time ago, perhaps, at the whim or fancy of someone in order to settle a particular problem which might have arisen. I have never been able to get to the bottom of this, but I am an unregenerate believer that the personnel function in any bureaucracy has to be carried out as a totality. When you recruit someone to go into the system, that person you are recruiting should technically be your recruiting of the person who will be at the top sometime hence. Thus the kind of conditions which persons would have to come into the Service and conditions of service while they are in the Service, their promotion prospects and all of these matters are important to the individual in his personal development in terms of his career.

Sometimes I wonder how it is possible for the Establishment Division to know precisely how many people are needed in a particular area for a particular job. This brings me to the second point, Mr. Chairman. With all due respect to the persons who function in the Establishment Division, and I think I should say that the Chief Establishment Officer and his staff have demonstrated, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that they are competent and capable persons. But the whole question of job evaluation, and the whole question of the numbers of persons required to carry out a particular job is a specialist area, and I believe the time has come when, instead of having the Senior Assistant Secretary, Assistant Secretary, Administrative Assistant, we should have persons whose speciality it is in assisting in the recruitment, the training and the development of people for a particular service.

I hope that the Government, in the coming years in the not too distant future, will see the wisdom of this kind of approach to their personnel administration because unless that is done what will continue to happen is that when you have a very competent person in, say, Ministry X, who because of the expertise he or she has acquired by working in that particular area, and that person is now due for promotion will then find that Establishment will find that there are seven or eight other persons who are "senior" to that "person", or who are eligible for promotion, the ultimate result of which, Mr. Chairman, is that you get square pegs in round holes. That is bound to result in the loss of efficiency for the total bureaucracy. The bureaucracy is unable to produce to the best of its ability because it is organised, perhaps, wrongly.

If one looks at the system which operates in other countries, one can find that these three divisions of Recruitment, Establishment, Personnel and Training, Pensions, all of these are intertwined into one Department carrying out functions that are interrelated. After all, Mr. Chairman, the line between the recruitment and retirement can easily be seen and, therefore, when you are going to assess what kinds of manpower you need to carry out certain kinds of jobs you need to have inputs that are clear and that can be identified not only by those who are already in the system, but by those who are coming into the system as well.

I hope that the Government will find it possible – especially now that we have institutions such as the Institution of Management and Productivity that can help them in creating a proper and systematic approach to recruitment and the administration of personnel to take a look in that direction. I have tried for sometime to get this kind of thought generated in the minds of the person who makes these kinds of decisions, and I have not so far been successful, but I think that if the thoughts are given to persons who claim to be of a different gender, perhaps, they will see the inherent wisdom of reorganising their personnel system in such a way that when the Minister of Communications and Works want an evaluation of the people in his Department he can get an expert to come and do the evaluation. It is very difficult, Mr. Chairman, for a Senior Assistant Secretary who worked in, say, Weights and Measures for 10 years and managed to be promoted, who now finds himself in Establishment to know precisely what the Minister of Caribbean Affairs really needs when he calls for a certain kind of Economy, or what the Minister of Sports needs when he calls for a particular kind of individual to assist in one sport or another. It is no longer, a hit or a miss concept. It has been demonstrated that the ability to assess, the ability to recruit, is something which persons can learn, and failing to accept the point in its totality, perhaps, the Government will give serious consideration to letting all of the persons in the Establishment Division go out and get some of the systematic training that is available around the world and which, no doubt, is available to the Government of Barbados.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is quite correct. The four posts that he refers to are supernumerary posts to the normal Establishment. It is required to hold posts of persons who are on secondment elsewhere within or outside of the Service. At the present moment there are a number of Permanent Secretaries, or people of the Permanent Secretary grade, who are outside of the Barbados Service working for the Barbados Government: That is the Director of Tourism and a gentleman referred to previously by the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs and External Relations, Mr. Babb; Mr. Jackman, who is on study leave, and Mr. Skeete, who is on secondment to the Inter-American Development Bank. The point about the interrelationship between the Personnel and Establishment Division is a point which, no doubt, will be considered, and I trust that the hon. member's point will be received more receptively than, apparently, in the past.

It is well known that Personnel Management is a specialised area, and it is also well known that there is a need for a continuous review of the interrelationship between posts in Government and posts in semi-Government undertakings. That is a function which the Establishment Division provides at the present moment. I want to assure the hon. member that we are not approaching this matter with any closed ideas, and I am sure that as a result of our own investigations into the Public Service that the matters will be taken into account.

3.15 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Christ Church Central was up before I was able to speak, but this is a small observation which I wish to make, and it is in respect of some information which this Committee was given yesterday that with the post, I believe, of Attendant, Law Library, the Chief Establishments Officer has been asked to look at this with a view to upgrading it. I think the Committee was grateful to the hon. member for St. Philip North for bringing to attention the fact that the person who held this particular post has been promoted to the post of Deputy Marshal, and that some problems were related to this particular promotion, nothing about the particular officer in his capacity as Attendant, Law Library. I believe where instances occur of persons who have performed efficiently in a particular post and there are no promotional opportunities within the particular department in which the person works or is attached, since the person has developed an expertise in that department or section and the department can well do with the continuation of his services, but it is a question of promotion and advancement of that officer career-wise, then I think the question of upgrading the post is not the answer to that particular problem unless of

course there are good and solid established grounds for the upgrading of the post.

I have always felt and I believe it would be more appropriate if some increment as well as the necessary seniority were accorded to the particular officer as something personal to that officer or some such development were considered rather than trying to solve the problem by promoting the person into another position where very well the Peter principle may come into operation. There are some instances in the public service of this problem of promoting persons who have given very efficient service at a particular level, but because there are no promotional opportunities within the particular department or section they have been promoted and problems have occurred. Either you have a rigorous training programme if you believe the best thing is to promote the person, or you develop some system of increments specially to that particular officer. We have known of instances in which persons have been promoted from the post of messenger to that of buildings officer or buildings maintenance supervisor, very competent officers, but I believe in such circumstances and at the very time when these promotions are being done, a rigorous training programme would have to be instituted, or as I said, it may be best for some special increment together with the attendant seniority were accorded to the particular officer.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the point that the hon. member has made is well taken, because we ourselves have come and found that apparently in the past there was no rational basis for dealing with the situation as described, because we have come and found where certainly in my Ministry by way of illustration particular posts have been from an establishments point of view overseeing especially in relation to the hierarchy dealing with the local board system, and because of the personalities of the individuals attempts were made to juggle with the establishment and disturb the hierarchy instead of dealing with it in the manner in which the hon. member said, that if you felt openly that a particular person should be kept, then you pay him a personal allowance; so I think that concept is well recognised. It is a concept which I may say I have come across particularly in the legal profession, because many people have been recruited as messengers in law offices and it has been discovered that they have risen far above and performed functions far ahead of what a messenger would perform, but you cannot appoint them as typists because they cannot type, or they do not take shorthand, so the only answer to that is to have a flexible situation in which you deal with the particular person and usually you do not want to transfer him to another section because he has not got the qualifications for that section and you cannot keep him where he is because it is not enough money for him, but it is unfair, and in the civil service obviously you have that too.

You would have some people who are particularly good say in income tax or customs, but the establishment does not allow for any promotional opportunities to him, so you try to move him into something else where he is a failure; so the only answer to that is to have some flexibility in your establishment to be able to keep him there, but let it be understood that he is being paid because there is special expertise in that direction, and I do hope that in some of the instances which have come to our attention the attitude now advocated by the hon. member was accepted. It may have been projected before but rejected, but I want to tell him that we feel that type of thing is the correct approach.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I think, Mr. Chairman, it is correct to say that not only is the concept of personal allowance used in these circumstances, but there has been certainly discussion. I think in practice there is the use of the concept of notional promotion where there is a genuine case for an increment to be granted and the person be treated as notionally promoted I think for the purpose of his allowances and what not within a particular department where there is this sort of expertise. I am not sure which concept the department actually prefers, but I know they do take this into account, and indeed in talking to the Chief Establishments Officer on problems which have occurred within my Ministry he has been very helpful in making this suggestion. I believe that what I have said is confirmed by the advice which I have now received on the matter, that the Establishments Division used both concepts and looks at it in the particular cases; but there are cases where there is actually retraining recommended to bring somebody else into the post if as in the case of the one cited at the law office by the hon. member for St. Michael North. That case is slightly different in that here I believe it is felt that the duties of that post were incorrectly graded before and a genuine regrading is necessary in a case such as that.

The question that the sum of $1,720,928 under Head 4 — Public Service Divisions (2) Establishments, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 4 – PUBLIC SERVICE DIVISIONS (3) TRAINING

Head 4 – Public Service Divisions (3) Training – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $548,132 under Head 4 – Public Service Divisions (3) Training, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a small observation here arising out of my experience as a Minister. I think a very strong effort has to be made to relate training of people in the civil service to the developmental needs of Barbados. Between yesterday and today a lot of comment has been made about the performance of the civil service, and one important comment has been that due to the lack of sufficient man power and skills it would not be able really to spend the large amount of money in the capital estimates to keep the country going. Bearing that in mind I think one has to review what has been going on in the past as regards to training.

One other thing that struck me very forcibly in the past was that very often training occurred just because of the individual's interest or ambition to get additional training and not necessarily because this particular training would assist in the Ministry or for that matter in helping us to get our development plan going any further. 3.25 p.m.

Another point which I have observed in the past is that very often when people have gone overseas and have been trained and return to Barbados they often find themselves in a position where that training is not put to any use for the people of this country. It may be due to the fact that promotional opportunities within their previous fields might not have been there and it has become necessary to put them somewhere else, but I do not see the point in training a person and then putting him in an area where that person would not have to use the training for which money has been spent. If we are going to be able to get our development going at a very quick pace and at the same time contain Government expenditure, I think each Minister must be in a position to find the type of people with the skills which would help him to execute his development plans.

Therefore from this point of view I would like to say that I think the time has come when we must look at what has gone on in the past and make a determined effort to try to relate what is going on in the future to the development needs of Barbados, and make sure that we do not have to come back here year after year with the type of apology that due to the lack of the appropriate skills available in the Civil Service we are not able to implement a full Capital Programme although we may vote the money during the Estimates debate.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on this question of training I want to make a few observations, and indeed to repeat a contribution which I have made on a number of occasions when I have had the opportunity to speak on this question of training in this Chamber.

As the hon. member who has just sat down has indicated, quite a bit has been said since we began yesterday about the need for personnel and the kind of quality and technical people who can make the kind of contribution which is so necessary for the whole process of development, and this is a point which I think should be well taken and that everything should be done to ensure that as a matter of policy a number of areas of training should be designated as critical areas of training, that is, areas in which a concerted effort will be made to ensure that there are a number of people who are trained in the particular skills in order to push forward with our developmental plans.

I would want to say that quite naturally the Democratic Labour Party recognised this particular matter, and as a matter of fact I think it was during the regime of the member for St. Michael South when he was Minister of Education that the National Development Scholarship was set up for precisely this kind of situation, but I would go further, because when we are thinking in terms of training, and even although this particular Head relates to the civil service, we have to be aware of the entire role which training has to play in our total development in this country, and more and more we see the need and indeed the greater intervention of Government in the whole process of planning the development of the country, so that when we are thinking in terms of training we have to look at the whole range of training, both public and private, and if you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, just to reiterate a point which I have made earlier on on this question of training, it is that I see that there is

a need, a very real need for the private sector in the same way that the public sector has recognised that there must be a special sum of money voted towards training, the private sector must recognise its responsibility in this particular regard, and also set up a fund for training people who would be able to return and make a useful contribution, whether it is in the private sector, but most certainly within that sector, and if it so happens that it is to be utilised by the Government sector, that this kind of facility should be made available towards people who work in the private sector.

I see this, not as any contribution on any joint basis, I see it entirely as the responsibility of the private sector. What I am saying is I do not see any need for employees or workers to contribute towards this fund, but that this is a fund which must be contributed to by the employers, because in the final analysis, in addition to the country they are the people who will be benefiting from this kind of exercise. Quite naturally, Mr. Chairman, this is going to prepare us for what we will have to undoubtedly accept and put into operation within the next couple of years. I am talking in terms of the whole concept of worker participation, and what we were dealing with, and the kind of strictures which have been levelled and the criticisms and some of the comments which have been made over the last two days when we were debating this whole question of Establishments and Personnel and what have you. We have been talking in terms of making new inroads into the whole concept of management, the whole concept of how do you get the greatest efficiency out of a particular exercise, and as I see it, Mr. Chairman, we have to recognise very clearly that the concept of worker participation is a modern concept which might be modern for a situation like ours but one which has a growing attraction and in which Governments and the private sector in a number of other countries have recognised that it is the only way they can really get the most out of a particular exercise, and I would therefore hope that with all we have been talking about and whether it relates to the private sector or whether it relates to the Government sector that enough scope and opportunity is given for a more meaningful participation in the decision making of any particular area of occupation other than personnel interests.

You must recognise that when you have a situation where decisions are coming down, and I believe that this is part of the frustration which has developed within the civil service, that is, that you have a situation where there are a few people who are involved in the decision making and where orders are just handed down and little or no attempt is made to involve the people who have got to execute these decisions into involvement in the making of the decisions, and I think that this is the kind of exercise and this kind of involvement is going to be very important in the development of our country and one which we cannot put off for much longer.

I wish further to query Item 15 – Loans to Individuals where I notice that there has been a reduction of $10,000, and to find out what is the reason for this reduction. I further notice that quite naturally there has been an increase of $44,550 in the Training Fund and I am not sure what is the relationship between the two, but certainly there must be some kind of explanation for this kind of reduction. It may very well be that people are not as interested in taking loans as they used to obtain in the past, but I generally speaking would want to reiterate the point that we have to identify the critical areas of training within the service and within this community.

3.35 p.m.

These have got to be in technical areas and also in some professional areas. For some time the Service has been suffering from a lack of highly qualified accountants. It is true that there are a number of qualified accountants within the Civil Service; but you have got to accelerate the training in this regard and particularly people who will be able to work in these departments, and especially revenue collecting departments.

I do not think that there is any doubt about this, that the private sector has from time to time been able to get away with a considerable amount of rape on the economic life of this country by being able to pull the wool over the eyes of a number of people who are supposed to be charged with the responsibility of collecting revenue. There are a number of tricks which are used in this particular regard.

But we must recognise very clearly that the nation needs this. The Government sector must be able to produce and must be able to retain people of a high calibre who are able to deal with these particular problems because in the final analysis it is going to reflect on all of us. If, for example, we have the business sector being able to avoid the payment of taxes in a number of ways, then those of us whose income can be easily identified will have to pay more taxes. You have heard the argument of the hon. member for

Christ Church East that we have reached the limit of our taxation; but we may have to go beyond that limit.

What I am saying is that we have to be very careful and that we have to recognise very clearly that in this area of training a very clear thrust must be made to ensure that training within the public sector is the kind of training which will lead to improvement in efficiency and provide the kind of people at the critical level that are needed to push forward our developmental process.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just a few questions to the Minister under whose item this portfolio falls. I would like to know in fact whether the Government intends to continue with the Civil Service Training College. I am aware that this training college project had been under the aegis of the United Nations Development Programme. I am also aware that funds from the UNDP have tended to dry up. I wonder if the Government does not consider – if in fact they are not continuing with this college – if they do not consider the benefits of the college to be of such importance as to warrant the spending of our own money, if necessary, to provide a certain kind and certain quality of training for senior, and indeed all Civil Servants.

On Page 10, I believe, of the "Trinidad Guardian" of this month there was an article where one of the Ministers in the Ministry of Finance in Trinidad and Tobago indicated that Trinidad and Tobago will in fact be establishing such a college; and he went on to make a number of points to demonstrate how important it is that persons within the Service should be able to get not only on the job training, but some kind of hiatus away from their work where they can get some kind of training.

Mr. Chairman, I myself believe that the establishment of a Civil Service College *per se* is not a necessity. I believe that with the establishment of BIMAP some attempt should be made by the Government to marry these two concepts together. I think that the work which BIMAP has been doing has now become well known. I believe that it is accepted on all sides that the whole concept of management in this country has changed since the establishment of BIMAP not so long ago; and many of the persons both in the private sector and the public sector can testify to having benefited from some very serious, high level courses which have been given in that institution.

I have been told that in recent times there has been a lessening of the number of Civil Servants attending that institution. I think, myself, Mr. Chairman, that it is desirable that those persons who are working essentially in the public sector should have an opportunity of a cross-fertilisation of ideas with those who are working in the private sector. I think only when we have this kind of relationship can the one sector understand what is happening in the other sector.

There are a number of things which the Government has to do which are not always understood by the people in the private sector; and I believe in fact that if those who are participating in the implementation of the various projects can participate with those who will benefit, or believe they will not benefit from the project the only thing that can come out of that is good rather than ill.

The productivity in the public sector cannot improve unless the management in the public sector can be trained in the new arts of management. It is unfair to expect from the public sector managers a level of performance commensurate with that in the private sector, although, Mr. Chairman, a careful analysis of what goes on in Barbados will prove beyond the shadow of doubt that it is a myth that there is any higher productivity in the private sector than there is in the public sector. What you will find is that the productivity in the private sector is more measureable because they concentrate on the bottom line, and the projects which the public sector people carry out are projects which do not come to a sort of final position day to day or month to month.

After all you cannot quantify the productivity of the Garrison School only in terms of the fact that a building has produced because the benefit from that is a continuing process; and there is no bottom line to say what was the absolute profit from having put up that school, or indeed, if we get it by September, the Roebuck Street School.

The point that I am making, Sir, is that it is essential, especially those persons at middle management or senior management level in the public sector should have an opportunity to rub shoulders with those who are working in other sectors of the economy; and this can only be done if the Government is prepared to arrange training in such a way that persons can get away, move away from their desks from time to time.

As one of the hon. members said this morning, it is impossible for anyone to work 10 months, 12 months, especially in a ministry like the Ministry of Finance where one, day after day

is faced with a tremendous burden of work. It is impossible for that person to come up with new and different ideas every morning or indeed every month. If, however, that person is put back into an environment where ideas is the name of the game, that is to say in some kind of training environment, the chances are that that individual will come back to his desk renewed and refreshed, and better able to perform, and therefore the productivity of the public sector and indeed the productivity of the entire country is bound to go up.

My colleague raised the question of persons who go for training, go for overseas training, and come back only to find themselves working at something they did not train for. This Mr. Chairman is (a) the product of the size of a country and (b) something I have mentioned earlier, the unrelatedness of the Training, the Establishment and the Personnel Divisions.

The person who goes overseas for training should go with a specific job in mind when that person comes back to Barbados; and not everyone who goes for taining ought to come back and immediately get promotion. This is part of the problem that we have – that as soon as someone goes away for training and he or she comes back he or she feels that I am entitled to some kind of promotion. Of course that can be dealt with what has been described as "notional promotion"; but by and large, Mr. Chairman, I would not like to see Barbados reach the point where we do away altogether with overseas training; because if we do not allow some of our people to go away and see how things are being done in different places what will happen is that you will get a certtain kind of incestuousness and you will get the kind of situation – I should not have said that. That was not the word I meant. The Prime Minister is very good. He likes to find to put down the member for St. Michael South West. I meant incest.
3.45 p.m.

You will get a certain incest. *(Asides.)* The point is, Mr. Chairman, that only when person go overseas can they find out what is happening in other places. There was a time in this country when experience used to mean that you were doing the same thing wrong for 20 years. We wish to avoid that kind of thing, and for those reasons I would like to see that our training would (a) concentrate on having a cross fertilisation between the public and private sectors in Barbados; and (b) continuation of some overseas training so that we would not have the kind of inbreeding which, obviously, would flow from the same persons teaching each other.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like if I may to invite the Hon. Prime Minister to reply to the remarks that have been made, and in particular to explain why is it that, in the light of the acknowledged fact that we will only be able to spend some 66% of the Estimates on capital projects because of the stated fact that we are suffering a deficiency of trained manpower, we will only be spending the modest sum set out in the Estimates for training. It seems to me that that is to adopt a really contradictory posture. I, with all respect, would like to hear the Hon. Prime Minister's reply to that.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, there are only two points I wish to raise on this Head. The first one is that, before you deal with matters of training, it is important for the Government to carry out a survey as to the numbers who need to be trained over a long-term period of, let us say, 15 years, and to that extent it is important – if this point has been made already, I wish to be excuse. I did not hear all of the debate as I was outside doing something else, but it seems to me that it may be necessary in terms of effective long-term planning to get off the ground and have properly functioning a manpower unit to look at your productive needs of the next 15 years and to have the machinery to cope with and answer those needs over the next 15 years.

Certainly, the quality and the type of training that has to be embarked upon, in my submission, must reflect policy. If we, as a Socialist Party, are going to train people we must train them with a view to the implementation of Socialist objectives. It may become necessary in the fulfilment of our political philosophy to get more involved in the private sector and to aspire to the control of certain aspects of the commanding heights of the economy. We have to be assured that when we decide to take over any enterprise that we are ready, we have the manpower and the trained manpower to handle these enterprises. We do not want to be met, as I have said in here in a previous debate, with the stalling tactics of private enterprise that we do not have enough people trained. We must plan for them from now.

I think it is in the Trinidad newspapers that I have read sometime in the last year or so where that Government adopted a very bold policy of training accountants and senior management people to run enterprises when they made a greater step toward nationalisation, or, as they call it sometimes, localisation of industry and enterprise, and it is important in the technical field that we start getting these people ready. Later on when we come to the debate on Head

18 dealing with housing, I will have something to say.

For example, at the Housing Corporation I have noticed that we have to effect a programme of building, let us say, 800 houses a year. Over the past 10 years the average number built by the last Government was 233 units, but we found a situation where there was no architect to plan the estate. There was no quantity surveyor for 10 years. There were not enough surveyors attached to the Housing Corporation. There was only one until a couple of weeks ago when I had to appoint somebody else, and I am still looking for a third. There is no Economist at the Housing Corporation. There is no Estate Planner. They were just building houses because the Minister would say: "Put up some houses by Oxnards." Just before election they built forty or fifty houses at Oxnards.

No Government that says it is Socialist, either the B.L.P. or D.L.P., can operate on an *ad hoc* basis. It is inherent in a Socialist policy that your economy must be planned. That is the basic principle. Members do not have to be convinced about that, but now that we have a chance I want to see some attention given to what all of us have been seeing on both sides for as long as we have been in politics, and some of us even before we were in here. I am asking the Government to get this manpower survey, or manpower unit established. As soon as it is humanly possible, let us look at the needs and the areas where we need people with expertise and prepare the wicket for their training so that in the long-term planning we will have enough locally-trained people who have an interest in Barbados and who want to do something for their country, and a plethora of people on whom we can draw to work in this country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief on this Head. I appreciate all that has been said by hon. members, and note will be taken of the points made. I will like to assure the hon. member for Christ Church East and the hon. member for St. Michael North Central that the Government is actively investigating and taking steps to deal with its lack of trained man-power.
3.55 p.m.

We recognise the bottlenecks we are suffering and we recognise the falseness of the concept that because you have unemployment you therefore automatically have a pool of enough workers to do anything you want if you start a project. We will accept that. I also appreciate the comments of the hon. member for St. Philip North who has just sat down, and he may be assured that the Government is concerned with the manpower needs of Statutory Corporations as much as of the public service proper.

Now on the particular question raised by the hon. member for St. Lucy that areas of training should be designated as critical areas, to some extent this is already being done. For example, the Community College is currently carrying on a course for land surveyors, this having been identified as an area where there is a grave and serious lack of manpower as indeed the hon. member for St. Philip North pointed out.

As far as the concept of worker participation in the management arrangements in the public service are concerned, a look will be taken at that. I myself was not present for this part of the debate, but this is the note which I have which was taken for me. Perhaps I will have an opportunity of discussing with the hon. member exactly what ideas he has in this field. Certainly he will find that in these public service ministries and the training division I am very humble. I am very willing to be educated and given guidance in these matters where my own experience has been limited. I am in the fortunate position of not having had fifteen years of doing the wrong thing behind me as a continuing guide for the future.

The hon. member asked the reason why Item 15 — Loans to Individuals, has been reduced. The hon. member will be aware that the Students Revolving Loan Fund Scheme is now in operation and this will be as available to civil servants as to private citizens. This is something which we expect members of the public service will make use of and for this reason grants under this vote are not thought to be of such a compelling need at the present time. Loans from the Students Revolving Loan Fund according to my information will be provided for people who go on training which is not necessarily requested by their departments and therefore do no qualify for grants. All these are reasons why we do not have to give the same priority to this item of loans to individuals.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West had me there with the word "incestuous". It is not the existence of the word which I question, but rather the appositeness and its appropriateness to the situation. The literary references to the word "incestuous" which the learned editors of the Oxford English Dictionary were able to discover deal exclusively with the Emperor Caligula and the Emperor of the

Persians who married his sisters, and I therefore could not quite understand what the hon. member meant when he said that if we did not give the civil servants overseas training that this would have a tendency to incestuousness.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister would give way, as he talked about Emperor I and Emperor 2, as he knows in the public sector sometimes there have been described as independent Republics, so if one Republic marries another Republic it would bear some relationship to the Emperor marrying his sister, but even so, I think he would agree that the word was well used.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I fear that I cannot actually agree. Fortunately it is a neutral word in the context of Barbados. Nobody has ever been prosecuted for it in Barbados but I must say I did not quite gather what he could possibly mean in the circumstances, except that apparently in Church Law incest also means the holding by the same person of two benefices, one of which depends on the collation of the other. I do not know if he perhaps meant that overseas training will stop public service pensioners from receiving other appointments ultimately which come out of the public funds which is a separate question, and one which I am surprised not to have heard canvassed by hon. members. But the humour aside it is well understood that some element of exposure to systems other than ours is useful in the training process. That is well understood and accepted, and while a good deal of training at tertiary level can be carried on at the University at Cave Hill, it may very well be that for a long time there must be some continuing overseas input into the training of our public servants as well as in I hope many other parts of our national life.

There are areas in Barbados of critical significance, dentistry springs to mind, agriculture and so on, where local training is not available and in any case it is probably undesirable for a small Island to become too introverted, which I wonder may not be the word for which the hon. member was feeling, and it would be a good thing in any case to look outwards as an exercise in itself. I hope that this satisfies hon. members.

Mr. TAITT: Just before the hon. member concludes, I do not think the Prime Minister responded to the question of the Civil Service College and what is his intention.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I took the note before I went out and did not read from it. The situation with the Civil Service College is that it can hardly be called a continuing project because as I understand it, a decision was taken to investigate the feasibility, but the proposals which were put up were not acceptable. The resources necessary to start these proposals were not then considered to be available or readily forthcoming. Since these UNDP funds as the hon. member correctly pointed out have more or less dried up, we have suffered serious short-falls of UNDP financing and technical assistance which have affected programmes in areas, which, if I may say so, are more vital than the establishment of a Civil Service College. I am assured that the idea has not been shelved, but I anticipate that it will await new proposals and an occasion more propitious in terms of available resources before we can expect to be able to take a decision on it.

Mr. TAITT: Will the Prime Minister give consideration therefore to having the civil servants, especially the management level civil servants, participate more in the BIMAP exercises? I do not think he heard this, but I am told that there has been a dropping off in the number of civil servants who attend BIMAP, and I wonder if in the light of the information he has just given civil servants will find their way back to BIMAP with a view to getting that kind of training?
4.05 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will take the point made by the hon. member and raise it with the Chief Training Officer and his successor at the earliest opportunity.

The question that the sum of $548,132 under Head 4(3) – Training – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 5 – CABINET (1) – CABINET OFFICE

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $875,585 under Head 5 – Cabinet (1) Cabinet Office – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be long on this, there is just one Item I wish to draw to the Minister's attention, Item 12 – Conferences and Delegations.

When the Democratic Labour Party was in power we used to hear so much about joy rides for Ministers and all this talk, and every now and again you get a Parliamentary Question. I just want to say that the Government obviously now realises that being an independent country you have to travel, you have to attend conferences, Commonwealth, CARICOM, Finance Ministers,

IADB, World Bank. I see the Minister of Education is looking at me very attentively, but I think at the moment he holds the record. I am not quarrelling with it, I am only saying that when we were over there we used to hear the anthem that we were spending the taxpayers' money and I expected to see a big reduction in this Conferences and Delegations vote. I am not quarrelling with it, but I am glad to see that the boot is on the other foot and you realise that if you are an independent country, if you are going abroad to meet your colleagues to make a contribution to Barbados you have to have a substantial vote especially in the context of CARICOM and other international, U.N. and world commitments.

It is necessary, but I remember we had to pass around information on how many civil servants, how many Ministers and what everybody went on, and now I am glad to see that you have promised the taxpayers to cut down this vote and yet we still have the same figure we had when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, so I just want you to understand that I can appreciate the need for it, the necessity for going to conferences, but as I say this is another indication that when you are in the Government you now begin to understand what independence means to Barbados, that you cannot stay at home and meet your colleagues, you cannot achieve economic aid for Barbados, you cannot attend educational conferences, health conferences, communications conferences, Attorneys General meetings, Prime Ministers' conferences, IADB and World Bank conferences unless you have the money to do it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I really was trying to find out whether the hon. member was talking for the sake of talking or trying to score a political point. If he is trying to score a political point he has scored none at all.

The first significant thing about this vote is that it has not been increased this year. In the year 1975–76 the vote was moved from $529,073 to $650,000. At that date the overall budget was something like $208 million and the then Prime Minister said that there was no point saying that the $650,000 out of $208 million is a lot of money. The Estimates this year call for $378 million. There has been an increase in the cost of travel, as the hon. member knows, there has also been some inflation, as the hon. member ought to know, there has been an increase in the cost of hotel accommodation overseas, and despite this the vote has not been increased. The hon. member must know this. I believe when the Prime Minister gets up he will also give you the state of the vote which may shock you and let you see that despite what the hon. member was trying to fish out by way of asking questions, that there has been more than unusual restraint, certainly by this Government, on trips abroad. The hon. member should know that. I think the answer is that if you compare like period with like period you will find that in your time there was more spending on a per month basis than there has been under this Government.

Mr. TAITT: I am not quite sure that the Attorney General made any point. He made a non-point, because he must acknowledge that in the period which he quoted inflation was running rampant at 36%, that they have come in when it is down to 2%, thanks to the Democratic Labour Party.

Secondly, we travelled because we had something to do, they have not done anything yet.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am really quite amused at the exercise about travelling. I cannot at the moment put my hands on the Estimates for 1974–75, but this travelling vote stood, as the hon. member for Christ Church West pointed out, in 1975–76 at $529,073. However, it was supplemented in 1975–76 to bring it up to $640,342. In 1976–77 $650,000 was voted and under the Democratic Labour Party the use of this vote ran at roughly twice as much per month as it has under our party, and out of $650,000 voted we have spent less than was spent last year and we still have $80,000 left in the vote. We have voted the $650,000 again because a very tight rein is kept on conferences and we feel that there is no need to be stingy just in case a major and important conference comes up unexpectedly that we have not calculated for, and we will therefore have to spend the money, but we still have $82,000 less $22.90 left in the vote.

We are spending very very significantly less than the previous Government spent. I have not myself bothered about this vote, I do not know if for example the sabbatical leave of the former Prime Minister was taken at the expense of the conference vote and he was paid a per diem for it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to make this abundantly clear, Sir. At no time was any passage or any allowances of any kind paid to me while I was teaching in Florida; at no time, absolutely at no time, neither my passage there or backwards, all I got was my salary during my absence from here. So when the hon. member

gets up and says that my sabbatical leave was taken at the expense of the country he knows it is not true and he should not make statements like that. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement, Sir, I object to it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have obviously made the day for the former Prime Minister. He has been able to tell the truth and tell it with some force and indignation, and perhaps with no fear of contradiction whatsoever. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You must withdraw it.) There is nothing to withdraw, what is there to withdraw?
4.15 p.m.

There is nothing to withdraw. What is there to withdraw in it? He said that he did not do it, and that is an end of the matter. I do not know if.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. The Prime Minister of Finance has access to all the vote books and everything. He made a statement in here today in your presence and hearing, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that my sabbatical leave was taken at the expense of the Conference Vote. He said that. I said that it is untrue.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Prime Minister said that he did not know. Now you have explained the position. You are saying that you did not. Do you get the point?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But when the former Minister, the member for St. George, Mr. F. E. Miller, went on three months leave, was paid allowances, subsistence and passages in both directions, for over three months; but I did not receive one penny except my salary from the Government of Barbados, and no passages were paid for me. Furthermore, I have taken Civil Servants to conferences at my expense. *(Asides).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You see, the hon. member for St. John will not leave well enough alone. Having stated that he got no allowances, for the Florida trip, a statement which I would be prepared to accept, in my ignorance, he has now gone on to say that Mr. Freddie Miller once took a three months trip at the taxpayers' expense, and that he, the hon. member for St. John, once took Civil Servants away on the Government's business – more than once took Civil Servants away on the Government's business out of his own pocket. I am sorry. I do not believe that. That is all there is to it. I cannot say more or less; and I am going to check up about Freddie Miller too; because I distinctly remember since the credibility of the hon. member apparently is today's theme, is making a similar statement about Freddie Miller and Belfield Searles – that he heard Belfield Searles say that the South Africans should not have shot the Africans at Sharpville, that all they needed to do was to flog them. I went and read the debate and the statement did not appear. I asked Mr. Searles. He denied it; and Mr. Edwy Talma, who was called in aid by the hon. member for St. John, also denied it. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: So I would advise the hon. member not to put his credibility too far down the line any further today. His credibility has taken a sufficient airing in the House today, for him to be careful about making these statements about people.

There may be other matters. The Conference Vote has been kept under the strictest possible control. I cannot put my hands on the Estimates for 1974–75; but as far as I can judge, this is a vote which has been supplemented virtually every year because it is exceeded. We have not supplemented it this year. We have not even spent it all.

I am going to say something – I do not want to appear to be putting any case for Ministers and money and so on; but the Attorney General can confirm; other Ministers can confirm, that there is no doubt that the state of the allowances today means that you are frequently out of pocket – plainly not to any great amount – I believe in the case of the Minister of Education who has suffered more from this Conference Vote because of our policy than any of us he was out to a great amount – not necessarily to a great amount; but you are frequently, if not always, out of pocket.

We have very stern rules so far as obtain in Cabinet. When the Minister of Communications and Works and I went to St. Vincent – it was just for one or two days on a Post Office matter – we were given funds to pay for hotel and to pay for subsistence in St. Vincent. By the kind courtesy of the Premier of St. Vincent we were put up at a house belonging to the Government, Shrewsbury House; and we paid back the hotel money. We paid back the excess since we did not have to pay the hotel. It was probably taken out in some other way.

We have been very niggardly, if I may say this; and I recognise it and the Cabinet well

recognises it. We did not allow a delegation to go to a conference in Karachi, a Third World Conference. I believe it was called the Third World Education Conference – partly because as UNESCO has said, the educational problems of Barbados are not those of an under-developed country. We have the typical educational problems of Europe and North America. This is recognised internationally and accepted by me. That was part of the reason but part of the reason also was economy, and I know that the Minister of Education when he had to go to Lagos and then to Uruguay, he was a substantial amount of money out of pocket, and he himself knows that he will really have to put it down to experience.

We have not revised the rate although they have been in force for a very long time. When I attended the United Nations, as the Attorney General will tell you, I did not get enough money to pay my hotel bill. I was a few dollars out of pocket on paying the hotel bill. I think that if we have managed to get by with half the expenditure which the previous Government has been carrying on every month for 18 months, not just for six months of a financial year – for 18 months or longer: if I could look back a little longer I would see it – I think that we have some thing to be proud of.

I do not really think that the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition are in point – that we see now that there is to be no joy riding. We have stopped the joy riding and have saved some money on it; and we have saved it at the expense of our own pockets. I cannot promise to carry any Civil Servant abroad out of my pocket. I will tell you that in the early. That is one thing that you will never hear me say in the House of Assembly; that I have carried a Civil Servant abroad out of my pocket. I have no access to these million dollar funds and so on; but what I will say is that the Government will not waste this vote. It may be necessary to consider $5.00 a day more for food or $10.00 a day more for hotel bills because hotel bills are going up. I know because I am speaking from experience. I know that the *per diem* rate, particularly the sterling rate, cannot cover your daily expenses.

I know that a Minister must expect to be a little bit out of pocket if he stays abroad for any length of time; and therefore there may be some very slight revision of the *per diem* rate which will apply to Civil Servants as well as to Ministers and everybody else who travel; but what we will promise is that we will not use this vote as a means of supplementing Ministers' salaries or giving any encouragement to joy riding around and about the world.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, under Cabinet Office – Head 5(1) – I see dealing with the Question Personal Emoluments – Other Personal Emoluments, Item 2, and the full details of the personal emoluments, I assume including the Other Personal Emoluments, are set out in the Schedule of Personal Emoluments 1977-78.
4.25 p.m.

I see here under (a) "Other Personal Emoluments in the Schedule, 1 Personnel Assistant to the Prime Minister; 1 Executive Personnel Secretary; 1 Press Secretary, and I see the total 2. I have not checked with the Amendment which have been issued to see whether 2 has become figure 3 or not. I am not certain whether this is one of the Amendments that have been circulated. It may very well be, but if there are three posts attached to the Cabinet Office: 1 Personnel Assistant to the Prime Minister; 1 Executive Personnel Secretary, and 1 Press Secretary, maybe that figure should be changed to 3. I do not know. As I said this may have been circulated, but I am not certain. If, in fact, it has been circulated I am certain the Prime Minister will point it out. This seems to me to be a new post. I have not seen any reference to it anywhere, whether by any enterprising journalists or not, and there is no note on this particular item. I well recall that on a previous occasion we have been told – I would not say by whom because I may be told that I read the speeches of certain hon. members over there, but I know on previous occasions in Estimates debates we have been told that the note should be there in order that when the Auditor General comes to check, or when those checks are made, there can be verification that the amount of money has been spent in accordance with the wishes of Parliament.

I see this post of Press Secretary, and I see attached to it for 1977/78 the sum of $15,204, which I believe is about – I am not certain of the sum, but the present salary of a Parliamentary Secretary would be, I believe, in that region. I am surprised, in view of the strictures that have been made when the present Government was in Opposition about notes and so on, particularly in respect of new Items, that there is no note on this particular matter and, maybe, the Prime Minister will give us some explanation of this particular point. I would not put it in any other way. Maybe we have gone away from the Westminster model, and I do not know if we have gone to the Washington model now with the Press Secretary to the President, not of the Republic – *(Asides.)* Yes. The

Republic of the United States. That is the one I am talking about, the Press Secretary. This may be the North American model here, but maybe the Prime Minister will tell us something about this inasmuch as this subject falls under his responsibility.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad, again, that the hon. member has read my speeches and taken note of what I have said with such care that even though the presence of the hon. member for St. John in the House, obviously, has inhibited him from saying anything that could be construed as praise of the present Prime Minister... *(Asides.)* With regard to the Note, I regret that the hon. member's eloquence is sadly misplaced. He has not understood the significance of the Schedule of Personal Emoluments. We do not put notes in the Estimates. The last Cabinet did not, and the new Cabinet does not put notes against Personal Emoluments. The purpose of the Schedule of Personal Emoluments is to include all the notes thereof, and if there were no notes he could not have discovered that a vote is being solicited for a Press Secretary. You have read the Note, the only thing is that the Note is in the Schedule of Personal Emoluments and the Note specifically refers to it.

I have heard what the hon. member said about this new position. Instead of looking at the Establishment and seeing that we have gone down under Statutory Personal Emoluments from 23 to 18 persons, that we have reduced the vote under Statutory Personal Emoluments from $437,000 to $348,000, that is by eliminating two Ministers and three Parliamentary Secretaries and one Secretary, instead of commenting on that and praising the Government for taking away some of the top heavy administrative structure – just as I suggest that there may be too many Permanent Secretaries, so did I decide that there were too many Ministers – he starts to make jokes about notes and Press Secretaries.

He also has revealed a certain lack of knowledge if he thinks that at Westminster there is no Press Secretary. If he followed the English papers and American papers recently, he would, I think, have asked himself, with all that well known curiosity which should be the hallmark of the Barbados Scholar, who was Joe Haynes and why was he in a position to get a glass of whiskey thrown over him at No. 10 Downing Street? He would have realised that Joe Haynes was Mr. Harold Wilson's Press Secretary. Mr. Callaghan had a Press Secretary, so indeed have all British Prime Ministers who were in existence when I lived in Britain, and I lived under a number of them. It is a well-known institution, and it will take, I hope, some of the load off the Government Information Service. I hope so.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister, in what could only be described as one of his flights of fancy, managed to do everything except to explain the Press Secretary. He has not explained the need for it. All the Prime Minister has said is that he hopes it will take some of the load off the Government Information Service. Those of us who know anything about the Government Information Service know that the last thing they want is any load taken off of them. Sir, I will go further. Of course, he talked about the gentleman who got the whiskey thrown into his face, and I dare suppose when he gets up again he will tell us who is his Lady Falkland since he is equating us with – *(Asides.)* Quite seriously, Sir, just so that he will know that my colleague was not joking and that we on this side are serious, that is the Government that told the people of this country that the first thing they are going to do is to wipe all of this – you have me so that I cannot even say words – wastage and they are going to reduce the number of Ministers, and they are going to reduce the number of Parliamentary Secretaries from 6 to 2.

Let me tell you how they have reduced them. They have an inverted arithmetic they work over there. They have two Parliamentary Secretaries to start with. They then give everybody, who can bear it a piece of the action as a Chairman of a Board, and now they come talking about a Press Secretary at $15,000 a year. Imagine the Prime Minister of this country, who is telling the people of this country that we have to hold strain, doing this sort of thing. Lord Nigel, the Baron of St. Judes, got up there at CBC and reduced a poor, old, gardener to two days a week because lessons are tight.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. The hon. member is being, as he mostly is, irrelevant in this debate. Whatever anybody do at CBC can never be relevant on a discussion under Cabinet Office dealing with other Personal Emoluments.

4.35 p.m.

I submit the hon. member must stop liking to hear his own voice and come back to the debate.

Mr. TAITT: You have to admit that the voice is at least good.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is well taken. The hon. member is irrelevant; please desist.

Mr. TAITT: Please desist from being irrelevant, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Mr. TAITT: I am making a point with regard to the Government's attitude on wastage and I am speaking about the Press Secretary which I see as a wastage, which I see as a back door introduction of the same kind of person that makes a Parliamentary Secretary. I do not accept that I am not speaking about this item, and the Attorney General can talk until his face turns blue, if a Government can allow in any of its departments, let me put it this way, a poor gardener who had a five day week job to be cut down to two days a week because money is tight, and that same Government comes back and tells this country that the Prime Minister needs a Press Secretary, I would say this: I think the Prime Minister has demonstrated a great capacity to reward his friends, and I think that is a noble trait, and in the same way he demonstrates an even greater capacity to punish his enemies.

Sir, I do not know who this Press Secretary is going to be but you need $15,000 a year for a Press Secretary. I am not going to stand up in here and say it is going to be Glyne Murray, nor am I going to say it is going to be Carl Moore. I am not interested in who it is. I am saying that taking the taxpayers' money to pay anybody in Barbados, this size country, for a Press Secretary is a wilful misuse of the taxpayers' money.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, I submit that the hon. member is again in abuse of the Standing Orders of this Honourable House in imputing personal ill-will and spite to the hon. member whom he is directly attacking on this matter.

Mr. TAITT: If he wishes me to substantiate it, I can do so.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I submit that it is an attack on the motives of the hon. member and indeed of the Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To what are you objecting?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That it is a wilful misuse.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The hon. member is reflecting.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw the word "wilful". It is a gross misuse. It is the height of incompetence on the part of the Minister who has been preaching restraint in this country on the question of money to come to Parliament and ask for $15,000 a year for anybody whether it is a yard fowl, a yard duck or a leghorn, and Mr. Chairman, I will never sit down in here and agree that it is right that somebody ..... I am not going to pay any attention to the rumours which say that one person who applied for the job at C.B.C. did not get the job, and therefore.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are being irrelevant dealing with the Cabinet Office. You are talking about a Press Secretary.

Mr. TAITT: I am talking about a Press Secretary and a Press Secretary presumably will be dealing with matters connected with C.B.C., with matters connected with the Advocate and with the press in general.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not dealing with C.B.C. now.

Mr. TAITT: I am dealing with the Press Secretary. I am not prepared, Mr. Chairman, to talk about how the Press Secretary, whoever he or she may be, did not get any other job anywhere else. What I am saying is that you cannot fool the people all of the time and tell the people of this country that they must hold strain. You are reducing people all over this country..... *(Interruption)*

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet I feel that I may be able to speak with interruptions from the other side, but I am not prepared to speak with interruptions from the Gallery. I am not in here on my own behalf; I am in here on behalf of the people of St. Michael South West, and I will not have anybody from the Gallery shouting while I am speaking. *(Asides)* If the hon. member for St. Michael South East believes that I would curse the people of Barbados, that is his business, but I would never advocate that they be flogged publicly. That is not my piece.

The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, and I am making it because I feel passionately about it, is that they come in here andthey walk around the country and they fool the people of this country that we must cut down the number of Ministers, we are going to cut down the number of Parliamentary Secretaries, we are going to cut out wastage, and six months after

they come into Parliament with the Estimates and produce an Item for $15,000 for a Press Secretary for the Prime Minister. As the Nation Newspaper said, they already have a Personal Aide, they already have a Personal Secretary; the Prime Minister already has a Parliamentary Secretary. *(Asides)* As for him, I hear he is down in my constituency offering people jobs. He had better try and get them.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, the hon. member is not allowed to speak with respect to people who are in the Other Place.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, what nonsense is he talking?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are talking about somebody in the Other Place. Please withdraw.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I go further. You talked about wastage, Mr. Chairman, and if you look at this item properly you will see that there is a footnote which permits me to refer to the salaries of Ministers under this Item. Within six months they want a Press Secretary and increased salaries. I was shocked when I heard the Prime Minister say that since November last year they were studying how to increase Ministers' salaries. I almost fell out of my chair. I cannot believe this great combination of morality, I almost said immorality but I know that would have been out of order.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Again the hon. member is misrepresenting the facts as given by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister never said that since last year he has been studying ways to increase Ministers' salaries. If the hon. member gave that nasty article to the press, I would challenge him to go and make that statement in public or read the same article that was sent. I would challenge him to do it. Now he is showing his true colours.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, whatever my true colours are, there are colours of which I am proud. My colours are colours which emanate from Fairfield, Black Rock and I am proud of them. I am not embarrassed by my colours and never will be. My colours are such that I can tell him that I accept any challenge he offers me at any time anywhere. (Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Go and repeat the statements outside.)

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister said in here this morning that he appointed a Committee in November to look into the salaries of the Ministers.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I charge the hon. member with deliberate misrepresentation of the statements made in this House. The hon. member said the Committee was appointed to go into the salaries of Ministers and members of Parliament and pensions.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the fact that he said.....

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

Mr. TAITT: You cannot have a point of order on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please take your seat? *(The hon. member sat.)*

Mr. TAITT: On a point of privilege, he cannot speak on a point of order on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. TAITT: Well put him to sit down!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You take your seat.

Mr. TAITT: I am speaking Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you take your seat?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, he cannot speak on a point of order on a point of order. As I was saying.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you be seated?

(The hon. member sat.)

Mr. TAITT: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not called upon you yet. I will hear the Hon. Minister of Labour.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I would just like to advise my colleagues on this side to leave the hon. member because he is a product of the former Prime Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

4.45 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. I would just like to advise my colleagues on this side to leave the member over there, because he is a product of the former Prime Minister.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I would rather be a product of the past Prime Minister than be a product of the present one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Carry on with the debate.

Mr. TAITT: I am trying my best, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am product of Sir Grantley Adams and I am proud to be a product of Sir Grantley Adams, I am not ashamed of it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Two hon. members should not be on their feet. Will the hon. member please continue? You have two minutes more, but you may come back another time.

Mr. TAITT: Within those two minutes, Sir, let me merely state that I am appalled, as all Barbados must be appalled, that a Government which came to these people and promised so much in the area of integrity that the people believed them. The beginning of the word is now that (a) they wish to have increased salaries, and (b) that the Prime Minister must have a Press Secretary. It is only a matter of time before we have additions. I say that it is a terrible tragedy that the people of this country do not have an opportunity to speak to them again. The people of this country could never agree that the Prime Minister of this country should have a Press Secretary at $15,000 a year, and I look forward to the appointment of that distinguished person.

Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: Mr. Chairman, it is necessary sometimes to expose hypocritical attitudes when they are displayed. This Government as part of its electoral campaign to the public of Barbados proclaimed that in the event of it being elected to power it would re-organise the machinery of Government and would effect savings in dollars and cents. The hon. member pretends to be a person of some education and of some honesty.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. He has to withdraw that, he is casting aspersions on the man's character, the insinuations are there. I am objecting, you have to rule. He cannot say that an hon. member pretends to have some honesty. Does he not read the rules?

Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the word "pretend" and substitute the word "profess".

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You cannot get on with that. You have so much experience and still getting on with such foolishness? You have to withdraw the word "honesty", I am not objecting to "profess" or "pretend", I am objecting to the use of the word "honesty" because you are imputing dishonesty to the man. (Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: I am not imputing dishonesty to anybody). You are,so get up and say so.

Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: I say, Sir, that the hon. member professes to be a person of honesty.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I object to that remark and I call on him to withdraw it. On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I say the hon. member professes to be a person of honesty.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am a person of honesty and I object to him saying I profess.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, since the hon. member now says again he is a person of honesty he must be professing to be honest.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It may very well be very funny for them over there, but with all due respect I submit that it is for you to control this Hon. House and it is for you to avoid any member of this Hon. House casting aspersions on any other member of this House. If I said, for example that I do not believe that the hon. member who just spoke professes to be a murderer I am sure he will object, and I am saying that I object most strenuously to the aspersion he has been casting on my honesty and I ask you in all humility to ask him to withdraw.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I see no need for the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw. If I say that I am honest I profess to be honest, and that is perfectly in order.

Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: Yes, Sir. But I say this, that in dealing with facts and in marshalling arguments he has demonstrated today that he is incapable of appreciating facts. The estimate for Cabinet under Personal Emoluments for the year 1976–77 was $641,996. If he had read his Estimates he would have recognised that. The Revised Estimates were $668,160. The Estimates for 1977–78 is $571,906, a difference of some $96,254. Any three or four year old child who was not retarded would be able to see that that results in a saving of some $96,000.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the hon. member that if he divided that $96,000 by 24,

the number of members in this House, it could stand a difference of $4,000 per man and still not reach the amount that the other side spent.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Sir. Will the Hon. Minister state unequivocally that he will not return to this House for a supplementary?

Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: Sir, that is not even a point of sense. As I said yesterday, there can be no political capital to be made over the fact that this Government has decided in pursuance of its policy that there will be no revision of salaries for members of Parliament and terms of conditions without the appointment of a commission of enquiry. We have no apologies to make to anyone for carrying out that policy, we are not telling the public of Barbados or the Commission that the commission must recommend or not recommend, it is a matter entirely for them to recommend it and the terms of reference are sufficiently wide to include in their consideration and in their evaluation of the salaries of this House the general economic condition of Barbados.
4.55 p.m.

Do not let us be any hypocrites in this. As I said yesterday, I know what it is to win and I know what it is to lose. I am prepared, as I have always been prepared, to go to the public and state what I honestly believe to be the position. So do not think that you can come and make any cheap political capital. In your attempt to make political capital state the facts to the public. Get up and say now that if the Commission recommends a salary increase of 1% or 2% that I, Branford Taitt, will not draw it.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The last time that salaries were discussed in the Other Place the same now Leader of the House was in the Other Place; and we told him that if he did not wish a salary increase let him get up like a man and say that he is not going to take it.

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: We have absolutely nothing to hide. Let us get these facts straight because I believe that it is the duty, as the hon. member for St. Michael South said yesterday, that politicians who have been elected to go honestly to the public and let them know that the people who are in politics are people who are entitled to the same kind of considerations as any other person.

It is a fact, and I want to get this in your head that April 1973 was the last time that salaries were revised in Barbados for members of Parliament. It is a fact that throughout the course of our history, since people have been paid as members of Parliament and as Ministers that the Civil Servants' salaries were settled, the Judges' salaries were settled; and then by the horse trading method which the Democratic Labour Party had for dealing with the salaries of members of Parliament. According to our method of putting it out of the political arena the salaries of Cabinet Ministers and members of Parliament will be fixed.

I repeat that every time the hon. member says it, do not think that we will back back on this. We are not that type of men to be afraid. We have at least five more years in here. Do not let anybody fool you about that. We went to the public with our promises. At no point in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party did we say that we were not going to ask for salary increases. You are not scoring any point. You are attempting to pretend and in your pretence you are not telling the public the true facts. I say that because again today you mentioned that a Commission was appointed to enquire into the salaries of Ministers.

Again, like the intellectually dishonest person who wrote the article, he failed to mention the fact that Ministers were not being treated differently from any other member of Parliament. Why do you have to do these things? Then he gets up and proclaims his honesty. The truth of the matter is that when one is elected to Parliament as a Government, it is the prerogative, the constitutional right of the Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues to say what Ministers they should have, what offices they should have – Press Secretary or otherwise. That is what we have been exercising and will continue to exercise until the electorate throws us out, despite the attempts at distortion of the hon. member and his ilk, we have a responsibility and we know our responsibility in respect of the economy of this country. That is why we did not do it ourselves.

The truth of the matter is that any objective debate on this will take into account that we have already effected a saving of $96,000. Yet, the hon. member will get up in here and say that this Government during its election campaign said that it would reduce. The hon. member who professes to be honest, who professes to be educated, who professes to be a master at marshalling arguments – why does he ignore a vital fact? You will now see how the hon.

member's profession of honesty stands in the light of an examination of the facts.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the capacity of the Leader of the House to shout is not, in my view, the marshalling of facts or the presentations of arguments. I confess to not being able to shout either as stridently, as historically or as meaninglessly as he; because my reasons for speaking are not necessarily his reasons for speaking, and are not motivated by the same spirit by which he seems to be motivated. What I say is that the Ministers going to get an increase is not a lie. He has not yet said that it is not true.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Again the hon. member is attempting to prejudge and anticipate the Commission. He is entitled to go before the Commission and say that the economy of Barbados cannot stand the increase. I have never said that they will get an increase or not get an increase. I specifically pointed out yesterday or today that we have put to the Commission as part of its terms of reference to consider the salaries in the light of these things.

Mr. TAITT: I do not know what that means, Mr. Chairman. I notice that the hon. member's voice is leaving him. I hope that he does not have to shout anymore. The point I raised is the question of morality. It is no point to tell me that I did not mention that they saved money by not having more Ministers. That is elementary. That is what children in second standard would be able to find out.

What I am telling him is how they could have saved another $15,000, if that is how he wants it. I maintain that it is immoral for them to come in here as they did and gave backbenchers an opportunity to earn a piece of change as Chairman of Statutory Boards.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. The hon. member has been quarreling for days about laying off people and saying that we would not employ anybody. Now that we have employed one person he is saying that we should not employ that person.

Mr. TAITT: We have to assume that the person who is going to be Press Aide is currently unemployed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member over there is a journalist. He is unemployed and he has been knocking around for the job. That is his problem.

Mr. TAITT: They would never be a better one. Mr. Chairman, I question the morality. They have been in power for six months and they cannot understand that shouting will not help them. I am looking at the Official Gazette of 10th March, 1977 and I see here a list of names of Real Estate Agents registered on 31st January, 1977. I see here two names. I wish to believe that these two persons are not the same persons who are now members of the Cabinet. I see on Page 269 one Mapp R. G. I see on Page 268 one Brathwaite L. B. I wish the Prime Minister to give this House the assurance.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Have you checked out Dr. Caddle on the Medical List when he was a Minister?

Mr. TAITT: I wish the Prime Minister to give us an assurance that no members of his Cabinet, as far as he knows, is currently practising in the area of real estate. I do not mind his shouting. I am asking the Prime Minister to give that assurance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant to the debate anyhow.

Mr. TAITT: How could it not be relevant when we are discussing the Cabinet and we are discussing Cabinet Ministers and there are Cabinet Ministers whom I know as Hon. L. B. Brathwaite and Senator the Hon. R. G. Mapp?
5.05 p.m.

I have seen two names here listed under the Real Estate Agents appearing on the register for the 31st January, 1977, and I am asking for an assurance that these two gentlemen, if they are the same gentlemen, are not practising.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is improper to refer to a member of this Parliament by his name. The hon. member has just referred to me other than in the proper form.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He also referred to the Senator in the Other Place. Will you withdraw?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I did not refer to the hon. member. I am reading from the *Official Gazette,* and I am asking the Hon. Prime Minister to confirm that these two persons are not members of his Cabinet. That is all, and if there are, they are not practising.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South West take his seat. Be seated! The hon. member is carrying on and making no

worthwhile contribution to this debate at this point; he is totally irrelevant, repeating himself, and I rule that he discontinues *(Asides)* Order, please!

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, we have really strayed from this Head. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There is a Rule which says that members when seated must be silent. Please ask the member for St. Michael South West to be silent so that I can hear myself. I was dealing with the Cabinet Office and in particular the Head dealing with Conferences and Delegations and the vote of $650,000. I just want to say that I would like to have some comment from the Prime Minister on it. The Prime Minister has said that he and other members of his Cabinet have suffered personal losses when they attended Conferences and Delegations. Obviously, the House will not want this situation to continue in the future. In the past the member for St. John and Mr. George Fergusson suffered losses of about $17,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for St. John, the Rt. Hon. former Prime Minister, and Mr. George Fergusson suffered losses of about $17,000, which the then Government owed them and would not pay them. I do not know if they have got it back yet, but that is not a loss that we, as members of this House, should expect any member in here to carry. It means, therefore, that the rates will have to be revised in the future to ensure that Parliamentarians do not suffer losses because the *per diem* is too low or for some other reasons. I hope that the Prime Minister, as a matter of urgency, would have the whole question re-examined so that in future the Government would not find itself out of pocket at the end of a year owing members or former members thousands of dollars, as I believe they now owe the former Prime Minister and Mr. George Fergusson. The hon. member for St. John said that last year.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister is very much mistaken if he believes that the money that I have spent out of my pocket going on Government Conferences will be marked off to experience. That is one big joke. I will be claiming every legitimate penny over and above what they gave me by the end of this week. Let me make it clear. They gave me $10 (Barbados) a day for internal travel in cities like London. I went from the Airport by Taxi, and by the time I got into inner London I had spent the $10. I have been paying $18(US) per night over and above what they gave me, and I will be claiming it. I am more interested at this point in talking about the $600,000. Everybody is trying to talk about cutting back and restricting the money spent in this area and that area. I believe that we have to tighten our belts and cut back in some areas, but not on this one. I am not agreeing with that at all. They say that I travel a lot. Well, I do not ask anybody to send me anywhere. If they want the Government's business done, and they figure that I will have to go I will go, but the Government will have to pay for it and not me. This $600,000, in my submission, is not enough.

Now, Ministers and officials going away on Government business used to travel first-class. After the former Prime Minister owned an aeroplane he decided that other people should travel tourist class. In other words, he kicked down the ladder when he got on top. I do not have any personal plane. I believe that I, as a Minister,....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to get one point straight. The Rule about travel applied to me equally. The only places that I have ever travelled in my plane, which was a $34,000 second or third-hand plane which I paid the bank for, and not as promulgated on Labour Party platforms as $828,000, but $34,000, was from here to St. Vincent, from here to Trinidad, and from here to St. Kitts. When I travelled in that way sometimes I took Government Officers with me at my expense and did not charge the Government either for my travel or for theirs. I want to make that abundantly clear. When I travel, say, to the World Bank....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if the hon. member will give way.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order, Sir. How can he rise when I am on a point of order?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I apologise. I never knew he was on a point of order. I never realised you were on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Take your seat. It is rather long, but it is really an explanation.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When I travelled to the United States, let us say to Washington, or any other country, when I did not travel at my

own expense, I travelled tourist economy class, and I insisted on it although the members of my Cabinet and the former member for St. Michael West on several occasions in here said that the Prime Minister should not be travelling economy class. I insisted on travelling economy class. With regard to this nonsense about when you get better off you kick down the ladder, it was more expensive for me at that time and not cheaper.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An explanation rather, and not a point of order.
5.15 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, the hon. member for St. John said that the plane he owned cost $34,000. Am I to understand that the Daimler which is a motor car costs more than the plane that he owned? I do not believe you again. There is no aeroplane in the world that could cost $34,000. I saw it; it was one like Barclays Bank's, a six seater.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not responsible for the ignorance of the hon. member. We did not have free education at the time when he was growing up.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I agree with that, but you are occupying my seat and I am occupying yours. I am home with you. That is your problem all the time; neither do I work for the mafia or for Sydney Alleyne.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. James take his seat? I am listening to the Minister of Education.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, getting back to this business of travel, I am not going to get like the others who want to impress the public that they want to cut every single penny. If I am going on Government business all the way to East Africa where I have to spend fifteen hours on an aeroplane, I want to travel in comfort, and it is an embarrassment when I go into the VIP lounge at London Airport and I am introduced to and sit down to have a drink and talk with other Ministers from other countries who are making the same trip as I am, that when I go in the limousine out to the plane and I am carrying on a conversation, when I get to the top of the ramp all of them turn left to the first class section, and I cut off my conversation and head into the tourist section. That would not do and I do not believe you are going to have any economy in that area. You cannot ask me to go overseas and try to negotiate $3 million in aid for the school meals programme and tell me you cannot give me a first class air ticket, and when I get off the plane every part of my body is aching. I am 6' 2" and when I sit down in a cramped tourist class seat I am no use to myself. This money has got to be upgraded. I do not mind the former Prime Minister; he could afford to talk about going tourist class because when he gets at Seawell they will upgrade him to the first class section because he is Prime Minister, but I have not got there yet.

I heard yesterday and today members on both sides of the House talking about the review body to increase salaries and all that, and I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South talk all round in a circle about a review and he believed there should be a regular review, but when I asked him whether he meant a review upwards he would not say. Let me tell you something. I would like an increase in salary. If the other hon. members do not want one, that is their business, but let me make this absolutely clear. The hon. member for St. Michael South West would know that I got in the Senate during the last salary increases and opposed everything on a principle and I am standing on the same principle this time. I believe the Review Committee will decide if we should get more or less, how much more and so on, and like a good cricketer I will abide by the umpire's decision, but that is not to say that I do not want any more money. Everybody has been talking about the article in the Advocate yesterday and what the hon. member for St. Michael South West said about pressure. Now I do not know of anybody who has been pressuring the Prime Minister over this thing. I have been going to Cabinet meetings and I do not know about anybody applying any pressure on the Prime Minister, and moreover he is not the type of man you can easily pressure, but if you want to know if somebody has said that there should be an increase, I would like an increase and I am not moving from that, and there is not a single person in Barbados, I do not care who he or she is, who would not like more pay than what he is getting right now; but as I said, it is nothing at all to do with the member for St. Michael South West saying that you must give me more money or I will be packing up and leaving, because whether I get more or not I am going to stay here. That is not the matter under consideration at all.

Getting back to the question of conferences, delegations and so on, a lot of people in Barbados are under the mistaken impression that they are joy rides as I heard coming from the other side. I do not understand how you can expect me to be

working from 9 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night and going home so tired after a conference that I can hardly sleep and having to be away from my family and living in very difficult circumstances in all kinds of rooms all over the world with no air conditioning and a lot of mosquitoes eating you raw, where there are no lifts and you have to walk up flights of stairs, stay in hotels which have no water in them, and you tell me that these are joy rides. I want people to get it clearly in their heads that I have not had a joy ride so far. If there are any going I would not mind taking one, but I have not had any so far, and I will down on my insistence that the debate over this $600,000 is full of hypocrisy, because members on the other side know it and I have heard them repeatedly when they were in Government complaining about the difficulties they had when they went away on Government conferences. They complained about second class travel, they complained about the allowances they were given, and I am surprised that they should get now on the other side and complain about it.

I say as I started that I do not believe that this is an area in which we can at this time afford to cut back. When you are already to the bone there is nothing you can cut back on, and unless the Government is going to make up its mind that it is going to be represented at fewer important conferences, then I am saying that this figure is inadequate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to where this debate started and speak a bit about the matter raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South because I think the debate has come back to various perennial subjects. The hon. member for St. Michael South West has started campaigning early and taking the opportunity to make certain allegations in this House that I have twice today challenged him to repeat outside, and I hope he will do it because I do not think the second libel action I am getting I am going to be soft hearted anymore and end up being $7,200 out of pocket. This time I really want to get some money out of somebody.

I want to make a few points clear. I do not think members recognise that within the Ministry of External Affairs there is existing a Press Officer, – I want to get that clear and into the record – who is graded in one of the foreign service grades, either as Foreign Service Officer I or Foreign Service Officer 2. One of the reasons why it is necessary to have someone dealing with the press in this particular Ministry, and I think the same reason applies in the Ministry of the Prime Minister, is that the Ministry has a very strong external content and very frequently I believe that the Press Officer if we could afford it should also be allowed to travel abroad and operate at international conferences as indeed happens in the case of Trinidad and Tobago and in the case of Jamaica. When I went to the United Nations last year I recognised that third world countries like our own had to use personnel in the correct way if we are to maximise opportunities of giving some publicity to the things for which we stand and at the same time attracting attention to ourselves so that we can benefit financially and otherwise. There were very many statements which our delegation made in Committee and out of Committee and it took weeks sometimes before our point of view was reflected in the press. Not so with Jamaica. You will have noticed recently that the Minister of Foreign Affairs and External Trade in Jamaica, the Hon. P. J. Patterson travelled to the United States where Jamaica in my opinion was being savagely attacked by Newsweek and he did a first class job in correcting that image, and at the same time in publicising Jamaica and giving some fillip to its tourist industry.

5.25 p.m.

He had the Afro-Caribbean Press in, had a Press Conference for them, entertained them to a luncheon and tried to explain Jamaica's position, but all this was done for him by the Press Officers attached to his Department in External Affairs.

Members must recognise that Prime Ministers – both the past Prime Minister and this Prime Minister, and I am sure succeeding Prime Ministers – must conduct in their own right no matter whether they have a Foreign Affairs Section or not a certain amount of external negotiations and external relations, and to do this I do not think it is fair that they must have to be relying on their own skill, looking after their own Press Conferences. You can increase the Establishment either by having a Press Officer in the Prime Minister's Office under the Head of Cabinet Office, or you can increase the establishment by putting him in GIS and seconding him to the Prime Minister's Office, or you can do it in the way that you have a Press Officer in External Affairs, in my office. Mr. Jackson, a very competent chap who is in the post, I think he was recruited by Mr. Freddie Forde. I did not expect that that would lead to the sort of questions asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South, because I think having seen the appointment he was entitled to

ask an explanation of this Committee and I believe that we must give explanations as we are entitled to give, but it led to a barrage of political assault – and I hardly like to use unparliamentary language – but the sort of argument that I thought the hon. member for St. Michael South West would have discarded and remember as only when he was in the first form at Combermere School.

He should have matured beyond the position where he is going to go and get a copy of the Official Gazette to say that a name appears in the Official Gazette, no morality, and links this with the Press Officer. He should have matured enough to recognise the force of the contentions of the arguments of the Hon. Leader of the House, and if he has read the Party's Manifesto he cannot use non-sequetors to prove his point in talking about Chairmen of Statutory Boards being appointed from sitting members of the House or of the Other Place. The last Government had both Chairmen and members of Statutory Boards who were members of Parliament, it is nothing new. I cite the example of Mr. Sam Ashby whom the hon. member for St. John always said was one of the outstanding people in the field of industrial development in this country. He was Chairman of the IDC for several years, a leading member of the Democratic Labour Party, contributing to their Council, and what was the problem about that?

Let it be quite clear that not one additional Chairman has been added to the number of Statutory Boards Chairmen other than as existed on September 2, 1976; that is the point. I think it is rather unfortunate if we are going to continue to try to argue politics along the line of appealing to a few people and misleading them on essential political facts. The hon. member may well want to argue that he does not agree with the principle of members of Parliament being Chairmen of Boards or of other Statutory Boards. That is a matter of considerable argument; their responsibilities, their relationship to Ministers, all of this is room for argument, but he simply cannot argue in here that simply because these people are there that the Government is patting the back of somebody or practising political patronage, or giving their people additional money to the disadvantage of other persons who are not being employed. That sort of argument is a non-sequetor.

The hon. member probably believes there are no selections. I believe the days when one hon. member towers above all his political colleagues either in here or outside have long since past. The Hon. Sir Grantley Adams, as he then was, and the hon. member for St. John in their time and in their own right were giants in their parties, but we have lived to see that concept of the political leader being moved, and that concept of the politician being no longer accepted, and if you have a combination of collective responsibility of different sorts, I think that we are all capable now of trying to argue politics on a different level, it is not a question of personalities, it should not be. I think we should get down to saying to the country these are the facts, you analyse them. We believe that we can probably by our methods and ideas move the country further on, advance, as was the slogan in 1971, but I think we must stop these little carping criticisms about hon. members and fishing out Gazettes and referring to somebody else, that sort of thing which is unbecoming in a debate under this Head and this Item.

Sir, I have already made a brief comment on the vote dealing with entertainment. I have gone abroad once since I have become a Minister. I have asked the Cabinet on about two or three occasions when I was asked to travel abroad not to send me abroad. If I have to go as a matter of public duty I will go, I am not interested in any trip diplomacy. I do not think the hon. member for St. George South would want to have the disadvantage of leaving his family. He has just returned from Ghana where he was on the seventh floor of a hotel, no lift working, day in and day out he was up and down, mosquitoes, no air conditioning working, and he said when he got to London, I regret to say that the motor cars of the Mission are in such a state that we could not even offer him transport in the Mission, and therefore he had to spend on taxis which exceeded the amount of money that was given to him. People must recognise this. I do not believe there is any member in the Cabinet that would take a penny from the Government to put in his pocket on an overseas trip.

I will tell you now. When I was in the Opposition and I went away with the CPA, the hon. member for St. Philip South will bear us out on this. The hon. member was head of our delegation, he made a significant contribution not only to the CPA debate but to cementing relations between ourselves and Canada, particularly the province of Nova Scotia, and the hon. member will agree that himself, Senator Ward as he then was, and myself had to pool our resources together for us to give some entertainment to another delegation on

behalf of the people of Barbados. This is so, Sir, and I gave my support 100% because I felt that he was pulling his pocket for the people of Barbados and I pulled my pocket then. Some of us could afford it at some times much more than we could at other times, some of us cannot afford it at all, and I think that we must have a reasonable standard and we must stop giving the impression, as the hon. member for St. Michael South West is doing deliberately, that hon. members are in here abusing their positions, getting money for their pockets, or indeed in here only to get money out of the taxpayers while they are squeezing the poor workers. That is an unfortunate way to conduct a debate of this nature. The longer he stays in here he might learn a bit more, and as the hon. member for Christ Church South Central said, I am prepared to stand up on a public platform and debate with him on questions of principle.

Yesterday I spoke very strongly about the article in the Advocate because I thought it was derogatory, just as I thought some of the comments being made by the hon. member to which I took objection were of the same calibre, and if the hon. member does not desist from this sort of conduct he will be run out of public life sooner than he thinks, because he will lose his seat next time. I will campaign the length and breadth of St. Michael South West, even if I am not running again in the next election, to make sure that he loses his seat, for that brand of politics, it is about time it leaves the country and time that we get rid of that cheap way of campaigning and posturing as he has indulged in this afternoon.

5.35 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I have to add a little to this debate for the simple reason that I have found myself out of pocket just a few weeks ago on a very little trip out to Miami looking at the Farm Labour Programme; but that is not important to me, unlike my colleagues, because money is no big thing to me. I have handled a lot of money for a long time, so money is no big thing to me. In the meantime, I too can complain about the allowances, but that is not what I am really concerned about at this stage.

The member for St. John has a strange way of saying things about people who unfortunately did not go to a university, or to Harrison College, Combermere or Lodge School. I want to put the record straight now once and for all. When I was in the Opposition he said to me that the only thing I had passed in life was a bus. I told him on that occasion that I also passed the test for corruption with which he had a great deal of experience.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Deal with the Cabinet.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am dealing with the Cabinet and I must draw to the attention of the Committee that I too have suffered in this. The hon. member for St. John once said that his aeroplane cost $34,000. When there was a debate in here the hon. member said about two years ago that he had to go to the First National City Bank and borrow $69,845 to pay for an aeroplane at that time. Today it is only $34,000. I do not know if he is referring to United States, Canadian or Barbados dollars. What I believe he is referring to is the Canadian millions that he is now negotiating with Guyana for the petro wealth dealing with the Middle East bandits.

He has a strange way of referring to people who did not go to school long. I want to get the record straight between the two of us today. I went to Roebuck Street Boys' School, and I am not ashamed of that. I passed through Seventh Standard at the age of 12. I went to the Barbados Academy and the present Chairman taught me there. It is not my fault if my father could not keep me in school long enough. I have nothing to be ashamed of. I am proud to know that I can occupy a seat which a man like Mencea Cox once occupied and who did not have a formal education and like Griffith, a Colonial Secretary in England and Shinwell, a coal miner. I am glad to know that I am in a position to dictate to him and tell him what he is to do, where he should go and when he should go.

All of those free trips at the expense of the Government are over. That is his problem. All the conference trips and the free money that he used to get and used to give Sydney Alleyne, all of that is over now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please deal with the Head Cabinet Office.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am dealing with Cabinet Office because the former Prime Minister, the member for St. John was in the Cabinet and he was Minister of Finance. I must let him know that all the free money he used to give Sydney Alleyne, the bandit, when he was his friend, and the free trips out of Barbados are all over; and the boy who did not go to school very long can now tell him when to get his passport and when he should go out

of Barbados. The boot is on the other foot now.

I believe that the allowances are too low. It is immaterial to me whether you raise salaries or not. I have made my position clear on the bench of the Opposition. When my colleagues did not vote I got up and voted with the Government because I felt at that time that they were too low. When I came in here in 1966 I felt that members of Parliament should not be paid because I knew no better at the time. I felt that it was a public service, something that they were doing for the country, and that they should not get anything. Then I realised as Mr. Lloyd Smith once said, we do not know the problems that you have in Parliament financially. I got up and voted, as the members over there can bear me out, and voted with the Government.

I do not know whether there is going to be an increase in the salaries of Ministers, parliamentarians or Civil Servants. That is a matter entirely for the Commission and the Minister of Finance. I would like to make my position very clear. At no time have I ever discussed the raising of salaries with the Minister of Finance, and never had any plans to do it. That is a matter entirely for him; and as far as I am concerned, I do not care if they raise them in 1978, 1980 or 1981. I am out of the woods already. Both of my kids are out of the university, and I am home. I can live on $1,200 a month far less $2,800. I take home $1,641. In 1965 I was taking home $2,000 a month in this country. This is what I get out of politics today.

You hear snide remarks from the member for St. Michael South West talking about Ministers salaries going up and somebody getting laid off and that kind of nonsense. I want to make my position quite clear because they seem to believe that only the Adamses and the Fordes and that crowd are to be in the money thing. I do not care if they raise it or do not raise it. I do not care if they raise it until 1986 when I believe that I will no longer be contesting an election. I just want the member for St. John to understand quite clearly that while I did not go to the university, were it nor for Hitler he would not have gone. I went to the university of dedication, courage and sincerity; and I worked towards the cause of the late Sir Grantley Adams. I am not a hypocrite like some of them about this – diabolical nuisances further more liars.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am not certain that this is under the Head Cabinet Office. If it comes under this Head I suppose that it will be under Item 14 – Contingencies; but I believe that the Cabinet has appointed a number of Commissions, or intend to appoint a number of Commissions of Inquiry and other types of Commission; and I am not certain where in the Estimates these will be paid from; and I wonder if it is under Item 14 which is subject to the control of the Prime Minister subject to reference to Cabinet.

I am not certain, and I am wondering if we can be told where these various Commissions of Inquiry will be paid from, and whether at the same time we can be given any indication or estimate of the cost of the only Commission which has sat so far – I believe the Commission of Inquiry into the Cubana air disaster. I am wondering if we can get some indication as to the cost, either real, approximate or estimated for that Commission of Inquiry.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised the question of the cost of the only Commission that has been appointed. I think that that comes specifically under the Head – Caribbean Division (Civil Aviation and Tourism Division). When we reach that Head an approximate amount of the cost will be given to the hon. member.
5.45 p.m.

I am rising in case there is any further point on the Press Secretary which hon. members want. The contingency is the normal vote used to maintain Commissions of Inquiry. *(Asides)* Apparently, hon. members are so satisfied with the rest of the Cabinet that they do not want the Prime Minister to sum up.

The question that Head 5(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 5(2) – PRINTING DEPARTMENT

Head 5(2) – Printing Department – in the sum of $594,010 – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Printing Office is very straight-forward, Sir. It is nearly all recurrent expenditure. The non-recurrent is only $3,400. I will draw this to the attention, perhaps, of members of the Press who have so vividly highlighted the Second Reading speech of the hon. member for St. John, and said that we could make savings in the non-recurrent vote when the non-recurrent

vote is $1 million in $276 million, which is half of 1%. All the savings you could make on that vote, if no civil servant got a fan, a filing cabinet, refrigerator or a chair, would be a mere drop in the ocean. If the Printing Office did not get the drawing table and the adjustable set square, the office chairs, the metal stools, and the work table, you would save $3,400 out of $594,000. That is the only point I would really make on this. This is overwhelmingly a vote for the continued operation of the Printing Office.

The question that Head 5(2) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 6(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 6(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation – in the sum of $360,729 – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, under Head 6(1) – Prime Minister's Office – Direction and Policy Formulation – there are some adjustments to be made here. There are several amendments to be moved on this page. On page 10, delete the words "Culloden Farm" against Item 11 and substitute the words "Prime Minister's Residence".

There should be a Note 7 to read:

"To meet the cost of Government Advertisements."

Note 9 should be deleted and the new Note 9 should read:

"To defray the cost of such Independence Celebrations as may be approved." The present Note 9 should be renumbered 10.

Note 11 should be altered to read:

"Includes provision for the maintenance of Culloden Farm."

In Note 13, delete the words "Antique" and "Stenonette 2002".

I beg to move that Head 6(1), as amended, stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman speaking on Item 9 – Independence Celebrations – there is a point which concerns me and which I think that people who have a sense of history and, indeed, and appreciation of facts and the presentation of facts must have some concern. Now, under this Head $150,000 was voted last year, and this year they voted $100,000. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that last year we celebrated the Tenth Anniversary of the Independence of this country, and as part of the celebrations you will probably recall that the Government Information Service brought out a documentary on Independence. Now this documentary, in my view, Mr. Chairman, was probably one of the greatest national injustices that has ever been perpetrated in this country because what it sought to do was really to twist history and to make a false presentation about the whole question of Independence and the facts surrounding the celebration of Independence. It was interesting that in this documentary one had a view, for example, when the Hilton Hotel was opened there was a situation where Conrad Hilton, who was not a Barbadian, was presented and spoke for a long time whereas the former Prime Minister of Barbados, whether one wants to accept it or not, who is the architect of Independence in this country, was left out. That is the kind of situation that history will record, and no amount of whitewashing and no amount of words will change history.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I wish to inform the hon. member for St. Lucy that what he is talking about had nothing to do with this vote or anything in the Prime Minister's Office. This is not a part of the Independence Celebrations. I can assure hon. members that none of the funds which went into the making of this documentary film about which, I think, he is talking was paid from this Head.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, as you will appreciate, I am talking about the Independence Celebrations, and I am talking about the way in which we celebrate our Independence. This year we are going to be celebrating our Eleventh Anniversary of Independence.
5.55 p.m.

It is conceivable, Mr. Chairman, that part of the celebrations which you will be having might very well be a repeat of some of the things which were projected as part of the Tenth anniversary of our independence, and as I was indicating, Mr. Chairman, we have got to examine this matter very carefully. If the Prime Minister does not want me to examine what I am dealing with under this Head, I can wait

until I come to the other Head, Government Information, because I intend to deal with this particular matter. As I see it it relates to independence celebrations and I am saying that the kind of distortions and twists which we are attempting in this particular matter is an attempt not really to do justice to history, but really to try for one reason or another to play down the contributions which particular people have made towards the development of this country, and as I said, as a person who has a sense of history I must deplore this kind of situation. As I said, I will come back to this matter when we come to Government Information because I feel very strongly about this and I am going to be also dealing with the whole question of the media and its role within the society, but suffice it to say that is the extent of the comment which I will make at this particular time on this Head.

On the question generally speaking of independence celebrations, Mr. Chairman, I recall for example the hon. member for St. Joseph during the time when we were in here in the last session along with the hon. member for St. Peter and I who represent constituencies which are in the rural areas, calling for some aspects of the celebrations in the rural areas, and again I would like to make a call for some global celebrations if we are going to be celebrating independence. I have pointed out on more than one occasion that I see no reason why these celebrations or anything to do with independence should be concentrated in the metropolitan areas. We feel that we should have a broad enough plan which will encompass and embrace all of the areas of Barbados, because after all we are not talking about the independence of Bridgetown, St. Michael or Christ Church, but we are talking in terms of the independence of Barbados, and this is something which we have to watch very carefully and ensure that people in the entire country have some sense of belonging and are able to participate and share in whatever there is as far as celebrations for independence are concerned.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, it would seem as if the hon. member for St. Lucy has suddenly realised that he is a Barbadian and that he represents St. Lucy, because when I came to this Chamber in 1971 I asked for the celebrations for independence be spread into the country districts and not only be concentrated in the St. Michael area. Now I have never yet heard that member vote against the Government that was then in power although he represented St. Lucy, but today he seeks to draw me into his argument that the celebrations for independence should now be island-wide and not be a St. Michael operation since we are not celebrating the independence of St. Michael. For his information, from the time I became a Minister and sat at Cabinet I have expressed my views that the independence celebrations should be planned well in advance and not in the way it was planned under the last administration where a week before independence somebody from the Prime Minister's office would telephone the headmasters or headmistresses at the country schools and tell them to put up something quickly, send a list down to Central Purchasing and let him see what he can get as prizes, and then you would find people in the districts telephoning the M.Ps asking whether they could put up $200 or $300 to help pay a band to go on a school pasture, and they called that independence celebrations.

Mr. Chairman, I have never yet heard the hon. member for St. Lucy get up and ask for celebrations to take place anywhere outside of St. Michael. I remember once asking that as part of the independence celebrations that the then Government set up what could be called a native market, and Philip Greaves said that they had no interest in it and he voted with the Government; so what foolishness am I being told now? As a member of the Democratic Labour Party in Government he never wanted anything for St. Lucy or anywhere else; everything was right and in order, but now, in less than six months he can find everything in the country wrong. As far as I am concerned I will represent St. Joseph and as a member of the Cabinet I will express my views. I know this Government has planned country-wide celebrations for independence, but because of the state of the economy in which they have left it, the celebrations if curtailed this year will have to be in that position, but as I have said, this Government will not do like the last Government. This Government will not plan celebrations in which the Prime Minister and some of the members' friends will attend while all the other country districts are left out there, and hear that a few buses will be coming to town. We will do proper planning and plan within the context of the sum of money which is available to be spent on independence celebrations.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, all I want to say is that I have had my disagreements with the former Prime Minister, but one of the first things that really hurt me was to think that that party over there could celebrate ten years of Barbados' independence.

If I were Prime Minister and you were to have the Government, you would have had it after because you did not know anything about it. The architect of independence is the Rt. Hon. member for St. John. The Rt. Hon. member for St. John will go down in history as the architect of independence for this country and there is nothing you can do about it, and what hurt me was that he called an election and allowed you all who opposed independence...

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, can you also give to us that he was the architect of the white paper that told a lie in respect of the sum of money which independence would have cost and fooled the people of Barbados? That is what you must also say.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All I am saying is that 300 years from now whoever is the historian, however biassed he is, he will have to record that the Rt. Honourable member for St. John took this little 166 square miles into independence and gave to you and me a sense of pride, that today we can boast we are Barbadians and we can have our own passport, that we can stand at attention when we hear our own national anthem and that we can have our own national pledge; and whatever is happening in this House, all the attempts to denigrate and destroy his image, history will forever record it. What hurts me is that the election was called at a time when you could celebrate a decade of this country's independence. That is what hurts me, and whatever you do for the next 100 years, history will have to record it. I saw Conrad Hilton at the opening of the Hilton where the Independence Dinner was held; I had just come back from Jamaica and went to the Hilton that night where people were feverishly working to open it for the independence supper that night when the Duke of Kent was here, and when I could sit down in my drawing room and see Conrad Hilton get more play on T.V. than the Rt. Honourable member for St. John, I almost shed a tear to see that we have no pride in our own country and that they were so out to denigrate and destroy his image that even that a member of your party who is now a member of the Education Board appointed by the Hon. Minister of Education, wrote in the Nation that she felt hurt to think that the Rt. Honourable member who was the architect of independence was on that night given less play than Conrad Hilton.

6.05 p.m.

She had to write in the Nation that she felt hurt to think that the Rt. Hon. Errol Barrow, who whatever you say of him, the architect of independence, was on that night given less play than Conrad Hilton, and I felt ashamed as a Barbadian to think that so deliberate was the attempt to try to erase from the minds of the public the image of Independence, that we have reached such a depth of depravity that we could go on the media which we in the Democratic Labour Party established and give Conrad Hilton, a foreigner, a man who has about 90 wives, more coverage than the man who has gone to London, the man who has cut the flag, the man who had lowered the Union Jack, the man under whose regime we have had the National Anthem, the National Pledge and the National Flag.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. He talks about the man who lowered the Union Jack; ask him what he did to Sir Grantley Adams, the man who put him in politics. Ask him what Frank Walcott did to Sir Grantley Herbert Adams, the man who formed the Union. Up to now, ask him if they have put back up the photograph of Sir Grantley Herbert Adams in the Union building. That is politics, you get what you give out, if you cannot take it you can cry.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not defending him, I am just saying this, that that was one of my saddest moments when I looked forward to a decade of independence and all I could see was Conrad Hilton, a man who had no connection with Barbados, given more coverage, his speech was more mentioned than a man who had led this country into independence and unless we in Barbados start getting proper perspective for our national heroes and those who have made contributions we will slide down the road to decadence. However much we hate somebody, however much we dislike somebody, we have to start in this country to give Jack his jacket however much we hate or dislike Jack, and try to put in perspective the contributions of those who have gone before us, what is our condition? I will tell you that one of my saddest moments was when I sat down in my drawing room with a Campari and soda and watched Hilton, Hilton, Conrad Hilton given more coverage.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have said that ten times.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, if I ever commit a crime for which I would certainly be sent to gaol I am going to ask that the hon.

member for St. Michael South Central appear in my defence, because he is an excellent defender of the indefensible.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not want any advertisement, I do not want any commercials in here, my ability speaks for itself, so cut out the commercials.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I am offering the hon. member for St. Michael South Central a certain job in the event that I would need his services, because when I hear him stand up and so eloquently defend the past and spent record of the hon. member for St. John, I wonder, and I would like to introduce the hon. member for St. Michael South Central to a book written by the illustrious Japanese author, Yukio Mashima, the sailor who fell from grace with the sea. *(Asides)*. If what the hon. member for St. Michael South Central said was pertinent to the debate, what I am saying is equally pertinent.

I would like to recall, Sir, that a former President of the United States who obviously made a contribution towards the development of that country – and I am referring to Richard Nixon – has gone down in disgrace because he lost the opportunity to write his name with honour on the pages of history, just as I am saying the hon. member for St. John lost his opportunity to write his record with honour on the pages of Barbadian history.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I object to that, Sir. I definitely object to the hon. member casting aspersions on my character and comparing me with Richard Nixon and saying that I failed to write my name with honour, that could only mean I wrote it with dishonour. That is a reflection on my character and I strongly deprecate it. I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that, Sir.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. John came in here yesterday and he exposed for all of us in here to see the record.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Michael West, will you please take you seat? I cannot have two hon. members on their feet.

Mr. JOHNSON: I am talking on Independence Celebrations, Sir, because the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is saying that the hon. member for St. John will go down everlastingly for having brought Barbados into independence. Yes, it is true, and that is as far as he can say, he will also go down in history for what has happened subsequent to independence. *(Asides)*. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why the hon. member for St. Michael South West is not working now and I am working. I have four jobs and he has none. 6.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please let us get along with the debate.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It serves me right because when they were going to chase him away I should have let them chase him away. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order at all. If I may say so at this juncture, the hon. member for St. John in his remarks to the hon. member for St. Michael North West said nothing that was a reflection on your character. That is my ruling.

Mr. JOHNSON: If the hon. member has a mirror up before his face and he sees a reflection in the mirror, it is not me holding it. It is history holding it before his face.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on with the debate.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Independence is history; but what is important is what will happen post independence. I am submitting that it is not enough for anyone to point to single moments in history when they may have had something to do at any specific point. Continuance is important; and history is developed upon what is happening in progression, not what happened in isolation. The hon. member for St. Lucy is complaining because we have not gone down there and set up a circus in the name of Independence. *(ASIDE:* And bring you down?).

I have already reminded him that he and the others over there are perpetually fooling the people; and I am suggesting that the time has come when we must start looking for substance, and when we search the record of the Democratic Labour Party for the last 15 years it is difficult to find any substance or any enduring things to which one can point with pride. Every page that we turn is tarnished with

the ugly hand of violence. Yesterday was an example.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If that is the teaching that he gave at BIMAP no wonder he should be fired. Anyone who has lived in Barbados knows that he is not speaking the truth. If he is teaching at BIMAP the courses are not worth anything. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. JOHNSON: If the hon. member for St. Michael South Central does not leave me alone I will give him another baptism of fire in this House. *(ASIDE:* Hon. F. G. SMITH: All right. Any time.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on with the debate.

Mr. JOHNSON: All that I want to point out is that it is not enough to get up and make empty speeches about independence. If a man had an opportunity to write history in ways that should be remembered fondly and he lost it, that is nobody's fault but his own. The hon. member for St. John had an excellent opportunity over the last 15 years to be remembered fondly in Barbados, and he let it slip from his grasp.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the objection is. I take it that the only objection is to the reduction in the size of the Independence Vote. We only spent $86,600 on the Independence Celebrations. The vote was a little inflated because, as I remember, provision was made to buy musical instruments, hi-fi equipment etc. for NIFCA and I think that these instruments had actually been bought: and in any case they did not come to the volume that was voted.

We did our best within the budgetary constraints that existed during September. I think that the Independence Celebrations was one of the ways in which we made it clear that we were not wasting money, one of the ways in which the Government made it possible to keep down the size of the budget. We tried to cut down on wining and dining although, as hon. members will be aware, the entire Opposition was asked to all of the functions so far as I know.

We did increase the prizes given by the National Housing Corporation by the Ministry of Housing to tenants in the housing estates for the best garden, the best kept house and things such as that. We also gave prizes in schools for the best essays relating to Independence. We increased this sort of expenditure under this vote; but we reduced the amount of money which we made available to Embassies overseas who entertain nationals.

I have no apologies whatever for having taken the decision not to spend $150,000 for Independence Celebrations even if it was the 10th Anniversary of Independence. That was a traumatic time in Barbados. We had the Cubana incident. We had the Sidney Alleyne incident and we had recently had an election. There was bitterness and division in the land, a bitterness and division which even now has not been healed; but it was at its peak on that occasion. I did not consider it appropriate to consider a very large Independence Celebrations expenditure.

As far as the Government Information Service programme on Independence is concerned, I will deal with that under the next Head if it is raised again; but in so far as it is mentioned under this Head, nobody has set out to disrespect any of the historical figures involved in Barbados' independence or in Barbados' political history.

There is nothing like the refusal to walk out to the Independence Flag Rising with the Leader of the Opposition which characterised the old regime, and the present regime. Many of you will remember seeing pictures of Independence Celebrations in other countries – even Guyana – where blood had divided the parties. The blood of many Guyanese paved the way to Independence; but Burnham and Jagan walked out together to lower the British Flag and raise the Guyanese Flag.

Those of you who were present will recall that the then Leader of the Opposition, a man who had made no small contribution to the history of this country, Sir Grantley Adams, was not even given the privilege of walking out to help haul down the Flag. So how can you regard us as being the party which showed spite towards historical figures?

In all of the years that Sir Grantley Adams gave service to this country he was never invited to be a member of the Governor General's Privy Council. One of the first things that I did when I came into power was to insist that the Leader of the Opposition be retained in the Privy Council; and I asked the Acting Governor General to ask the hon. member for St. John to

continue to serve. He turned down the offer with contumely.

There is nobody on this side who will not be given respect where respect is due; but where respect is refused we cannot be blamed. At all times I have had an acute sense of history, and have informed my actions by such a sense of history as much as the next man. I was recently attacked on a political platform for being evil, wicked and not having a sincere bone in my body.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into it; but I do not think that the Prime Minister should go into that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not going into it. I am just saying that you can investigate every speech that I ever made on a political platform, and I have never ever described the member for St. John as wicked or saying that he did not have a sincere bone in his body. Strange though it may appear, Sir, I have always been extremely careful of my remarks about political opponents, and especially the hon. member for St. John, careful to give criticism where it can be expected, but just as careful to keep criticism within proper bounds, aware of the fact that I am dealing with a figure of history – we have been hearing so much about figures of history – and it grieves me when the hon. member lets himself down as he let himself down yesterday.

He would be surprised to hear that; but he can believe it because it reflects on all of us for the reason that for many years he has represented Barbados. So do not accuse this Party or this Government of showing disrespect to people on the other side. It is something that burns deep in my soul – the determined disrespect shown to Sir Grantley Adams by the Democratic Labour Party for many years.
6.25 p.m.

It is a disrespect which is accepted throughout Barbadian society. It is the kind of disrespect that has Eric Sealy on the platform now saying what a wicked man he was and how he held Barbados down, but I do not have to go into that. I resent any suggestion that there is anything deliberate, or Government inspired, in any derogation from the part which the former Prime Minister may have played in the Independence Celebrations. If you want a personal opinion, or perhaps I should not be giving these psychological type opinions, but I still will give this one. A personal opinion is that whatever his qualities there were not qualities of smoothing a situation out or of making people feel that he was a man of mellifluent character who would overlook small infringements, and it may very well be that the Public Service had formed an impression over the years that you have to be very careful not to offend the Prime Minister. The Public Service got to the stage where I could never have expected, for example, the Government Information Service to allow something to appear which was favourable to me – not after they and CBC had been specifically informed that I was not to appear and that the cameras were not to be sent to our Press Conferences. All that has happened is, perhaps, that public officers had lived in such a sense of fear that they had not realised that the curtain of fear had been lifted and they could show what they want and do what they want.

Do you think it possible that under the old regime that last night's CBC telecast could have been put over with the Prime Minister receiving two minutes or a little less, and not even the Leader of the Opposition, but a back bencher from the Opposition, not even the Shadow Minister of Finance, who I take is still the hon. member for St. Michael South West, I have not seen any repeal of his appointment, appear in the Press – Do you think that CBC could ever have given a back bencher of the Opposition more than half of the report on Parliament for a day? They can do it with no fear. *(Asides.)* I saw the same person in here today. I observed he was not taking any notes when the licks were going in the hon. member for St. John. If he thinks that the hon. member for St. John knows more economics than me that is a reflection on the quality of the appointments which were made to journalistic positions at CBC during the old regime. That is all I can say. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I really am not going to say any more on this Head. There really cannot be anything more to say except that we are not discriminating against the Opposition. You can do what you want as far as we are concerned, and we will give credit where credit is due.

The question that Head 6(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 6(2) – GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SERVICE

Head 6(2) – Government Information Service – in the sum of $118,996 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, hon. members will observe that Government Information Office is now embraced within the Prime Minister's Office. I would just like to say that this has absolutely nothing to do with the matters which were just canvassed so enthusiastically by the hon. member for St. Lucy. I am sure the newly appointed Chief Information Officer will tell you that there is far less disturbance and interference from above than there ever was under the old dispensation. I am sure of that.

Since hon. members have asked something about the Press Secretary, and I was able just to get in a word about it taking some of the load off the Information Office, I will repeat for the benefit of the entire House what I have already said in private to the member for St. Michael South. The decision to have a Press Secretary came about when we were in Opposition, and Mr. Peter Morgan made a speech at Paradise Beach Club which was defamatory of myself in my view and gave this speech to the Government Information Officer to circulate. The Government Information Officer on direction converted what had been, perhaps, a slander into what, I think, was really a libel. When my lawyers wrote to the Attorney General complaining of the publication, the Attorney General replied in paragraph 1 he had received the letter. Paragraph 2, on behalf of Mr. Gladstone Holder, I would like to offer your client an apology for the article. Paragraph 3 also denied that it was defamatory but, nonetheless, the tone was set by paragraph 3 that the blame was going to be thrown on the shoulder of Mr. Gladstone Holder, the Chief Information Officer; therefore, I did not proceed with the matter and the Attorney General, to whom it would now fall to defend it, told me yesterday or the day before that I should take note that the matter is now time expired. It is barred by time and could no longer be pursued.

I considered that it is very undesirable for the Government Information Officer to find himself, perhaps, put in a position where he is asked to take a role more connected to the Prime Minister as Chairman of a Political Party rather than the Prime Minister as Chairman of the Cabinet. The idea of a Press Secretary in a Government Office is not by any means unusual. There is one already in the Ministry of External Affairs; the Government Information Office, as far as I am concerned, relates to every Ministry and not just the Prime Minister's Office, and it has officers stationed in many Ministries, and it has a duty to discharge to all of the Ministries. The existence of a Press Secretary in the Prime Minister's Office will ease many previously clogged channels of communication. I do not believe that the difficulties which were experienced by the previous Prime Minister with the Chief Information Officer will now have to be experienced by anybody.

I recall being in here when the former Prime Minister made a statement that he had nothing to do with the Government Information Officer, and that he does not talk to BLP Information Officers. I believe this matter even, eventually, may have reached the Public Service Commission level, but I think Mr. Holder wrote asking the Commission for a vote of confidence. So I understood. I think that all these little unhappinesses and the bad relationships that existed between Mr. Morgan and Mr. Holder, I believe, will be eased for the future. I do not think that I would ever ask, or would wish to ask, or have asked the Government Information Officer to do the things that Mr. Morgan would have wanted the Government Information Officer to do. I do not believe so but, nonetheless, I think that information in a Government and in a political sense will be better provided by means of the Press Officer. I think the hon. member for St. Michael South West says he takes the place of a Parliamentary Secretary. Well, I do not see it in quite those terms. It is a lot cheaper than a Parliamentary Secretary but who, at least, can deal with things that you would not ask a Government Information Officer to deal with.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this has given an adequate explanation to a matter that was canvassed earlier. I beg to move that Head 6(2) stand part.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: There are members over here, Mr. Chairman, who wish to speak. I want to thank the Prime Minister for the explanation which he gave for this post first of all in private and now more fulsomely here on the floor of this Chamber.

6.35 p.m.

If indeed from the outset the need for this particular post and the reasons for setting it out here and providing the funds for it had been set out from the start, I think it would really have prevented members from this side from having to ask about it in order to find out what it is. We do not wish Government by prodding and I think where there is a new matter being introduced – I have spoken in these terms before – I believe it is incumbent upon the Government to explain these matters, not afterwards, but before...

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation, if the hon. member cares to take a look at my working copy of the Estimates which belonged until day before yesterday to the hon. member for Christ Church East, he will see that I have written at Head 6(2) a note on Press Secretary. In other words, this is always where I was going to talk about it. The note has been here since Sunday morning; it was written in the presence of the hon. member for Christ Church East... *(Asides)* It may not be on yours, but I am just telling you that I have a note here and this is always where it would have been talked about; so he can't say that I did not tell hon. members about it before it happened. This is the time when you would have heard it. As a matter of fact, I gave back the book to the hon. member and he said "no, no, you take that because it has that note", and he has mine and I have his. So the hon. member really must not say that I would not have commented on this or I would not have announced it unless such and such was the case. He must give me a chance.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I did not say he would not have commented. I said there should not be Government by prodding. But in fact I am almost in support of the need for a Press Secretary because I have always felt that the Government Information Service should be expanded in this regard to provide more coverage for the Ministries. Now there are large Ministries which only have the services of members from the Government Information Service part time and some of them are very large Ministries and could do with full time officers, and I am certain that the presence of a Press Secretary in the Prime Minister's office may very well obviate the need to come and dragoon the press and enterprising journalists because when new matters are being developed like the appointment of commissions to enquire into salaries of members of Parliament and Ministers, maybe if there was a Press Secretary in that office, the information would have been given out in due course instead of enterprising and experienced journalists having to ferret out the information by means of a well tried practice in journalism.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I had indicated when we were discussing the previous Head that there were a number of comments that I wanted to make and the Prime Minister indicated that the comments probably would better be placed under this particular Head, and as I indicated, I intend to refer to them. I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is rather interesting and somewhat strange that the Prime Minister is on the defensive apparently in this particular Head, but I would like to draw his attention to the fact that just a couple of minutes before he spoke, the hon. member for St. Joseph indicated in an aside and then on his feet at the point which I attempted to make at that time and which was made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and gone into in even more detail then than I did at that time, that that is politics. We have to see the criticisms which we are levelling at the way in which the Government Information Service handled the documentary which was prepared for the Tenth Anniversary Celebrations in Barbados in the light of what the hon. member for St. Joseph pointed out, that this is politics.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that you read the manifesto of your party, the Barbados Labour Party. There is a section on page 17 of that manifesto which deals with broadcasting and the media, and it was very specific about what it intended to do with regards the Government Information Service. It said: "The Barbados Labour Party will also reorganise the Government Information Service to ensure that it performs its proper role and is rid of political interference in its day to day operations." And it goes on making other points. The other point I want to refer to in the manifesto is the last one which it makes on broadcasting and the media where it says: "Restore to journalism true professionalism and assist journalists financially or otherwise in becoming better qualified."

As the hon. member for St. Michael South said just now, we had the experience here over the last two days of hearing all sorts of comments made about the press and about what appeared in the press purely because some person working at the Advocate was able to get hold of information before the Government decided to publicise this information, and for that reason we see now a situation where this kind of enterprise is being attacked. It is strange, Mr. Chairman, because one can

remember instances in which the Barbados Labour Party supported the Advocate in various stands which it took when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, and we are not now trying to control what appears in the Advocate or anything like this, even although we would have heard the Attorney General yesterday make a statement and then corrected himself quickly when he said that if the media does not become more responsible that they would take over the media and ensure that it is locally owned.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, the hon. member must not misrepresent me. I never said that the Government would take over the press. I want to make that absolutely clear.

Mr. GREAVES: The hon. member and I have already had a talk about this, and I indicated that I would raise it here. I think I understood the point he was making, but as he very well knows, this is politics. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that when we examine what is contained in the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party and we examine the statement which was made by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member for St. Joseph, one would see very clearly that this was politics, because I am certain that people who watched that documentary even some of the members of the Barbados Labour Party present in this Chamber, were ashamed to see that such a rape could have been made on what was an obvious historical fact, and as a matter of fact, as I was on the point of pointing out, we had the very strange situation of a non-Barbadian – and I am sure you watched that film...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you using the same arguments over and over again that have been repeated and rehearsed in here four or five times already today? Carry on, but don't be so repetitive. *(Asides)* I am not speaking to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; you just behave yourself.
6.45 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to question your ruling in here, but I would question you outside, because you are in control of in here and I am not going to cast any reflections on anything you say in here because you are in charge of in here, but I want to make the point that I could not be repeating myself because this is the first time I am speaking on this particular matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are repeating arguments that have been used by other hon. members; that is repetition too. It is not my intention to muzzle an Opposition, but I would certainly like you to confine yourself to the debate and avoid repeating arguments that have already been put forward.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I will restrain myself, but we are dealing with the Government Information Service in the context of broadcasting and propagating news. I use "propagating" in its very simple meaning, that is, just spreading information and not propaganda. We have to be very careful about this because we must recognise that the Government Information Service has an important role to play in this country, and obviously it has a role to play from the point of view of letting the public know what the Government is doing and what are the Government's plans and this kind of information, but when we are getting the kind of situation where we see what in my view was politics being played, then this is a cause for complaint and this is what I am complaining about, this is what the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, complained about and which I understand the Prime Minister to say that he did not know anything about, but it is significant that Information falls under the Prime Minister.

We, as I said, have to be very careful and we have to be very clear about what we are doing. If it is considered that the Government Information Service should become an arm of, and indeed should propagate information about, the Barbados Labour Party as a political party, then let us say so, so that we will understand very clearly the game that is being played. If on the other hand the Government Information Service will be operating on a higher level, then we have to again make this point very clear so that people will understand very clearly what we are dealing with. We have to look at the entire context of the media and the role of the media in this country.

We heard a lot of talk about freedom of the Press and so on. I want to say that as far as I am concerned freedom of the Press is a myth because no Press is free anywhere at all. The Press is free as far as the Editor allows it to be free; as a matter of fact, he expresses the point of view and he can be influenced by any particular point of view or can project any particular image. You will recall also that the Advocate-News when it brought the supplement dealing with the tenth anniversary of

independence, you will remember the kind of supplement which appeared. I personally wrote a letter to the Advocate complaining about it; of course, the letter never appeared, but what one saw was the following Sunday an attempt made to correct some of the injustices which had been done, but I have said history is there for the historians to interpret.

As politicians we will probably try in our own way to score political points and try to make a little distortion here and a little distortion there for the moment, but when history comes to be written the kind of contribution which people have made towards the society cannot be overlooked, and I want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has set itself some very bold and broad objectives as far as broadcasting and the media, and more specifically as far as the Government Information Service is concerned. I would sincerely hope that the Government would ensure that some of the principles, or indeed all the principles which it has laid down in its Manifesto when it was campaigning to capture the reins of Government, that it would try to fulfil these objectives, and particularly the one in which they have stated very boldly that they would ensure that the Government Information Service performs its proper role and is rid of political interference in its day to day operations, in spite of the hon. member for St. Joseph who said that that is politics and that is the way, according to my interpretation or my understanding of what he said, that that is how they intend to play the game.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in my five full years in Parliament I have always on each occasion when I have had the opportunity both by way of the Supplementary Estimates and the main Estimates spoken on this Head. I have not always had a response from the then Government to the comments which I made in relation to the question of the Government Information Service, or indeed the concept of freedom of information in so far as it should be practised in this island.

I think that any objective observer of the media in Barbados would concede that since the 2nd September, 1976 there has been greater freedom in the media in Barbados than existed prior to that date. I say this firm in the idea that if one looks either at the length of film used in relation to us when we were in Opposition, the number of occasions on which we were given any elasticity to appear on television or on radio, if one looks at the political coverage now being given to both political parties, and indeed to non-existent political parties, the one-man band of Eric Sealy and his fly string orchestra, one will be well satisfied that there seems to have been a different climate in the media in approaching the question of reporting events in this country.

In speaking on this Head I also speak as one who has been Chairman of a newspaper which is dedicated to promoting regional radical change in the Caribbean, Caribbean Contact Limited, and I know I speak also as a responsible member, alternate member to Mr. Frank Walcott, on the Caribbean Press Council, and I speak too as one who has shown considerable interest in this subject in so far as views of the Barbados Labour Party were enunciated in its Manifesto. I think it is correct to say that this Party since it has become the Government of the country has done nothing to harness freedom of expression in Barbados.
6.55 p.m.

I wish to put this firmly on the record particularly in view of the casual remarks that I have heard from time to time on political platforms including those from my good friend, the hon. member for St. Michael South, who, I think, in the exuberance of his language, said in St. Lucy that we would soon have a Communist state in Barbados; but it is an undoubted fact that you can find more criticism and less fear than there was before.

When it comes to attitudes towards the Press, the hon. member for St. Michael South West – he seems to be a little bit upset by the speech that I am making – the Press was handled by the gentleman of whom he said he would prefer to be a product – in a particular way between 1959 when I returned to this country and 1976. I have heard the hon. member for St. John attack the late Mitchie Hewitt, and said that he was a dunce in relation to his writing. I have seen him attack Jimmy Cozier, Tony Cozier and the late Joe Brome. I could go on and list all the persons attacked at meetings of his. I followed every big Democratic Labour Party meeting between 1959 and 1961 and listened to his attacks on the characters of journalists who may have disagreed with him. That was his technique.

Mr. Gladstone Holder, former Information Officer, received dusty treatment, unfair treatment, in my view, in the Civil Service at the hands of the past Government – led by Mr. Peter Morgan, the then Minister of Information, and by the Prime Minister himself. I argued very strongly in here that the Civil Service

Association which is now the National Union of Public Workers was lacking in strength and conviction in not taking up the case of Mr. Holder.

The records are there for anyone to see. Mr. Gladstone Holder became a pariah in the Government Service. He was banned by the Prime Minister from going on Radio and Television; and junior officials were put over him to go on Radio and Television and Mr. Gladstone Holder could not. We got to the stage that in the Fire Service since the Chief Fire Officer objected to his treatment in relation to a junior officer being sent over his head to purchase fire tenders, a directive came out to him that he was not to give any information even about cane fires and so on, so that journalists could not get that kind of information either. That has surfaced in my ministry with disastrous consequences; and a few days ago I directed a reverse decision.

I am citing this because all of a sudden now that they are in Opposition they are going to cry "foul" over an event that I think has been properly explained in here by the Prime Minister. I too appointed with its standard of Journalism, of professionalism and rectitude in so far as historical events are concerned; and its low technical standard; and I raised the matter.

The Prime Minister explained that there were some limitations they appeared to be working over; but himself, a journalist of some repute and great standing in the B.B.C. has set out to try to improve the quality of the Information Service. Even present officers in the Information Service, were looked down upon and passed over; and there seems to be no concerted policy to help improve the standard of journalism in this country.

I am sorry to say that the Advocate-News, only when I think it was under Daily Mirror ownership, and Dugal Smith was here, Ulric Rice and one other person were sent for limited training. They have never found that possible – although it makes over $1 million a year – it has never seen fit to establish a fund for training journalists who have worked for them for years. It pays its News Editor, for whom I hold no brief, and other people on its staff scandalous money in the context of Barbados today; and I hope that my friend from St. Lucy will put pressure on them when he negotiates next time with them. I make no bones about saying this. Those who wrote this meant it seriously, about training journalists of this country properly.

I have already asked my overseas ambassadors, particularly Professor Don Blackman, to look for scholarship opportunities overseas where we can try to find opportunities for offering them to journalists. They do not have to be BLP or DLP journalists. Barbadian journalists should be given the opportunity to go abroad and study. As far as I know, there is one young lady who got an international scholarship – a lady from my constituency, as would be expected – Sandra Mason. Other than that I have seen no effort to upgrade the standard of journalism.

We are dealing with events as important in the economic field as the Lome Convention; and I doubt whether there is anybody in the media here to specialise in this or even to have read this convention. An hon. member raised a most important point on the question of the development in the social economic field for the next 20 years in the light of undeveloped countries. How many journalists can you find who have taken the opportunity or who have been given the opportunity to study the whole subject of worker participation and what has happened in countries like Scandinavia and Germany on this issue? The Barbados Workers Union, to its credit, at least takes those who are in the realm of control and leadership and send them on limited courses; but very little has been done by private enterprise or at governmental level for improving the quality of the Press in Barbados; and I am amazed and astounded that this could happen.

I believe that freedom of the Press does not mean uncontrolled and absolute freedom. If I may quote a statement by Henry Adams who said that absolute liberty is absence of restraint. Responsibility is true restraint, and therefore ideally the free individual is responsible to himself. The Press must be responsible to itself as it must be responsible also to the community.

If members over here take issue with the article which appear in the Advocate, certainly I can say that we have not launched an attack on any particular person. I personally object to the article because I believe that it is a peice of bad reporting. It was also copied by CANA, and I have made a statement myself about an hour ago to the Manager of CANA; and I am appealing to the news media to correct this type of thing. I intend to raise it with the Caribbean Press Council. It is a very bad piece of reporting.

You cannot put down an informed source who refuses to be identified, and who is going to make insinuations about the motives of people as if they were questions of fact when it is only persons hiding behind anonymity without coming out and showing their true faces in order to be identified and to be able to be replied to and dealt with properly.

This is what I ask people to do; and I do not think that any journalist who knew his profession properly would have reported in that way and would have given this as a report of any repute or standard. That is why I said that journalists, if they want true freedom of the Press, must also recognise that they too must be responsible to themselves. It is as irresponsible to be foul historical events as it is to hold up people in private life or public life to ridicule without justification. I regret very much – and I have said this before – I regret very much how politics is being drawn in Barbados.

Now, I have heard some comment about the role of the hon. member for St. John. I said to my party colleagues and I think that the Hon. Prime Minister repeated that no one can gainsay that he has made a historical contribution. Often on that side of the House I have spoken about the true historical role also of the late Sir Grantley Adams. It has taken us some time to correct a lot of the wrong things that were said about Sir Grantley Adams. It has taken us some time to make people realise that he was one of the historical figures. People must realise that when the history of education in this country is being written, the hon. member for St. Michael South West must have some proper place in the history of education for the sort of innovations that he attempted, some of which were successful, and some not so successful; but one must give him his role as the hon. member for St. George South has already done.

7.05 p.m.

If they both are in their respect innovators, I hope there will be a lot more boldness in dealing with the educational problems of the country, and he has struck out on that level. I think we must recognise this, and we must make journalists understand that there are other events of significance that they could write about without necessarily looking for the little gossips and the sniping things. Frequently I ask them, Why Taiwan? Take the subject of Taiwan when dealing with information. Do you know that there were people who were writing articles for the Press and writing about Taiwan without recognising the type of murders that Chiang Kai-Shek had committed, and did not know that the native Taiwanese and other people were being governed by a clique that came from the mainland and were dominating them, but were willing to assassinate me about the policy that the Government is following in relation to Taiwan? I would have expected that the journalists in the Press would have done their homework and then painted me as they wanted to.

I speak out on these things to show that every word in this Manifesto will be carried out. The hon. member need not be afraid at all. He will see that journalists, particularly if we can get the resources – I am looking for money overseas; I am looking for scholarships overseas to help them in the hope that young people will go and do a degree. How many people in the media have gone through a University Course? Not that that is a complete test of common sense. Do you not think that the *Advocate* should hang its head in shame today in this country that, after being almost 100 years in Barbados, it has not established a scholarship for journalism in order to encourage young people to go forward? *(Asides.)* I never worked with the *Advocate.* I was never a director of the *Advocate.* I would like to see the *Advocate* come within one of the principles we have set out in this Manifesto, and I am going to repeat it. We must encourage the development of locally owned independent newspapers and broadcasting services, and it is about time that we localise in the Caribbean Region some of these newspapers. Not that, mark you, I am saying investment or foreign ownership is to be totally discouraged when you are looking for overseas capital, but I think it is reasonably true to say that those papers which are more Caribbeanised are not dominated by Government because that is another cardinal principle that I believe in, and which the Party has set out in the Manifesto. There must be more conscious of their developmental role in the society and having a greater respect for the political figures and the social institutions of our country than others who are interested in it, but they are either too frighten to make up their minds on something, like the *Trinidad Guardian* was. *(Asides.)* I am not coming in from the sun. I feel very strongly on this, and I like to be in the sun. I may say that the hon. member, who is a journalist, who has had some training in journalism, should respect a good speech when he hears one. This is not self-praise, anyhow, but I must make these points because I want the Press to understand, and particularly young people in this country to understand, that journalism is a powerful profession. It is a

necessary profession in the community; it has strength of character in it, if you want to use it that way. Those of us like the Hon. Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. Michael South and myself, and I believe, the hon. member for St. Michael South West, and the hon. member for St. Michael South to a lesser extent, have dabbled in the fields of journalism and we know what we are talking about when we say it.

I, on behalf of journalists, beg the community to help them to do a proper job, but they must stop misusing their role for limited purposes and so distorting their own true perspective of professionalism. We are going to ensure within five years we trust, but certainly within the 15 years we hope, that every one of these tenets is adhered to.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in view of the hour, I do not want to belittle the hon. member at all. I like to hear him talk. You know the old saying: "Give him a little rope, and he will hang himself." Sufficient to say that it is a quarter past seven, and I ask that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 8 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
7.15 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken, this House was in Committee of Supply to which it now reverts.

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

HEAD 6 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE (2) GOVERNMENT INFORMATION OFFICE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the sitting was suspended, the Hon. Attorney General was on his feet.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have completed my speech.

The question that the sum of $118,996 under Head 6 – Prime Minister's Office (2) Government Information Office – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 6 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE (3) ELECTORAL OFFICE

Head 6 – Prime Minister's Office (3) Electoral Office – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $171,000 under Head 6(3) Electoral Office – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to refer to what the Government would consider their bible. There is at page 2 "In principle the Party would seek to establish a permanent Electoral and Boundaries Commission with full constitutional protection to preserve free elections and to put an end to the sorry system under which the machinery of elections in the constituencies is largely in the hands of persons known to be supporters of the Democratic Labour Party." I shall not comment on this too much for obvious reasons, but be that as it may I would like the Prime Minister to say when we are likely to get an Electoral and Boundaries Commission. I said I shall not comment too much on this for obvious reasons, but the Prime Minister under whom elections now fall will tell us how soon he proposes to get this commission functioning in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member may rest assured that this commission will be in operation God willing and other events permitting before the next general elections.

The question that the sum of $171,000 under Head 6 – Prime Minister's Office (3) Electoral Office, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 7 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY
DIVISION (1) DIRECTION AND
POLICY FORMULATION

Head 7 – Defence and Security Division (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to note 12 of this Head to insert after the word "Walkie-talkie" the word "equipment", so that the note will read "Provides for purchase of walkie-talkie equipment for security guards at Airport."

I beg to move that the sum of $691,342 under Head 7 – Defence and Security Division (1) Direction and Policy Formulation, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I shall not be long because I think the Government understands that on the question of defence and security they have the unqualified support of the Opposition in maintaining the constitutional as well as the territorial integrity of Barbados. On this matter, before the year is out, I am sure there will be further debates on other aspects and I would like in respect of what the Attorney General says and the allegations made against the Democratic Labour Party in this area of defence and security to assure the country that the Democratic Labour Party has never at any time been concerned in trying to destroy that integrity or that territorial sovereignty, and therefore on this Head the Opposition is certainly not opposing it because it is obviously a vote in which the Government in power has got to keep a constant vigilance, because they say the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. There is nothing in this vote with which we can complain, and I think the hon. member for St. Michael South West has already issued a challenge to the Government that if in truth and in fact there is evidence that any member of the Democratic Labour Party is involved in any conspiracy or treasonable activity, then of course he should be brought to justice. There is only one comment I would like to make and it is that I read that one Sydney Alleyne is being tried in Martinique.

Now when I heard the GIS release on this I realised that he is a schizophrenic, idiot or one of those persons who like to create an impression. I have not had the privilege of reading his verbatim defence to the President and other members of the Court in Martinique, but when I read the GIS release where he is alleged to have said he heard of atrocities in Barbados, anybody who heard that is not living in the known world or he is on Mars. That alone would show you what a crank Sydney Alleyne is. Now when he says that he is an international banker and he is a friend of Barrow, you have to sympathise with the man because he is dropping names. It is a wonder he did not say he was a friend of Jimmy Carter or Giscard D'Estaing because you have to drop names in certain situations. Here is a man in a court of law. I agree the facts are right not that he is a "friend of Barrow" but in that he got a licence to operate a bank.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the hon. member refers to "Barrow", is he referring to the hon. member for St. John?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am dealing with the statement of Alleyne. I am not referring to any member in particular, but when he drops names now, then you understand. Here is a man in tights in a French Court where you are presumed to be guilty until you are proven innocent. Let us put ourselves in his position. At least the name "Barrow" in the Caribbean context would be known to the French authorities. Let us face facts. I do not know the real facts, but the facts may be in the possession of the Government; so when he says he is a friend of this man and that he got a licence to operate a bank, the facts are true, but it is name dropping only...

Mr. SIMMONS: Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition conceding now that it is true he got a licence for the bank when the hon. member for St. John when he was Prime Minister last year denied he gave him a licence for the Bank? Which one of you is telling the truth now, you or the hon. member for St. John?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: It is not a question of who is telling the truth. As far as I know he did get a licence to operate a bank in Barbados, so it is not a question of who is telling the truth. This is supported by facts; I do not care who says it is not true, anybody can prove it was so. You said he said it was not so, but I say as far as I know Mr. Chairman, he did get a licence to operate a bank. What I am saying is that here is a man in tights. He has been in

gaol longer than he should be given for bringing arms into the territorial waters. He is obviously now at the mercy of the French authorities; so he starts a little name dropping; so apart from the fact that he is a Barbadian, he was at one time a member of the Democratic Labour Party and therefore to that extent he knows the former Prime Minister, he also got a licence for a bank, and he is throwing in the pot, the kettle, and the kitchen sink. This is his tactic; it is the tactic of his lawyer whether highly paid or not. What happens is that the moment he shifts from the name dropping which obviously he hopes will influence the President and the Judges, he now switches to something which to us Barbadians shows that the man is a schizophrenic or a crank, to say that he heard of atrocities in Barbados. Good Lord! how could anybody in a peaceful country even with a change of Government tell a French Court that he read about atrocities? Have we had a spate of murders; have we had any unrest? There has just been a peaceful change of Government in a democratic way and he can tell a French Court that he heard about atrocities. That alone would let you know that the man is a crank. Then he bring in a phrase which you hear of in Palestine or the Middle East – he does not believe in murder or in genocide. When you hear about genocide, it is because I know Barbados that we really have to accept this man for what he is. Then the GIS report said we have a tight ship or a well organised group.
8.15 p.m.

I do not think having known Sydney, and I think any of us who knows Sydney over the years, could fail to understand that this man would implicate his own mother if it meant creating an impression among people. I was in London once at a conference, coming back from Spain, and I got this telephone call and Sydney Alleyne turns up at the Marble Arch Hotel, he cost me some money too because I ordered some drinks from downstairs, and Sydney is offering me £100 million not harbour alone, dry dock, ship building thing, and while he is there he is meeting some big people and saying 'I am talking to His Excellency,' and 'His Excellency's car will wait on me,' and that sort of thing. I forget where the conference was, I do not remember if it was to Brussels or to Switzerland, but Sydney and "here was His Excellency the Minister of Communications and Works, and we are having a very deep discussion about our project." Now, I know Sydney. I got the drinks for him, I let him use the phone, I was not like the Minister of Education, I was not out on my own then, I still had a few leftovers from Government, so I did not mind the little drink and I did not mind the telephone, but everybody knows Sydney.

You cannot link us with Sydney. If you have evidence to link the Democratic Labour Party that is a different story, but I think anybody who knows Sydney and knows the situation, would know better. Look how Sydney told the Judge that he did not know – a little 2' x 3' canoe, Sydney is not travelling on the Queen Elizabeth, he is not travelling on the Antilles, he is travelling on a little canoe, that if you have six guns and six rifles somebody must know – but Sydney started out telling the Judge he did not know he had arms on board. If you are travelling on the Queen Elizabeth or on a big yacht where you can have some guns, that is a different thing, but he and a single companion are travelling on a yacht coming through the deep waters, and he tells the Judge a big lie that he did not know. You should not really link the DLP with cranks like Sydney.

I do not know what are the security reports you have, and I am prepared to say that a Government in power must be vigilant. I will support any measures that this Government thinks are necessary to preserve our integrity, to maintain our reputation for peace and stability, because we have had an election in September, we have had a peaceful changeover – some of us were disappointed, and who wouldn't – but I think that we all must be committed to maintaining that peace, that reputation that in peace and security our future development can continue, but I think the Government is making a very serious out when they attempt and continue to link the hierarchy of the Democratic Labour Party with a half crank, schizophrenic like Sydney. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: How long have you known that?) All right, they say that Kennedy was a friend of the Mafia. Politics is one situation that I have found where today you and your enemy tomorrow are the best friends for political advantage the next day. You know, some of the things that some of us said about each other we should not speak to one another; this is true, but politics is one of these funny games, whether it is politics in Barbados, whether it is politics in England, in Germany, you will find that from day to day politics brings together strange bed fellows, and I think that the Barbados Labour Party too will find that in their own camp there will be people who are politically undesirable but who for reasons of political expedience, or for other

reasons, are hovering around, lurking around, waiting around in order either to use their connections, or to call names, or insome way to give the people outside the impression that they have the entrée to the hierarchy or to the big boys, and therefore we have to be careful of continuing to divide this country on the basis that the Democratic Labour Party is out to overthrow this Government, that they are in link with Sydney Alleyne – I do not know what the evidence, I am only speaking from what I have heard so far – but I am saying that if there is any evidence that can stand up in a court of law, and I am quite prepared to accept that in the sphere of security very often you get a whiff or a piff which obviously cannot stand the test of a legal court of law. I know that in the sphere of security very often you get information which cannot be tested in a court of law.

What I am asking the Government to do, if you get information which cannot be tested in a court of law, on the advice of your legal experts, but which for you is a warning of a possible threat or danger, act on it, but do not use that same evidence that cannot stand the test in a court of law as evidence publicly to condemn either your political opponents or anybody in the community, and I think this is where we have to draw the line. This is where the danger is, that the Government is in possession of information, the Government as a Government with the responsibility for running the country must be prepared to act on it, plug loopholes as given by that particular evidence, but if that evidence cannot stand the test of a court of law, the Government must not openly condemn their political opponents when they cannot come to a court of law and say that A, B, C or D is involved in a conspiracy to overthrow. I think this is where perhaps you have gone a little overboard instead of accepting – I think the Prime Minister admitted this in a sort of way when I raised the question on the debate raised by the hon. member for Christ Church East, that certainly the evidence might not be able to stand the test of a court of law, but yet it is information on which the Government must act, and therefore you get this division where a Government with responsibility for the security of the entire country has to keep its ears and eyes open, and therefore it has to be prepared like good boy scouts, but you cannot use that evidence if you are not prepared to push it forward in order to condemn your political opponents, and I thing this is something we have to be careful of in our desire to get a political advantage and to score a point.

You may very well survive the fact that you said the DLP was involved in a conspiracy, but five years may pass and not one member of the DLP will ever go before a court of law. All right, the public may accept that, the public may accept that certain members were involved, but I think that we should only make these serious accusations of treasonable activities if we have the evidence to present and to bring the miscreants to justice, because I view the security of my country in a very serious light, and I think that a responsible Government has got to while alerting the country and while at the same time preparing its defences, has to just stop short of condemning its political opponents on evidence which it cannot bring forward to stand the test and the light of day.

Therefore, I would ask the Government to be alert, and I would support them. I think the Opposition supports them in any attempt to secure this country against whatever outside interference, or CIA influence, or whatever external forces that may endeavour to disturb the peace and quiet of a country that has a reputation for peace and quiet, and I am pleading to you to refrain, however strongly you may feel – in fact the Government has a group of distinguished lawyers who are in a position to sift evidence – to refrain from labelling all of us on this side or your political opponents whom you defeated in September as treasonable persons, when perhaps five or ten years will pass and you cannot bring one single person to face a trial on a charge of treason. This is all I ask of the Government, the Opposition will support any endeavour to maintain our reputation for peace and security, especially in a region where from day to day we see other areas that we thought were stable crumbling around us, having their problems. Let us all join hand in hand as loyal and true Barbadians to secure the integrity of our country and to maintain its long established reputation for peace and stability.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will surprise the Hon. Attorney General now on the matters raised by my colleagues. I merely want to ask a question which one of my constituents have asked me to check on – if steps have been taken to allow Security Guards who work at the various Ministries to function for eight hours a day instead of 15 hours which they formerly worked. A Security Guard can only be relieved by a Security Guard. I am told that some of them work for long hours. I would like the Minister to take this in the spirit in which it is asked because it is something which I really wish that he would clarify.

In this respect there are some of us who from rumours or from fear have come to believe that our telephones are tapped. I would like the Minister to give the assurance that it is not so. I am asking it for my information and for my peace of mind. I do not believe it myself, but I would like the Minister to assure us that that is not the case.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am going to deal with the third question of the hon. member for St. Michael South West. I do not know if the tapping of telephones used to be discussed in the Cabinet when he was a member.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. I never discussed this in the Cabinet.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad that he has put it that way. My answer to that is neither have I. I cannot understand where this suggestion is coming from. I remember that I and the hon. member for Christ Church South Central were sitting down in a house in November, 1970 and we saw a man go up a telephone pole and start fiddling with the wires. The member for Christ Church South Central picked up the phone and the man answered "hello". I remember receiving a warning from someone who is now a member of this House of the fact that a conversation had been over heard and that certain steps should be taken to protect another member of this House and so on.

I did not know then if any telephones were being tapped, and I do not know now. That is the only answer that I can give. I know of no machinery in Barbados to allow this to happen, and I have been assured that it is well nigh impossible.

The Security Guard Service is still in the process of development, as well as in the process of having its duties clarified. The hours of work are set, but the nature of their work requires that there should be a system whereby there are four shifts. We maintain a staff of 28 at one spot and the off duty guards are of course available. Everyone works for eight hours. The only ones who work for more than eight hours may be the Guard Supervisors who may very well hold on even though his relief has come in the place of some other guard whose relief has not come; but certainly the period of time worked by any given guard is not more than eight hours.

Now, on the matter of Mr. Sydney Alleyne. I do not wish to deal at length with this Sydney matter; but there are one or two things that must be understood. In a small community like this we find it easy to make a joke about Sydney Alleyne because he has put forward so much nonsense about various things that we do not think that he can be serious; but we must not get into the error of thinking that no one has ever taken him seriously. I am saying categorically informed with evidence to produce in a court of law which will support my allegations. I am told that before we were in office he was responsible for carrying out three sets of dynamiting at the Barbados Light & Power Company of this island for the purpose of sabotage. That is something which is known to some hon. members on the other side, perhaps even the Leader of the Opposition. I would think so.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, security reports do not reach me. I had nothing to do with security reports. Security was supposed to be a closed thing. I, as Minister of Communications and Works, and as Minister of Education, never saw security reports.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I thought that they may have reached the Attorney General. We may have heard a lot of talk about Sydney Alleyne relating to the member for St. Philip North who got very alarmed when I repeated it in here. We did not appreciate that Sydney Alleyne does these things to a lot of people. He once reported that he had been asked by a then member of the House to assassinate me.

I have been told by somebody who did not call his name but made it clear to me that he was present at the Farm when that member of the House visited there one morning just before daybreak to make some arrangements about a political meeting to be held by the Barbados Labour Party. I was standing up by the platform and there was an incident involving a car belonging to the member for St. James which was then driven by his wife. She called a policeman. When I went down the road I heard an explosion at the spot I had just left, and it turned out that a quantity of dynamite had been carried to this meeting.
8.35 p.m.

An explosion took place. I do not know if deliberately or not, but the dynamite and the cap came apart. Some of the gelignite fell on an

olive tree, was picked up in a paper bag – these are facts and not speculations. I was at the meeting and this happened. I believe that Mr. Chairman's father actually had some of the stuff either fall on him, fall near him, or knocked it away or something like that. These are things that happened, and I was told by somebody who was there that they said: "Do not throw it on the platform when Tom is there and so on" and that sort of thing. I have been told these things and these things were related to a former member of this House; therefore, you must not expect me to dissolve in peals of laughter when I hear that this member has asked Sydney Alleyne to kill me. I did not take it over-seriously but, nonetheless, I took precautions. I mention these stories because although Sydney Alleyne is 90% of the time a joke, it is the 10% where he can cause trouble.

Now I have been told so much about Sydney Alleyne that I am afraid to repeat any of it. I do not know what comes from what they call a delicate source and so on. Even if I can touch on things that have appeared in print, we do not take him seriously. But he was taken seriously enough to have been appointed *Chef de Cabinet,* a continental type of thing meaning a very senior sort of Permanent Secretary to Oscar Cambona, the former Foreign Minister of Tanzania, who was the sponsor and the protege of Mr. Waldo Ramsay. *(Aside.)* I hear an aside at the back that Waldo Ramsay actually wrote the Bar examination for Oscar Cambona, but that is mere scandal. Oscar Cambona certainly gave Waldo a position in the External Affairs Department of Tanzania when he was Foreign Minister.

Oscar Cambona fell out with Nyerre. He appointed Sydney *Chef de Cabinet* and authorised him to recruit mercenaries to overthrow the Government of Tanzania. This was connected with a prominent Portuguese Right Winger, who Sydney himself has described as a Portuguese Fascist, a man of extreme wealth and shady – not revolutionary – shady Right-Wing interfering background. This has appeared in a leading British newspaper, so I am not telling you a secret. For a time the Portuguese gentleman, Oscar Cambona and Sydney Alleyne – this is recently. This is within the last five years and this is not anything long – traits about East Africa recruiting these mercenaries to overthrow the Government of Tanzania, and real money passed. This is not a mere adventure. You are talking about a man who was photographed at the side of the former Foreign Minister of Tanzania over a story saying that they were going to overthrow Nyerre. This is not Sydney coming to a hotel room with foolishness.

Sir, you must appreciate that there is a little more to Sydney Alleyne than we are allowing for. He formed a bank in St. Kitts. That was a fact. He formed a bank in Barbados. That is a fact. He found money from somewhere to give Cameron Tudor and George Moe. That is a fact. He found himself in Guatemala last year, a matter not unconnected with the present adventure. All of these are identifiable and verifiable facts. He has always managed to get into things at very sensitive times. Maybe he has had some luck; maybe he has had some forewarning, but he has had a lot of luck over a period of years.

Honestly, Mr. Chairman, some of these things which are secret I would like to talk them in here. Some would make you amuse and some would actually frighten you to know what he has been in. We will deal here with some of them. He was given a licence to run a bank here and a licence to import cement by the hon. member for St. Michael South West. He was given that licence to run a bank by the hon. member for St. John. I know he was given the licence. I have seen it, and I have revoked it. He was given this after he had gone into the High Commission in London in 1969, made a statement to the Acting High Commissioner and presented him with a Manifesto of terrorism which he was going to carry out in Barbados. Around the same time he had gone to certain printers in London – that relates to violence.

Let us now deal with the fraud. He had gone to a printer in London and said that he and Dr. Barrow – I am just repeating what was what – were carrying out certain businesses in Barbados and had certain stationery printed associating himself with the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John, he was only honourable then, and the printers were never paid, and they wrote to the then Prime Minister for payment through Sir Lionel Luckhoo as he then was. Sir Lionel Luckhoo wrote to the then Prime Minister and told him about Sydney Alleyne going about and taking his name in vain and using his name to obtain credit in London, and he still got a bank licence after that. He still got a bank licence from the same Minister of Finance whose name he had taken in vain. There are demands for payment on the files of Government for the printing and other work that Sydney had done, and he still got the bank licence after that. You must understand that this is, to my mind, a serious criticism. You have let a man, who you

know to be a vagabond, get a licence to operate a bank! I understand that he put Cameron Tudor's name and Lionel Luckhoo's name on his proposals to the Bank of Dominica when he fooled the Premier of Dominica to the tune of $½ million and so on.

Now, I am touching on the things that I can touch on. With regard to the cement licence, I will have to forgive the hon. member for St. Michael South West. Every day in here he makes us realise that he still has a lot to learn; therefore, he should partly be forgiven for thinking that if Sydney had the sponsorship of the Prime Minister that he could, at least get a little licence to import cement.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. It is a fact that while I was Minister of Trade licences were issued to Sydney-Burnett Alleyne to bring in cement. The licences were issued because Sydney Alleyne put in a price for cement which was impossible, but the people who issued the licences felt that if anybody could bring cement at that price it would be a tragedy not to have issued a licence. We further went on and issued parallel licences because we never believed that he would bring it in. But Sydney Alleyne is not the only crank, idiot, fool or criminal that we issued licences to. He is a Barbadian national, and the way we ran the system anyone who applied for a licence counts.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not going to deal with the cement licences. I am interested to hear that any fool, crank or criminal could get it. I hope he is not including Mr. Leo Leacock in any of these categories, but I would still very gently say that I do not see how a cement licence could be refused to West Indian Suppliers and given to Sydney Alleyne!
8.45 p.m.

I believe that if the Minister of Consumer Affairs cares to speak in this matter, even if not today on another day in the Estimates, he may be able to show that the price Sydney Alleyne quoted was by no means so favourable as we are being told; but I am not going into the cement matter. He should never have been given a licence for the cement no matter if he said he was bringing it in at $2.00 a bag. His licence formed a part of the quota and deprived other people from getting more realistic licences. That is really the argument against it with something like 200,000 bags or whatever it was.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, the licence which Sydney Alleyne was given did not in any way put out anybody else in Barbados. As I have already explained the licences were given and because as you yourself know in those days licences were given according to price; it had nothing to do with a person, and if you could meet a particular price, you got a licence automatically. You can enlighten the Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not want to get into a debate on cement. I will leave the hon. member to the hon. member for St. Joseph, but I have seen figures at which licences were given to Leo Leacock at higher prices than licences that were refused to Geddes Grant. He must not try to fool us with that.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, I defy him to show that information. I charge the Prime Minister with misleading the House.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to get into this debate; it is too high-powered for me. The hon. member seems to be falling into the same footsteps as the hon. member for St. John because when Sydney Alleyne was issued a licence there were only two people being issued licences for cement, Sydney Alleyne and Leo Leacock, despite the fact that J. N. Harriman had applied for licences at a price which would not have involved the Government in paying a subsidy of $1.01 a bag.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I challenge the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs to bring that information. It is the subject of a substantive question which I have asked in this House ever since back in October and the question has not been answered. Let him bring the facts here.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The question has been twice to Cabinet and is so involved with the dealings of the former Minister with the cement that we have had to send it back to be a little simplified, but I do not want to talk about cement. The hon. member however must beware of challenging people to prove things. He must beware without the files of getting up and challenging in the belief that people will accept it. Just to bring Sydney up to date and be a little less discursive, the particular danger of Sydney's latest adventure and escapade is that Sydney has found himself involved with people who do not know what kind of man he is. They think he is a dangerous man who can lead them into

serious adventures – that is one of my assessments of the situation – adventures on which they can make money. I do not want to make too many connections, but I have mentioned Guatemala. Sydney Alleyne found himself in Guatemala, and I do not believe that his reputation as a joke had preceded him to that still somewhat remote country in terms of its relationship to Barbados even, not in terms of geography, and particularly Sydney found himself involved with two men, one Virgo and one Capadora whom you must not categorise as being wicked merely because they have Italian names, but one may very well imagine can easily belong to some form of criminal conspiracy that would be ignorant of Sydney's earlier activities and who eventually might decide or have decided to make a prisoner of Sydney, I don't mean a physical prisoner, but tie him up in the web which Sydney may have had no serious intention of pursuing; but these men carried him along with them and this perhaps is a danger which I would ask hon. members to bear in mind.

It is beyond doubt that Sydney Alleyne was found in a boat with arms which he himself said were destined for Barbados. It is also beyond doubt that Sydney Alleyne has mentioned the names of members of the Democratic Labour Party's hierarchy to these men. The Leader of the Opposition knows of the names. If he keeps them from you he is a wise man. He would have done better to have kept the letter about the commission from the hon. member for St. Michael South West too. He would save the hon. member from making a fool of himself and talking about evidence and so on. What do you call a letter written to a member of the Democratic Labour Party saying that the plot is going to take place? These men didn't as we know know that Sydney can be a joke; they are looking to Barbados perhaps as a legitimate area for adventure, and this is where the danger comes in.

It is popular or it has become popular on the part of the Democratic Labour Party to pooh-pooh the whole plot saying that it is only a joke, there was never any plot, but the man was on his way to Barbados with a cargo of arms. Suppose he had not been apprehended at Martinique? Is it not elementary that some arms would have found their way into Barbados for a purpose which cannot be pleasant for any of us in here? This must be obvious, and to get up and try to give the public a sense of false complacency when you do not know the real facts is as irresponsible as anything of which we have ever been accused. I am glad of the very statesmanlike approach which the Leader of the Opposition made of it; he emphasized that it is in the nature of security operations that there are things that give evidence but which are not producible in a court. There are all sorts of things, all sorts of documents which you see but you cannot use, things you hear which you know are true, but which you are prevented by the law against hearsay perhaps from repeating. There are sources available to the security forces of virtually any country which can reveal the fully, completed conspiracy and which yet cannot be proved in court; all you can do is watch the people. This is not Russia; not even in Russia can it be done. This is not the Central African Empire where you can pick up somebody and make him confess. This is not a place where you wring confessions out of people. We just know about these things and I am saying about the Sydney Alleyne affair that we know a good deal more than the fact that a cargo of arms was on its way.

We have had access to documents indicating the number of persons which were to take part in the uprising, the way those who were not in Barbados were to arrive, the amount of money which was to be paid out. All these things we have had access to. If I had not seen them myself, persons connected with the security services of this Island have seen them. I do not know what success this movement would have had; it was nipped in the bud. We are fortunate to have hands helping us as well as our own resources, but to suggest that the entire thing is a figment of the imagination of the Barbados Labour Party does no credit to those who suggest it, nor does it give any assistance to the public of Barbados in meeting the possible threat.

8.55 p.m.

I cannot understand how first of all Eric Sealy and then the hon. member for St. Michael South West got on political platforms and say there was never a plot, it is all a wicked lie. Eric Sealy said that the Attorney General had received a letter from Sydney from Brazil and that four other members of Parliament had received similar documentations, and that there was never any plot at all; the hon. member for St. Michael South West says that there was never any plot, and so on.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Prime Minister is misleading this Hon. House. If he is getting mixed up with the people and where they come from, perhaps I can forgive him. He is saying that the member for St. Michael South West got on a political

platform and said something; would he please say which political platform and where I said what about him?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am not able with the hon. member, I only read in the newspaper, I have not done him the dignity of listening to anything he actually said, I only read in a newspaper that he said the Barbados Labour Party should stop saying that there was a conspiracy by Sydney Alleyne. I am probably wrong, I thought he said it in Independence Square or somewhere. If he says he did not say it, why then the Reporters are wrong, it would not be the first time the Reporters were wrong, but I am not prodding on that.

I again do not think that the Leader of the Opposition, although he made a very reasoned and statesmanlike speech in here, has done any major service in trying to ridicule the nature of the trial in Martinique. It appears that Sydney Alleyne's plot was to bring an armed person here who would be able to enter Barbados and link up with whoever they had to link up with, but that the arms would be brought in unobtrusively and collected in Barbados, so if you hear he was coming here on a small boat, he was coming here on a small boat because his arrival necessarily had to be unobtrusive. That is the point about the small boat, and all the points taken by the Leader of the Opposition were taken by the French Judge, but again hon. members do not seem to have read between the lines. Sydney Alleyne has a very expensive lawyer...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If the Prime Minister will give way, I was out at the moment regrettably, he did speak to me in confidence on the names, but my colleagues are a bit worried, and I would think that he could publicly say that none of the hon. members in the House are implicated in this. Since he told me in confidence I do not want to say anything as Leader of the Opposition, but I would like him to assure the House that none of my colleagues who are members of Parliament are implicated in this plot. I think he owes it to them, and I think he should do it. I respect his confidence, but I say my colleagues must be worried, since he told me the names, then they are wondering and I think he owes it to them.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member puts me in a very awkward position. The confidence of the Privy Council is really confidence, it really comes down to that. I tend to believe, you know, that if Sydney Alleyne came and wiped us all out the Governor General would have to ask the Leader of the Opposition to assist. He is the Leader of the Opposition, but if I point and I say none of those four members are mentioned on Sydney's documentation, does it not then suggest that the other hon. three members are? Do you see what I mean? You understand what I mean.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: This is a serious security matter and I think in an area as ticklish and as delicate as this he should give the House, no matter whom he mentioned, the Government has its security forces. I can quite see hon. members of the House being alarmed and he must be able to give some assurance, do not mind who Sydney writes, he can name the Prince of Wales, I think we should know, hon. members would like the public to know, so on this question of security, there is nothing that the security forces of Barbados have, apart from what this crackpot says, implicates any of the hon. sitting members of the Opposition. Do not mind what he says, because my contention is that your security forces should find a link at some point between what Sydney says and members of the Government either in the House or otherwise. So if you find a link the members would like you to let the public know. This is important, because we are all responsible members discussing a vital Head, and I think it is fair to the hon. members of the House that the Prime Minister, apart from what Sydney says, if his security forces have not linked any members of the House with what Sydney says, he should give the Hon. House that assurance.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am in a really very awkward position, I really am. Again let me put speculations to you. Sydney may have given one of his conspirators instructions to make contact with two members of the House; he may have, and he may have written to a third member of the House to declare his intentions. These things are all possible. He could have done anything like that. Is it fair for me in any way to say anything to direct the attention of the public to these persons? If a member is innocent he is innocent.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. This is a very serious matter, Mr. Chairman. The Attorney General stated publicly that high ranking members of the Democratic Labour Party, that it was an undoubted fact, and he repeated it in here...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not know if the hon. member will give way, but on a point of order...

Mr. TAITT: I am a point of order, my God!

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not prepared to reveal certain confidential information.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with respect, Sir. I got up on a point of order, another person got up on a point of order, you then told me you cannot have two hon. members on their feet. You should have told him, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister grew up in Codrington Hill, I grew up not far from Codrington Hill. I have been told something by somebody about the Prime Minister that is so atrocious that I could not believe it and would never reveal it, but it is something somebody told me. To say that Sydney Alleyne says something and then link the members of the Democratic Labour Party is the most poisonous form of slander.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are now making a speech. The hon. member will have a chance to speak again. That is not a point of order.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. The CBC News Editor and his department have on record a statement made and reproduced at the end of last year in a programme called "1976 in Retrospect", a statement made by the former Prime Minister, the member for St. John, dealing with security matters, and I would beg them for the transcript for tomorrow morning when we come back on this, and when he was Prime Minister dealing with security matters in the middle of 1976 he said that security matters are security matters full stop. Sometimes you cannot disclose all that is in your hands, you have to fire a salvo across the bows. Not one of them challenged him for further and better particulars of the security matters within his breast. It is not fair to the Prime Minister who is Minister of Defence and Security for them now to be asking for all the details and particulars of matters which are very sensitive, and I will read out that statement tomorrow morning when I speak on this debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point taken.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am totally disinterested in what the Prime Minister said in 1976. When my reputation and my integrity are being put on the line, when members of the Barbados Labour Party are constantly getting up and making statements implicating the high ranking members of the Democratic Labour Party, when all that might have happened according to what the Prime Minister just said is that Sydney Alleyne might have written a letter to somebody which might have done something, I say that that is scandal in its worst form. I am not asking for any particular details of anything in connection with security. What they do in their security business is their business.
9.05 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order. He is talking about the high ranking hierarchy of the Democratic Labour Party. He cannot consider himself to be a high ranking man.

Mr. TAITT: As first vice president of the party, I have to consider myself a high ranking member. *(Asides).*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In the last analysis the good sense of the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister will have to prevail. The member asked for information, which is obviously so impossible to give. If the police have the information you know that the question cannot be answered once it reaches that stage. Anyone who reads between the lines will know that Sydney Alleyne is trying to put himself in a political context so as to escape extradition; and a top class French lawyer has told Sydney Alleyne that if you emphasise this political matter we are not going to extradite you.

Nonetheless, it is also clear that Sydney Alleyne is not coming to Barbados to assist the Barbados Labour Party. I will have to see the full transcript of the evidence. I have not seen it yet; but what evidence has come through shows that my name and the name of the former Prime Minister and even other officials of Government have had their names dropped in the course of the case in which he is trying to project himself as a political martyr being sought by me.

Sydney Alleyne did say that he had a strong group in Barbados, and that it was associated with the Democratic Labour Party. We cannot expect them to be heartened because we must believe Sydney Alleyne story of a plot. We have no duty to surpress it. You are asking us to do what you ought to be doing – saying that Sydney Alleyne's stories about being connected with the Democratic Labour Party are not true. I cannot say that they are not true.

The people put the Barbados Labour Party in power. I am not saying that Sydney Alleyne

was to come here and make me Prime Minister. I am already Prime Minister. If hon. members realise this they would understand that they are not pushing us in any area where it may be embarrassing for us. They may be pushing us in an area where it is embarrassing for them. They will push, and they will push gradually at the secrecy which we are trying to maintain and it may worry them more than the things they do not know.

They will have to have confidence in the Leader of the Opposition, because he is being made aware of whatever may reasonably be indicated especially about members of the Democratic Labour Party. I have no doubt that if something so extreme comes up, he will come and discuss it with me; and I am sure that if he had any information relating to a plot he would come and indicate it to the Security Force.

My ministers did not ask me the questions that the member for St. Michael South West has asked. I want the whole thing passed over without any further disturbance to the peace of Barbados. I have been forced to ramble over this vote. The matter is at present *sub judice* and the rules apply equally in Martinique and in France as they apply in Barbados. There is information which should not be revealed because it has a bearing on the case, and I do not think that hon. members should press anymore. I have been asked not to have any public debate or discussion while the trial is going on.

Dr. CADDLE: If the hon. member would give way, can he enlighten me as to why the Government Information Service release was put out and you cannot have a debate on this matter under Government Business?

Mr. TAITT: Before the hon. Minister answers, how does he justify that the report on such a matter is a proper subject for a Government Information Service release? While I am on my feet let me say for the record that on an occasion when I was sitting on a delegation the Ambassador of Barbados to the United States of America said to me in the presence of other persons, have you heard what Sydney Alleyne is telling the people? He tells them that it is the CIA who sent him down. I wish to put that on the record.
9.15 p.m.

I wish to put that on record because he told me so. I say that merely to point out that the question of the information about Sydney, as the Prime Minister said, had us butting and bounding and going through all sorts of hoops, but I put that on the record.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Do you mean that the CIA was sending Sydney down here to destabilize the Government that, according to the hon. member for St. John, they put in power? Well, we hear everything. The proceedings in the court room are not private. The court is an open court, and I believe that the Sydney Alleyne matter is of public interest. Public Officers of Barbados travelled to Martinique to attend the trial. Nobody questions when Public Officers travel to Washington to attend a seminar. Public Officers travelled to Martinique to deal with the matter. I do not see that the report of a public trial which our Press *Reuter-Cana* who can quote so freely and maliciously from the *Advocate, Reuter-Cana* did not see fit to investigate this matter, or to cover the trial. It was, apparently, not competent enough to make itself aware of what was going on. They were more interested in stories about the Review Commission and so on. It is a simple matter of public interest and an explanation of justification to the public should never arise of how Public Officers came to go to Martinique. That is all there is. They went to Martinique to Sydney Alleyne's trial. What did they do there? They listened to the evidence. I hope that they had formed a team large enough to carry out other activities appropriate in all the circumstances, but that is what they went for. The trial was not secret. The evidence was given in open court. I believe that the Public Officers had to sit through something like eight other trials before they reached Sydney and, therefore, it was published.

We talk about open Government. Do you mean that we should conceal the fact that Sydney Alleyne was tried in Martinique? Is this something to be hidden from the public? I do not believe the hon. member for St. Michael South West would really suggest that.

Mr. TAITT: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister could start a little column where we will now hear about all the trials of every Barbadian.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to add very much to what the Prime Minister has said. There are a few general words I wish to make about the question of defence and security. Hon. members must understand, in the first place, that some members of the Cabinet are members of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Barbados and we carry certain Oaths of Secrecy. Particularly the hon. member

for St. Michael South West, I should like him to appreciate that when I make statements he will discover I do not do so lightly, despite the fact that he may find it politically advantageous to issue a Press Release afterwards.

I just want to clear the air on a few other statements which have been made in public about me. A Mr. Eric Sealy, spurred on, of course, by other people made the point that I was lying and that Sydney Alleyne was down in Brazil, and the Attorney General was, in his words, a dash, dash, dot, dot liar. This is the sort of thing that people, I suppose, in public life like myself have to put up with. The facts have proved otherwise, and if there was one purpose in the GIS Release which it has served to show, it is just to put the record straight. It is not that my creditability as against the creditability of the gentleman concerned can ever be put at a disadvantage, but I think I would be highly irresponsible, as a Minister responsible for internal law and order in this country, as a person with some international repute as an International lawyer, to make useless, senseless and unfounded statements on so serious a matter. I said that we had moved in extradition proceedings for Mr. Alleyne's extradition to Barbados. That is a step that was canvassed from very early, and I had very close discussions with the French Authorities on the matter. The question of the extradition was properly researched by my Department by my officers, by myself, and the proper advice on the matter given to the Prime Minister, as the appropriate Minister for Defence and Security, and discussed in Cabinet within the bounds that one would expect us to do.

Now, in this matter we have certain limitations on us. One is the limitation that you must have as a country dealing with other foreign Governments involved, and I want to stress that not only one foreign Government is involved in this matter of the relevant information and the whole incident, and there are certain limitations that are put on you if you are dealing with Governments as to what you can say and how much you can say. In fact, limitations are put on you as to how you can use the information that is made available to you, whether you can use it for the purpose of a trial or not. These limitations are placed sometimes before the relevant information is given to you. That is all in the nature of international security and it must be so. If it were not so there would be many Governments overthrown. Not simply a Government of a small country like Barbados, but Governments of larger countries as well. I have been very careful in my public statements on this issue in order to avoid giving out any information more than was necessary or, indeed, to give names of any particular persons in this event.

Now, the hon. member for St. Michael South West did duty by his political party. He issues a big challenge. I will tell him that when he becomes a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council, if he will ask the Prime Minister to recommend him, I will make the confidential and secret file in this matter available to him and he can draw his conclusions. Suffice it to say that his children, mine, and generations coming afterwards reading these files and what was in the files and my comments afterwards will find that every statement that I have made in public on this issue is backed up by available information on those files. I want to make this quite clear because a lot of challenges are being issued. I am not so puerile as to follow various challenges being issued to me to do this and do not do that.

I have listened to political commentators on this issue; I have read *Caribbean Contact;* one Mr. Woods; I have read the local newspapers; I have read the well-known Democrat Socialist, and so on. They have endeavoured to make comments as most of them do without having the facts. I am certainly not going to break the bonds of the security and secrecy that exist between the Police Force and other Security Forces in other countries. I feel that I have an obligation after I have given my word to Foreign Governments on this issue who exchange information with us. I have a duty to maintain that confidence.
9.25 p.m.

I am not going to be pushed no matter how many statements the hon. member may make, but I will tell him that when he becomes a Privy Councillor and I have him on oath and I can convey to him, confidentially, information, he is one of the persons I will give the information. He can have no fear about himself on these issues. That is all I want to say to him, but I regret very much that people are going to take this issue light-heartedly. This has been one of the most serious challenges to democratic institutions in this country regardless of who is in power, and I want to issue one warning; each one of us must be deeply conscious of the fact that no matter how much we may attack the police forces of Barbados from time to time or disagree with some of their actions, in the last resort our security rests in their hands, and it is in their hands finally that things can go right or go wrong in this country. Many of them are exposed to

dangers and some of them in fact sometimes comes close to losing their lives in the risks they may have to take in looking after security matters. That is why this vote is very important.

I am not going to comment specially on the notes, but I think hon. members would have shown some restraint in looking at the notes. I think in some respects probably the notes disclose more than we ought to disclose although we felt we had to make some disclosure to the House, but they disclose quite a lot in some instances, but no Government today in the Caribbean or anywhere else can but fail to pay attention to its security internally and externally. We are going to get more and more serious attacks on the integrity of Governments as we go on particularly in the system of political life that is prevailing in the Caribbean climate these days. I want to appeal to hon. members to show a little restraint on this. Sometimes of course the back bench may feel that enough information is not being proffered. As a matter of fact, I think there are times that the Prime Minister as Minister responsible for security must of necessity restrict the amount of information that he may even discuss openly in Cabinet, not because you want one man Government or anything of the sort; it simply is the nature of the information which is given, and I know how heavily these matters have weighed on his shoulders in his first few months in office. People may take this lightly, but it is no mean thing to sit down and realise that you have to talk to a few people about very delicate matters that could undermine the strength of the Government and of both political parties, because there might be misguided persons concerned in the community, maybe not dictated to by any political party, but maybe members of a political party who can get themselves wittingly or unwittingly in nonsense.

I consider Sydney Alleyne one of the most dangerous Barbadians that has ever been produced. He has a lot of characteristics that may commend him to us as a man of adventure and a man perhaps with a paranoia, but any person who can set out on a boat with arms and get into a conspiracy to overthrow any Government which has been democratically elected and which is not guilty of an abuse of human rights is much more than a madman, as far as I am concerned, and must be taken very seriously. It is on this note that the Leader of the House has indicated to me that he wishes you to put the question.

The question that the sum of $691,342 under Head 7 – Defence and Security Division (1) Direction and Policy Formulation, as amended stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until tomorrow, Wednesday, 23rd March, 1977, at 11 o'clock.

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

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

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply, and to that it now reverts.

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

RESUMPTION OF DEFENCE AND SECURITY DIVISION

Head 7(2) – Barbados Regiment – in the sum of $263,410 – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in rising to move this Head, I want to outline one or two factors which will inevitably, lead to changes in this vote during the forthcoming financial year and which I think it is only reasonable to place before hon. members at this stage. A decision has been taken in my Ministry to set up a small fixed establishment at the Barbados Regiment. Details of the size of this establishment and details of the overall command structure of the Defence Force remain still to be worked out and fixed by Cabinet, although this is expected to take place in the not too distant future.

It is expected that there will be an increase during the current financial year in the numbers of persons to be paid and the emoluments to be paid to them, and the House can, therefore,

expect that a supplementary will be sought. But since plans were not sufficiently advanced for inclusion in the Estimates at the present time, or certainly when the Estimates were compiled, we are at this stage asking only for $346,958, which is the actual decrease on last year's vote. The principal decrease is in supplies and materials where we have budgeted only for quite a small sum in anticipation that, perhaps, this vote will have to be increased to include additional uniforms, additional supplies and so on as well as the vote for Personal Emoluments. At this stage, I am asking only for the sum of $263,410 to be voted.

I may mention that the Regiment is not being expanded and established for purely military purposes. Indeed, when we come before the House for the actual military establishment, I daresay there will be some persons who will suggest that the numbers we are establishing are too few, but, be that as it may, the Government of Barbados considers that the Barbados Regiment has a training function to carry out and can very usefully carry out a function of training over and above any question of mere military discipline and training in the use of arms. Coincidentally with the work being done upon the necessary permanent complement of Officers and other ranks in the Regiment an exercise is also going on to effect training of a selected voluntary intake of youths, young men and young women, to be trained in skills other than the purely military. We anticipate there will be some pioneer training, training in construction skills, the artisan skills required to build roads, put up buildings, and so on. There will also be trained in mechanical skills and skills necessary to maintain vehicles and matters of that sort. It is hoped that an agricultural training plan can also be worked in with volunteer members of the Regiment assisted by some of the permanent staff actually establishing themselves by way of settlement on some of the lands the property either of the Government or the Agricultural Development Corporation. All of these plans we hope to formulate within the next six or seven months and to present to Parliament in due course. This vote can, therefore, be regarded as a holding operation to maintain the services of the Regiment at their present level until the expansion scheme has been formulated and settled, and until we can have a full debate on it in Parliament.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be too long on this. As an old army man myself, I think I am competent to make a comment on it. I would like to suggest to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister that now is the time, if he does propose to make a small permanent unit at the Regiment, to start and select some young men and try and get them trained at Sandhurst. This will be very important. I know quite a few young persons who would like to make the military their career. Even although in certain parts of Africa, Sandhurst training is certainly not the thing recommended, from the African experience, I think the Minister responsible should have clearly in his mind some idea of how many permanent officers he may need and try and get places for them in Sandhurst. We want a proper Regiment, and we want people with proper military training in spite of the Sandhurst experience in Africa. I think we need not fear the Sandhurst experience in Barbados, but I would like to throw out that suggestion. There are a lot of bright Cadets and Sgt. Majors in the Cadet Corps in Barbados who may very well like to make a career of the Regiment.

Secondly, when I was the Minister of Education, I was extremely keen on establishing Cadet Corps at most, if not all, of the Secondary Schools. I think the Minister of Education, if he looks at the file, will see the honest attempt I made to get teachers and to get Cadet Corps established at Parry/Coleridge and other Secondary Schools. I am sure that this is an idea, too, from the point of view of discipline, if nothing else, that he must have in mind. I found myself, having initiated this then, that what we have to do is to motivate the teachers. I gather from talking to the Colonel of the Regiment that quite a few teachers wanted to come in as Lieutenants without knowing how to shoulder arms, or order arms, or to stand at attention. I think that the scheme ran into that problem — the Minister can check that out — that we could not get enough teachers who were prepared to undergo a period of basic training in order to take over the Cadet Corps at the new Secondary Schools that it was proposed to start. I hope that the Minister responsible for Education will pursue this actively and succeed better than I did in motivating teachers to consider this activity as part of the expansion of discipline in the schools that do not have Cadet Corps. To that extent he will have to work closely in line with the Regiment because the Regiment have the training ground for any officers, or men, or teachers who would like to be officers in the Cadet Corps.

As an old army man, I come down in the morning and I hear "Advertisement opportunity knocks for a man who was a Major or had reached the rank of Major." That is all very good. He is wanted on a temporary basis. If anybody is a

Major, unless he is retiring, or he is no longer interested, or he does not have a job, he would not be a second in command on a temporary basis. I hear this all the time. Maybe it is an opportunity for somebody who has nothing to do, but at the same time I think that was a joke advertisement from my point of view of military matters. You are asking for a temporary person who has reached the rank of Major in any Establishment.

Well, I think that as soon as the Prime Minister has made up his mind and Parliament, I suppose when it is refered to them and they have decided what is the basic unit, whether it be two companies, three companies or whatever it is, then I suggest he should start to train people now. There seems to be an agreement in principle, and he should start now and pick out three of four youngsters and have them properly trained in this matter.
11.10 a.m.

The Prime Minister has quite rightly indicated that the army will be used not only for military training but also as a training ground for young people, and I think this is a vital aspect of our society. I am appalled every day by the indiscipline and lack of respect of both for other people's person as well as property, and I think if we can look at the whole question of youth training and use the Regiment in that regard, this would be a good thing. I know it is a costly experience as Jamaica has learnt, but I am sure that apart from the question of the voluntary intake of youths both male and female into the Regiment, the question of a period of some form of discipline is something which I would readily support. I know it is very expensive and it is a long term project, but I think it is something we should aim at, and I think we should use the Regiment even if it means an additional arm of the Ministry of Education in teaching technical skills. This would be a good thing and it would expand the technical education which I know the Ministry of Education is so keen to give. If we can work the Regiment and use it in that regard, then I would be happy about that.

I would like to say how very pleased I am to find that there is a liaison between the Barbados Regiment and the Bermuda Regiment and that we were able to entertain them here. I think it is a very good sign for West Indian unity. As a matter of fact, as Leader of the Opposition I have written the Premier of Bermuda, Jack Sharp, whom I know and congratulated him myself for the idea that we can establish this friendly relationship in exchanging of camps between our two groups, and I am a bit worried that I do not see a vote here for reciprocity, that is, for us sending a team or part of our Regiment abroad on an annual camp. Perhaps there is some vote from which it can be done, but I think if we intend to maintain interest in the Regiment, you have got to give an opportunity to those who volunteer and go on Thursday afternoons to go possibly to Bermuda or St. Vincent. You know when cricket did not have any tours nobody was interested; but the moment you could go to England or Australia everybody wanted to play cricket, because your experience broadens, you come into contact with a greater number of people, and I am very pleased to see that we have reached the stage where we can entertain the Bermuda Regiment, and I am sure that if we make a similar request it would be entertained. It is a heartening sign; it not only cements the relationships between one of what we used to consider the backward colonial territories in the region, but I am sure, having come here, we can give them some enlightenment on how true democracy works, and inspire them to move on to an area of independence as we have achieved.

I wanted therefore just to raise those few points to start training of officers. We want to send them to Sandhurst; we want you to expand the cadet corps in the other schools using the Regiment as the training ground. With regard to the advertisement for a major, you would not get anybody on a temporary basis. My rank is still Lieutenant on the reserve officers, so I can't even apply temporarily in my vacation. I have been on the Reserve Officers for the last twenty years odd and I have never seen my promotion as Captain or Major; so at least I am ruled out. I have acted Captain during the War, but my substantive rank was Lieutenant. I have never been able to make the majority as a major in any military establishment. You would not get anybody. It has got to be somebody from the Cadet Corps and you would have to second temporarily a second-in-command until you have been able to establish your regiment on such footing as you want. It is necessary and I say, the Opposition is not quarrelling with the vote; I am just throwing out some suggestions to the Minister of Education as well as to the Prime Minister which occurred to me when I look at this particular Head.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, just to reply to the Leader of the Opposition, we have borne very carefully in

mind the possibilities that Sandhurst might conceivably wish to add Barbados to its list of Sandhurst ruled countries. It is not a possibility which I rate very highly. I think I am right in saying that rather more than half of all countries in the United Nations are ruled by soldiers rather than by civilians. We are the odd man out in so far as we have two parties and Governments change and so on. It is normal for much of mankind to be ruled by a General rather than by a Prime Minister, but I think that day will be long delayed in Barbados. Certainly a regimental establishment is intended to be very very small indeed. The habit of soldiers taking over Governments has not lasted all that long. I suppose theoretically Napoleon was the first in modern times and his example was not followed for 100 years, and I think we are only going through a phase now and I think this phase will die out. The number of permanent officers envisaged is really very small indeed. It is only five or six officers and undoubtedly training ought to be given to at least one person who has the proper qualifications in Barbados, but again we are not envisaging any elaborate training scheme at present.

With regard to the appointment on a temporary basis of Staff Officer or second-in-command, there is in fact a Barbadian who has reached the rank of Major in an army outside Barbados who is interested in the position, but I think the Leader of the Opposition is quite right. I do not think he will be interested in it on a temporary basis, not to leave where he is now to come back to be a temporary officer, and I expect in due course the post will be established. Clearly the Regiment has to have a Lieutenant Colonel in command and a Staff Officer or second-in-command of the position of Major who can be trained to take over as the case may be, who can train and deputise. At present the Regiment has a permanent staff of only two at Officer level, that is Colonel Banfield and Lieutenant Gittens who is a lady; I suppose she acts as everything, Staff Officer, Adjutant and so on. The second in command in the Regiment at present is not on the permanent establishment.

I think those really are the only points that the hon. member raised to which he would want a reply. The training scheme will be elaborated in due course and hon. members will have their chance to make an input into it, but I would like to emphasise that the permanent establishment as being envisaged is very small. Indeed if my figures are correct, I think that the additional vote we will require on current and capital will be in the region of $350,000; so we are not planning the establishment part of it on a particularly lavish basis, and the volunteer soldiers who are going to train will be in for relatively short periods of time. We are thinking of a few hundreds, and therefore not of any great expenses where this is concerned.

On the Cadet Corps, there are plans envisaged for a very small permanent regiment, a larger volunteer reserve which will still continue to drill on Thursday afternoons and to take part in annual camps, and the cadet corps is the other arm of the secondary wind. There will also of course be a tertiary wing of persons who may want to move into the volunteer reserve or who can be recruited as third reserve beyond the immediate volunteer reserve, and the cadet corps a third reserve that can be called up for training in more military areas than they are likely to get in their initial attachments of a few months in the regiment as the case may be.

The question that the sum of $263,410 under Head 7 – Defence and Security (2) Barbados Regiment, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

11.20 a.m.

HEAD 7(3) – COAST GUARD SERVICE

Head 7(3) – Coast Guard Service – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that the sum of $843,904 under Head 7(3) – Coast Guard Service – stand part of the Schedule, I regret that I have to inform the House that grave dissatisfaction exists in my Ministry about the operations of the Coast Guard Service. It is a matter not by any means of satisfaction that I should find on going into office that so many of the things which in Opposition our Party said about the Coast Guard turned out to be true. I do not want to assign blame or to go into too many details of the infelicities in the present operation of the Coast Guard, and especially I do not want to criticise the personnel *en masse* when it may only be one or two persons who are not really emotionally equipped or properly trained for service in a disciplined force.

The reason why I do not want to condemn the staff *en masse* is that the Coast Guard was set up with the intention of its being a disciplined force but no discipline has ever been applied to it. As the Commanding Officer and other persons pointed out, effectively the Coast Guard are civil servants, and the attempt to operate a Coast Guard where those who are in charge would normally be expected to carry out their duties on the basis of giving an order and seeing the order is obeyed find that they have to – I would not say negotiate – but that they have to conform their disciplinary views to those more appropriate perhaps to the Port Department than a Coast Guard Service is not the fault of the persons concerned, it is the fault of the arrangements which have been allowed to go on for too long in a state of limbo.

There is also something which is not immediately connected with human difficulties. There is the fact that the Coast Guard vessels have an exceptional record of trouble and being out of service. I called about a month ago for a comment, I called for a report by the Commanding Officer of the Coast Guard as to why such comparatively new vessels were always out of service. Unfortunately, I do not have the file or any of the relevant officials here at the moment, but I have sent for the file. There is a catalogue of mechanical defects as long as my arm, Mr. Chairman, a catalogue of mistakes made in the putting together of the boats. I do not know if it is the fault of the makers, if it is the fault of those who wrote the specifications, but even I who am not a marine engineer by any means, I can see that it is a mistake to put generating plant below the water line of a vessel, close to a grating which lets in water, so that a good proportion of the time the sea water is getting into the generator and the vessel is going out of service. Certainly not since I have been in office has there been any occasion that I can recall that all the Coast Guard vessels have been in service at any one time. I cannot recall any occasion where it has been possible to put the whole Coast Guard fleet to sea, and only yesterday or the day before I got a cable from the Government of St. Vincent asking for the Coast Guard to come down to St. Vincent to assist in protecting an aquatic event they are going to have, a regatta they are going to have next month, and the reply from the Permanent Secretary was that we could accept this subject to any of the boats being seaworthy. A situation where a Coast Guard with four vessels cannot guarantee to undertake to protect a regatta in the piece of land nearest to Barbados, only 90 miles away, is a most unsatisfactory situation as far as I am concerned. Well, we are doing our best with the mechanical difficulties.

I recall that on the file one of the notes made is that some of the vessels were built by a firm that has now gone out of business, and there is some doubt as to who one would apply to if the specifications have not been met. As far as I care about that, it is too late to deal with that. We are saddled with the Coast Guard vessels, we are still paying back for them, they were supplied on credit and we are still paying every year out of the Ministry of Finance to settle this supplier's credit in the national debt on which I believe some little discrepancy between the Central Bank and the Ministry of Finance, I do not think the Central Bank takes it into account but we have to in the Ministry of Finance, but I think that we have to take the vessels now as we found them, we have had them for long enough.

The Coast Guard has no home any more, Mr. Chairman. This is another fact that I think the public must be well aware of. The harbour was so badly chosen and put together at Oistins that it has silted up beyond, in my view, any hope of recovery under its present configuration, and the dredge which the Government first rented and then bought is also partly silted up, and we have virtually had to abandon the harbour at Oistins, although the lifting equipment which is so necessary for the proper maintenance of the vessel is still up there at Oistins and the vessels cannot be adequately lifted at the Careenage, where they are at present berthed. The Ministry of Defence and Security has been turning things over and over in the six months since the new Government has taken office. First of all, we tried to fill some of the vacancies in the Coast Guard with persons who, if it was to remain an independent Marine Guard Service, could be expected to be enlisted as seamen and rise to become officers of a future unit operating independently. We got a number of applications from suitable persons, persons who if you are applying to the Regiment would have been very well qualified to go to Sandhurst. We got applications from such persons, people who have been Sergeant Majors of Cadets, people with certificates who have done some study towards higher national certificates in engineering after leaving Harrison College. We appointed a number of these very well qualified persons, we sent them letters of appointment and told them to report for duty on such and such a day and the persons failed to report for duty. When I made enquiries, it turned out that they had had second thoughts about

the Coast Guard because the image which the Coast Guard presents is not really a good one in the society at large.
11.30 a.m.

There have been incidents of what, on all responsible sides, are regarded as sabotage in the service. One Coast Guard vessel began to take in water. When the bilge pumps were switched on they did not work. It came back to be examined and it was found that the bilge pump wires had been cut – and I mean cut – and when a member of the Coast Guard who would have had every opportunity of access to those wires and who was the person responsible for the maintenance and looking after that part of the boat was asked if he could say anything about the cutting of the bilge pump wires, he said that when the petty officer came to him to ask him about the bilge pump a knife fell out of the petty officer's hand and may have cut the wire then.

I believe that the Leader of the Opposition as a former military man, if he was given that answer by somebody in a transport unit if a vehicle had obviously been sabotaged, that the sergeant must have dropped his baton or his knife or his wrench and done the damage, that man would have been charged and visited with severe military discipline because that kind of answer is itself an act of indiscipline; but you argue that these people are Civil Servants, and therefore you cannot apply the same considerations to them as you would if it was a disciplined force.

There have been other examples. One Coast Guard vessel put to sea. When it came back in it was found that there was unusual vibration. It was lifted. They looked at one of the propeller housings and they found that it had obviously struck some object and that the propeller shaft was vibrating. The officer commanding the Coast Guard called for the report of the day because the engineering officer who looked at it – whoever was the engineer responsible – said that it was probably damaged when it struck a large object; and it would have been impossible for it to have struck a large object without everybody on board being aware of it; but the report of the voyage when that object was struck contained no indication whatsoever that anything went astray.

In a sense that is an act of collective indiscipline; because if a Coast Guard vessel can go to sea and hit something and everybody on it agrees not to say anything in the report – they might not have collectively conspired to agree – nothing is said in the report; and nobody on board questions it, or as you would say at school, "owns up" when an investigation is made, clearly there is something wrong with the collective discipline of that Force.

Now, we are therefore in the Ministry considering what to do with the Coast Guard. We are considering it carefully. There are basically two proposals. One is to set up a Barbados Defence Force which will embrace both the Regiment and the Coast Guard. Another is to attach the Coast Guard as the marine arm of the Royal Barbados Police Force; and I will just say this: both of these solutions to my mind necessarily involve an amalgamation of the Harbour Police and the Coast Guard; and it may be taken, Mr. Chairman, as virtually certain that whatever proposal is eventually put to the Minister of Defence and Security, that a recommendation will be made that the Harbour Police and the Coast Guard will be amalgamated.

Discussions have already been held along this line. I have made enquiries of all those concerned. I have said to the Commissioner of Police suppose the Coast Guard and the Harbour Police are amalgamated and put into the Police Force, and the Coast Guard vessels then have to mount artillery – because they have no artillery at the present time – are the Police equipped to train Police Officers in the use of cannon and ship artillery generally? Apparently it seems to be no lack of confidence that this is something that can be carried out.

But I would like to emphasise, Mr. Chairman, in advance of any questions being asked, that no decision – I do not mean that no decision has been approved by the Cabinet – no decision has been taken by the Minister yet on the future organisation of a combined Harbour Police and Coast Guard. There has not even been a decision to combine the two although all the advice that has been received is in that direction.

Indeed it appears that some time ago, I think in 1972, anyhow a considerable time ago, the then Commissioner of Police put up to the Cabinet a proposal to expand the Harbour Police by acquiring a number of vessels for coastal protection and establish subsidiary Harbour Police depots at Oistins and I believe also at Speightstown; and that Cabinet Paper was considered; and the upshot of it all was that the proposals were rejected vis a vis the Police, but accepted for a new Coast Guard.

That is how the Coast Guard actually came into being, by the rejection of the proposal of the Police to expand the Harbour Police.

Those who were in the last Parliament will remember the then Prime Minister saying that he wanted a real Coast Guard. He did not want a lot of old Harbour Policemen with varicose veins on his new vessels. Well, the old Harbour Policemen with varicose veins have discipline and an understanding of the sea. Unfortunately they have no vessels. The Harbour Police have, as far as I am up to date, no vessels whatever. So you have a Coast Guard without police powers and you have a Harbour Police without vessels, to patrol the harbour.

We have these two bodies, complementary and yet apart. After the Cubana disaster and indeed when the Sidney Alleyne arrangement was in force special Coast Guard patrols were maintained. It was these that exposed the deficiencies of the boats to some extent. These were maintained, and we had to put Harbour Policemen on board these Coast Guard patrols because if the Coast Guard patrols had caught up with Sidney Alleyne there was nobody in the Coast Guard who could do anything about it. It would have to be a Harbour Policeman to effect the actual arrest; and it was not indeed only Sidney Alleyne they were after. They saw many a vessel moving in a suspicious way, it is thought trying to contravene the Customs Regulations.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, there it is that although we have been able to effect a very small decrease in this vote, we have effected this decrease in items that do not relate to maintenance of the vessels and vehicles as hon. members will observe. Although we have been able to effect a small decrease both in the voted estimates and the revised estimates, we have to ask the House for the very large sum of $843,904.

I must say this: I think that this is a wicked and monstrous expense to have to be asking the people of Barbados for, for the type of service that we are getting from the Coast Guard. I will give the House a pledge that the Government will take the speedies steps in its power to decide as to whether the Coast Guard and Harbour Police are to be amalgamated, to decide whether they will continue as an independent unit, whether they will join a Defence Force collaterally with the Regiment or whether they will join the Police.

We will establish conditions of service and of military or para-military discipline for personnel in the Coast Guard; and we will make it possible for some of the talented young men whose imaginations first turned to the Coast Guard when it appeared more attractive than it does now to return into this service and give some upliftment to its general operations.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 7 (3) stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I will not be long. I will not begoing over any ancient history because the Coast Guard is an established fact. The Coast Guard is there. The taxpayers' money is involved in the existence and the payment for the ships; and therefore the only question which I see facing this new Government is how to get the maximum efficiency with the minimum of trouble from this organisation. When the present Government was in opposition they questioned the need for a Coast Guard. I have never had any doubt in my mind that an island completely surrounded by sea has need for a Coast Guard. That is commonsense.

11.40 a.m.

I cannot think of any independent country that is an Island of 166 square miles, where you can get yachts coming in and smuggling, where you have an airport near to the sea, that a coast guard could not serve a useful purpose if properly organised and if properly controlled. I have always been convinced of that. The question of the need for a coast guard in a place like Barbados has never caused me any worry. I saw the need for it. You can quarrel with certain aspects of it, but you really cannot quarrel with the need for a coast guard in Barbados. What has always been a source of worry to me when I was in the Government is that there is urgent need for a Defence Act or something to put the coast guard on a proper footing. As a matter of fact, how they have not ran into trouble before beats me.

I would like to suggest to the Attorney General that even if he may be waiting for a comprehensive Act to deal with the Defence and the Regiment, which could be in one Defence Act, Part I dealing with the Regiment and Part II dealing with the Regiment. We do not have any helicopters or air force yet, but I would suggest that it is vitally necessary and long over due that there be on the Statute Books of Barbados some Act giving these people powers outside or within the territorial waters to act. They have been getting away with a lot

which could be challenged because there is nothing to guide them. Since they are not part of the Police Force, as the Prime Minister says, they certainly could have and, possibly, did act illegally on several occasions even although their work was humanitarian; therefore I am asking that priority be given to putting this on a proper footing.

Now, that other problem which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister raises can easily be solved. If you have a Defence Act, then automatically in that Defence Act you must have disciplinary procedures. Just as in the army you get the Army Manual stating absent without leave and countless other military offences, if you do have a Defence Act you automatically must have in that Act certain provisions for naval discipline. I share the view that if you have a coast guard, then the people in the coast guard should have some naval training. The Commanding Officer should be a naval man who has risen to some position in the navy – it is not like the Land Ship. It is all right on land where you cannot run aground on rocks when you are manoeuvring on Trents, but when you are out to sea you have to know how to give proper commands because the sea lanes are there, fishing vessels are there and, therefore, you cannot have any Land-Ship type of commander in charge of the coast guard.

It is true that Barbados has a large reservoir of seamen, so that to that extent we are not short of able-bodied seamen, or boatswains, or whatever type of naval personnel you need. We have been a country supplying seamen to nearly all of the shipping lines throughout the world. At the AB level, and probably a little higher, we certainly do not suffer for the want of persons whom we can recruit. I would like to see that aspect of training for the personnel gone into. At the moment you have a military man in charge of the coast guard, but if he went out to sea I do not know if he knows aft from fore, or B from stern. You cannot have a coast guard involving taxpayers money with persons who are not personnel in their own right. They can pick up terms like fishermen pick up terms, or people who go on an excursion to the Grenadines at Easter knowing which is stern, aft and so on. It is necessary to have certain things done. Do not let us go over the old history of whether it should exist or not.

As the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance says, we are paying for a comparatively new ship and it is going to stay with us. It can be a very useful arm in air/sea rescue. It can be a very useful arm until we have a shallow draft mariner at the Port. It is necessary, and this sometimes worries me. I can see yachts coming in to Barbados on the west coast, and nowhere in sight can you see a coast guard ship to go out and try to check what they are bringing in. We have had instances in this country of things being brought in on the west coast unknown to the Government because we did not have proper patrols along the shores of Barbados. The coast guard has a useful purpose to serve. The first thing that must be done is to put it on a proper legal footing. It must have discipline. I have been hammering this all the time, so do not let the member for St. Philip North go to pen like a Judge taking down verbatim notes. I have always been saying that it could probably land you in trouble if it did not have a proper legal footing. I have said it in here before; therefore, I support the coast guard.

I am sorry to hear – and this is something that would be beyond my knowledge or outside of my knowledge – that boats so comparatively new should be giving so much trouble. This, again, comes from the fact that, perhaps, there is something wrong in the recruitment of personnel. You must have a proper Naval Engineer on the ship. It is no sense picking up a mechanic who worked at a sugar factory and throw him on a boat and ask him to repair diesel engines or generators. If you are spending this sort of money you certainly have to be very serious and see that we have properly trained Naval Engineers who have worked on ships of this kind, properly qualified, and so on. They must be all Barbadians except, temporarily, I would concede that you may, necessarily, have to bring in one or two expatriates; therefore, I support that this service, apart from the employment opportunity it provides, should be put on a proper footing.

I did not know that these boats were never at sea because of mechanical difficulties. This is something that must be remedied. It is no sense having four boats, and find that they are all on dock at the same time in case of an emergency. That, to me, is something which could be remedied, provided we are prepared to hire and pay competent people to deal with the matter. The emoluments do not indicate if there is a competent Naval Engineer on the boat. I cannot see from this if there is any engineer on the Establishment or persons who can deal with the repairs.

The Prime Minister can tell me who repairs these boats. I do not know and I am asking

about the matter. I am not asking the question to embarrass him, I do not know when the ship goes bad who repairs it or who does not repair it; whether it is done by MCW engineers or whom, and I would like to know. There is nothing on the Establishment to indicate to me that there is an engineer trained or qualified in this field who is attached to the coast guard. The questions of difficulties, engine problems and discipline are matters which can be corrected. They can be corrected by an Act, and they can be corrected very easily. I do not consider those to be insurmountable obstacles.

As I say, when this was first established we ran into a lot of criticisms from the then Opposition about the coast guard. I think we could read the debates in here from days on end of the criticisms not only on its establishment, but annually about this coast guard.
11.50 a.m.

As a matter of fact, to be a bit facetious, I would have expected that the Coast Guard might have been cut out and the boats might have been sold like the North Point, judging from the criticisms we ran into when we were in Government, but I am sure Government will show much greater responsibility in this regard and will obviously try to iron out the kinks which are there. As to whether it should form part of the Defence Force or whether it should form part of the Royal Barbados Police Force, well, I am sure that you have got to give the Government some time to study the particular aspects of both proposals; so I shall not hammer that now because I should imagine that when the Government has made up its mind entirely as to what form the Coast Guard should take and into whatever unit it should fall, then hon. members would be given an opportunity to pass their comments. As I say, it is here with us, it can serve a useful purpose, and I think the Prime Minister will agree, unless I am mistaken, that when the unfortunate disaster of the Cubana Airline on the 6th October took place, the Coast Guard played a very useful part in that particular operation, and therefore its existence if for no other reason, was justified on that afternoon. I pray to God that there will be very few occasions or no other occasion when that type of service will have to be rendered by the Coast Guard. Judging from what I read in the papers that the Coast Guard went out, it certainly struck me as a justification itself or part justification in itself for the existence of this particular Coast Guard.

I think you will find from time to time during the next few years that when one is in Opposition obviously one brings to bear to the debate and to discussions an entirely different point of view from the opinion which one holds in Governments, and when you are a lawyer and trained in arguing both sides equally well, then you can also argue both sides equally well in Government or out of Government. That is why in this particular debate I am hoping I have adopted a responsible attitude in asking the Minister and the Government to see that what has come to stay with us, what is a permanent establishment runs at maximum efficiency and with the utmost discipline in the interest of the protection and the security of our country.

I am very relieved, as the Prime Minister himself has indicated, to show the usefulness of the Coast Guard, that during the Sidney Alleyne shenanigans the Coast Guard was used even although the faults and failures of it were shown up at that particular time, because of the extensive patrols which must have been mounted; so that we have two incidents in recent times to justify or partly justify the existence of the Coast Guard which I think can prove the last Government right in establishing the Coast Guard. Now that you are in power it is your duty to see that it has a proper legal basis, that it works at maximum efficiency, that any attempt at sabotage is completely destroyed. I have always supported this particular establishment.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, like the Leader of the Opposition I would like to make the point that one was rather surprised when the debate on the establishment of the Coast Guard took place in this Chamber to see the approach which was used by the Opposition at that time. That of course is a matter of history, so much so that every time the Government returned to the House for votes for the Coast Guard, there were a number of stringent criticisms which were made, and as a matter of fact, one of the Opposition spokesmen went so far on one occasion, and if my memory serves me right it must have been last year or late 1975, as to indicate that if they ever got the reins of the Government of this country they would think very seriously of abandoning the Coast Guard. As a matter of fact, the Advocate News in an Editorial cautioned the Opposition about taking up these kinds of positions because one could never tell what would happen if at some point in time they gained the reins of Government. What we have been able to witness, Mr. Chairman, is a very clear indication that the establishment of the Coast Guard and the whole operation for the protection of our coastal waters is something which we have got to pay very close attention to, and the Prime Minister has indicated very clearly

the efficiency which is needed in the operation of an establishment like the Coast Guard. I do not think anybody could fault him on that.

After all, we have to be aware of the importance of efficiency in any operation and I am sure he would receive as much support as possible in trying to ensure that the Coast Guard and any other arm of Government operates in the most efficient manner. Having said that, there are just a couple of questions I would like to ask, because I think there are a number of things which do not seem to square too well. Now one heard the Prime Minister just now indicating the way in which the Coast Guard has been handled and the question of discipline and what have you, and I would have thought that the Prime Minister would ensure that some of the best people, the people who have some know-how about giving directions to the Coast Guard, people with experience in military matters, would be at the decision-making level. Only this morning I heard a report on the news that the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security is going to be transferred and that the Chief Training Officer is going to become Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security. I recognise that the Prime Minister being in charge of Establishments has the right to transfer Permanent Secretaries as he pleases; but it would seem to me that a person of the calibre of the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security has the kind of qualities which I believe the Prime Minister would recognise as those which would be required for this kind of operation and getting the service operating as efficiently as possible. I recognise that this cannot be done by any one man, and I want to say very clearly that I do not hold a brief for anybody at all in this particular matter; I am looking at it purely from the point of view of efficiency and the contribution which the people who are involved can make towards this particular service, and that is why I am raising this question, because it is common knowledge that soon after the general elections on 2nd September, Slims, and I think everyone knows who Slims is, walked into the office of the present Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Defence and Security and told him that he would soon be moved from there. It would look as if what Slims foretold has come to pass. This is a very serious way of managing the civil service and of making decisions, because when you can get the people who are known for other things disclosing information like this, one must wonder. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the Barbados Labour Party talks about open Government, so that I believe in pursuance of that concept everything they do is discussed in the streets and everybody knows what is going on; yet at the same time last night we heard the Prime Minister and the Attorney General talking about certain things which cannot be known. At one time you want to have an open Government and at another time you want to be as secretive as possible; so that I am a bit worried about the objective of what we are doing.

12.00 noon

When we are talking in terms of the Coast Guard and in terms of establishing a service which is efficient, which can really perform the role and function which it should perform within the whole context of the service, then one has got to ensure that the people who man and who give direction and who make decisions as far as the day to day operation and function of the Coast Guard is concerned, that we get the best people, and I am not necessarily indicating that the person who will head this Division is not a competent person, not at all. It seems that there is some little thing which does not really square off and I hope that the Prime Minister in his reply would be able to give some information about this.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I thought that the position of the Government had been made quite clear and that the hon. member for St. Lucy quite understood the point which the Prime Minister was making. I think he was at some pains to list the problems which are at present confronting the Coast Guard, and he listed them by various particular in various categories.

One of the categories he listed, and I think the hon. member may have heard this, is the very serious problem being caused by sand coming in at the new Coast Guard harbour. I think he said, and the hon. member can be satisfied on this, that it is obvious that in the construction of the Coast Guard Station we either did not get proper engineering advice, or if we did get it we did not act on it, and I think he made it quite clear too, and if the hon. member did not hear I will repeat it for his benefit, that part of the whole feasibility study and survey being done on the Oistins Development will be to take into account the problem that has occurred in the Coast Guard harbour, and see in what way, if at all, this could be rectified. I trust that the hon. member would recognise that at the time when this problem occurred this Government was not the Government of the day, and certainly the hon. member must recognise that if there is any blame, and I believe there is, it must be fairly at the door of the Opposition who were then the Government of the country.

The hon. member for St. Lucy made some comments about the people who man the Coast Guard Stations. Again, I doubt whether since our coming into the Government there has been any large scale recruitment of persons for the Coast Guard Service. It is necessary to look at it from the point of view of re-organising it, assuming, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, we are saddled with it, but I think it would be incorrect to allow the statement that the Opposition made a song and dance about the Coast Guard and said it was going to scrap it on its being returned to power to go unchallenged. I am reading again from Hansard for the 16th March, 1976 at page 6229. What we said, and it was stated by the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Prime Minister in clear terms:

> "Now that question being out of the way, I want to state that the Opposition is still opposed in principle to a Coast Guard Service which is separated from the ordinary police duties which are necessary to an island like Barbados. The Prime Minister, when we first put forward the view that the Coast Guard Service and the Harbour Police Service should be one, whatever you call it, said that he did not want a lot of old Harbour Policemen with varicose veins in his new Coast Guard. Well, I do not know if the Harbour Policemen have varicose veins or not, but it remains our policy to integrate the functions of the Harbour Police with those of the Coast Guard. It remains our policy, Mr. Chairman, to formulate a policy on a matter such as this. I believe that the Opposition and the public are just as entitled to know what numbers they are dealing with and the circumstances of the Coast Guard as the Government and the Minister of Defence.
>
> I do not want to pursue that any more because I believe that the hon. member for St. James comes from a constituency with a sea coast..... etc. etc."

After that categorical and forthright statement of policy, less than just over a year ago, I would not have expected the hon. member for St. Lucy to get up to give this Hon. Committee and the public of Barbados the point of view that the Government, now it is the Government of the day, is reneging on honouring its policies or going back on a policy which it has clearly enunciated. One must really make these points clear, because since the election all of a sudden the Opposition has discovered that it has a voice in the country, and we will allow them to talk as freely as they want to, this is a free country and we believe in freedom of expression in this country, but all we ask is that you put forward the truth when you are attacking this Government on points.

The Prime Minister, in opening the debate on this Head of the Estimates today, said that his Ministry is considering looking at the Coast Guard in relation to the Police services, a promise which we gave in Opposition, and that however it comes down that Harbour police will be integrated as part of a Coast Guard Service, whether it is the marine branch of the police or not. I want to make it clear, Sir, that that is what was said, and I am reading from the report I have just borrowed from the Prime Minister which the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister is now reading, and I do not see what the song and dance is all about. This is the position, do not get up and believe that we are posers on one occasion and changing our tune on another, we have always been against the manner in which the Coast Guard was dealt with.

I remember very well that the hon. member for St. John never brought a paper down here to us at all. He went out of Government promising us a White Paper or a Green Paper on the establishment of the Coast Guard and the Defence Force and up to today he has not given it. I was then sitting on the Opposition and one of the points made by the hon. member for St. James and myself was that it is difficult to ask an Opposition to vote for a measure such as this unless you gave the reasons, set them out in a detailed paper and then let us see what is going to be the total cost. At the time the hon. member for St. John when he first brought the vote in brought it in rather late and slipped it through, promising to give the Paper. I have repeatedly on Supplementary Estimates called for the Paper. I have reason to believe that his Permanent Secretary did prepare such a Paper but it has never been circulated, so I am not blaming the civil servants for having done their duty. He just has not taken the House into his confidence, nor taken the people of the country into his confidence, and his personal style of Government in which everything he wants was done regardless of how Parliament felt or his Party felt is one that we do not follow.

There are many areas of Government that his Ministers did not know about, far less the hon. member for St. Lucy who was after all only a pure back bencher in those days and therefore would not have had much say under the sort of autocratic Government practised by the hon. member for St. John.

12.10 p.m.

I am not scared of the criticism of open government by us. You have heard backbenchers that have the courage to get up and give the courage of their convictions, give the Government the benefit of their ideas and so on. And the country must understand that this is good and healthy for a country and healthy for the party when you get this type of debate going on. All that we ask is that when criticism is made of the Government it is not built on malicious attacks and on facts that are not founded. That is all that we are asking; but we do not object to contrary points of view. As a matter of fact I welcome constructive criticism from the Opposition. It gives me an opportunity to look at their policies during the year and to discuss them in the interest of Barbados. I make no apology for saying that any proper ideas I get from the Opposition or from any other source, even Eric Sealy, if it is useful and constructive, I will be prepared myself to recommend it to my Cabinet colleagues and make sure that it is used in the interest of Barbados.

We cannot assume that we have all the brains over here and you have none over there or anything of the sort because we have become the Government of the Country; but be fair in your criticism. Do not misrepresent us on matters such as this. I know that the hon. member is capable, when he wants to, of real constructive criticism; but on this occasion he is in a political scoring point mood. I am not sure whether it is the member for St. Michael South West who affects his style or he affects the style of the member for St. Michael South West. I am not sure; but I think that there is a little co-ordination down there and they are working as a twin, and it does not really suit the hon. member for St. Lucy to be misled in this way, Sir.

I appeal to him. Let us argue and debate these issues in an open and frank manner, but not to make political points unless he has a factual basis on which he can do so. I thought I should clarify this for the benefit of the hon. member. I would hope that as the Prime Minister said, when his ministry has formulated its views and Cabinet has considered them, that the public and the whole of this Parliament, including members of the Opposition, will debate them to see what proper plan we can put up for the country in this aspect of its affairs.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General and myself have made it a point to have with us during the course of these debates copies of previous years' debates because we recognise that the now Opposition is likely to accuse us of having taken stances, adopted postures when we were in Opposition which are different now; and that was the tenor of the Leader of the Opposition's speech this morning.

Now it rings very hollow indeed that now that we have had a Coast Guard established for about three or four years that the Leader of the Opposition is now calling for, as he put it, a Defence Act or some type of legislation to deal with it, when he was a member of the Cabinet which established the Coast Guard.

I come back again. I continually accused the Democratic Labour Party Government when it was in power of faulty planning, if they did plan at all; because when the Coast Guard was to be set up, in addition to the physical siting of the Coast Guard station they should have determined in their own minds where the Coast Guard would have fitted within the Civil Service structure or in the structure of some disciplined Force.

Now the Leader of the Opposition, after four years, is trying to force the Government to create a Defence Act. Well, if it is necessary he will get it because the Prime Minister indicated this morning quite clearly and last year as quoted by the member for Christ Church West just now, that we have a policy. We said that it remains our policy to formulate a policy on a matter such as this. There can be no doubt that the details, the ramifications of our policy will be worked out while we are in office. As the Prime Minister has explained already, we have to determine whether this is going to be part of what you may call a Marine Guard with separate powers, whether it will be integrated with the Harbour Police, invested for example with powers of arrest which it does not now have – those are details to be worked out; but what I am very concerned about is that last year in March the member for St. John when he was the Prime Minister said at Page 1637 of the debate: "Let us get the facts now. No emotionalism. I promised sometime ago to give you a White Paper on a Defence Force which will incorporate the Coast Guard. (That was in March). The Government Printery has been inundated with bringing the debates up to date, and probably early next month I will have the White Paper laid on the table of the House and circulated to members on the whole scheme. It is right here in my hands. It is in typewritten form, 22 pages in this form, which will be about 30 pages in booklet form. It has everything about the Coast Guard and the Regiment and the necessary legislation.

Now he was promising that White Paper seeing the integration of the Coast Guard and the Regiment as a defence unit. He promised to give

it to us by April last year. They were here until August and we have not seen that White Paper; and I want the Prime Minister to let us know this morning in his reply whether there is a White Paper, and what is the Government's attitude to the White Paper. If there is one, we will accept it or we are not accepting it.

It just shows that the former Prime Minister was blowing a lot of hot air last year in March. Sir, my constituency, as that of the member for St. Philip South, is bounded by the sea; and I will concede here and now that the fishermen in my constituency – and no doubt those in the constituency of the member for St. Philip South – have told me that the Coast Guard is of assistance to them.

Nobody on this side, the Prime Minister, the Attorney General, have said that the Coast Guard is not necessary to Barbados. Recent events have shown that the Coast Guard is perhaps more necessary than some of us may have erstwhile for it to be. What we are saying is that the system for the future operation of the Coast Guard must be so streamlined as to put it on a sophisticated level, to put it on a basis similar to that of the Regiment or the Police Force in which people have pride in being a member.

Last year, I think it was in May or June, one of the Coast Guard vessels – and I suppose that the Prime Minister will have this on file – a man was out fishing in his boat, drifting as they call it. The engine had been cut and the boat was allowed to drift while he was fishing. The man was down in the bottom of the boat. A Coast Guard vessel in mid-ocean cut that boat in half and sank it. The man's name is Garfield Mason. It was a good thing that the man could swim. They threw him a life line, but through the admitted negligence of the officer operating the vessel – I think it was the "George Fergusson" – It cost the Government $11,000 to replace that boat. Somebody could have been liable for that man's death if he was not so fortunate as to have survived the accident. I do not know if they still have the same people responsible for the accident in the Coast Guard. Here was a situation in open sea. You are not on land. It is you, a fishing boat and the sea, and you sink it by running straight through it? Somebody had to be negligent, and somebody should have lost his job. I make no apologies for saying that somebody should have lost his job for it.

Well, luckily the man got a new boat. He is from Bayfield, I helped him with his negotiations and the man has got the good sense to get a new boat and name it after my race horse. He calls the boat "Floating Mohammed" and "Floating Mohammed" is catching a lot of dolphin and flying fish even though the horse has not been able to pay for itself these last two meetings. Mr. Chairman, I think that apart from aspects like this, the whole question of the Coast Guard should be considered. We agree that the siting of the Coast Guard station was the wrong one.

12.20 p.m.

I believe that in future the Government must bring home to these men the seriousness of the position. I hear all sorts of allegations about them, but I am not going to say them in here. I will give them a chance to mend their ways, but it appears that they are not as disciplined as they should be on the job. They must be given a sense of discipline immediately by the powers who have the responsibility for instilling a sense of duty and discipline in them, taking the Coast Guard Service by the scruff of its neck and deciding that something positive must be done to rectify the bad image which the Coast Guard Service, I believe, generally has.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I want to take up a statement which was made by the Leader of the Opposition. In taking this statement up, I want to agree with him and at the same time I do hope that the Hon. Prime Minister, who is responsible for the Coast guard, would pay heed to what I have to say on this particular statement. It was said that one of the problems about the Coast Guard was that there was no proper patrol. This is not only a problem, but a criticism and it is a very serious one. We can make a criticism against what we may term a protective force. We have a couple of jetties in Barbados, and if it were suggested that there was a yacht coming to Barbados, or even a big fishing boat coming to Barbados, with arms, it must be understood that these arms could be off-loaded at one of these jetty points.

What I am saying is that lots of people do not understand, or are not aware, that there is a jetty at Consett Bay and, to my mind, arms could have come into Barbados and they could have landed at Consett Bay. They could also be discharged somewhere in St. John where the two suspects were found. Sometimes we hear about this plot, and we do not understand the issue which was at stake. If those arms were landed at Consett Bay, they could easily have penetrated into Bath and you could have had a build up here, so we would have had a security problem.

The point I want to bring out is that we have to exercise vigilance not only around the St.

Philip area, as my colleague from St. Philip North has said, or the Christ Church, or the St. Michael areas, or around the St. James coast where it was discovered that arms, or ganja, or marijuana, or dope, was being peddled around there. Barbados has other areas that need to be properly invigilated. We have to bear in mind, too, that if we must have an efficient and effective Coast Guard Service it must extend its watch somewhere along the coast of St. Lucy, the St. James coast, the St. Joseph coast, Tent Bay, Bathsheba and Bath. We have to exercise our vigilance along these areas. We have been hearing a lot of talk about the coast guard, and people think that there should only be security along the Christ Church area, but there are other danger areas. I am very concerned, and I have a very sneaky suspicion, about the sort of vigilance that should be exercised in the St. John area. Day before I heard a statement in here from the hon. member for St. John, who made it abundantly clear, that he never intended or he does not want to see a road cut through St. John. I am suspicious about that because when you have a road going through St. John more traffic will be able to pass and a lot of things will be seen. The hon. member is a representative of St. John, and we have heard a lot about the flats in St. John. I am just saying how suspicious I am about this jetty and the coast guard. – I hope that the Hon. Prime Minister will realise that he has to make sure that he has a very good force down there to ensure that nothing creeps into St. John, hits off in St. George and comes to town. That is my little contribution.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, regardless of the circumstances surrounding the inception of the coast guard it is now with us, and what has to be determined is what role it will play in patrolling our shores and in maintaining the security of this country. When that role has been precisely determined, then one can set about definitely to decide what type of organisational structure, ships and so on the coast guard needs to perform that role. I think the atmosphere in which the discussion has been going on does nothing to improve the morale of the people in the coast guard and, certainly, does nothing to the image of the coast guard publicly.

There is a point which was mentioned by the Hon. Attorney General which I would like to deal with briefly, and that is the accumulation of sand at the Jetty up there. This matter cannot be dealt with in isolation because we are having other problems in other parts of Barbados. One of the things that has to be borne carefully in mind, as has already been brought out during our discussion on the Estimates, is that in certain areas in Barbados we do not have the type of expertise or trained personnel to advise the Government properly. In marine studies you will find that is one of the areas where there is this deficiency. It is quite possible that the type of advice given was not of the best, but not that it was given with any objective to undermine the Government. Maybe the person was not properly informed or educated in the particular matter to give better advice. One has to bear in mind in Barbados at the same time a lot of erosion is going on in different parts of this country. If you realise that sand does not come from Trinidad or any one of the other Islands here to Barbados, but it has to move from one area to another area, you will appreciate that the build-up of sand in one area may very well lead to the removal of sand from another area thereby exposing the land and leading to erosion.

We have to solve this problem because right in St. John and neighbouring parts of St. Philip there is a problem of erosion. When you go to St. Lucy, St. Peter and certain parts of St. James there is this problem of erosion. I do not believe that it would be wise to attempt to solve the problem of the accumulation of sand at the Jetty for the coast guard without paying due consideration to the problem of erosion which is going on in other parts of Barbados at the same time, because there is bound to be a relationship between the removal of sand from certain areas leading to the erosion of the Barbadian coast and the diminution in the size of the country and the build-up of sand at the coast guard area and other parts of Barbados. My point in mentioning that is that I think when you look back at the question of training people adequately, I think this is one of the areas in which you must make a special effort to have available to the Government and the people of Barbados people trained in marine studies and allied subjects who would then be in a very good position to inform us and advise us as to what should be done and what needs to be done.

12.30 p.m.

As I stated quite clearly, the Coast Guard is already here with us. There is no doubt in my mind that the present Government intends to let it stay with us, and therefore rather than getting in here and talking about the conditions which might have surrounded the inception of it, I think we should all be concerned in defining what role it has to play in the safeguarding of our shores and in the preservation of our integrity and our security in Barbados.

Sir, a lot has been said about the supposed threat to our national stability posed by one man

in another island, but at the same time I would like to point out that in Barbados for a very long time we have taken certain matters, security being one of them, rather lightly, and I recall in my role as Minister of Home Affairs some years ago that this was one of the problems confronting that Ministry due to the fact that people were able to come into Barbados and disembark without the knowledge of the Immigration authorities and the Police authorities. When I recall that background I can immediately see the need for the proper patrolling of our coast line because not only do people come in and disembark without the knowledge of the Coast Guard and the Police and Immigration officials, but many things can happen; they can bring in drugs, illegal liquor, arms and a host of other things which would not be in the best interest of the people of this country. Therefore I believe that we have to try in our discussions to build up the morale of the people who now constitute the Coast Guard and enable them to present the type of image to the public that would do a credit to them and give the people of Barbados something to be proud about, and also encourage the people of Barbados to support the Coast Guard, because if only for patrolling our coasts, immigration matters and the smuggling, not to mention the violation of our territorial integrity and things of that nature, I can see a definite need for the Coast Guard and I can see that part of the role will have to be in that particular area.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it does not appear to me that there are really a great number of questions that have to be answered. I think hon. members seem to me to be generally agreed so far, and I am obviously not even paraphrasing, I am making an inference from the speeches of hon. members that the Coast Guard has proved to be no more than an expensive toy in the hands of the former Minister responsible for its operation, and I would like to give the hon. member who spoke last and who has just sat down an assurance that the Government is seeking ways and means to defend the integrity of the Island as he put it, and to do a policing job which for many years the negligence of the Harbour Police has made out to be satisfactorily carried out.

One or two persons have asked me about the actual conditions of the vessels. It is my opinion that the supply of the vessels was carried out on the most incompetent lines. I do not know what advice the Minister had available to him, and I do not know what advice he took, but the report of the Officer commanding the Coast Guard dated 9th of this month, in response to my request for an explanation of why there is such a high incidence of non-operational reports on vessels starts out by saying that "the incidence is the result of (a) the choice and design of the vessels, the choice and positioning of much of the original equipment, the non-availability of adequate information about the vessels and the inconsistency of their specifications." I would suggest that if the morale of the Coast Guard is low, it is less low because of what the hon. member for St. Lucy is suggesting, namely, that the Leader of the Opposition has been attacking it rather than because they have some vessels that were not entirely suitable for their purpose.

In one vessel, the George Fergusson, sea water used to enter the engine room through the vents, and the salt caused considerable damage to the engine room equipment, but that has been corrected as a result of the initiative of the present Commander. I do not know who supplied the original radars in these vessels, but all of them suffered and I believe they have all been repaired. The radars have been put up in such a way that they constantly had sea water splashing on them and they turned out to be a type of radar that was very uneconomical to maintain, and a different type of radar has had to be found. The Officer commanding the Coast Guard said about the vessels themselves that they have always had these recurring problems. If these problems were referred to the supplier, I can find no trace of action being taken by them. It appears that the suppliers discontinued trading some time after these vessels were built, and their successors have had much difficulty in acquiring information about the vessels. This lack of information has delayed the delivery of necessary spare parts.

This is the kind of administration which we were given by the hon. member for St. John when he was handling the Coast Guard, Vessels whose suppliers – we still as I say have not paid for them yet – have gone out of business and about which information and specifications of spare parts cannot even now be found. Certainly I will be looking into the question of the continued payments of these matters, because these reports are new. I have only had them since 9th March, and there is one I have not even seen yet, a letter from Lloyds Register of Shipping about our Coast Guard vessels; this is the yacht and small craft department indicating that they cannot give a classification for the Coast Guard vessels of Barbados, meaning of course there is some limitation in their international circulation. They have no plans of machinery, electrical installation, pumping, piping, tail shaft, nothing. You cannot even get a classification at Lloyds for them, so it

will be seen that the whole operation was commenced with maximum incompetence at the outset and this is what we now have to try to bail ourselves out of.

The Leader of the Opposition asked about whether there was an engineer. The Coast Guard has a very competent based shipwright who has himself been able to see some of the mistakes in the vessels. He has been able to stop some of the leaking through which sea water was coming to damage valuable equipment and so on, but of course he is not an engineer. There is a consultant engineer, Mr. Charles Emtage, who is well trained and whom I have reappointed as a consultant engineer. He takes a look at the boats and examines and reports on them and indeed the only trip I have taken on the Coast Guard vessels I was very much obliged not only to the Officer Commanding and the Permanent Secretary but to Mr. Emtage for coming along and giving some ideas about it.

As far as the sand at Oistin is concerned, I think that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central may not be as familiar with the coast line as perhaps hon. members from the constituencies which unlike ours have a beach. The amount of sand in Barbados is not finite; sand continues to be produced all the time and one of the reasons why the Coast Guard Harbour perhaps silts up so quickly is that it is close to one of the main sand-producing reefs and areas of Barbados which is Bowbells reef, and normally the sand would flow and continue to replenish the beaches all along the west coast and maintain a lot of sand and suspension in the waters – this is a common feature of Enterprise Road area generally – and the fact that the Coast Guard has trapped such an immense amount of sand does not mean that sand is not available to deposit on beaches by careful beach engineering further up the west coast.

1.40 p.m.

People speak of erosion. I do not know if there is so much erosion in Barbados, what I believe is that there are movements of sand, so that forty years ago the sea was in the roots of the tamarind tree at Accra, but there is now permanent irremovable beach, perhaps forty or fifty feet beyond the tamarind tree. There are Barbadians who can remember the sea in the road at Rockley. No Barbadian will ever again remember that, because of course the sand has now been trapped, but the sand moves and it moves up and down the coast in patterns not properly studied, not completely studied, so I do not think that the accretion of sand at the Coast Guard means that there are areas which will never have sand. I think sooner or later the sand will come back, I am told that a study is needed there, and indeed the Oistins Survey Scheme is going to make a study of the sand position and indicate what beach engineering works are necessary to put beaches where they are of maximum use to the local population and conform with the future development at Oistins as a fishing port and whatever else may be sited there.

To deal very shortly indeed with an issue raised by the hon. member for St. Lucy, I think he would really have better not raised it, I cannot tell anybody what to say or what not to say in here, but there are considerations of tact and good taste which sometimes informed speeches of hon. members, which with the greatest respect I would say were not entirely present in the comments of the hon. member for St. Lucy, on the exchange of offices between the two persons of Permanent Secretary level. If the hon. member perhaps reflected that the transfer of Permanent Secretaries is constitutionally given to the Prime Minister, and again for reasons of tact or good taste, it is most unlikely that any Prime Minister would wish to enter into any kind of discussion whatsoever about his reasons for carrying out civil service appointments. If he thought of that perhaps he would not have made the statement, but I would just suggest that when he deplores the moving of one Permanent Secretary from a particular post because of the sterling service that he could render in that post, he is reflecting on the public officer who is coming to take that post, because implicitly there is a suggestion that the incoming public officer will not be so competent. Implicitly there is such a suggestion.

As far as I am concerned, both of the public officers involved are competent for the posts which they will be taking up on April 1, 1977. I would not even wish it to be said of the present incumbent of the office of Defence and Security that he is incapable of working anywhere else, because that is also implied in what is said by the hon. member for St. Lucy. I think that he will be a very competent Chief Training Officer, and I would not wish it to be said of the Chief Training Officer that he is not competent to fill any other post in the public service. I think it extremely unfortunate that any remarks along these lines should be canvassed in the House of Assembly; unnecessary and unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, I really cannot recall if there is any other point on which hon. members specifically asked for assistance. I am assured there is no other point, and I move now that the sum of $843,904 under Head 7(3) – Coast Guard Service as amended – stand part of the Schedule.

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

HEAD 8 – AUDIT

Head 8 – Audit – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $81,929 under Head 8 – Audit – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

HEAD 9(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 9(1) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Direction and Policy and Formulation – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 9(1) stand part, I have to move certain amendments. The first is, I beg to move that a note 14 be inserted to read: "To meet expenses of Technical Assistance provided to the Government and professional services rendered by non-governmental agencies or institutions." In the columns of figures, the figure for Statutory Expenditure which occurs in four places in the first column, I beg to move that "675,231" be deleted and "679,231" inserted in its place. In the Total Expenditure, I beg to move that that be altered by deleting the existing figure and inserting the figure "1,776,772," and the Net Increase should also have $4,000 inserted on it to read $250,271.

Subject to that, I beg to move that the sum of $1,097,541 under Head 9(1) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Direction and Policy Formulation – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

HEAD 9(2) – TREASURY

Head 9(2) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Treasury – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $281,072 under Head 9(2) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Treasury – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

HEAD 9(3) – DATA PROCESSING

Head 9(3) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Data Processing – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $445,086 under Head 9(3) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Data Processing – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that. 12.50 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could outline what is the equipment at the Data Processing Unit at present. I remember that they had 1401s, and I believe that they got a new system 360. I would like to know the present status.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, the 1401 computer which we had many years ago, and which was criticised by the hon. member for Christ Church South Central and me has been disposed of. I have not had occasion to look into this matter, and we have not bought any computers other than the IBM – I think it is 370 or 360. I am not an expert on these things. If the hon. member wants specifications and numbers I can have it sent for him; but I am not by any means up to date on the specifications and numbers of data processing and computers.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I had asked for the information because knowing what equipment there is in the Data Processing Unit would have been relevant to what I had to say; but it is all right. I do not need specifications and numbers. I do not know why the Prime Minister considered it necessary to react in that way.

I am wondering if any steps have been taken to align the Data Processing Unit with the Statistical Department. I know that at some time there was some question whether the Statistical

Department and the Data Processing Unit should not be put into one department. I am not sure if that has occurred; but if it has not, I would like to offer the suggestion in keeping with the call for efficiency. I certainly must suggest the use of the data processing equipment and the desirability of having statistical information on an up to date basis.

Here let me state categorically that I am not criticising the Statistical Department. They have to work under very difficult conditions and sometimes it is difficult for them to have the statistical information which departments or persons in the private sector require as expeditiously as they could, if in fact there was one Statistical Department which included the Data Processing Unit.

I cannot think of any administrative reason why these two departments could not be combined, and I can think of a number of good reasons why for purposes of efficiency they should be combined. I think that computers are not always being used as effectively as they could be for the stream-lining of the administrative structure or the administration of the bureaucracy.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things I had hoped to see happen in the next few months was the putting of the Customs Department on a computerised programme. I believe that the whole question of importation into Barbados could better be co-ordinated by co-ordinating the information made available if in fact there is some relationship between the documentation required for importation and exportation and the data bank which keeps information or which should have information about these matters as they relate to Barbados.

You will recall, Sir, that we heard for example of one department ordering large quantities of a product not knowing whether it has the money to pay for it. I believe that that department should in fact have had information out of the data bank and that the Government should aim towards having a system where communication for statistical purposes happens as a matter of routine rather than how it now happens.

I am not blaming the Government for this. I am making a suggestion to the Government that if they have not yet considered they should give consideration to it. I believe, and I have believed for some time, that we do not have the best programmes, or that we have not utilised the computer in the best possible way.

There are persons – Barbadians in Barbados, and some Barbadians outside of Barbados – the Minister of External Affairs can find out through his Ambassador to the United Nations – that there are Barbadians of good will who are prepared to come and assist in writing programmes for our data bank and our Data Processing Unit which would dovetail even a greater number of the programmes that we now have.

The Prime Minister is no doubt aware that once or twice a month there is a lot of activity at the Data Processing Unit as he tries to get out, let us say, the Waterworks bills. If the programmes were so co-ordinated, there would in fact be an almost automatic preparation of bills, not only for the Waterworks Department, but for a number of other departments. I am not sure if the teachers' salaries are yet computerised. If they are, then the point that I am making now is obviously not valid. If they are not, I believe that all the persons being paid in Barbados ought by now to be receiving computerised cheques; and this would go a long way towards eliminating a number of the costly errors which are still being made from time to time on the whole question of payments and pay outs.

I think that I heard that the Leader of the House on another occasion say that Waterworks bills had not been paid for three years. Think what would have happened if a proper computerised system had been designed at the beginning. It is my hope that the Data Processing Unit will be seen, not only in terms of a computer down there where something happens, but as part of the planning process and part of the statistical data which persons must need for development purposes. If one is familiar for instance, with Statistics Canada, almost monthly one is able to get statistics on every item that has come into Canada or gone out of Canada by merely taking up a publication and going through it.

I believe that it is not outside the realm of Barbados' capacity to have that kind of system. It is ironic that the more under developed the country is, the more it requires a computerised system of operation. I hope that the Government will continue to pay attention to this area of stream lining the whole statistical output of the Barbados bureaucracy.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, it is remarkable, the speech made by the hon. member. It contains a criticism of his performance and the performance of his party in office; and in particular it is a ringing indictment

of the lact of understanding of the former Minister of Finance.

Computers are not new things. Barbados is not the only country that has a computer. As the hon. member has said, if you look at other countries, computers have been used as accounting tools, as legal research tools and in an infinite variety of ways for speedy and quick presentation of information. In the 15 years that they have been informed the hon. member has been a Minister for many years. If he had these thoughts, he either did not express them or did not receive a sympathetic hearing.

Since we assumed office one of the first things which was raised by the Ministry I now hold and which combines part of the function which the hon. member held when he was a Minister, was the appalling situation with statistics for trade, the appalling lack of information. Now he speaks about the Waterworks Department. I really did not feel that the hon. member thinks before he speaks because there are other utilities whose performance you can compare with that of the Government's Waterworks Department.
1.00 p.m.

The Electric Company has its computer, but the Waterworks Department is on data processing. Data processing was a section of the Ministry of Finance created by the former Minister of Finance. He bought an old useless computer. We criticised it in here. When we criticised it in here, what was the hon. member's Party saying? What galls me about the whole of this is that I know there was available to the Democratic Labour Party and to the hon. member in particular the services of a gentleman, who is really a very qualified and skilled person in computers and their usefulness, Mr. Walker. The hon. member knows that. *(Asides.)* I am not quarrelling with you. I am only demonstrating that every time you get up and open your mouth you put your foot in your mouth. That is all. I am not quarrelling with you at all.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am not quite sure I understand why the Leader of the House considers it necessary to go off into flights of fancy about what I said. Mr. Chairman, all I did was to draw to his attention that problems exist. I am not suggesting that I could have solved all the problems. If he does not wish us to draw anything to his attention, he merely has to say so. If he has all the answers to everything and he does not want us to help, just tell us. It is useless for him to get up and try to make a controversy out of something that is not. It does not call for foot and mouth and all of that kind of rhetoric expression at this hour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order!

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I was only trying to advise the hon. member that when he gets up, he must be careful about what he says because when ever he speaks he criticises the former Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, and he displays to the public and to anybody with any intelligence listening to him that he was part and parcel of a totally incompetent machine. The position with the trade statistics and other statistical information is that a meeting has been called, and I have here a note from the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Trade, so far as trade certificates are concerned, that the Statistical Services are promising to provide the tabulations on imports and exports of Barbados to the rest of the world to the Ministry of Trade so that we will know in our Export Promotion Programme in our Industry Winning Programme what Barbados exports to each individual country, and we are hoping to have it so up to date that we will be able to tell that in roughly two months after. I would like to see weekly statistics. In Jamaica in the *Gleaner* you can see a column under the trade column every week what is the last week's export. The hon. member who was Minister in charge of Industry never thought of, or if he thought of it he never had enough power and influence to try and get those things done. In the short time that I have been there...

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Hon. Minister giving way?

Mr. TAITT: He has given way, Mr. Chairman. If the Deputy Prime Minister would check his files very carefully, he would find that as early as 1972 I discussed with the officials in the then Ministry of Trade having a computerised system for the entire Ministry, so that we could have the kind of statistics he is talking about. He knows and he will discover that no Minister can go and grab anybody by the neck and choke him to make him do what he does not want to do in the time he wants it done. I am not certain why the Minister is continuing on this line. The files will show that I have constantly been trying to get this. If he gets it, I will be very glad for him.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I understand the hon. member. He is now confessing his total inability to get things done in his Ministry. Do you mean that it took you up to 4½ years and you still have not got things done? We have only gone in seven months. We have had the meeting, and we have said what we want. That is the problem. We say what we want, and no obstacles will prevent us from getting what we want. We are able to demonstrate and point out these things and say why we want them, and we are getting them. *(Asides.)* We have already seen.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross talk, please!

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I have here in my file a statement that we will be getting these statistics. The Ministry of Tourism got their Tourist statistics. If you had done your job properly, you would have had your Import Export Statistic in the same manner because the same Data Processing Unit and the same Statistical Services provide that service for the Ministry of Tourism. It is not a question of different people doing it. The trouble was that there was a different Head in Tourism.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that the first ball which the hon. member bowled at me was a somewhat unexpected one. Although, as it turns out, I knew the answer, the very fact that the question was asked made me suspicious of my own knowledge because I did not really think that the hon. member would suddenly get up and ask – it is not a general knowledge quizz – what computers do the Government have? He goes on to ask when we are going to join the Statistical Department to the Data Processing Unit. Well, all of these matters evidently deal with conceptions that I was not aware were matters of controversy or matters of discussion at all. He is talking in altogether in a different language. He is posing questions which I did not think were arising within the structure of out present organisation. Of course, they do not arise within the structure of our present organisation because they have been resolved.

They always say that an ignorant person is not a person who does not know. An ignorant person is a person who does not know that he does not know, and I really believe that the hon. member for St. Michael South West is asking me when are we going to join the Statistical Department to the Data Processing Unit is using what he thinks are concepts picked up in the course of his training, but really is making a simple subject altogether too complex. He really is guilty of grasping at six words – trying to force in six words where one would make his meaning clear. The Statistical Service is only one of many Departments of Government using the Data Processing Unit, and it is so because that is how we define it. However you name a department you will still have to analyse its functions before you can decide that there are functional infelicities in its operation.

The Data Processing Unit is a Data Processing Unit pure and simple. It mans a computer; it tells you how to put questions into a computer and it evaluates the answers, and as such it serves the Statistical Unit, the Land Valuation Department, the Electoral Unit, the Chief Electoral Officer's Department, and we are working now on one or two other areas as well. We are looking at the same problems which are touched on by the hon. member. Is the computer being sufficiently used? Are there areas of Government where a proper programme would give better information to those who have to take decisions? All of these are the areas, and I believe anybody who deals with a Data Processing Unit would be seeking to identify it.

1.10 p.m.

Just to draw an example, when the National Insurance Scheme first came into being, it was questioned whether it would not be desirable to have an identity number which attaches to all Barbadians for more than one purpose. In other words, why have a separate National Insurance number, a separate number for electoral registration, a separate Inland Revenue code number and so on? Hon. members, I think, will be interested to hear that even during these Estimates I have been discussing this with those concerned, particularly the Chief Electoral Officer in his forthcoming new enumeration with a view to having some more generalised system of computerising the population. There is no reason why the entire population from birth should not be given an identity number and this number remains with them for electoral purposes and National Insurance purposes and other purposes connected with Government through their lives, and the Minister of Health indeed is the person who initiated this latest round in discussions, because the National Health scheme when it comes in, will have to have some system of general identification not just of every worker like the National Insurance, but everybody in Barbados since everybody has to be covered under the National Health scheme, and everybody will have to have an identification number that can be computerised and that can be passed through the data processing unit for necessary purposes, and we are thinking of either building on the existing electoral registration numbers and

combining these for National Insurance and Health Insurance purposes, or giving a new series of numbers to everybody with different prefixes for the particular purposes that are needed. In other words, we are using the data processing as a service unit for the entire spread of Government and we are not defining it as a department of statistics.

Now in Canada the data processing unit may in fact be defined as Canada Statistics or whatever. I am not even sure about it. It may be defined in that way, but our statistical unit has a particular purpose; it collects vital statistics and it has a series of inputs into data processing and a series of outputs through them, but it has nothing to do with land valuation, and it is not really thought necessary if you have a central data processing unit to insist that a further administrative structure be put on top of that through which requests will have to pass before the unit can be used. The data processing unit has its own administration and it works for different departments and I do not think this has proved an unwieldy scheme.

To answer the specific points, the system is a 370 system and the ancillary equipment includes a card reader, a sorter, a visual console, tape units, desk units, and there are a large number of key punch machines including verifiers. The key punch machines that used to be in Statistics have been transferred to data processing.

The hon. member asked about salaries. All monthly salaries paid by Government are computerised now except those of the Police and the delay in computerising the Police salaries will shortly be resolved. There are various deductions in Police salaries. The Police have outside arrangements with supermarkets, with the Police canteen and so on; they have credit arrangements and their bills are met from their salaries, but all of this is being dealt with. Arrangements are also being made to deal with the weekly pay rolls of Government. There have been some delays I believe especially with payment of temporary staff, but we have had few difficulties with weekly pay rolls, but I hope that these difficulties will cease. All of this is in the process of being organised. Hon. members may in fact rest assured that the Government understands that it has an expensive tool in its present computer system and we also appreciate that we cannot make meaningful decisions in many areas unless we have proper information. To take a very small example but one which has been nagging me ever since I have been in office is that I am not satisfied with the immigration statistics.

A large number of immigration arrival and departure cards are filled out and these should form an ultimate control in estimating your population at any given moment, because there is a 99.9% degree of accuracy in the registering of births and deaths in Barbados in my opinion, but that degree of accuracy does not exist in monitoring movements in and out of the Island and as we can very soon expect transient movements into the Island; as a matter of fact they do already exceed the population. You will understand that this is a major problem. I would like to see that computerised, and we are taking what steps we can at the Airport to streamline and improve the immigration system so that we can have a proper analysis of departures. We are fairly sure we have arrivals well covered; we want departures covered and this is something I believe we must devise a system for where the tool available to us, the computer, can work to give us answers. I do not know if that is what the hon. member meant when he said customs or whether he meant that the customs warrants should somehow be computerised and read by the computer in data processing. I really have no idea. I hope he does not mean the latter. If all he means is arrivals and departures, well we are working on that. I do not even believe that the price control division which was so much his brain child and where he evolved a system when he was Minister of import licences was designed to impose physical controls on what was coming in, but designed for the purpose of monitoring the imports of certain items. I do not know if his mind which stretched to that exercise now thinks that such an exercise should also be computerised, because I do not believe we would be able to manage that. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that the ideas that exist about import licensing was the correct concept and I cannot promise at this stage to be attempting to computerise information that is relatively diffuse in such circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this is a matter of political controversy, the data processing operations. Really all I can do is to assure the House that like the previous Government and the devoted public servants who ran this department and who run the statistical department, and like indeed my predecessor, we will try to make the best possible use that we can of this department. It is a new departure in Government in the last few years which was supported by all sides, and I believe that everybody is doing what he can to ensure that it is properly used.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why it is that the Prime Minister constantly feels

he must get up and tell somebody or the other that that person is ignorant. The Prime Minister further said that a person who is ignorant is a person who does not know that he does not know.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, if the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. TAITT: I am not giving way. I have heard enough from him on this. The Prime Minister knows who is ignorant; he is the only mortal in this country who is not ignorant and he is the only person who knows that. I am speaking on data processing and I am responding to something he said, but he did go on to admit that I have been trained, thank God.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister then demonstrated that he has absolutely no grasp of the computerised services, he has no knowledge of them, he demonstrated that he does not understand what I was talking about because he proceeded to answer many of the questions which I asked after making the foolish preamble into asking them. Why can't he just get up and give information? He is the Minister under which this falls and it is his responsibility if a question is asked about it for him to get up and tell the House what the answer is. It is not necessary for him to get up and talk about who is ignorant. If we wish to discuss who is ignorant, I will take him for a discussion anywhere at his choosing.

If you look at appendix "B" you will see that under (d) of Personal Emoluments that we have a Director of Statistical Services and under the same (d) this is at $22,584 a year.
1.20 p.m.

Under the same "D" we have a Director, Data Processing Unit. In a country 166 square miles with 250,000 people, this is probably the only place in the world where these two services are divided in the way they are divided. I do not know why they are divided, and while I am on my feet let me make this point. While I am in this House of Assembly and I happen to make a point which I believe in, and it happens to be a criticism of something that the former Prime Minister or anybody else on this side did, I have no apology to make for that. You all seem' to believe that the former Prime Minister when he was Prime Minister was not susceptible to or of criticism. You seem to feel that we and the Prime Minister....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair. Go ahead.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if you feel so, Sir, but I hope you do not. The former Prime Minister was just like anybody else, a man with a lot of ability who made errors from time to time like any other human, and on the other side they are always trying to villify him, either by innuendo or by direct statements. I am not here to defend the former Prime Minister, he can do that himself and has done it extremely well, and I am not going to apologise because I have made a statement which might imply a criticism of the past Government. We were the Government for 15 years and it would be passing strange if in that 15 years we had made no error, and if we made an error and we are now in a position where we can see it was an error, is there something wrong with our saying that that error should be corrected? They came into power precisely to correct all the errors that we made. So for those reasons, when it is offered, when constructive criticism is....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way, we give him the assurance that we will correct them in the five years so that we could be here for another ten.

Mr. TAITT: All we wish to see them do is to get started, then we would know whether you are going to be here for five or ten.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member will give way again, I thought the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister had put paid to this sort of allegation, that he has started and is already getting results where he could not get in four and a half years.

Mr. TAITT: The Deputy Prime Minister said he had called a meeting. All the fulmination the Deputy Prime Minister made added up to saying that he had called a meeting. When you check the record you will see that all he said was "I had called a meeting." I called a lot of meetings, and the Ministers over there will call a lot of meetings and a lot things will be decided. A lot of things about Data Processing will be decided, but the point is that this Barbados can have a system of statistical information, and for the benefit of the Prime Minister, statistical information is what comes out of a Data Processing Unit. If he wishes to organise his Ministry in a particular way that is his privilege, but he does not have to be so sarcastic about the way he organises his Government, we all know he is the Prime Minister.

I merely wish to add that in suggesting that there be a computerised approach to persons and things which come into Barbados I am not being

original, this is something which occurs in a number of countries. If a study is done of the Treasury Department computerised system in the United States it will be found that they have been able, precisely because they have computerised the area of Customs, that they are the most productive department in the entire United States Bureaucracy, and there are certain aspects of that computerisation which if the Prime Minister consults with his officials they will tell him that it is possible, and all we are suggesting is that as they go along over the next five years they can make better use of the computer than we were able to make during the last five years. That is basically all we were suggesting.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it seems that there will have to be another reply. I was not aware, as the hon. member said, that I tell everybody they are ignorant, I know that sometimes I am forced to tell the hon. member for St. Michael South West either directly or by inference that he is ignorant. I was not aware that I categorised any large number of other persons in the course of these debates, and when I speak of ignorance I am not meaning it to be insulting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Marshal, excuse me. I hear a noise in the direction of the hon. member for St. Lucy; will you check and see what it is disturbing out there? Please continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We have now heard this....*(Asides)*....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Any member addressing the Chair will stand.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We have now heard this set out a little more, that there is a Director of Statistical Services and a Director, Data Processing Unit, and there need only be one person. I do not want to go for the dictionary like the hon. member has to go for it from time to time, but that is the sort of remark that you make when you do not know that you do not know. The Director of Data Processing is an administrative officer who need not necessarily have any knowledge of data processing at all, he is the administrative officer in charge of the department. The Director of Statistics is a professional statistician, a technical officer. The two posts are not interchangeable, and in the Data Processing Department the computer is not used only to produce statistics, no statistics are required as such by the Electoral Office, the computer is used by the Electoral Office in a way that the Director of Statistical Services would never need to use it. What it does is copy the names of every elector in Barbados out, put them in alphabetical order and arrange them on the voting list. The Director of Statistics is not involved in that, he is not involved in land valuation, that is the whole point. The hon. member is confusing the organisation of the United States, the governmental structure and organisation of the United States with that of Barbados.

The word "computer" is very frequently used in North America. Something is computerised when you buy an elaborate calculating machine; you computerise a supermarket when you buy a large calculating machine that can calculate varying discounts, add a sales tax and take it off from certain items and so on. You read, because in North America big words are popular, that a supermarket has computerised its operations. The American Customs is computerised when there is a machine that can read the code number of an import and when a warrant is passed through the machine the machine reads the code number and punches out the duty, and so on. I do not believe that our volume of imports necessarily demands that on the one hand; it may or it may not. I was trying to ask the hon. member what he meant, he does not know what he meant. He is just saying we should computerise the Customs; why? Because he has read in a book somewhere the American Customs are computerised. In one sense it would actually be harder perhaps to computerise ours than the American because there is no generalised system of import licences in the United States, the United States Customs operation is actually a simpler operation than that of Barbados, it has much more volume but it is basically a simpler operation than that of Barbados.

This is what I mean, Mr. Chairman, when I talk about not knowing you do not know. You catch at the word "computerise" and you hear about Central Statistical Services, but you do not realise you do not know. The reason why in the United States it may seem – and look, we are comparing the United States to Barbados, that in itself perhaps will define what I mean about ignorance – but the reason why it may seem that there is a great centralised computer system is partly because in Barbados we are so small that all our departments can use one computer. In the United States there is no possibility of – well, elections would not count, that is not a Federal activity – but there is no real possibility of a land valuation system being put on in the same computer in the United States as trade statistics. They are too many, so everybody who needs the sort of services that are rendered by data

processing would normally get their own computer system, because the volume of work in any given area is probably sufficient to support its own Data Processing Unit.
1.30 p.m.

Data processing units are built into all these activities in a country the size of the United States in a way that they are not in Barbados. We only need one major data Processing Unit which can serve a whole host of departments; and that is what the hon. member has failed to conceptualise and grasp. That is all that has happened. He does not realise that our scale is too small for 10 IBM 370s.

I should say this too, Mr. Chairman. I was sitting down here very ignorant and humble and waiting to hear what the relationship of the particular type of computer was going to be to the hon. member's argument; but he has gone right through his speeches; and nothing that he has said that I can discern would have been said differently if I had told him that it was a 2900 instead of a 370. He has said that his speech depends on what type of computer it is; but he has not referred in his speech to any question of a variation between computers. It is not that a little learning is a dangerous thing. A little learning presupposes that there was some learning. A little reading is proving itself to be an even more dangerous thing. Would that it had been accompanied by a little learning and a little understanding.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to state that the Prime Minister demonstrated to all those persons in here who know anything about computers and data processing and statistical services – he demonstrated a total and complete lack of understanding of the whole process. He should on some occasion admit that there is something he does not know. He can go and check with his officials and they will tell him that he talked foolishness. To talk in terms of whether land valuation can go on the same computer....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which is all besides the point.

Mr. TAITT: That is not besides the point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is what the Chair rules.

Mr. TAITT: I am dealing with data processing, Mr. Chairman. *(Asides).* Do not give me any chance, man.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Withdraw that and make your further contribution to the debate.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw. If the Prime Minister will check with his own officials they will tell him that it is only a question of time. He seems to think that the computer is something that you hang up clothes on. It is the question of the amount of time that you have available to use the computer; and in relation to the question of the 370, the Prime Minister gave that information after I had made my contribution; but this niggardly approach he has – why does not somebody tell him that he is Prime Minister now and that he should get on with the business of the people? He is always behaving as though he is still a fledgling lawyer in James Street down in the yard cussing people and things like that. He is Prime Minister now and should behave like one.

The question that Head 9 (3) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 9 (4) – Central Purchasing Department – in the sum of $1,148,711 – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 9 (4) – Central Purchasing – stand part. In so moving, Mr. Chairman, I would draw to the attention of hon. members that we are trying to make economies in this department. We are very glad that we have been able to hold down the nett increase to only $68,000 to $69,000 instead of $1 million. We are trying to make savings in Stationery, particularly Stationery; and indeed when it is examined, you will observe, Mr. Chairman, that the increases are virtually all in personal emoluments. In fact I think that they are all in personal emoluments. We have made $1,000 in savings in other departments and trying to enforce economy in many areas in Government covered by Central Purchasing.

It would not be amiss to say the plans that the Government has for Central Purchasing. We are actively pursuing the possibility of providing the sort of warehouse space and increased staff to enable this to become really a central supply department rather than a central purchasing department. We are looking at this and we are trying indeed even to identify the land where the operations of central purchasing could be carried on more conveniently than they are at present.

A very careful watch is being kept on the price of items being supplied to Government through Central Purchasing – as the prices

charged for these imported items, and not only imported items, but locally produced ones too – we feel that there is some little tendency for suppliers to charge a little more when they are dealing with a duty free customer, perhaps a little more so when they are dealing with Government; and if you are not very careful in having them monitored and watched, you will find yourself being taken for a ride you should not be going on; since as a major bulk purchaser, Government should be getting it at a little less rather than a little more.

Hon. members may rest assured that many of the complaints which I would not wish to hear ventilated too loudly if they are going to be reflections of an unfortunate nature on individuals; but these complaints are being investigated; and if any hon. member hears of a circumstance or circumstances where the Government is being taken for a ride, he may rest assured that a note or a word to me and the matter will be investigated.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I have long been critical of this department; and it is a bit refreshing to hear the hon. member for St. Thomas stating that they are effecting some economies in this department. When this department was set up it was the opinion that it would, through its efforts, bring about a large amount of savings to Government; and the purpose if it was to get around the necessity of having to deal with the people in Bridgetown as had been going on with the various ministries.

One thought that in having a Central Purchasing Department it would function in such a way that they would be able to get reduced prices for Government when Government sought to buy certain commodities either locally or from overseas. Very often, from my survey as a Minister, we found that we were no better off. What really used to happen was that you wanted something in a Ministry. You had to go through Central Purchasing; and then Central Purchasing would get on to the agents or the manufacturers in Bridgetown or other parts of Barbados, and you would have to wait until they got that item to pass it on to you.

Now the point is that sometimes a lot of time was spent that way; and sometimes, for example, in the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Communications and Works, work was sometimes delayed while the people in Central Purchasing went around trying to find or locate the particular items which this Ministry or that Ministry wanted. I believe that it can go a very far way in helping Government reduce its cost in certain areas; but for this to be achieved, the Central Purchasing Department would have to undergo a radical re-organisation, not only as regards personal, but the method of its separations.

While it may be easy to deal directly with manufacturers overseas, one does not see the necessity very often for the same Central Purchasing Department to go to the local agents and then set about to get supplies through them. There have been a lot of complaints about, and as the hon. member said, it may not be nice at this time to go into details about the nature of these complaints which one may bring against the Central Purchasing Department; but I would like to stress here very clearly that something needs to be done if Government is to get the benefit of having this department; because when you consider the amount of money that you are spending in salaries, and then you are not getting any benefit, you may very well come to the conclusion that it is more expensive to get things through the Central Purchasing Department than by the various Ministries going into Bridgetown or other parts of Barbados and dealing directly with the local agents.

I say that because you have a very big staff to pay to achieve an objective which the Ministries were achieving may be from the point of view of time. They got the things quicker; and if we are going to have these delays which can be evaluated in terms of time, it may very well turn out that the effect which one expected to have had by setting up this department has not been achieved; and rather than doing any good, you are really saddling the people of Barbados with another expenditure.

1.40 p.m.

I would like to remark, again, that it is refreshing to hear the hon. member stating that they have effected some economies. I do not know if these economies are merely from the point of view of containing salaries, or containing the type of stationery or equipment that the Central Purchasing Department is using, but what I would like to know or to hear at some time in the future is that by the method of operation in purchasing commodities the Central Purchasing Department has been able to effect large savings by their method of operation in getting certain commodities for Government. I do not believe that the present method which they have been using for some time in setting about to obtain the commodities for the benefit of the Government has brought the Government any worthwhile savings. If the Government are going to purchase things in such large quantities, as we

know they have been doing, and also purchase items which are very costly, we believe that some steps be taken to ensure that Government are getting the best benefits by having this centralised organisation doing bulk purchases, or purchases for any matter, on behalf of the various Departments and Ministries of Government.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The point is well taken, and I appreciate what the hon. member has said. We are all discussing here that there may be very well some merit in many of these arguments, but I think that a serious effort is now being made to assist those responsible in running the Central Purchasing Department. Perhaps, they do not only need direction but assistance. The experience of new blood sometimes can give assistance over and above any direction which may be applied in the context.

The question that Head 9(4) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 9(5) – CUSTOMS

Head 9(5) – Customs – in the sum of $372,957 – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 9(5) – Customs – stand part.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, to repeat what I said earlier in this debate, I hope the Prime Minister will give a serious look to making both this and the Department coming a Department in which he can retain people who are actually trained. I know from my experience that a lot of people were moved out who were competent and who were looking for promotion after countless years in these Specialists Departments Head 9(5) and 9(6). Since he is responsible for Establishment and Personnel, I hope that he can ensure that he will retain in these two Departments the persons who have gained experience over the years. I have always been disappointed with the sort of shifting around of persons who are trained because the persons quite, naturally, need promotion. I do not think a man should be held down because you say he is a specialist in this, if in terms of remuneration he is not going to get remuneration that he sees other people in the Administrative Section of the Service getting, perhaps, even although they may be junior to him. That is all I want to say on this.

The question that Head 9(5) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 9(6) – INLAND REVENUE

Head 9(6) – Inland Revenue – in the sum of $111,898 – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 9(6) stand part.

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

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned here about my particular constituency and the betterment levy. I notice from checking the memorandum to the Estimates that some $30,000 in total is estimated from the revenue of the betterment levy. I am going to suggest that, perhaps, some reconsideration should be given to the abolition of that particular levy. It applies at the present time to two areas, and the constituency which I have the honour to represent is the only constituency in which the particular levy has so far been raised. I am going to suggest that we should give serious consideration to the abolition of the levy in that particular area.

The other point which I would like to raise is while one looks at the personal emoluments, one discovers that the grading of the post of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue in terms of his salary is inferior to some other Departments of Government. I am going to suggest that, perhaps, one should look seriously at the question of so regrading his position that his salary is increased. I am of the view that he carries a tremendous responsibility. The hon. member for St. Philip North, I think, wishes to be associated with this particular point and, perhaps, one should give some consideration to the emoluments of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue in that respect.

There is one question which I would like to direct to the Minister of Finance, and it is what is the position in relation to the proposal that Barbados should become a tax haven? I believe that is one of the points raised in our Manifesto, and I believe that if one is looking to discover ways of increasing employment that the creation of a tax haven in this country, certainly for foreigners, would mean that some of the companies which are loaded with funds overseas might be attracted here, and I would like to discover what is the position in that regard.

There is one further point. I notice that there is a provision for the expenses of the Tax

Appeal Board, and at Cave Hill we are trying to discover whether the judgments of the Tax Appeal Board can be published in a Law Report form so that the students of the Revenue Law Course there might use them and, of course, they might be available to practitioners who might have to advise on these matters. I know that this is done in Trinidad and in Jamaica and, I think, in Guyana, and, perhaps, you may give some consideration to publishing the reports in a form which does not disclose the identity of the particular taxpayer so that the Rules relating to secrecy are not infringed.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to associate myself with the remarks of the member for St. Michael North West as he spoke about the emoluments of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. I, too, believe that the emoluments of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue can do with a serious review.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the contributions have been short but important, and they touch on problems which, perhaps, go a little way outside the Estimates. First of all, dealing with the betterment levy, I would like to give the hon. member an assurance that, from the first time he raised privately with me the question of the application of the betterment levy, I have been considering the matter with the assistance and the advice of officials both of the Inland Revenue and of the Ministry of Finance and Planning. One of the principal arguments which is at the moment influencing me is that the betterment levy legislation was introduced at a time when the taxation base and valuation system was different from the present taxation base and valuation system.

1.50 p.m.

House owners have already started to pay and will continue to pay to the Government on a regular basis some element of betterment levy by way of the new valuations and the taxes on improved values. I can make no promises. All I can say is that a very careful consideration is being given to the operation of the betterment levy. I do not however believe as at present advised that it will be possible to go all the way with the hon. member when he says that it should be abolished. Vis-a-vis the salary of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, I might add indeed persons in similar position, particularly one may think of the Controller of Customs, there may very well be some argument, although such argument can scarcely be supported or entered into again in a debate on this Head of Inland Revenue where the relevant emoluments are statutory and really cannot be touched and do not need to be voted, so I would not want to go too far into it, for dealing with a number of these officers on the same basis as the Chief Technical Officers in the Ministries where such positions exist, not perhaps all of them. There are only a limited number of officers who are in the category of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue; Accountant General, Medical Superintendent – Mental Hospital, Controller of Customs, Chief Engineer – Waterworks, Director of National Insurance, Hospital Director, Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions and Deputy Solicitor General. All these officers are now at the same level.

There may be a case for thinking that some of these officers' responsibilities and what would be desirable in their training make them approximate to a step higher in the Service than the step they at present occupy. I can only say that all these fundamentally establishments matters are being kept well in mind by the Establishments Division and by the Minister responsible for establishments.

The third point raised by the hon. member for St. Michael North West I think he will agree again is a weighty and important matter, but one which does not directly arise out of debate on this Head. This relates to the tax haven possibilities envisaged in the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. I really cannot enter into any detailed discussion on this at the present time. No tax matter should be anticipated until the guillotine is ready to fall or until the doors are ready to be opened wide, but I will say that the Ministry responsible for External Trade and the Attorney General's Office have, I believe, now completed their study of the International Business Companies Act and legislation generally and will soon be forwarding it for the consideration of the Ministry of Finance. The Act as it existed had not been brought up to date even to exempt International Business Companies from the payment of corporation tax. It really was as primitive as that. There are certain areas where we feel other inputs may be necessary as the thoughts of the Government advisers become more crystallised as a result of the information which is now being fed into the system generally.

There are a number of people working on the tax haven concept. The Governor of the Central Bank perhaps is the most active, but there are people within the Ministry of Finance pursuing these needs as well and we are in contact and indeed may decide to employ the services of an overseas adviser with experience in this area. The Governor of the Central Bank has visited in several parts of the world his

counterparts where tax havens exist and he is working on one or two models at the present time for presentation to the Ministry for our consideration. If what the hon. member is seeking is a re-assurance that the Government is actively working towards expanding our tax haven facilities, I can give him that re-assurance and I can also say that the response so far has been encouraging from one or two overseas businesses. I have myself held talks with representatives of major companies – I am not talking about $10 million or $20 million, I am talking in terms of money as they are described – who have indicated to us the sort of conditions they would want to see, and I am speaking only of companies of the utmost reputability. We are really not looking to become another supermarket in the Mafia chain; I am talking only of reputable companies. They have indicated to us the sort of conditions they would wish to see if they were going to set up an operation here to handle the distribution of profits or provide other financial services normally to be associated with tax havens. Again I can hold out no immediate hopes. I can only say that we are offering these facilities and trusting that the general reputation of Barbados, the fact that we have demonstrated our stability by changing Government with hardly a ripple on the smooth and orderly progress of our society, will combine to make Barbados attractive to those countries which value such qualities and which also happen to be countries which have the same sort of political system and the same sort of political ideals as we have here in Barbados. I think this is something which is very important for people to take note of, that the money which you associate with tax havens prefers to come to countries where there is no political discord, but where the absence of discord is not achieved by anti-democratic means. In other words, that it is unlikely that the countries of eastern Europe would ever be a tax haven for anybody no matter how stable their systems, but it is quite likely that Barbados which demonstrates that a tired Government can be retired and a new and vigorous Government come in is the sort of place in which we hope these international business communities can take comfort without ever seeking control.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to say to the Prime Minister that I have always admired his turn of phrase and his ability to speak English. He did tell His Honour the Deputy Speaker that he should not anticipate him and in the course of that statement he did say he should not anticipate him until the guillotine is ready to fall. Certainly I hope the Prime Minister will give me the assurance that, knowing what the guillotine was used for in France, that is not an indication of what his budget is likely to mean to the people of this country, because I think he knows from his wise reading that the guillotine was the method of execution in the French system and I would like his assurance that that might be an unfortunate turn of phrase but not intended as I may have taken it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Again, I am sure the hon. member does not expect me to respond to that, but I can quite faithfully promise the hon. member that there will be a budget and it will be an interesting budget for the people of Barbados.

The question that the sum of $111,898 under Head 9 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (6) Inland Revenue – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock.

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

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

On Resumption:–

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply, and to that it now reverts.

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

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING
HEAD 9(7) – RATES AND TAXES

Head 9(7) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Rates and Taxes – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $247,466 under Head 9(7) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Rates and Taxes stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING
HEAD 9(8) – LAND VALUATION

Head 9(8) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Land Valuation – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $211,568 under Head 9(8) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Land Valuation stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING
HEAD 9(9) – STATISTICAL SERVICES

Head 9(9) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Statistical Services – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $78,627 under Head 9(9) – Ministry of Finance and Planning – Statistical Services stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE
HEAD 105 – CABINET

Capital Expenditure – Head 105 – Cabinet – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, under Head 105 the figure "15,535" in the column on Revised Estimates is an error, and I beg to move that it be deleted and the figure "97,655" be substituted. In the notes, Note 3 should be deleted, and Note 2 should read: "Provides for the purchase of 3 ceiling fans, printing press machine and a cutting machine." In the Object Classification, Sir, under 054, the Item "Plant and Equipment, 100,000" should read "101,000".

I beg to move that the sum of $179,000 under Capital Expenditure – Head 105 – Cabinet – as amended stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few points here in particular to Parliament. For the period I have been in here I have not been really impressed with the type of facilities which have been offered to the members of Parliament, and on previous occasions during debate on the Estimates I have commented on this matter. Again, I am going to comment on it, and the reason why I am going to comment on it, so far during this debate a lot of comment has been made about an article appearing in the Press.

I am not going to comment on the article, but the point I am going to make is that the politicians of Barbados in present day times have a way of selling themselves short, and the Barbadian public has got accustomed to that, and therefore the Barbadian public tends to see people in politics as things less than human beings, animals, people without any morals, people without proper standards, people who go into politics primarily with the objective of getting a piece of the action – action meaning money, finance or things of that nature – and you find that all along we have been trying to create an impression among ourselves or our opponents, and this concerns members on both sides, that our opponents are as bad as people seem to think they are, and the people take their cue from us.

When you look around here and see the way in which the facilities have been provided for members of Parliament who have to come here, especially during Estimates for very long periods of time, it substantiates the view that we are selling ourselves short. I think that if we want the public of this country to have a better opinion of us, then we have to stop this adversary politics that has been going on and try to do things not only from the point of view of the behaviour but from the way we set about to provide ourselves with facilities that would enable the public to accord us the type of respect which is due to us. In private enterprise you will find that the Directors usually have facilities befitting their position. It is amazing that the members of Parliament who more or less can be considered as comparable with the Directors in private enterprise, the difference there being that you have to look over our purview of a larger

expenditure, a larger sum of money, it is only natural that the people who are put in that position have proper facilities that would encourage them to discharge their responsibility in a proper manner.

What has been in here for a long time might have been all right in years gone by, but with all the development that has been taking place in Barbados, and it is obvious to many of us, I feel that some effort should be made to upgrade the facilities in this Parliament, not only by the provision of a new Library and offices, but from the point of view of rest rooms and facilities particularly for women, because we observe right here in our midst we have a female member, and I do not see any evidence so far to indicate that this has gone down well in the minds of the people who planned for the development of this place, that adequate provision should be made for that particular person. You, Sir, would know that in a long debate such as this sometimes you want to rest, there is no place around here for that. Earlier this week I was a bit disturbed when conversing with His Honour the Speaker, because of the long period he has to sit around here, and while in discussion with him we had to remark on the absence of proper facilities where the man can go and recline and rest until he is needed.

The same thing is true for each and every member here, and not only that, we have people who come to us for different reasons, and there is no proper place around here where you can go and sit down and entertain these people, and I think it is high time we take a serious look at the type of facilities we have been providing for ourselves over the years for conducting the business which we have gone and asked for, or asked the people to elect us to do, and seriously I think it is time to put ourselves in a better position in the eyes of the people of Barbados.

I have no quarrel with the provision or construction of a new Library, but the point I want to make is that the provision of a new Library and offices is not going far enough, and I feel there is a lot more that should be done to provide facilities for all of us, not only for Government members, but the members on this side and also the people who may have to come here to visit any one of us. I would like to draw forcibly to the attention of the hon. member for St. Thomas that I feel that some additional consideration should be given to provision, if not to all the members, at least for the particular member who is a female in this Chamber, and some effort should be made soon afterwards to get a group, maybe some of the members in here or from outside, to look at providing proper facilities for all of us in here.

3.10 p.m.

I do not think that we can go on selling ourselves short with all the dire consequences that arise from that. To continue to do that, the articles which appear in the Press will continue to appear and maybe something worse will appear. I think it is high time we seek not only to pull up the level of debate, but seek to pull up the image of Parliament itself in the eyes of the people of Barbados; because right now people tend to believe that this is just may be little better than a circus where they come for entertainment. They expect certain things to occur, and when they have got that they go home feeling pleased without any proper analysis of what has taken place, of how the policies or the laws that have been discussed here are going to affect their day to day life. To them it is a sort of entertainment. They do not have anything to do and they come in here looking for some entertainment.

I think that it is high time that we who have been entrusted with the responsibility of running the affairs of this country stop being afraid of dealing with ourselves justly. Too often a lot of us are afraid of dealing with ourselves justly because we feel that somebody is going to make some political capital out of it. It is unfortunate that because of this fear we refuse to do the things that should be done; and one of the consequences of this refusal to do the things that should be done is that we end up selling ourselves short.

Once again I am appealing to the hon. member for St. Thomas that I think it is time that we should take a serious look – members of both parties – at the type of facilities that are now available to members of this House; and something should be done about it in a very short space of time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the views of the hon. member who just took his seat. When I was on the other side I made a plea to the last administration in a similar vein that Barbadian politicians in particular always seem to sell themselves cheap. If you drive a new motorcar whether it be a "Jag" or a Daimler – and I have been driving them from 1956 – you have created in the minds of the public that you should not have that. You are to go around dirty with hair plaited, looking like how Glenroy Straughn used to look, to convey to the public that you are out to help the masses.

That is not my approach. I believe that if I can appear in front of any of my constituents in the finest tailored garberdine, and Bally shoes; and not Charlie perfume – the best. Not Joy, man, that is too cheap. Rochas or something like that, *(asides).* You think I am talking about going into a supermarket. I am not talking about taking up something off the shelf. You have to ask let me see that one over there because they have it behind lock and key.

I am prepared to go to my constituents that way; but many of us seem to project that you have to do some monkey things; cook food and eat the food to make them feel that you are with them. Now that is not my style, and I am not prepared to condone that type of behaviour. When election comes you can see somebody with a football giving away, cricket bats and pads. That is really selling yourself cheap.

There must be a Parliament. There is always going to be a Parliament; and unless we are prepared to make it a worthwhile place for people to come and listen to debates – whether we attack each other on the floor of the House, whether some people may consider it a circus or not – we are all politicians and we set out to score points politically.

Therefore I am supporting the hon. member; but if you go into the gents' room in there – I am sometimes ashamed to go into the gents' room. Reference was made just now for the facilities for the ladies. I have never been into it, but I have been told about it. Look at Mr. Speaker's office. He is sitting here. His chair is there and right behind him is the bathroom; and anything that goes on there you can know what is going on in front.

If we set out to put nearly $200,000 or $3,000 in the Estimates you are going to hear the other side – and I will say as we used to do when in the Opposition, or as we would have done; because the member on my extreme right, I think the member for St. Michael South West, would get up and say that you are not finding work for people or some nonsense like that and you are spending money in renovating the place.

I feel that this is the pride of the country, and whether you went to a university, whether you were a Barbados Scholar – somebody has to be a Barbados Scholar, somebody has to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water. That is how society is made up; and I believe that as long as the people make the decision outside and you come in here the people expect you to be in good surroundings and you are to conduct yourself accordingly in the surroundings.

Now I am going to say something. When I first came here in 1966 they had a horse shoe table in here. They did not have these cheap things that when you sit down you are afraid that you are going to fall out. You had a chair similar to what Mr. Chairman is in now; and I was afraid of the atmosphere just because of the way it looked. I was afraid even to open my mouth because it had a different atmosphere.

Now you have some pine things. You are acting just as you behave. You are acting cheap and you are behaving cheap. If you go into my colleague's office, Sir, I know this, that if you put down thick carpet inside – I told the Leader of the Opposition this, that if he had an office like that he could only charge a fee of golden apples and mangoes; because the client that is going to come to you will find that you are are in a mango and plantain office; but if you have heavy carpeting, nice air conditioning and a big desk you charge accordingly and the client will find the money to pay you; and if we act cheap the public will see us as cheap people.

Sometimes I go along the road and I hear people saying that since Craig become a Minister he has a Jag. I had to tell a man one day when I used to work with General Feeders, when I used to bring the feed on a view van and a pickup, and the car that I gave my wife and my girl friend, I said I have been driving all of these before I drove this. But this is the way we sell ourselves cheap, that since you are a Minister you are now accustomed to something.

I would like to support the hon. member; and I believe as the Prime Minister would explain in his reply, that there are going to be better conditions in here for members of Parliament. This is my belief, and I am going to support any Resolution that comes in here because it may not be L.S. Craig today or tomorrow, but somebody out there who did not go to a university, unlike the member for St. John who always feels that you have to go to a university to come in here, that you can only make a contribution if you came out of Belleville, not if you came out of Carringtons Village. You cannot be a George Lamming unless you were born in Belleville; and the member for St. John at that time had a Great Dane to carry to school. That used to lead him to school; but I do not know if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had had a Great Dane to carry him to school; but I had Tom's dog, as the Leader of the Opposition would say, to watch me going to school during the time that I had there.

I am going to support the member on this although I know what the plans are, and I hope that when we come in here with a Resolution I do not hear you all in Independence Square – because I know that the Leader of the Opposition is a person who says that he begs God to stop him from talking on mornings but he don't know what is wrong with his mouth: he cannot help. I hope that you all do not go into Independence Square and say look you spending the taxpayers' money, because you are advocating this. I have supported this when I was in the Opposition. I have never been in the habit of buying cricket boots, bats or balls. No team will ever be called the "Lionel Craig Cavaliers" or the "Tom Adams Wheelers" or the "Freddie Smith Joiners". I am not in that. You are going to vote for me for what I can contribute, and I am going to do my best while I am in here.

It is as simple as that: and the day is going to come when either I am going to be pushed out or I am going to step out; but while I am in here I feel that Parliament is the highest office of the land. I heard a lot of weather made about Salaries. I read the "Express". Before the Prime Minister could even set up the Commission, I read in the "Express" I saw "Barbadian Ministers and M.P.s want more dollars". So the Leader of the Opposition who is a Methodist preacher – he has that Methodist approach after he makes a few trips to the lunch room, he has that Methodist approach on evenings.
3.20 p.m.

He is a lawyer, but after making a few trips to the lunch room all of a sudden he becomes a Methodist priest and he is going to beg us to unite and join hand in hand. I know that old style very good. I was in here long enough to know that old trick very good. I know when you go into Independence Square we are going to hear a different story. It will be dog eat dog out there, but now you are in here you want to talk about let brotherly love be continued sometimes. I only hope you do not put your mouth in it again. I am warning the Leader of the Opposition in particular. You said yesterday evening that you have your right foot anchored in the crease; you know that the Prime Minister is a good googolie bowler, and you are not coming down the wicket to get stumped again. I am only warning you to keep your right foot anchored, as you have decided to do, and let the member, I think, from North Central shine because that is the person whom they have their eyes on. I am warning you good. You are an old fellow; you have served your country; you still belong to the reserved, and when the Sydney Alleynes come for the Barrows you will be there with the gun to help rip them down. I know you are a Lieutenant in the Reserved Force, but I did not know that before. Step out gracefully and let the member for St. Michael North Central take over because that is his goal, and as soon as you slip you are going to slide.

Mr. Chairman, of course, I have to support this, but I would like to support the views of the member for St. Michael North Central in that Parliament should be looking a lot better. Sometimes you come in here and the cobweb is pulling you down; the sinks outside in the Gents' Room are full of mud; the tiles are bad; the Secretary, Miss Banfield, is working next to a toilet over the years. It is no longer in nineteen twenty something when people used to meet once every three or four months, and when you came into the Court Yard the police knew your car because you were the only one who had a car at that time. This is the car world and the Democratic Labour Party is not responsible for it. There is an economic revolution throughout the entire world and we are in that spate of activities.

I feel that if we are conducting the business of Parliament and the people's business in the highest office of the land and the place that make the laws, we have to sit down and arrange for the Judges to get salaries, sit down and negotiate and try to bring together the sugar workers and the Union when the Union may not have a case, or the sugar workers may not have one. They come to the Minister of Finance for a piece of change to keep things going. We have to lay down the law of the land, and as soon as a member of Parliament asks for something for Parliament of which he may not be in even the next five years, you will hear that there is a public outcry. I am not going along with that. I go into a lot of these executive offices around here. I know that a friend of mine once went to the bank and borrowed $10,000 to do a business and the first thing he had was an air conditioned office, carpet two feet deep, telex system, touch button telephone, and to see him you had to see a secretary. He was a big bird. He started big and he continued because that is how he operated.

What do you find in here the highest office in the land? An arborite thing made by the people at Glendairy. The seats are damaged and so on. You go to the wash room and you do not find a piece of soap at all. That does not exist. You will see paper towels. I like good living, but I do not know about the others. I must be always in good conditions. This is my whole approach. I like good clothes, good food, good cars and good women. I want to see a good Parliament.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I came to Parliament for the first time in 1970, and at that time the House was sitting in the Senate Chamber. I was told that we did not have access to the room for which the House of Assembly should sit because extensive renovations were being carried out to the room. I believe about early January or February we moved from the Senate Chambers into this Chamber. The first thing that struck me was the way the lights had been installed – very high in the air, as though you were not to see what you were doing. I then went off to Africa. We arrived on a Sunday night. The Monday morning we went to the Parliament Building. I was amazed to think that we in the West Indies were told about these backward people in Africa, but when you saw the Parliament Building in Ghana, Mr. Chairman, it was something to behold. It was a building in which there were adequate Rest Rooms, the PA system was extended to every section of that building so that members of Parliament could go in the Rest Rooms, the Conference Room, the Library, and they could still follow the proceedings of Parliament.

Mr. Chezley Boyce was the Clerk attached to the delegation, and we were so impressed that we asked for and were given the plans of the Parliament Building in Ghana. On my first speech on the Estimates I raised the issue of having a proper room for Parliament. I was amazed to think that what the Chairman for all these years, Mr. Russell Lowe, used to call the highest court in the land had desks made from plywood and arborite. I believed, when we first occupied this new building, nails were driven through the arborite. They were not even drilled and screwed, but were nailed down like deal board. I drew that to the attention of the Committee in the first Estimates. When you go to the washroom, Mr. Chairman, the doors do not even close. The public will be amazed to think that if the female member of Parliament, the one who was here before, or the one who is here now, attempted to use the washroom anybody could pass and look in on her. *(Asides.)* As she says, you have to perch and hold the door. This is the washroom of our Parliament.

It goes further than this. The hon. member, who spoke first on this issue, was a member of the last Cabinet. I remember the former Prime Minister saying, when we were on the other side complaining about Parliament, that Parliament was no place for decent people to come and, that is why he does not come here too often. Year after year, while in Opposition, we have asked for proper facilities to be provided. In the Estimates last year, at page 6131, I drew to the attention of the Committee the state of the air conditioned units. The horse trading that went on when these units were to be bought was interesting. These units were never meant to be covered with plywood. They kept so much noise here because, as I understand it, there was horse trading between companies and certain officers. They are padded with cotton wool and something else to keep down the noise. They were not meant for in here, and the cost of those would have put a proper air condition unit in this whole room.

I will say, again, when the Estimates are over this year at least 50% of the members will be down with influenza and cold because the air conditioned unit is switched on and off and it can never be regulated. As far as the microphones are concerned, sometimes you get up to speak and unless the operator sees you, you cannot be heard.

3.30 p.m.

As regards the microphones, sometimes you get up to speak and unless the operator sees you, you cannot be heard. These are things that we as members of Parliament have sat through during the last ten, fifteen years simply because the Government of the day did not appreciate the work of Parliament. I know that the Prime Minister has already discussed how he will refurbish Parliament, and when this is done there is no use the present Opposition saying that we are spending money to make ourselves happy because the records will show that while in Opposition we called for a better Parliament. In which other Parliament would you see Reporters walking in and out from the middle of Parliament? The Reporters are always set above the level of the members and they move in and out. The media is set above; you do not see them. Parliament belongs to the people who are elected in here, that is the 24 members and the Clerks, not the Reporters walking in and out. They cannot do any better because they cannot gain access unless they come in between here, and we pointed this out year after year to the last Government. When the plans come down this time and we produce a Parliament which is befitting to any country that believes in parliamentary procedure, the Opposition cannot tell the people that we are spending the people's money unwisely, because our policy has been built up by the things we said when we were in Opposition; so if it is done during this Session of Parliament, then it is part and parcel of our philosophy. I believe that Parliament should be a comfortable place. As I said before, this is the only Parliament where you have to spend months before you see Hansard. I understand it has been brought up to date now. During my first three or

four years here you could not find in the following year the debate on the Estimates for the previous year in order to make reference to what you said then.

When we were in Guyana we worked out a system and we followed a system whereby Parliament met from 9 o'clock in the morning until 3 o'clock in the afternoon and by next morning every member was given a copy of Hansard which was recorded the day before, printed in Parliament, and it was all presented to the last Government, and if they really intended doing anything about Parliament, something would have been done, but instead the Minister of Finance who was responsible for Parliament could give instructions to pay $500,000 to Golden Mile in St. Peter that is still lying doing nothing. He bought a second-hand boat and towed it in the Harbour for a cement plant for which plans had not yet been completed. Even so, the agreement looks as if it would fall apart now, but Parliament remains the same.

Mr. Chairman, we have complained that we need extra lights in here. I have heard the Clerks at the Table complain about the lighting system. Look where they sit and where the lights are. This is the only place where I have ever seen that a light is placed in the air behind your head and your shadow goes over what you have to read or write. We have complained about this time and and time again. Why is it that in other Parliaments each member would have a light over his desk so that he would see what he is reading, but here yours is perched over your head that you cannot see? Year after year you will find that Parliament would okay sums of money to pay an electrician who nearly burnt down the building up there because he was a yard fowl of the previous Government, a man called pot belly. You see him walking up and down touching every switch and when he comes back next day half the wiring is burnt out at Parliament, and nobody in the previous Government ever thought for one minute to let us pull it out and do something about it.

You, Sir, in your first Session in Parliament have asked hon. members to keep quiet behind you. That is the only room that M.Ps. have to rest in; if they go in the back room they are next to the toilets. If they go in the lunch room, they are next to where the pots and pans are; if they go behind the Chamber here, they disturb Parliament; yet you expect Parliamentarians to come to Parliament and do the people's business. It is time that Parliamentarians look upon themselves as what they are.

Mr. Chairman, I believe they had a very good reason why Hansard never used to be printed early. I remember when the last debate took place about Parliamentary salaries we said on that side that we would always canvass the idea and put the salaries of Parliamentarians out to a private commission for enquiry, and that we would not fix our own salaries, and the present Leader of the Opposition got up and said that they fix the salary of the Chief Justice and asked whether he would let anybody outside tell him what salary he should get. This is how they look at themselves. They had no confidence in themselves but I believe if you come to Parliament and do a job of work suitable to what the people pay you to do, there is no excuse for not rebuilding Parliament. It is not my Parliament. It is not the Parliament of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central or the hon. member for St. Thomas; it is the people's Parliament — the man from Bathsheba, the man from Chalky Mount, the little boy from Carrington Village; all have got an equal opportunity of enjoying the people's Parliament. I cannot carry it home; I cannot leave it in my will, neither can any Prime Minister who sits there. The only thing I know like that is a Church in Constitution Road that goes from the top preacher to the next preacher by a conveyance; but Parliament as far as I know cannot be conveyed from one Prime Minister to the next.

This is the people's Parliament and there are things we have got to understand. When there are institutions or buildings belonging to the people, money can never be badly spent on them, and I believe that all members of Parliament should join in pressing the present Prime Minister to do something speedily about Parliament because with a heavy legislative programme and you have got to come here from 10 or 11 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night, you know, Mr. Chairman, that when you get out of that Chair you have got backache, your neck hurts you and you go home and are useless for two or three days after. When Friday night comes I do not know the one of us who will be able to carry on normal activities for the next two days, because you sit down in some chairs, as the hon. member for St. James said, that if you do not hold the back you will fall over. The cheapest things are bought for Parliament. When a Permanent Secretary wants a chair, you see the different grades of chairs. I did not know that until these Estimates. You have a special grade chair for the Permanent Secretary, then another chair for the Senior Assistant Secretary, then another type of chair for the Assistant Secretary. You give everybody what he wants. When you

look at the chair of the Managing Director of a firm in Bridgetown, it is something completely different from the Floor Manager's chair; it is a status symbol; but where politicians are concerned, it looks as if they must walk like somebody sweeping the road, not that he is an indecent fellow, but he is dressed befitting the job he is doing. Must you treat politicians so to let them know they are of the people? I do not believe in that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be long on this particular matter. I have already spoken on this Head under the Current Estimates and I do not wish to repeat the views I expressed then. I can well understand how my friend the Minister of Agriculture, the member for St. Joseph, feels about the lights. He wants to bring the lights; he cannot see very well and maybe whenever he is speaking he seems always to generate a lot of heat, and if the lights can be brought a little lower down maybe some metaphorical light will be brought into the debate rather than the heat that he tends to generate.

Mr. Chairman, there are only two items under this Head: Parliament and Printing Department. One provides for the purchase of Printing Press Machine and a cutting machine. I regret I was not present when the Prime Minister introduced this particular measure, and I do not know what explanatory details were given in regard to item 2.
3.40 p.m.

If this is related to the provision of equipment to Parliament itself to assist in the printing of the debates, and if that particular measure will lead to an earlier release of the debates of Parliament, then I certainly would be giving this my support. From time to time we have canvassed this idea of the early release of debates, and every time we came to this we understood that some plan was being devised, some re-organisation of the Government Printery, or some other type of proposal, but always tending towards the early release of debates, and we seem to have been in that posture for a very long time, not actually achieving but always working towards achieving. If the provision of this particular equipment here, which is identified as a printing press machine and a cutting machine, is directed towards providing Parliament with equipment, or providing some other place with equipment which will lead to the early production and release to members and the public of the debates of Parliament, then I certain will be giving it my support, and I do hope that the Prime Minister if he has not already done so would give the necessary information, because the words spoken in Parliament, the views expressed are important as far as the matters and the issues facing this country are concerned, and what we say is a matter for the record and it gives us our views, and these are taken into account.

I think what we have to be concerned about in this country is a question of efficiency. I think this country is tending to be diverted by the "isms" which are coming on to the political scene, and everybody is concerned about this particular "ism" and that particular "ism", forgetting that whatever type of "ism" we talk about, the key to the progress and development of this country is efficiency. Whether that is under capitalism, socialism, liberalism, conservatism, nihilism, or the philosophy of my hon. friend from Christ Church West – he will give his own name to his brand of politics – whatever "ism" it is that we talk about, the key to development of this country is efficiency and production. We can have capitalist systems that are non-productive, and you can have socialist systems that are non-productive, and I think that this country should not be diverted from the main task of getting on with the increasing of the level of efficiency and the levels of excellence in the country by the debate on that particular matter. That is my personal view, and I express it.

There is no place this can be better expressed than in Parliament itself, because if conditions inside this Parliament, which is supposed to be the law-making body in the land and which is supposed to analyse the issues facing the country, if the conditions are not such in this Parliament that would assist in the development of efficiency in our work as parliamentarians, then to that extent we are retarding the progress of this country. I maintain that whatever contributes to inefficiency in this Parliament should be cut out with a sort of Occam's razor. We have to apply these measures to whatever leads to efficiency, and one area is the availability of debates. It pains me that when I want to do research on matters I have to go either to the Public Library or down to the Archives, and that is not always convenient. The records of this Parliament should be available right inside this Parliament, and the conditions for their safe keeping and for their accessibility to members on demand should be a matter of course, this should not be a major problem.

As I said, if these items of Capital equipment which are being requested under this particular Head will lead to that, then it gets my wholehearted support.

As far as Item 1 is concerned, Construction of a new Library and Offices, I have already spoken on that Head in the Current Estimates and I will not repeat myself on it, but I merely wish again to say that there is a Library Committee of this Chamber, and when standing committees are established we should not wait for the plans to come down from on high, the committee itself from the very beginning should be on the ground floor, as it were, in the discussion of these plans, not to wait to see something coming into the Estimates about the construction of a new Library and Offices and the relevant committee has not met yet to consider this matter. I look forward to an early summoning of this committee to discuss these plans.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to refer to the question of the efficiency of Parliament. I speak on this matter because when we go back for the records there are things which we are going to support from out here, or at least certainly I am going to support, depending on whether I believe that they are in the interest of the country. I am pleased to see as far as the raising of the efficiency or the prestige of Parliament is concerned, I am pleased to see and I am saying it, that the Prime Minister has been coming to Parliament regularly. I believe that the presence of a Prime Minister in Parliament should lend something to the status of Parliament itself and I am pleased that he comes in here, but that does not mean that when he comes and takes a position over there on a particular matter that we are not going to be critical when we go back into the record and see that he was taking a different position over here. There are a number of matters on which he will have to reverse himself, as he has done already, and on which he will have to modify his position somewhat. (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You must point them out to me). Yes, we will find them and point them out to you, matters on which you will have to, if not reverse, modify your position on, so we are going to give him support, but that does not mean that we will not say when we were over there we were, say, giving a particular line whether it was on Defence and Security or some other matters, we will say that and we will point it out, but we will also say we will support this particular issue.

On this matter then I give my support to the general proposals that there should be an improvement in the physical conditions and the amenities of Parliament in order to make Parliament a more efficient place. The Library should have some type of research staff to enable members to have materials and so on in debate, and whatever else goes towards making Parliament a more efficient place. These things I support. I regret that as a member of the Debates Committee that particular committee has not yet been summoned, or at least I am unaware of the summons, but I do hope that there is time to rectify all of that so that we can get down to the business of making this Parliament one of the most efficient institutions in this country.

3.50 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be very long; but I really have got to reply to the two speeches – one made by the member for St. James and one made by the member for St. Joseph. Since September 2nd I am beginning to wonder whether there is not a subtle attempt, deliberate or unconscious, to try to see if they can stop me from making a living at the Bar. The Prime Minister in this House said one day that he is sorry for the poor litigants who hire me. The litigants are not sorry. Today you hear the member for St. James saying that the members on his right and left have thick carpets and a posh office, and I have an office where I must be a golden apple lawyer. Well, let him say that outside. Let him come outside and call me a golden apple lawyer. He would see whether I am mashing the crease or whether I would get stumped again.

These are two attempts – do not mind me: I can handle myself. One is sorry for the poor litigant, and the other, I am a golden apple lawyer. Well, if he thinks that that sort of remark is going to stop me from making a living in Barbados he has another thing coming. Whether he said it in jest or in seriousness, it certainly is not the type of remark you make about a lawyer who has 25 years at the Bar, who has been Attorney General of this Country, and whose reputation has always been very high both in and out of Barbados; so if this attempt about poor litigants is to put me off, I want them to stop it. I want them to say it outside in the course of my profession.

I do not mind myself. I can handle myself. I learned my lesson. I know how the ball is playing and I am going to bat to suit; and I hope that everyone bats to how the ball is playing. I paid for my license, and I am telling you now that anybody who is not playing that sort of game with me will get stumped too. Let us get that straight. Let me issue a warning. I am not going to huff you, and then eat your man. I am warning you. If you do not eat you are going to get huff.

What worries me is that the same member for St. Joseph who is talking about working class people can look at a tradesman and electrician and call him "pot belly". He did not just come in and fix the lights. He must have got a contract. *(Asides).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. He has a nickname as "Jelly Belly". I knew him. I worked for him and that is how I refer to him as "Jelly Belly"; and that is what he is known by up in Barbarees Hill. If you want to change his nickname you go and baptise him something else. Baptise him "Sleepy". Are you not known as "Sleepy Smith"? Do you not refer to yourself as "Sleepy Smith"?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am known as "Sleepy Smith". I am not ashamed of being called it. But if you are talking of him other than disparagingly, I would understand; but when you call him "Jelly Belly" or "Pot Belly" you were suggesting that he was incompetent or inefficient, came up the stairs, put the lights high and nearly caused the building to burn down.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. When the Leader of the Opposition has taken too many trips to the lunch room and has something handed to him over the bar he usually behaves in this way. What I said was...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The only thing I have drunk for the day was a Coca-Cola. *(Asides).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Do not come with any goddamn foolishness.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Please withdraw.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I have only had a Coca-Cola.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please withdraw.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Withdraw what? That he is telling you that I am a goddamn drunkard?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your language is not parliamentary.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I withdraw; but I am going to blister him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All right. Do it outside. You are spoiling a very pleasant day's debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Sir. I am submitting that the words used by the member for St. Joseph with respect to the member for St. Michael South Central where he states that the member made frequent visits to the lunchroom over the bar is a clear implication of alcoholic...

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I never said anything...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am submitting that that is insulting and offensive. I am submitting that it should be withdrawn and struck from the records in the interest of good debate in this country.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand what they are getting at. I never said that he was a drunkard. I never used the word "drunk" yet. I do not know what he is talking about. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Do not let him withdraw it.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: No. For what?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I do not want you to withdraw it. I do not need any protection from you, Bolden.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I have never had the occasion since I have been Chairman of Committees to refer to the powers which the Standing Orders afford me. Do not let me have reason to do it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But if you sit down in the Chair and hear him suggest that I...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not consider that the language used by the hon. member reflects on the character of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I agree with you; but the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, experienced in this Chamber...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Try to contain yourself and not get out of hand.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You finished now, Sir? Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I am nothing to

do with what somebody assumes reflects on me. Anybody in the gallery would get the impression from the member for St. Joseph that I went in the dining room and I was drinking strong drink. I had one Coca-Cola for the whole day. That is what he is suggesting, unless he is dishonest.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I believe that something has gone wrong with the Leader of the Opposition. He started off by claiming that I was making disparaging remarks about the man who put in the lights. I said that "Jelly Belly" was maintained or retained in this Chamber to maintain the lights. Every day he would be seen in here fixing something and even the wires burnt out and nobody took any steps at renewing the fixtures at Parliament. If he objects to me calling him "Jelly Belly"...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not going over all of that now. Let us just continue with the debate on Head 105; and there is absolutely no need for this type of behaviour.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I agree with you; but when he can suggest that I went to the dining room...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair must be heard in silence.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I did not walk in here or beg to come in here; and when he is going to suggest to the public gallery – if I was drinking coffee he would not have said anything. If I was drinking Coca-Cola he would not have said anything; but the impression that you are trying to give the public is that my speech is the result, as Paul said, on the day of Pentecost, when the Christians were speaking in tongues, these are drunk people. I will not stay in here...

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I never said that the Leader of the Opposition was out there drinking. I never saw him out there drinking. If he wants to say so, that is his business. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will we please continue with the debate or call it quits?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I am saying is that he can say – he did not call him "Jelly Belly". He called him a pot bellied man.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The electrician that works for the House of Assembly – his name is Laurence Harris; and whether it is a member of this side or that side, to introduce his name as "Jelly Belly" it lowers the standard of Parliament, Sir.

4.00 p.m.

You must have electric lights if you are going to work at night. How do you mean that electricians are nothing to do with air? I would not waste my time because if you get that sort of ruling, you might as well sit down.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In reply, Sir, very shortly without dealing with the golden apples, the mangoes, the cups of coffee, the Coca-Colas, or Jelly Belly, or anything else, the hon. member for St. Michael South, I would like him to know that his remarks are much appreciated, and upon this occasion I will not thank him for the tribute which he has paid to me in attending Parliament. He and I are both aware that in saying he is glad to see the Prime Minister in Parliament so much, he is not praising me, he is criticising the hon. member for St. John. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. There must be no cross talk.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: But the only people who criticised the hon. member for St. John in here today are the hon. members for St. Michael South West and St. Michael South. Nobody else has called his name that I can recall. *(Interruption.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Marshal, there is some noise over there. Please ask them to keep quiet!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member for St. Michael South, I think, has made a number of points we must all take to heart. We are going to produce some new offices in Parliament. I sincerely hope it will be possible to move these two enclosures from here and give Parliament a little more room. Phase one is only concerned with beyond that wall, but I very sincerely hope that Phase two will get rid of what has been properly and correctly called the arborite and plywood that now disfigures the Chamber. It is significant, Sir, that we are going to spend less on putting in four offices than was spent in putting up these four hard-board plywood and arborite tables, laying down this piece of carpet, and putting those benches over there. We are actually going to build a new Library and offices for $78,000, whereas, I believe, that the last repairs in Parliament reached $108,000 not counting the furniture. When we have finished that we are going to try to produce Phase two, which will improve the interior conditions in here.

On the question of publication of Debates, I think the hon. member for St. Michael South is not, perhaps, up to date. I have moved heaven and earth since taking office as Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to have the Debates made as up to date as possible. I think we are now up to the end of January. I gave instructions, and I know that this is done, and I hope that it is still being done, that the Debates can be purchased separately at the Government's Information Kiosk in Independence Square. You ought to be able to go there and buy the Debates up to the last Debate of January of this year. I only hope we will be able to provide a weekly service when we are really going. You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that not only are we keeping up to date, but we are also filling in all the old back Debates from 1959, 1964, the missing Debate here and there which has never been published, so we are well aware of that.

Mr. Speaker, who has brought a talent to the office that has been, I think, lacking, and I do not say this with any particular criticism. He has brought a determination to the office which has been lacking in the more part-time Speakers who have been his immediate predecessors. He has collected together all of the photographs of old Parliamentarians, old Parliaments, and the other material which exists or have existed of an archival nature around the Chamber and has had all of these photographs rebound with a view to hanging them up in a suitable place in the fullness of time.

The comments which have been made by hon. members about the lavatory accommodation have all been anticipated and we are planning proper lavatory accommodation all round, but I will say that you cannot expect a really radical expansion of space available to members until the Post Office is moved from downstairs. That is something we have to consider. Downstairs will have to be used for Parliamentary purposes at some stage as well as upstairs. This must be anticipated but, unfortunately, it cannot come into being until we find it possible to transfer the facilities of the Post Office.

On the general facilities of Parliament, I want to say a word for the ears of the staff. Many Departments of Government have documents lying about the floor in places where they should not be. The Customs is an example. Many Departments of Government have untidy offices, but I know of no Department of Government that has offices as unnecessarily untidy as Parliament. Many parts of Government want new filing cabinets. I know of no Department that has filing cabinets whose keys cannot be found – filing cabinets full of material which may or may not be of importance, judging by what is in the other filing cabinets, I would imagine not of very great importance as much as Parliament. I want the staff of Parliament – admittedly they are all acting at the top at the moment – to adopt the kind of attitude that will clean out and tidy up this place. There is no point subscribing to newspapers unless you file them. Mr. Speaker, when he was a back bencher, gave Parliament a large number of newspaper filing covers. It is filthy, to tell the truth, Sir, to see the way papers are allowed to hang about in the Library at present. I know there is not much accommodation, but it is a dreadful commentary on people's sense of orderliness and tidiness that they allow this to continue.

There are two many people that hang about the precincts of Parliament. Every day I am seeing people sitting down when members want to use the telephone. They are sitting down in the telephone chair using the telephone; they are eating in the Library when members might want to go in the Library and seek to use whatever is in there by way of Debates. I believe that many of the Debates of Parliament are about here somewhere, but it has reached the stage where you cannot even find the Laws of Barbados since these bound volumes. This is not good enough. I want to ask those responsible for it to take a good solid look at whether they are satisfied at the tidiness of the offices and the organisation of the offices even with the relatively slender resources that they have at present. If you want an example you need go no further than the Senate. Throughout my career in Parliament I have observed that the Senate is tidy, the Senate's books are kept properly locked up – I do not know if the hon. member for St. Michael South West will agree with me, but the environment in those tiny rooms in the Senate is a better environment than the environment in the House of Assembly. I want the Acting Clerk, the Librarian, the Secretaries and everybody to bear what we say in mind.

When we have the new Library we will be able to collect together all our volumes and, perhaps, bring some material back up from the Archives. I think we must now make the job qualification for Librarian to involve some knowledge of Library techniques. We will be quite prepared to face the cost involved. When we see what the services of Parliamentary Libraries do for members in countries without resources significantly greater than the resources of Barbados, we really have to be astonished that we have put up with so little for so long.

4.10 p.m.

I hope when this new Library is built, and I must say I intend to have work started on it with the concurrence of Mr. Speaker at the very earliest possible opportunity, we will not want to see the same practices going on as are going on at present. We will want to know that you can send a note to the Librarian and say "send me the debate for 9th April, 1956" and it will come at once. It was so once upon a time. When I first came in here it was like that, but like so many other things in Barbados, things have gone down hill a lot in the last five years, and I do not really mean that as a political criticism pure and simple. I myself have seen the standards of efficiency which were driven into me in a number of years of employment in another country eroded, and I am glad to find myself in an office where standards of efficiency have been a pleasant surprise, and the same way that Barbadians can go abroad and hold down positions – and again I believe the experience of the hon. member for St. Michael South West would concur with that of mine – where they have to be efficient, where the day that they cannot carry out the simple functions of their office they will be looking for a job, if Barbadians can do it abroad, they can do it here at home, and as Parliamentarians we should see that this kind of task begins at home, and do it right here in Parliament.

The question that the sum of $179,000 under Head 105 – Cabinet – as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 107 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Head 107 – Defence and Security – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I will explain these items. As a result of the expanded Security Guard Service at the Airport, it is necessary for the Security Guards to have a vehicle to get about the Airport. At present I believe they use other vehicles that probably belong to the Ministry of Civil Aviation and their use may really clash with the proper use to which these vehicles should be put. The Security Guards have been given the old control tower as their headquarters and money was voted elsewhere to give them communications equipment which will be installed in the old airport tower, not very expensive network, $20,000 or something like that, and they also need a vehicle to make it possible for them to cover a much greater distance it will now be necessary to cover at the Airport bearing in mind the expansion. Hon. members who visit the Airport may have observed that there are one or two entry points into the Airport premises and compound which are really inadequately guarded. By the Aero-Service hanger it is still possible to drive up there and walk on to the runway with hardly any impediment. There are other places where light aircraft are parked where the demands of security indicate some presence of the Airport authorities responsible for defence and security, and we think that a vehicle really is a basic necessity at that point.

The second item is a vote for a land rover and for rifles, and also for target frames at the Barbados Regiment and the security of the armoury. This vote is divided. The armoury at the Barbados Regiment needs some repairs for greater security. I do not even want to go into the details anyhow. The details themselves may involve a breach of security if I tell you what they are, but it does urgently need certain matters being improved.

The land rover; I have forgotten how old the land rover this is to replace is, but this is very urgently needed for the regiment. Rifles: the Regiment has been using 303 rifles that were good weapons during the Boer War and still continued to give service during the First War although better were then coming on stream, and it has become very difficult to get ammunition for 303 rifles. I believe it costs four times the cost of .762 mm ammunition, and it is intended to buy a different calibre, the .762 calibre weapons which are much easier to obtain these days and much easier to keep in order and much easier to get ammunition for. We are beginning to replace the weapons along this line. The target frames: it is impossible to teach people to shoot unless these target frames are in proper order, and I believe this does not only affect the Regiment, it probably affects the Rifle Clubs and so on which exist in Barbados. I consider that this expenditure would be necessary even if the Regiment was not going to be expanded, and therefore we are asking for this sum of money. Indeed, Sir, it may very well be that this will be all the capital expenditures that are needed at all as well as immediately even if we do expand the Regiment, and I think the sum of $113,600 is modest in the circumstances.

I beg to move that the sum of $113,600 under Head 107 – Defence and Security, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just one question of the Minister in connection with the security at the Airport. I am not sure what the policy with regards to members of Parliament who visit the Airport is. I seem to recall that there was some system of handing out identification cards so that members of Parliament who go to the Airport would not run into certain difficulties which they could otherwise run into. I might draw to the Minister's attention that I was issued one in my other capacity and no one has asked for it back, and I do not know if it is still valid. I wonder if the Minister could just give an indication as to what is the present position.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Airport Manager has a list of all the members of Parliament and other people who come within the category of people who are given passes. This list has not been changed in any way under this administration and perhaps the best thing that the hon member can do in order to avoid any possible embarrassment would be to surrender that one and he will be issued with a new one.

The question that the sum of $113,600 under Head 107 – Defence and Security – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 109 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Head 109 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment which I am seeking. In the note to Item 2 the words "Purchase of Assets" should be deleted and the following words inserted: "Equity contributions and Government participation in commercial ventures". In the note to Item 4 I should like to amend the note to read: "Inland Revenue – Provision for installation of records storage facilites and for other alterations to office accommodation."
4.20 p.m.

I want to say a few words under this Head which attracted such enormous attention in the speech of the hon. member for St. John on the second reading debate. We heard how all these projects are continuing projects and they were all there before, how there is nothing new and so on and so forth. We have been in office six months and so I suppose that to have got in the Transportation Study and the Scotland District Study, if the hon. member is not satisfied with that, well he is not satisfied with it, nonetheless they are there, but some remarks were made especially relating to an amount of $20 million from Trinidad and an amount of $48 million from Venezuela which are said to be available to the Government and upon which the Government has not drawn, and which if the Government drew there would be no need to put in the Item International Seafoods and so on. This is something that has evidently been said for a long period of time, since before Christmas Mr. Kipping Simpson, the Managing Director of International Seafoods was saying why am I the present Prime Minister saying that International Seafoods owes $12 million, that Mr. Barrow told him that the Trinidad Government will give $20 million and then it would not owe any money. Well that is perhaps indicative of the intellectual level of the former Managing Director of International Seafoods, but it is also an example of how an idea can get into your head even when you are a person of perhaps above average intellectual capacity, and it can take possession of your head to the exclusion of reality.

There is a Trinidad facility of $20 million. It has to be borrowed, and if it is spent, and going to be spent, it still has to appear in the Estimates. It may very well be that the Trinidad facility of $20 million will be drawn down in the process of liquidating the International Seafoods and setting up the joint Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago Shrimping Company, but to the best of my knowledge it is not tied to that. When it was first arranged Barbados decided to make an advance to Jamaica, and did so make an advance, which was widely represented at the time in fact to be attached to the Trinidad loan. If we felt like borrowing the money from Trinidad and lending it to Jamaica we could, it is a facility which the Trinidadians out of their – it must be a billion dollars in foreign reserves now, it was $875 million the last United Nations Report I looked at which was perhaps around October or November – if they choose to make $20 million available to the Barbados Government to borrow, it still has to be accounted when we borrow it, and I would just advise the hon. member for St. John that he is in no position, or should be in no position to know matters which are essentially confidential which relate to a drawn down upon a foreign facility, its continued existence or whatever. He goes on and on about why don't we draw the Trinidad money as if he is going to be written a letter to say "Dear Mr. Barrow, I would like you to know that today I drew the Trinidad money.

Yours sincerely, Tom Adams." He did not conduct Government that way, neither do I. The facility is merely a fact of life to be drawn on as the Barbados Government sees fit. I would like to think we would be able to negotiate it upwards in the fulness of time; what you can be sure of is this, that if it is spent it will be spent only through the Estimates.

As far as the Venezuelan facility of $48 million is concerned, I have been unable to discover the existence of this facility. The only person I have ever in life heard quantifying any Venezuelan facility at $48 million or any other figure is the hon. member for St. John. There is no such facility. The Venezuelan Government has indicated its willingness to open negotiations, to carry on negotiations about giving Barbados a foreign exchange credit facility for the purchase of Venezuelan oil. The Venezuelan Ambassador gave me a personal message from President Carlos Andres Perez to the effect that he would be glad to open the negotiations. These negotiations are in a sense in prospect if we find we need the facility, but I think it is not betraying any secrets of Government since hon. members on the other side will be aware that there has been an on-going investigation into Barbados' oil and petroleum products needs. It started some years ago. The hon. member for St. John was kind enough to say in here that I would be glad to hear that the then Government had taken up my idea about a National Petroleum Corporation. A Committee sat, it reported, its report is now being analysed, our own input is going into it, we are analysing the petroleum needs, we are examining domestic petroleum production, we are looking at the consumption of petroleum for the purposes of producing electric power, we are looking at the viability of the refinery. There are different views in the Cabinet about this. I suppose the hon. member for Christ Church South Central and I do not let two days pass without talking something about petroleum and the solution to our difficulties, if you call them difficulties, with petroleum products, the future destination of energy based on petroleum in Barbados.

As regards this $48 million I can only repeat there is no such facility to be drawn on, there is only the offer to open negotiations and to discuss if necessary what assistance Venezuela can give Barbados by way of a foreign exchange credit. That is the point, it is not that they are going to lend us money to buy petroleum, they will allow us in effect, cutting out all the intermediate stages, the effect of it is that we may be allowed to pay for petroleum without using foreign reserves. There are ways of arranging this, but it has not reached any point where any kind of case, not decision, has been put by either side. As far as I know it exists purely in the preliminary – in fact it is at the pre-preliminary stage – and to go on telling the public of Barbados that there is $48 million available from Venezuela is like saying that the person who said that he authorised the purchase of a car is a diabolical liar. The two statements are of equal quality and equal mischievousness.

I have already touched on this Head in my second reading speech and therefore I will not go over each Item individually, Mr. Chairman, but if there are any Items on which hon. members want information I will be glad to assist as far as I can.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, so much time was spent on Monday when the main speaker on both sides made their input on this Item, generally they were speaking on this Item, that I do not propose to repeat any of the arguments which were put forward or any of the canvassing which was done. I am very pleased to hear the Prime Minister admit that there is a facility of $20 million which the Trinidad and Tobago Government – and I do not believe that any one has ever suggested that the Trinidad and Tobago Government will be giving that money to Barbados, obviously if one talks of a facility one can only mean that the arrangements are going to be made to make the loan available on fairly comfortable terms – but there are one or two things which appear in the Capital notes.....

4.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things which appear in the Capital Notes on which first of all I should have a couple of comments, and secondly ask a few questions. I notice that there is going to be an arrangement for the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company Limited for the acquisition of equity shares; and I believe that not too long ago the Government announced that they had made arrangements for loans to be increased – the level of the loans to be increased upwards to $50,000.

I am not sure whether the Government has taken into account that when the loans are raised to $50,000, for a number of reasons which are well known to persons involved in this kind of thing, it will mean that the number of persons who will be eligible for mortgage financing will be reduced. Low income housing *per se* will tend to disappear because what will happen is that

those persons who for whatever reason can match the $50,000 loan are the ones who are going to move in and take up most of the loan funds.

I believe that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance is aware that the Caribbean Development Bank when making a loan to the Barbados Building Society recently, limited the level of loan to $40,000; and I believe that the intent there was to ensure that by not letting the ceiling rise too high, that persons who genuinely need loans for small houses would get loans.

I do not wish to belabour the point. I think that the point can be easily grasped that once you begin to raise the level to $50,000 you are endangering the actual number of persons who will be able to benefit from the loans, indeed the level at which people will be able to benefit, unless, of course, there is going to be such a massive infusion of capital that it would not matter.

I share the views of the hon. member for Christ Church East when he pointed out that steps ought to be taken in Barbados to make Housing a national project in the sense that if one was faced with a war, one would mobilise all the resources at one's disposal to fight that particular war.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it is true that the Democratic Labour Party has gone some way into getting Housing in its true perspective for a 20th Century Barbados. That is a fact. I am not here blowing the trumpet of the Democratic Labour Party; but I am thinking of Housing as we look at it in the future. In a Caribbean country not far from here – it is true that its system is different from ours – but they have been able to build 75,000 units of Housing in two years' time. They were able to do this because they approached the concept of house building and providing decent housing in a particular area of their country as a national project where they mobilised the resources and dealt with Housing in a manner commensurate with war conditions.

Mr. Chairman, for a long time in this country, and perhaps for too long in this country, it has been extremely difficult for persons who wish to borrow money for mortgage purposes to get that money. Sometimes the requirements of a down payment can be such as to make it impossible for persons who are employed, for persons who have been employed for a long time, persons who can be considered solid citizens in the community to get money to build a modest house.

One of the things we wish to avoid is an increase in the value of Housing to the point where a half way decent house becomes out of the reach of the ordinary man and woman in this country. I believe that these things can be avoided by Government paying attention to the input of costs for housing construction.

To touch on a subject as an example – I touch on it not to create political controversy, but to indicate what I mean. I believe Mr. Chairman, that it is better in a community such as Barbados for the Government to find a system of subsidising a raw material like cement than for it to be allowed to find its economic price in the market place; because it is an economic fact that the cost of existence, the cost of living in a community can be judged by the cost of housing in that community. We are finding in Barbados that the cost of Housing is going up at a rate that is not commensurate with the rest of the growth of Barbados; and soon we will be back in the situation we were in 10,15 years ago when few persons could build houses in this country.

Any Government, which ever Government is in power in Barbados, owes it to the people of Barbados to make it relatively easy to have a decent place to live. For those reasons I hope that the Government will take steps to ensure that the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company has as much capital as it is humanly possible to give it so that people in Barbados can borrow more comfortably and with much more ease.

Mr. Chairman, I am not certain what is the position with regard to the cement project over which a lot of communication has been gone into over the last two or three years. As I understand it, land has been acquired in the northern part of the island. As I understand it, some samples of the materials in Barbados have been sent to London and other places – I believe Milwaukee. I believe that we had reached a point where the cement project was about to commence.

When the World Bank got into the Act, and from the position of some $30 million for the cost, I understood that somebody came down from the World Bank and said that the cost of the project would now be $50 million (U.S.). I believe that I heard the Minister of Finance in this House earlier in this session saying that they were not certain if they were going to become involved in building any cement plant for $100 million; but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that at some point the people of Barbados or the Government of Barbados has to come face to face with the

absolute need for us to be able to produce our own cement. If we can produce our own cement, the cost of building in this country will in some way be stabilised.

Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, when the original concept of a cement works in Barbados was put about, – and this was handled in the Ministry of Finance – there was the concept of constructing a vertical kiln which at that time would produce about 80,000 to 90,000 tons of cement.

I believe that at that time some private persons, a Mr. Freddie Clarke and another gentleman whose name I cannot remember, who had attempted to have the cement works as a part governmental, part private project. They had approached the Government with the project suggesting they could have a vertical kiln put up within an 18 months period which would produce 80,000 tons of cement.

When the gentleman whose name escapes me at the moment, Mr. Chairman, went off to Spain to look at the dry process, as it was then described, he reported back that there were only two or three vertical kilns functioning in the world; and we had some reservations about putting in a system which was somewhat novel. At about the same time the Government of Guyana indicated that they would be interested in becoming involved in a cement works because they had need for about 100,000 tons of clinker. 4.40 p.m.

Clinker is the stage before the cement is crushed, or the last stage before it is processed into cement, as you very well know, Mr. Chairman. It was in that context that the Government of Guyana opened discussions with the Barbados Government and a Mr. Pat Thompson, the former Ambassador of Guyana to the United Nations, and a Mr. Birdstrong, the then Adviser to the Guyanese Bauxite Company, came up to Barbados and had discussions with officials in the Ministry of Finance and the Minister of Finance and the Guyanese Government indicated that they were prepared to take 30% of any company which would be established and, again, the discussion was around the establishment of 180,000 tons. It then became apparent that if you are going to construct a cement works for 180,000 tons, and looking at the cost benefit, you might as well go all the way and get the economies of scale and construct one for 280,000 tons. Soon after that, and I believe this was at the same time when the Trinidad Government sent its Ministers up here to discuss the amalgamation of the shrimping fleet, the Trinidad Government also indicated that they were interested in the cement works because instead of their having a second Cement Plant and expanding their present Cement Plant as well, they would be in a position to take some of the load off the Barbados Plant. That is the stage at which, I believe, the matter rested when the people of Barbados made their historic decision to throw the Government out. *(Asides).* To throw the DLP out. I bow to the distinguished, learned and Rt. Hon. Prime Minister ... I am glad that he says that there is still a Government because I myself sometimes get very concerned about how they talk about the then Government and the present Government. I have always assumed that the Westminster model meant that the Government continued and it was just the persons who changed, but they have their way of speaking.

The point is, Sir, that it is fairly clear that some kind of cement project is necessary for Barbados. If you look at the requirements of cement throughout the Caribbean region, you have in Jamaica a Plant that has been recently in trouble, but I believe they have managed to correct that. They have been giving consideration to putting up a second Plant in Jamaica. The Leewards and Windwards Islands are currently purchasing all of their cement from outside of the region, and cement costs in those Islands run in the vicinity of $8, $9 and $10 a bag. In Guyana they use, as I indicated before, about one hundred thousand tons of clinker. If Barbados would put down a Cement Works here it cannot but be successful. Even if we took cement at current cost, the cost of production of cement in Barbados, and given that it is one of the few areas where we would be able to use our own raw material, the Cement Works can be demonstrated by very simple arithmetic to be a potentially financial success, but more important is that it would put us in a position where we are not dependent for so vital a raw material from outside sources. It has not been widely reported in recent times, but there is no question that there has been shortages of cement in the last few weeks which, in turn, has caused a slow down in the construction industry which, in turn, has caused a slow down of activity generally speaking.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to dwell too much on the reasons for the shortage because I believe, Sir, that you are fully aware of it. I am being induced here to give more details, but I do not think that is necessary. You are aware of why the cement shortage came about, and I would offer a mild caution to the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs that he must

not be led into any misunderstanding and misgivings by some of the people who deal in this particular commodity in Bridgetown. You will observe that the Government made a great song and dance about the fact that we had cement on import licence.

Mr. Chairman, you know how the cement licensing system works, and to my great consternation, and I do not even know if surprise, I have discovered that the merchants in Bridgetown now have established the identical system which we had in the Ministry. I can only say that if the merchants can get it to work that way, and the Ministry feels that it is better for the merchants to run it than the Ministry, well then that is all right with me. The only thing I have to say is that the cost or the ultimate cost to the consumer has shown a distinct differential upwards. I do not wish to dwell on that because I do not wish the Minister of Consumer Affairs to come in here and start shouting and jumping up and down and pelting at me. *(Asides.)*

I heard the Minister of Caribbean Affairs say I better had not. I think that now I am on my feet I will take the opportunity to do a clarification of something which has been intimated by the Prime Minister – *(Asides.)* You would prefer me to wait. I think he is quite right. He prefers me not to deal with the commercial cement part of it, but I am discussing the Cement Plant and I think I had better talk about it. *(Asides.)* You let me do it. Let me tell you something, Mr. Chairman. Time and time again in here the Prime Minister, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, the member for St. Michael West, and one or two others on that side have made veiled, sometimes not so veiled, and sometimes outright insinuations regarding the manner in which we handled the cement cess in the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce. We have had the *Advocate* newspaper in an editorial saying that they hope I would not spend a lot of my time in here defending actions which I took, but the insinuations were to the effect that there was some kind of kick-back from cement allocations.

Mr. Chairman, you, more than anybody else in this House, are aware of how the cement industry functioned in the Ministry. I state here categorically that I have never ever received a single cent or any other inducement from any person in Barbados for the issue of a cement licence, or for any licence for that matter. I state that. I will say this about the cement. When Mr. Leo Leacock, who is a poor black business man, who is among the most efficient business men in Bridgetown, visited my house – I admit freely that he is my friend; we were born in Black Rock together, and I admit freely that he is my friend – on an occasion when Pat Roach at J. N. Harriman & Co. was about to shaft the Government on cement when they discovered that the Trinidad & Tobago people would not be able to sell us any more cement, the man from Columbia came up and he and Pat Roach were coming to the Ministry of Trade, and their position was to let us increase the offer to the Ministry of Trade because they cannot get it from anywhere else. The price at the time was $45 (US) per ton, and they were going to come in and offer $47 (US) per ton.

4.50 p.m.

Again, Mr. Chairman, you are in a position to advise this Honourable House that the manner in which we used to deal with it – and if only you could speak I know you would straighten them out – is that we had a Planning Committee in the Ministry and there was a lady of the highest integrity who is now working at the Central Bank, a lady whose quality has never been questioned even by the Prime Minister, who used to deal with the question of cement, and so we had a...

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I really do not want to stop the hon. member from initiating a debate on cement. It is probably a very good idea to have a debate on cement, Leo Leacock and the $260,000 that he made out of the cement, but there are rules about not naming persons or discussing their conduct unless you give notice, and the purpose of these rules is not to suppress debate; it is to enable Ministers to get the documentation and so on to deal effectively with the debate. The hon. member has a Head coming up Head 10(14) – Price Control – which represents the consumer affairs specific function of the Ministry of Agriculture; he also has a Head coming up under Direction and Policy Formulation, Head 10(1) of Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs. It is very unfair to me because a feasibility for a cement project is being...

Mr. TAITT: Is that a point of order?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The first point of order is that he must not mention... I am on a point of order, so nobody else can get up... to put it crudely, Pat Roach and Leo Leacock's name unless he gives notice, and the reason for giving notice was to allow us to have the files here and the relevant officers. I will actually make a plea. I really do not want to stop him, but I would actually beg him to hold off for a little longer and deal with it when we can

assemble the Parliamentary Question, the prospective answer, the cement file, Mr. Grosvenor and the Price Control files and not to deal with it under this Head. It is only marginally relevant to this Head. It is only relevant to this Head because this Head has in the word "cement", but it can be dealt with by the Minister concerned, not the Prime Minister. I am only marginally in it myself, and I would really ask that he refrain from sorrying about the gentleman from Columbia, Pat Roach shafting the Government and Leo Leacock and everything when he is dealing with a vote for $13 million for the Ministry of Finance and Planning for major construction and planning operations in Barbados over the next financial year. I have made the point of order that it is out of order, but I will ask him not to deal with it now.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will draw to your attention that while the Prime Minister is in here, he is just another ordinary member and when there is a point of order, I hope we can look forward to the same latitude which the Rt. Honourable member has got.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me make the point that it is not the intention of the Chair to muzzle the Opposition. The Opposition will have every chance to speak, but the Opposition must also know that the majority is entitled to have its way. It must have its way; it is entitled to it. I am not here to choke or muzzle any one, certainly not.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to discuss what you are here for...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Carry on. If you want to initiate debate on the cement project, cement plant and cement business consumer-wise, go ahead.

Mr. TAITT: With all due respect, I submit that the Head is Head 109 – Ministry of Finance and Planning. Under the Ministry of Finance and Planning, there is Item 2. Item 2 is "Cement Project". The cement project has to do with the supply of cement to the country, and if that is not a reasonable place on which I can discuss the supply of cement into this country, I do not know where it would come.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister after six months in office appears to be going senile or something, because the Prime Minister himself on more than one occasion has called the names of numerous persons in here and I am not aware that he had given any indication to anybody that he was going to call the names. Of course it may very well be that Mr. Pat Roach is a public officer and I am not aware of that, and if he is he merely has to tell me.

The point I was making before I was so rudely and deliberately interrupted is that Pat Roach from J. N. Harriman & Co. and a man from Columbia joined together and were going to the Ministry of Trade to shaft the Government.

Mr. WARD: On a point of order, clearly what the Prime Minister was saying has not got across to the hon. member. The vote here is dealing with a cement plant to manufacture cement. Under another Head there will be marketing. The hon. member must be able to distinguish between the two points. We are now dealing with Capital Estimates for the establishment of a cement plant. The hon. member is talking about something that took place two years ago. We are talking about the Capital Estimates in regard to a plant, therefore marketing will come up under another Head. He is trying to cross the manufacturing plant with marketing. Clearly the Prime Minister is asking him to say what he is saying under another Head. It is as simple as that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, according to what the hon. member has said, the fact that Christ died 1900 years ago would mean that we should not start off with prayer. I can appreciate the hon. member wanting to defend Pat Roach. If I were he I would do that too, but I have stood in here on numerous occasions when the Prime Minister is winding up and the Prime Minister has savaged me in here because there was no chance to respond, and I am going to speak on it now. *(Asides)* I asked Leo Leacock to see if he could find a source of cement to prevent us from being in this terrible predicament, and Leo Leacock & Co. went out and got quotations from the same company that J. N. Harriman & Co. were submitting and put lower quotations.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, I would like the hon. member if he is going to talk about Leo Leacock and cement to give us the date of this lower quotation as opposed to J. N. Harriman & Co. because I have the file here. Give us the dates and let us pin it down once and for all now. Don't go at random or at large as we say in law. You tell us the dates when Mr. Leo Leacock & Co. submitted an application for a licence for cement and the price quoted so that we can compare what you are saying with the actual facts that are recorded here.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am not the Minister any longer. The Minister cannot call on

me to submit it. I would offer to him that if he would go and read the Minutes of the Planning Committees in the Ministry which he how has responsibility for, he will find all this documented in the Planning Committee Minutes. If tomorrow he wants me to come in and give him the specific dates, I would do that. I have not got them here with me now, Mr. Chairman. The point I am making...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In any event, it does appear that we are shifting too far on this whole question of a cement project, and here we have gone into a matter that is completely off. I am allowing too much leeway. Please confine your remarks to the question of the cement project, which means of course building a plant, constructing the mills, the kiln and things of that sort.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the day is not today. What I can promise you is that it all is going to hang out in this House, the facts instead of the insinuations and the constant harpings which they have been getting on with from the time long before they came into power talking about cement.
5.00 p.m.

All the persons they have associated me with, Mr. Chairman, have been small, poor, black businessmen, all of them, and that is what they have attempted to suggest. *(Asides.)* You bring the evidence. (Mr. BRADSHAW: You used to get your piece). You say that outside, why do you not say it outside?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In any event you had half an hour already. You can come back again.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just let...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I draw to your attention that the hon. member has exhausted the time that he is allowed by the rules.

Mr. TAITT: I am very grateful to the distinguished Minister for drawing that to your attention. It is for you to rule, Sir, but let me...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said so before the Hon. Leader.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order, the hon. member must obey the ruling of the Chair. The hon. member must sit down, call on him to sit down, Mr. Chairman, he is not entitled to speak any longer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please sit.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, for a long period of time a lot of talk and false impressions have been created in respect of the criticisms of the Labour Party, the Government, over the attitude and the manner of operation of the previous Government in their acquisitions and their attempts to carry out projects. The basis of our criticism has been that the former Minister of Finance approached these matters with no business sense at all, and that is our charge. We will start with Seafoods.

The truth of the matter is that any analysis of the balance sheet of the Seafoods will show that its liabilities were about $12 million, and whether the hon. member for St. John says it a thousand times or not, the truth of the matter is that he cannot produce, he will never be able to produce, any valuation from a competent valuer saying that the underlying asset value of the assets of International Seafoods amounted to more than $7 million. Despite that fact, which to anybody with any iota of understanding of a business would know that that company is totally bankrupt, the Minister of Finance authorised the purchase of shares in that company at par.

That is the charge.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: What elucidation?

Mr. TAITT: If he will give way, Sir. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago had a delegation with two Ministers and all the persons connected with the shrimping company owned by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. They met at Paradise Beach Club and it was agreed, we had officials from the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Trade, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and it was agreed that one of the conditions on which the Trinidad and Tobago Government would participate in the shrimp project is that they would buy out the ten existing shareholders, and it was agreed that they would be bought out at par. The reason was that the sudden rise in the cost of fuel had carried up fuel by $1.4 million.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking, I must object. That is not a point of elucidation, he has an opportunity to reply and display his lack of knowledge of accounting and

sophisticated business technique. He cannot interrupt my speech.

Mr. TAITT: I do not build supermarkets so I do not have any business sense.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I am not giving way, the hon. member must not interrupt, and I am going to go further and teach him another lesson, he cannot distract me from my trend of thought.

The truth of the matter is, and the gist of the criticism is, that the former Minister of Finance authorised the use of taxpayers of Barbados money to buy the private shareholders' interest when the underlying value of those shares was nothing, because the liabilities exceeded the assets to the tune of $4 million. The more the hon. member gets up in here and opens his mouth the more he displays his ignorance of financial matters.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member is misleading the House. If the hon. member would bring the information to the House...

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, is that a point of order? I am not breaking the Standing Orders of this House, I object, the hon. member must learn the rules.

Mr. TAITT: I am stating that what he is saying is at variance with the facts.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: He still does not know after seven months in Parliament what is a point of order. The position is very clear, Sir, the liabilities were $12 million, the assets were $7 million; $4 million in deficit. Notwithstanding that the former Minister of Finance took up the hard earned money of the taxpayers of Barbados and paid out the former shareholders at par. That is the criticism, and it is a valid, genuine criticism.

Let me tell you how you take over a company in those circumstances. You tell the shareholders it is nothing, give me your shares at $1.00 – and I am coming now to the Trinidad joint venture which was simply this, that Barbados' contribution.... *(Asides)*....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, no cross talking. I will have to ask the hon. members if they continue in this way to withdraw.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: The position was, Sir, that a new company was to be formed, because if they did not form a new Company and anybody came into the old company and you brought in new money into the old company, the liabilities being more than the assets, the creditors would be able to take over the new assets, so a new company was formed and Barbados' contribution to the new company was to be the physical assets consisting of the boats. That is what Barbados' contribution to the new company was, so when the hon. member gets up and says that Trinidad said you had to buy out the shareholders, I challenge the hon. member to produce any information in which the Trinidadians said that you had to pay out the shareholders.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. I was there, Sir, and I heard the two Ministers say it, I do not have to produce anything. I state that I heard them say it.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I challenge the hon. member to say that any Trinidad Minister said that the Barbados Government had to pay the shareholders at par.

Mr. TAITT: He is just wicked, that is all. They just want....

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, even though the hon. member is very confident, I challenge the hon. member. I repeat it, Sir, I challenge the hon. member to say in here that the Trinidad Minister or anybody from Trinidad ever told the Barbados Government that they had to pay out the private shareholders at par. I challenge him to say that. Let him get up in here and say that. Of course not. Is he saying that the Barbados Government had such a weak-kneed approach to the Trinidad Government that they would allow them to tell them how to value the assets of a company that is bankrupt? Do you see what I say, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. No, it was that the Barbados Government had such a concern for its own people. When Barbadians invest in a project you cannot just let the project die merely because you are wicked.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order, you are trying to explain your position.

Mr. TAITT: It is true though.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, let him continue. The more he continues the more he demonstrates his obvious lack of sophistication in these matters. It is a good thing that the good Lord took the Government out of the hands of people like him, because the man does not know what he is doing.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. Is not that blasphemy or sacrilege? I just want to know. I would like the member for St. Michael West to tell me, Mr. Chairman, whether.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will have to address the Chair on that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I just want to know. He is saying the Lord took a Government from somebody. I would like to hear the Government that said I was being sacrilegious, whether that is not sacrilegious or blasphemy, or I can ask the Bishop, the Bishop might be able to tell me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I know I got in my piece.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, you see, Sir, what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did not appreciate was that I used an adjective, the good Lord, but the basic position is, let us be serious and let us approach this in a businesslike fashion. We have to approach these things in a businesslike fashion.
5.10 p.m.

Therefore do not tell me that out of the goodness of your heart you are going to pay a person for his shares at par when the shares are worth nothing. You can do that with your private money. If the hon. member wanted to pay the previous shareholders – if the Minister of Finance wanted to do it he should have used his own private money; but what I object to is using the money of the taxpayers of Barbados without coming here and letting Parliament decide that that was a proper use of the people's money.

That is what I object to, and let us not fool ourselves; and I am sorry that the former Minister of Finance is not in here; because this is the point that he has been evading. He never had any evaluation from any competent person saying that that company was worth $12 million. Therefore it is a bankrupt company because that is the totality of its liabilities to the First National City Bank.

Now, when we come to the Trinidad situation it was a joint venture; but we had to put in the boats as part of the joint venture, and the Trinidad Company as part of the joint venture would be providing service for the boats in Trinidad because they would get greater utilisation of their plant; and to the new company they would sell the fuel at a reduced price. So that the new company would start off at no high fuel price and therefore you would be able to make that an economic venture.

But Barbados' total contribution to that would still have been the $12 million; because you would then got to have taken the $12 million that you got under the loan and pay off the First National City Bank to free the boats so that you could transfer the boats to the new company. That is all it is. So in truth and fact it would still have cost you $12 million. You are only shifting your creditor from being the First National City Bank to the Trinidad Government. *(ASIDE:* At a lower interest). At a lower interest. That is all right. The difference between 6 or 8 or 10 or 11 per cent. But it still cost the taxpayers $12 million; and if you were starting off free you would not have to pay that $12 million.

Now, Sir, on the joint venture I have had the opportunity of discussing with the Minister in Trinidad the joint venture, and the position is that although all of the legal formalities have not been concluded with respect to the joint venture, this present Government does not intend not to carry through the joint venture. The Barbados Government circulated to the Trinidad Government a copy of the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the new company. It has been in the hands of the Attorney General of Trinidad for about a year. It has not come back out yet; and one of the reasons for the delay also is the fact that each of the individual countries – Trinidad and Barbados – are subject to licensing under the Brazilian licensing system in the area where they shrimp. The licences were given for a period of years and they expire in November this year.

It will be appreciated that unless the Brazilian Government concurs in the joint venture the licences may become void. So you do all of the mechanics to get the joint venture going; and there are negotiations going on now with the Brazilian Government at the renewal time of the licences to let them understand that although because of the Brazilian Government's policy of licensing boats of certain Governments that we still would like the joint venture arrangement.

It is also without prejudice to another joint venture arrangement with the Brazilians themselves so that we will be able to get a greater number of boats licensed under the Barbados Flag, so to speak, because we have 22 boats and we only have licences for 17. I feel that it is necessary for all of us to look upon this as part of something that has happened. Do not try and cover it up. The thing we have got to do is to try

and teach our people how to run businesses; and you must profit from the past experiences.

I keep telling the hon. member that I have a peculiar type of experience in this respect; because I have been concerned for many years with bankruptcies and winding ups; and I get to understand how companies go bankrupt and how you value assets when they are bankrupt. I know a fellow in Barbados who had two or three companies; and every time he would never acknowledge the fact that he was bankrupt. When you showed him his liabilities he used to go home and revalue the assets and show you that the assets amounted to more than the liabilities; and he could always produce to you a paper showing you that he cannot be bankrupt because he has more assets than liabilities; but whenever you told him to get a valuer to value those assets, he said that he had as much experience as any valuer.

That is the position with the former Minister of Finance. However he looks at the liabilities, he tells you the boats worth that. The true test is to put them up in the market and see how much anybody will pay for them.

In addition to that, Sir, it is the policy of this Government that fishing is such an important thing to this community, that we would like to see a national company responsible for all of the off shore fishing as opposed to the in shore fishing. What we have at the present moment is a deficit in the amount of fish caught by our fishing boats, and what we consume – somewhere in the vicinity of seven to ten million pounds a year. Hitherto there was very little off shore fishing done in Barbados in respect of people going out for three to four days or three to four weeks.

We had a number of people who used to go and ferry fish from the Japanese fishermen or from the Korean fishermen or from the Trinidad boats and bring them in here and sell them under a licence system to the Barbados Marketing Corporation. That is King Fish and Bill Fish and fish of that type.

It has also been known that the Food and Agriculture Organisation has been seriously concerned over the wastage that has taken place in the shrimping operations in South America. That is, when you catch fish, most of the time except off the Brazilian waters, the Guyanas and Surinam, you bring up a lot of other fish which the shrimping companies are not interested in, but which is first class protein that can be sold at a reasonable price to the populations in the area.

A lot of pressure has been built up, and we have intensified that pressure with International Seafoods in respect of the marketing of that fish. When we came into power this was one of the first things that we had discussions with them on, and we said that we want to see more of that fish marketed in Barbados, and at a reasonable price; and we will be able to show that the last quarter of last year that the amount of poundage per month has gone up and has been sold somewhere in the vicinity of 60 or 75 cents a pound, depending on whether it is croaker, or whether it is trout, or whether it is shark or things of that kind.

So that we see that a situation can develop here where we will be able to produce more and more of that fish because it is there; but the question arises whether it is economic with the boats we have now – the other five boats – because it is more profitable to shrimp if you have licences in the good waters – if those five boats are the right type of boats or not. So that is being investigated.

The former Prime Minister, the member for St. John said that he did not understand the reference to Barbados National Fisheries Company. He did not understand it when he spoke on the second reading. Well this is it; because your International Seafoods Ltd., because of its bankrupt nature, and because of its past history, you will either liquidate it or get out the assets and put them in the new joint venture; but there is still a need for this off shore fishing and marketing because we must in this country take advantage of those reserves which are near to us physically in the Caribbean; and our people need that fish; and it is better for us to set up our own institutions to catch that fish than to buy fish from the Japanese which they catch as a by-product of their tuna operations.

We are also trying to encourage tuna boats – at least one or two – to come here and use here as a base, and teach our fishermen how to catch fish. After all, a lot of it is caught within 200 miles off the East Coast of Barbados.
5.20 p.m.

Those are our ideas and this is why we put it in the Estimates. That is why we will come on the floor and tell the public what the position is. You must never be afraid to tell the public what you are doing, if you believe that what you are doing is right. I do not even believe that the former Minister of Finance believed that he was right when he paid out the money. I do not believe it. He adopted it on a friendly approach. He was just like the hon. member over there who

dealt with cement. I will deal with him a little later on. I want to give the assurance, Sir, that on the question of the joint venture we have not changed anything. Far from changing anything, we want to intensify it.

On the question of the Mortgage Finance Company, there has never been a bitterer critic on the banking system in Barbados than I have been. I have been criticising the banks in Barbados and their lending policies for at least 15 years. I make no apology for criticising them because I believe that they do not lend on the terms and conditions which are in the best interest of the borrowers of Barbados. This Government has already made it clear to them, and has used its legislative powers to control some of their lending policies. We have only started with the truth-and-lending sections in the hire purchase orders. This is something that amazes me. It amazes me that such an important innovation could have taken place in this community and none of the financial journalists took it up. You talk about the restrictions on hire purchase, but there is a second Order which says that the banks can only charge interest upon a reducing basis, and effective savings have been introduced as a result of that Order. That is what the journalists must point out. They must analyse the financial activities of the Government for the benefit of the public so that other people can understand it, too. If you do not understand it, then you cannot deal with the bank.

The second position is, and I have been a bitter critic of this, that the terms of lending in Barbados of a 5-year or 7-year decrease is much too short. The Commercial Banks must lend for 20 and 25-year periods. They have to do it. They will have to do it under the Labour Party because that is the only way that you can get people to be able to own their houses. The Mortgage Finance Company, the National Insurance Funds, and the Savings Bank in Barbados must do something about this matter. The time has come when the Savings Bank in Barbados should be lending money on this basis. That is our attitude and that is the reason we have acquired all of the shares in this Institution.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I had only planned to spend a few minutes talking about the cement project and, indeed, I will start with that because I have a good deal of concern and I note that the Barbados Labour Party is putting a good deal of emphasis upon continuing projects that were begun by the Democratic Labour Party. Now, merely because these projects have begun is no reason why we must be under any particular restraint to continue them. I hear, when I think in terms of the cement project, a lot of arguments along the economic side as to how desirable it is that we carry on with the project that I hear will cost us something in the neighbourhood of $100 million in Barbados money. It ought to be clear to anybody, who is reasoned in his approach and who thinks in terms of the consequences that can accrue from going into projects of this magnitude, that there are some very serious ecological and environmental problems that will associate with a project of this sort.

Now, Cement Plants throughout the world are notorious for the environmental damage that they inflict. If one should go to Jamaica or Columbia, or any of the places where Cement Plants are currently in operation, one thing which would become immediately obvious is the serious encrusted layer that spreads out for two or three miles around the Plant. Barbados has put a good deal of money and emphasis on the development of tourism as one of the principal means of raising foreign capital for the carrying on of its projects, and I do not see how it is possible for us to regard that a developing tourist industry and a Cement Plant can be compatible projects.

When we think in terms of the location for the Plant and the area from which the clinker will be drawn, I think we ought to stop and wonder what are the consequences when huge bulldozers begin to gouge out large tonnage of mould and clay from down in the St. Andrew area of Barbados, an area which without any interruption or without any external impetus is able to slip and slide whenever a heavy rain comes. Morgan Lewis, if you were to pass down that way, is always in need of road repairs because of the constant moving of the soil, and yet we are contemplating picking up $50 million (US) in the name of manufacturing cement on some minor economic scale, a scale so miniscule – *(Asides.)* The Hon. Minister of Education has given me a word – so infinitesimal, that is my own word, as to be very marginal in any benefit that we can expect to derive from it. It is not a labour-intensive industry; it will only employ somewhere in the neighbourhood of 40 people, I am told. We have to think of the logistical movement of clinker from St. Andrew to St. Lucy; we have to think in terms of the sea damage in the immediate area of the Cement Plant itself.

Sir, if you will permit me to draw an example of what I am talking about, I can refer with some authority to the north-eastern coastline of the United States, stretching all the way from Caroni, New Jersey, down to Atlantic

City. That entire coastline at one time was very heavy in tourism. It was a tourist resort area, but because of some lack of foresight and planning, because of serious failures of projection that entire coastline now stands like wasteland. When you pass through Lindon, New Jersey, you have to put something over your nose because of the stench of the industrial chemical estates that proliferate on that entire area. Beaches where people used to travel miles to bathe are now desolate, stink, stagnant pools. In spite of this information, here we are willing in a small community like Barbados to undertake a project which gets its raw material from the very fabric of the country.

We are already intensively involved in quarrying activities. We have the Bagatelle Quarry, Rogers Quarry, Ellis Quarry, Kingsland, Grazettes and a host of other quarry projects that have left gapping holes in our landscape. Here we are getting ready, merely because the finance is available from the World Bank, to undertake a project that is bound to have serious and everlasting social consequences, which I am sure will not be in the best interest of Barbados. The social consequences far overweigh any economic advantage, in my mind, that should be expected to be derived from a project like this. I would caution the Government of which I am a part to spend money on a feasibility analysis not only along economic variables, but to spend money on a feasibility analysis taking seriously into consideration all of the attendant social consequences that will go along with the establishment of a Cement Plant in Barbados.
5.30 p.m.

Indeed when it comes to the House of Assembly I will have a lot more to say about it if it reaches that stage, and I am sure that if you take the necessary caution that is indicated in these circumstances, it would not get that far.

Turning to fishing, the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister has just made an eloquent plea for the development of the fishing industry in Barbados. I do not want to get involved in the International Seafoods scandal because he has already dealt with it at some length, and the only person incapable of understanding the serious, wicked misuse of the taxpayers' money in the circumstance of International Seafoods is the hon. member for St. Michael South West. I am sure that the hon. member for St. Michael South understands that it is a scandal, even though he might choose a more mellifluous or innocuous term to describe it by. Fishing on the other hand does not do any violence to the landscape. It does not destroy our ecological environment, but you get protein at a cheap cost to the people of Barbados. We have boats already; albeit they were bought at an enormous price because if we were to try at this stage to sell the shrimp boats we have down in the Harbour, I am confident that we could not expect to get $3 million for the whole lot because they are fibre glass hulls, they have holes in them, and they are no longer what would be regarded as current in the capital works for fishing. Therefore let us think in terms of developing International Seafoods industry by providing proper fishing fleets and let Barbados forget all of this nonsensical exercise that comes in the name of development, things like a cement plant, merely because the World Bank is chasing us down with money and begging us to spend it, and we have not sat down long enough to contemplate how best we can spend $100 million in the interest of the taxpayers of Barbados.

I do not want to get into social development, because that does not fall under this Head, but we need a lot of money being spent in the area of development along these lines, and I am never going to be able with a clear conscience to support any project introduced into this Assembly for a cement plant because I know and anybody who has gone as I have said to countries where cement plants exist will know that they are a menace, an eye-sore, a health hazard and a blight. The only instance where we can excuse the establishment of a cement plant is where we have huge land masses and we can site these plants far away from developed areas, but there is no place in Barbados that can qualify as being far removed from developments, and I do not care where you put a cement plant in Barbados, it is going to be in the wrong place. It is going to require its raw material from the wrong source. The Scotland district will cave in. Right now we are undertaking massive soil conservation measures down there through the Ministry of Agriculture because the land slips by itself constantly, and here we are spending money to stop soil from slipping and we are getting ready to spend $100 million to go and dig it down. That cannot make sense in my head, and I am sure it is not going to make sense in the final analysis in the heads of thinking people. So I would urge on all to weigh the social consequences heavily when we contemplate these things.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would like to know if the hon. member

is a member of the Barbados Labour Party or an independent member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON: I am a member of the Barbados Labour Party with an independent mind. One of the things I must teach the hon. member for St. Philip South is that unlike that lot that existed for fifteen years under the solid whip of the member for St. John, hon. members on this side are not afraid to criticise any action that comes before it because our Prime Minister is a big enough man to recognise that he is not capable of running Barbados alone. That is why the great combination was formed, so that we can all have our independent input. We can guide our Prime Minister in making sound judgments in the interest of Barbados, and he knows that he is a giant by anybody's standards, but he knows that he cannot carry it all alone and that is why he is over here and that is why we are going to do a far sight better than that lot did for the last fifteen years, because one man went mad for fifteen years and not a soul on that side had the courage to get up and tell him that is not a good thing to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time is up. You can come back again.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I am in the process of winding up what I have to say, but I am saying that my friend over there should have got up and said "Dipper, you cannot do these things; you cannot take up $12 million of the taxpayers' money and prop up Kipping Simpson and that crowd because it is not in the interest of Barbadians." Do you know what really irritates me? Whenever a serious mismanagement exercise is undertaken, he and others like him get up and talk about black people and poor people. They are always excusing their mischievous misdeeds by appealing to poor people. Poor people had nothing to do with the $12 million he has gone with, and I am sure not a person from St. Michael South West will get one farthing out of it. I see some of them out there and I do not think they got any of that money. Sir, the hon. member for St. Michael South West must realise that even if his mind thinks like that, that day has long since past when we must allow people to take advantage of an economically disadvantaged mass of people in the interest of a minority. I am going to stop and thank you for allowing me the thirteen minutes which you have done under this Head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You had sixteen.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a contribution to this particular Head, and indeed in listening to the hon. member for St. Michael West, I want to say that he is expressing the concern quite naturally of people who have some idea of the kind of ecological and environmental problems which can be caused by the developmental process which can be brought on a society. In listening to him I was reminded about a statement which was contained in a paper that was delivered by Arthur Browne who is a Governor of the Central Bank of Jamaica; it was delivered to the 1974 Duke of Edinburgh Study Conference in England and he was making this very point about the kind of problems and difficulties which developing countries face on this question of development.

5.40 p.m.

We are in the situation where the now developed countries are talking a lot and spending quite a bit of money on the ecology and on the environment, and at the same time we are in the situation where we have to provide for the developmental process, whether it is by way of providing raw materials, whether it is by way of providing the materials to go into construction or into any other developmental project in which we are involved and at the same time providing the much needed jobs. It is true that a cement plant is not a labour intensive plant, but when you recognise the kind of problems which can develop from a situation where a country is on the verge of pushing ahead with its developmental programme, and where construction as has been pointed out and recognised by the Prime Minister, and of course by the former Prime Minister, that the construction industry is the one industry which has the effect of really impelling the developmental process forward, where you are going to be faced with all these problems a decision has to be made. As I said, developing countries find themselves in this kind of situation; what do you do? You have rampant unemployment, in this particular instance you need cement, you need a whole set of factors which go to assist in the developmental process, so that a decision has to be made. As far as I am aware I have not heard the Prime Minister indicating that kind of concern. What I know, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure that you notice very well is that cement has been a big problem for us; well, Mr. Chairman, you deal with cement and you know this very well, because I notice from the papers recently that your

company has promised to bring in cement, and then a day or two before it was due to come in your company said it could not supply the cement, but that is just by the way, all I am saying is that this is a difficulty.

Having been faced with this difficulty, we have to make a decision, and if the bold decision is taken to set up a cement plant and recognising the kind of problems which can develop if it is not properly sited, and if it is not properly equipped, I have every reason to believe that what should be done, quite naturally, before we proceed with the plant is to examine some of the modern plants, and as I said, the question of dust emission would be the kind of problem which countries would have been experiencing, and they would have developed techniques to control as much as possible dust emission, and I would hope therefore that in this particular area some very close attention is paid to ensure that the kind of inconvenience which would normally be caused if proper attention is not paid to this kind of development that this would be done.

I do not think that anybody can gainsay the fact that within the context of Barbados and the Caribbean that there is room for a cement plant. You know that yourself very well, it is true as I say that it might cut out some of the trade but you might very well become the marketers for the cement overseas, but let me move on from cement into another area which has some relationship with cement, the area of housing.

We have seen here and we have heard the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Leader of this Chamber refer to the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company and the fact that the Government intends to acquire equity shares within that Corporation. It is accepted that the construction of houses and the house building programme for all purposes is very important. We recognise some of the difficulties which have been experienced in being able to attract the kind of financing that would have hoped into the area of housing, but the kind of housing problems that we have here are sufficient for us to pay considerable attention to housing and indeed the kind of housing that we are going to be providing for the people who need houses in this country. I notice that there is the question of the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company providing up to about 90% of the total value of a house and at the same time that the amount of mortgage money which is made available to people has been extended to $50,000, so that what in truth and in fact we have to be careful of is to ensure that we do not have a situation developing where we are going to be making mortgage finance available to people who would want to be constructing houses in the $50,000 or $60,000 bracket and we have to therefore ensure that the kind of housing we would be providing would be in the lower income bracket. I am not really talking in terms of low cost, because in the context of today's prices it is difficult to talk in terms of low cost housing, and housing at the same time which one could consider to be decent and acceptable, but I would hope that a lot of emphasis would be placed on providing housing at that particular level.

I would want to point out that there is almost an absolute need in this area, and I would hope that the Government would be able to ensure that with the additional funds which will be made available in housing, that particular attention would be directed in this particular area, the area where the need is greatest.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to get into this debate, but after listening to the hon. member for St. Michael South West and the hon. member for St. Lucy I am somewhat at a loss as to what they are trying to say. The two of them are like one at the east and one at the west, because the Hon. Prime Minister when he assumed office found a situation where the Mortgage Finance Company was lending a mere $32,000 – that was the maximum that the Mortgage Finance Company was lending – to potential home buyers. In other words, if a house cost more that $32,000 the potential home buyer would have to look for that extra money, and the situation was that under the Democratic Labour Party houses were built in the vicinity of $40,000, so in order for, what they are saying now, the average low income worker to obtain a house he would have to look for $8,000 if the house cost $40,000, and all of us know that to find $8,000 in Barbados is a very, very difficult thing to do, because we know the income earning capacity of the average Barbadian.

What has happened since this new Government took over was that the Prime Minister realised the seriousness and the plight of the potential home owners and he through his instrumentality has asked and directed the Mortgage Finance Company to make available a loan now of $50,000. We have a situation now where it is possible for the average man to live in a $55,000 house for the first time. This is

the situation, and we must compliment the Prime Minister. Some of them are not bold enough to say when he has done something good for all of us, and I must say now that it is foresight, and a man who understands the plight of people, who understands what is means to have a proper home and to make available a proper home for people, that the Prime Minister has come forward with this suggestion.
5.50 p.m.

Now the potential home owner will have to look for a mere $5,000 to have a home costing $55,000. In other words he would have to look for a mere 10 per cent and the Mortgage Finance Company would lend him $50,000. I cannot understand how you can have a member getting in here and saying that $40,000 is too much – suggesting that. What damn foolishness is that, when on the other hand one member is suggesting that the ceiling should be raised?

Mr. Chairman, these are the stark facts. We must examine it on the question of cement. Cement is not the only factor which determines the price of a house. There are other raw materials. What we must consider is that if we have a cement plant it is true that the price of construction would be dropped. That is not all. We must ask ourselves in what areas we can provide the raw material. As was suggested to me by a friend from the Philipines, bamboo is being used and we must consider having some of these materials used to help fortify or re-inforce the construction industry.

We are accustomed in Barbados using steel. We have got this idea, but most of us do not understand that in countries like India and Pakistan they have been using bamboo as a means of supplanting the steel. Mr. Chairman, we can think in other ways. Do not argue before this Honourable House that cement is the only factor which will help to reduce the cost of construction. No such argument can be valid. There are other factors; but you will find people trying to capitalise on a situation because there is a shortage of cement.

Cement has always posed a problem. We must find ways and means of cutting construction costs. Further to that we must think in terms of generating employment. We have got to understand that it is the Government's concern to have the construction industry going, so that more employment would be generated. That is the whole thing about the cement plant. I can only see the cement plant in the context that it would assist us in having ready the material which is so necessary and vital to the building industry so that we will be able to build more houses; generate employment more and more as time goes on.

I have heard other members talk about the building programme. It is true now that for the first time that people are becoming house conscious; and they will be able through the foresight of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to have available funds from the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company. What the hon. members from that side would not say is that the Caribbean Development Bank has made available some millions of dollars through the Barbados Development Bank to assist the Mortgage Finance Company with lending to potential home buyers; and during the tenure of office of the Democratic Labour Party they did not find it fit to exact this money from the Caribbean Development Bank; and they are quarreling because they did not find it fit to have the means available whereby they could get the money. The Caribbean Development Bank would like to lend money in order to channel it through to potential home buyers; but the advantage was not sought.

What we are saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we in this Government have been able to tell potential home buyers in Barbados that if they want to, they can have money available; but what is important is that the Mortgage Finance Company would have to put its house in order. The people of Barbados must understand that they would have to be prepared to draw this money.

The money is available. Ask them on that side if they ever told the people of Barbados that the Barbados Development Bank had money which could have gone towards helping potential home buyers. Nobody knew that. It was left to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to make that point abundantly clear to the people of this country; and we have got plans to make sure that people who want houses will have to look for less money – 10 per cent. A mere $5,000 will now be asked for in order to get a house in the vicinity of $55,000. Under the Barbados Labour Party that is now possible. Under the Democratic Labour Party you had to look for a minimum of some $8,000 in order to get a home.

They should not be coming here and trying to give the impression that we are trying to burden the people. That is the impression I got, by saying on one hand that $40,000 is too much, and on the other hand that people should be encouraged to get houses for over $50,000. On this particular item I must say that people ought

to be aware of the ability of the Hon. Prime Minister who understands the idea of house ownership. Who understands the plight of the people of Barbados and who understands that the people of Barbados need houses; and he is prepared to invent every possible avenue so that house ownership can become once and for all reality to lower income people of this country.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if the hon. member has ever read the book called "Animal Farm"; and I just want to pose a question for him; and it is a very simple question. I would like to know....

Mr. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. member would like to know if I have read "Animal Farm" I would say yes and lots more other books.

Dr. CADDLE: I would like to pose a very simple question. If there is a loan of $50,000 being available if the previous speaker would tell me what would be the monthly repayments or instalments on that over a 20 to 25 year period and relate that to the income bracket of the people who would be able to meet that type of repayments and tell me if that includes the lower income people that we all seem so concerned about.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, my friend the member for St. Michael South East has introduced the politics of the bamboo – the big bamboo into the subject of house construction; but I am not dealing with that now, nor am I going to deal with the question which the member for St. Michael West has been inviting me – he seems to think that I have some knowledge about persons going mad or something like that. One person in the last 15 years or something like that; and I would just like to let him know that I am not aware. I do not have the knowledge which he is certain that I have. I believe that in this country over the last 15 years more than one person suffered from mental disintegration, and I am not going to use any mellifluous phrase either; but I am certain that no one in this House to the best of my knowledge suffered, because I believe that it is a condition for disqualification.

To be serious, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if under Item 2 – there are some very heavy items here – equity contributions, some $12 million; and there are some very heavy projects here – cement project, flour mill project, Land Reclaimers Ltd., purchase of shares, International Seafoods Ltd., with payment of net indebtedness, Barbados Mortgage Finance Company Ltd., acquisition of equity shares.
6.00 p.m.

There are some new projects. The joint Barbados, Trinidad & Tobago Shrimping Company and the Barbados National Fisheries Company. In addition to that there are the other purchase of assets. Inasmuch as these are all very substantial projects, I am wondering if, in his reply, the Minister of Finance will tell us what is his estimate as to how the $12 million might be divided among those many projects. There are all very heavy projects, and this would give us some idea about timing and so on. I am interested in some type of breakdown because this must be available for purposes of the preparation of the Estimates.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I am sorry I cannot give the hon. member an accurate list. Unfortunately, the Permanent Secretary, Planning, to whom I was speaking to 15 minutes ago, for various reasons which I fully accept, is not able to be here at the moment and, therefore, I cannot read accurate figures from the file. The cement project is only a matter in the low hundreds of thousands because at this stage this is pre-feasibility studies.

As far as the Flour Mill is concerned, this would be an exact amount relating to the payment of equity. I really cannot carry all of these figures in my head. The Land Reclaimers is a very low account. International Seafoods would be about half – about $6 million. With regard to Barbados Mortgage Finance Company, it is impossible to say exactly what this is because we are only budgeting for $½ million on that. The project is only in the development stage. If I say, for example, in respect of Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation that we are anticipating paying $800,000, but we have put a case to the owners of the shares for 500,000, you will see it will cause embarrassment. If the hon. member wants an actual list he can be given a more detailed list, but I think that if I tell you that International Seafoods, the joint Barbados, Trinidad & Tobago Shrimping Company and Barbados National Fisheries Company, probably, speaking from the top of my head, will account for between $8 million and $9 million to $12 million, I think you have the sort of answer or indication that will give you an idea of the extent of the ball game.

The question that Head 109, as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Head 10(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation – in the sum of $924,403 – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, I beg to move the following amendment to Note 14:

"Delete the figure "169,00" and insert the figure "169,400."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to highlight the matters which fall under this Head. In the first place, I must say that in the Ministry of Agriculture there is a situation in which the Ministry is seriously understaffed particularly with technical officers for carrying out many of the projects which we have set out in our Manifesto. Under the old Administration there was a proposal put up by the Administrative staff for an increase of some 34 to 36 personnel. That has never been dealt with, and since taking up office we have again made a request for an increase in the number of staff in order to carry through a new policy in agriculture. Because of the serious financial constraints of the Government, we would not be able to get the total number of staff which we would like, but there is a possibility that some addition would be made.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the total vote on agriculture will be less than was voted before. Although large sums of money were voted for agriculture, on many occasions the money has not been spent. The main features under Direction and Policy Formulation, Mr. Chairman, lie in Grants to Institutions where you will see in Note 14 the Barbados National Standards Institution, which we are hoping will give us the spearhead into moving Barbados into the metric system in the first instance. Secondly, we are hoping that in the near future we will have a proper system of standards being marked bearing in mind the development of the clothing industry and all of these matters will bring more foreign exchange into Barbados from the point of view of export.

With regard to Note 13, you will observe that a token sum has been inserted. I believe it has been said before, and it is well known that the Annual Agricultural Exhibition took place at the Home Agricultural Station in January of this year. The Station will now revert to a place for the development of agriculture, and there is a search on for a new exhibition ground. A token sum has been reserved for that venture. As a matter of fact, we have identified a site already, and we are waiting for Cabinet's approval for negotiations to start. There is a sum of $20,000 for professional services in that respect. The Ministry has already started on a system of registration of farmers. We are hoping, probably, by the end of this year that we would have registered practically every farmer in Barbados. In this connection, we would like to move into the system of zoning.

Arising out of this we recently had discussions at the State Department in the United States and we have had preliminary documents. We started off a preliminary study into bringing a scheme of crop insurance to Barbados to cover all crops which are grown.
6.10 p.m.

The policy of the Ministry of Agriculture is that Barbados must now feed itself rather than depend on the heavy import of foodstuff which can be easily grown in Barbados. In November last year I said that I had placed an embargo on the importation of certain crops which could be grown in Barbados. I do not know if it is fate, but I am told that the southern part of the United States has had its first freeze in fifty years with the result that the price of tomatoes is in the vicinity of 98 cents U.S. in the United States; cucumbers are as much as 80 cents U.S. As a matter of fact, while having discussions last week in the United States it was drawn to my attention that the crop insurance fund has been so heavily hit as a result of the drought in the west and mid-west of the United States and the frost in the Southern United States that they are not taking on any more insurance from these counties and the price of foodstuff has risen to astronomical heights over the last three months, and will remain in that area for a very long time. That makes me feel assured that Barbados must now look at providing its own food supply and not depend on foreign countries to feed us when we can grow the necessary food, because whenever there is a price rise outside, it is reflected in the cost of living figure in Barbados.

In order to bring an insurance scheme into Barbados, it is necessary that we carry through with a zoning policy. That has already been started in the Ministry and we are hoping that probably by this time next year we will be able to tie a system of insurance of farmer crops to a contract system with the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and on that we are hoping to tie the financial institutions so that a farmer will now have easier access to money than he had before. If there are any major points under Direction and

Policy which the other side would like to raise, I would be glad to respond when the time comes.

I beg to move that the sum of $924,403 – Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of points I would like the hon. member to give further information on. Recently there have been some statements in relation to the direction and policy in relation to the Ministry of Agriculture coming from the Barbados Agricultural Society and the Pig Breeders Association, and I would like to know what is the policy of the Minister in relation to these two organisations if he so cares to expand further and in addition to that, I would also like to hear from the Minister how he is now using his technical staff, especially the Chief Agricultural Officer.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I should just like to tell the Hon. Minister that I had my first drink for the day just now.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we really do not have many questions over here, but we would hope that the Minister would respond to the question by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. We have seen some disquieting statements about – I do not know if you can put it as strongly as lack of cooperation, but there must be some small indication that there is not as great cooperation as the Barbados Agricultural Society would expect.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: How many hon. members on my left happen to be making speeches? Will you please continue, and I hope the other hon. members will be silent?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am certainly under your control. I know I am making a speech. I would hope the Minister could clarify the position for us. We all note the call he has made for persons to go into farming and to get the land back into agriculture. We have taken note of this and we hope that there is some response. The Barbados Agricultural Society, as I understand it, are trying to respond to that particular call, and I can disclose my interest here. I am a member of the Society, a very small member, and I am really hoping that the member would respond on this particular matter.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, in replying to the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who wants to know my policy in relation to the Barbados Agricultural Society and the Pig Industry, in October I called a meeting of the Barbados Agricultural Society and their Board in the Ministry. We held a meeting from 9 o'clock in the morning until 1.45 p.m. that day in which the policy of agriculture had been outlined to the Board of Directors. We told them exactly what was planned for the development of agriculture in this country, and there were no objections to the policy. Subsequent to that, I move now to the pig industry, we had another meeting dealing specifically with the pig section of the B.A.S. They had complained during my absence when I was in Mauritius of problems existing between the National Pig Farmers Association and the Barbados Canners and Packers referred to as BARPAC. When the meeting was held they brought a number of problems which they said they had experienced between themselves and BARPAC. BARPAC was also invited to the meeting. At the meeting it was pointed out that the pig farmers had gone into a venture and they had never told the Ministry of Agriculture what was happening. We outlined the policy to them and one of the points which was mentioned at that time when they complained about a glut of pigs on the market was that they would sell their pigs out so that we could make plans to take them off via the Barbados Marketing Corporation. We have never had a reply to that letter.

Subsequent to that there were many newspaper reports about non-cooperation. I do not know where the non-cooperation is because I have said to them on numerous occasions that we have an open door policy and if they have any problems to telephone or write a letter and they can come to see the Minister and his staff. They said they have problems with onions, pigs, etc. Incidentally we got a letter saying there was a problem in the marketing of onions. We telephoned them and held a meeting on the Monday and we put certain things into operation.

They also complained that they wrote the Ministry offering assistance in the 4-H Movement. We are looking at a re-organisation of the 4-H Movement and we know they are willing to help, and we are glad that they are willing to help because the 4-H movement is suffering from a lack of adult leadership. The Lions have also written saying they would help in reorganising or leading the 4-H movement; but everybody must understand that we have only been in office for six months, we are having meetings every day of a week. As a result of these meetings with various

sectors, I have not even been able to visit all the sections of the Ministry of Agriculture which I should view because I am tied down in the office having meetings with various people who write and ask to come in and have meetings.

When it comes to how we are using the Chief Agricultural Officer we are using him as he should be used. He is the senior technical officer in the Ministry and that is the position which he occupies, he is the chief technical adviser to the Minister and the Ministry. When I went to the Ministry I found a situation where I had to call three staff meetings in the course of a week and a half in December because I realised there was a rift between the staff. The junior officers said they could not get along with the senior officers, and the senior officers said the junior officers did not get on with them. I called a meeting and told them that I had been a practising lawyer for fourteen years; we have our rows in Court and we abuse each other in Court on a principle, but when we come outside we are still friends.
6.20 p.m.

I asked them in the interest of agriculture in Barbados to forget their petty differences, forget the Bajan attitude and let us get together and work in unity in order to raise the development of agriculture in Barbados. As I said, the senior staff has been told that in my view they should put themselves in a position that if any member of the junior staff is worried about anything he can call them 9 o'clock at night, or 10.00 or 11.00 o'clock at night, and say 'I have a problem here, how do I go about it? Can you help me solve it?' That is the situation I would like to see in the Ministry. I have told the Senior C.A.O. he is the senior man, he has a duty to do and I do not want to hear from him that junior officers do not get on with him or that he does not get on with them. I told him straight and plain it is the Ministry of Agriculture, it is working for the public of Barbados and there should be no petty differences or positional differences in the Ministry as far as I am concerned.

That is the situation, that is the way in which the Chief Agricultural Officer is being used.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to draw this to the attention of the Hon. Minister. It has been charged that the Minister is trying to destroy the Barbados Agricultural Society, saying that it more represents the plantation owners than other people; I do not think so, I am just letting him know what I have been hearing and I would just him to respond to that. It has also been stated in other places that one of the Directors of that Association is making it a habit of going in the Ministry of Agriculture and interfering with the staff, which leads to a lot of discontent and things of that nature, even cursing some of the staff at some times, and I would like to know if he is aware of that, if it is true, and what is his reaction to that kind of behaviour.

At the same time it has also been stated – and indirectly he has confirmed it – that there are a lot of differences between the staff and I am particularly concerned with what role really the Chief Agricultural Officer is performing. One gets the impression that he is idle, he is not being permitted to perform as he should be performing.

In relation to the pig breeders, their problem seems to be one of price, that the price which has been offered – I do not know if by the Minister – has not covered their costs, and if they have to accept that price then they will suffer a loss to sell their pigs at that price. I would now like to invite the Hon. Minister to respond to that.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Before the Hon. Minister responds, there are certain aspects, particularly of the last matter mentioned by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central in respect of pigs, that concerns both the Hon. Minister's Ministry and the Ministry which I hold. I think this is an opportunity for us to restate a few facts in connection with the pig industry which the public has been told in official releases but seem to have forgotten because of the propaganda machinery of the Barbados Agricultural Society.

It is a fact that during the regime of the last Government Barbados Packers and Canners was given industrial incentives to set up a pork processing plant in Barbados. It is also a fact that in the Ministry of Agriculture and in the Ministry of Industry attention was drawn to a report on the study of a processing plant in Barbados by Tropical Products Limited, which report said according to all the evidence it was an uneconomic industry having regard to the price of meat. Notwithstanding that, and I do not blame the previous Minister for granting the fiscal incentives, because Barbados Packers and Canners claimed that they have technical experts and they disagreed with the conclusions of the other technical experts, so no blame can be attributed to anyone for giving them fiscal incentives, but in my opinion what is wrong in Barbados with producers is that producers must understand that processing, because of the Barbados context, is something on which they must get in on the ground floor. They should never ever have allowed a pig processing plant to come into Barbados without themselves participating in the equity capital and having control of it.

As I have said before, and I said in the Senate when it came up, I warned them that if you studied agricultural processing in Barbados one of the reasons why the sugar industry has been able to survive is because of the fact that the growers of sugar cane were intimately connected and participated in the equity capital of the processing. We are a small market, and when you think of it, that the capital involved in setting up a plant has to earn a rate of return, the fight between the producer and the plant if they are separate is bound to be big. This is where a fundamental mistake was made; that plant was pushed to open for electoral purposes, I have no doubt about that at all in my mind. That plant, when it opened, never had the Public Health Certificate, it was unfinished and everything. We came and we found that, and what is worse, at no time was the Ministry of Agriculture involved in the price fixing of the price of pork for the producer, and the two sides decided that they were going to participate in a show for electoral purposes and they agreed to pay above $1.30 for the pork.

The truth of the matter is, if a comparative analysis is done in the Caribbean area of the processing plant in Guyana, the one in Jamaica, or anywhere else, you will see that there is no producer in the Caribbean area who can get $1.30. They have been at loggerheads with one another, it is the plant that has been at loggerheads with the producers. When the Government came into power I acted as Minister of Agriculture for a short time when the hon. member was away, and I called a meeting of all of them, I went through all the files, and an in-depth analysis of the economics of the situation was undertaken and as a result of that – of course, we have a lot of problems with the plant, and I want to say that they have corrected them, according to the Director of Medical Services – in February this year, mark the dates, the Ministry of Industry received a letter which was copied to everybody else from the Public Health Authorities saying that they had then cleared the plant. It is a most remarkable thing that our style of Government is that a plant can go into operation in a food industry without a Public Health Certificate. That is what has happened, well those days are past, because we have it here and we hope that from this experience no plant would be able to operate in the future without complying with all our public health laws.

One of the beneficial things is that we see the lacuna in the law and the Attorney General is bringing in power for the Ministry of Health to close down the plant until it produces the Public Health Certificate.

6.30 p.m.

Now, Sir, I do not understand where this war is coming from between the Barbados Agricultural Society and the Ministry. The position is that the Barbados Agricultural Society for some reason or another seems to have got into its head that somebody is attacking them because they only have 400 members. The truth of the matter is that there are over 12,000 farmers in Barbados.

They seem to think, or seem to have some kind of inferiority complex. They have published that they have 400 members. I congratulate them for having 400 members, because they have taken the long way to organise. They have even induced the hon. member for St. Michael South to join them.

Where I take issue with the journalists in this country is that analysing their statements they do not keep pointing out that they may not be an actual representative of the majority of farmers. I do not think that they can claim to be representative of the majority of farmers.

I believe that there can be established in Barbados a proper marketing system so that everybody who produces is known, and the volume of what he produces is known. That is the fundamental basis of marketing; and we have come and inherited a situation in which none of the essential base data from the establishment of the marketing system has been established. So, why are they worried about that?

Whether we like it or not, we have to accept the fact that the consumer in Barbados will only tolerate for a certain period of time a price higher than what they can get from abroad. There is only a certain margin there. They are prepared to pay a difference of 10 per cent or 12 per cent.

We have a responsibility not only to the producer, but to the consumer. We would like to see the pig industry viable; but what they must understand is that the days in which you had a gentleman farmer and hired employees at low income wages are over. If you are a farmer, you will have to chip in and do some of the work yourself. All of them do not seem to understand that, although some of them do seem to understand.

I myself have detected a weakness in the Ministry of Agriculture in that I do not believe that it has sufficient staff and sufficient expertise to do farming cost accounting so that they will know the full cost of production under conditions in Barbados.

We have had the problem of negotiating over prices for onions in Trinidad; and the statistics that we produce for Barbados' production of onions were faulty by every delegation. Indeed, the people from St. Kitts were able to demonstrate the inputs in their case; and the CARICOM commodities group had to give a schedule which shows that their onion cost were lower than Barbados'.

These are facts that we have to recognise. We have to be as competitive as possible, so that if you say that it costs x to produce, that does not mean that the Barbados consumer must necessarily pay that price. I agree that it is necessary in order to build up the industry that some element of protection has to be given to them; but there must be a limit to the protection. So I do not know what this fuss and round about is for.

I know that the Minister of Agriculture has been trying, in conjunction with his officials, to find a solution to this problem which we have and which is being accelerated. This is what should have been done before. I know that movements are taking place between the Ministry, the Packers and Canners and the Barbados Marketing Corporation in an attempt to produce a formula where we can get the industry going; but the fact that you fly off and say that the industry is going to destruction – I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to one thing.

Both the Ministry of Agriculture and the Pig Farmers Association have repeatedly called for the pig farmers to register. I have read in their own journal that only 80 pig farmers have registered. How can you plan an industry on that basis, when according to them, they need thousands of pigs in Barbados, and when the annual return shows that only 80 pig farmers are registered? Then they make this claim about the great destruction of the pig industry.

Where are these noises coming from? I have no doubt that there are a number of people – I happen to be one of those people who believe that the pig industry is one industry which we should try to keep; but I only hope that people, when they are trying to set out their position, should not try to use the Press in a manner to put blame upon people, when in truth and infact the blame lies at them themselves, with their production techniques, their lack of organisation and their command of the whole area.

When I was in the Senate I warned that I have never seen a processing industry in a small country like this which could survive without letting pig farmers have a part of the interest; and I well remember giving a lot of study to this many years ago. When you look at countries like Denmark and such other countries you will see that the processers and the producers are very inter-lock.

Therefore, these are points which I feel should be taken into consideration. Do not mind what is in the newspapers. If we had proper Farmer Journalists, they would analyse the situation and tell you what is the price that the Agricultural Marketing Corporation in Jamaica gives a producer. What is the price of feed. They will tell you what the Guyana Marketing Corporation gives to the producer, and what is the price of feed. They will tell you what the Trinidad Packers and Canners give and what is the price of feed, and then you will be able to see the competitiveness and the efficiency of our producers.

They feel that we are new in this game and they feel that they must now make noises to get more members. You know that when you do not have a majority, to make enough noise you try to get more members. The hon. member for St. Lucy will understand this technique but when you do not have a majority you make a lot of noise to make people say I had better join because something will come; but of course they are not in that position now. They have all the members they want.

Sometimes I excuse them on the ground that they have not got off the ground fully; but this Government has declared its policy on agriculture. The Minister has repeatedly reiterated that there has got to be some measure of control of the industry because we have to know who is producing, and what they are producing. You have to know who is using land to grow what crops, because we have a small amount of land and we want to get the best possible returns from the land; and there should not be this argument. They cannot remove us from office. I do not think that they feel so. So do not scream off in the newspapers. I only appeal to the newspapers to get somebody who understands about these things. That is what I would like to say, but steps are being taken.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Before the Minister replies, it seems that the problems in agriculture are very real problems, and I am certain that the Minister, now that he is seeing these problems, not from the Opposition bench but from the Government bench, will be able to bring an even more sober approach, hopefully, to their solution. I am very glad to see the Hon. Minister in that type of nocturnal dress. We do not usually see him in that type of dress. I am glad to see him looking like that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. The hon. member has always been accustomed to my sartorial elegance.

Mr. SANDIFORD: But, there does appear to be a need – let us say from the start that all of us recognise the importance of agriculture, the importance of food production; and in order to achieve efficiency in this regard, it is obvious that there is need for co-operation. I was not aware of these problems myself; but I am glad that my colleague, the member for St. Michael North Central, brought this to light – that there seems to be some problems within the administration; and the Minister himself has confirmed that there seem to be some internal differences.
6.40 p.m.

I am certain that if you have a Ministry with those types of problems that nobody is going to benefit from that and agriculture will suffer. I would just appeal to him, as I am certain that he is already set out on this, to use his well-known skills of diplomacy to sort these matters out and get everybody working together, first of all, inside of the Ministry. When he turns those skills outside of the Ministry to bodies like the Barbados Agricultural Society, whether it is 400 members they have or however many, they constitute an important sector of agriculture. I am certain that it is necessary for him to use those skills also in that direction.

There is just one final question. I am not being long on this. I would say two questions: one relates to some information which I saw in the Press recently, and it did indicate that there was some new development proposed for the Ministry of Agriculture in which the Ministry would be devoting its attention towards selling seedlings to the farmers rather than seeds. *(Asides.)* Thank you very much. The Minister can clarify this. It is not instead of but in addition to. The second question relates – I am certain this is a perennial one as well – to the role of the Agricultural Extension Officers. I am wondering, if the farmers have to go to the Agricultural Extension Officers or..... *(Asides.)* I am sorry, Sir. That can be dealt with under another Head, so I would not raise it.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Sir, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central spoke about a report of destroying the BAS. Here, again, there is a problem of newspaper reporting. Here, again, this is where people have read the newspapers, they have not sought to obtain correct information, and then they attribute the statements in the newspapers to somebody else. When we brought a Resolution to the House for the BMC, I was discussing in here the new system which I hope the BMC would follow in that we were looking for commodity marketing. As the Leader of the House has said, when I took up the Ministry of Agriculture I found it in a hopeless position. There was no record whatsoever. You cannot tell what the production quantities are in Barbados. You do not know what the consumption quantities are. You do not know whether there is any access; therefore, the Leader of the Opposition shouted: "Are you canvassing for the BAS?" It was during the debate for the $750,000 for the B.M.C. I said that I was not canvassing for the BAS, all I was saying is that there should come a time about July when the BMC should be buying from commodity groups, and if the BAS represented one sort of people I did not care whom the others belonged to as long as they formed themselves into some sort of an association. The newspapers reported something different and, apparently, this has been bugging the mind of somebody that we want to separate the BAS into plantations and so on. That was never said in here. If you check the Hansard you will find that was never said. It was a case of faulty reporting, but nobody at the BAS or otherwise sought to get a copy of the Hansard to see exactly what was said.

Now, with regard to the question of the Director of the BAS interfering with the Ministry's staff, as far as I know, there is a Board of Directors of the BAS. The staff has never complained to the Minister about interference or somebody causing trouble among the staff. As I have said, I would never stand for that. I do not know if there is any rift between staff members and the BAS. I do not see why it should be because the staff members are controlled, as far as I know, by the Permanent Secretary and not even by the Minister. I believe they should file a complaint with the Permanent Secretary, if what the member alleges is so. I do not know about that.

The hon. member asked whether the price offered for pigs was an economical price. Let us look at the whole pig situation. I came back from Mauritius and I saw numerous articles in the newspaper complaining about the Pork Processing Plant not taking pigs, and there was a glut on the market, etc. At that time nobody had phoned the Ministry, or written to the Ministry, or asked to speak to the Minister. While the reports were appearing in the newspaper, the Minister of Agriculture from Guyana came through the entire Caribbean, including Barbados, offering whole carcasses of pork to the Packing Company or anybody in Barbados at what was approximately 90 cents(Barbados) a pound. The price that was offered came at a time when the Plant had not taken any pigs for several months. All the time we, in the Ministry, were holding discussions with the Plant, with the Ministry of External Trade and so on trying to find a solution. We had a meeting with the BAS asking them to put forward a price as to what they would sell pork at. We asked them to register and tell us how many pigs were out there on hoof. They told us that their members would not even register and asked us to do the registration. We then put a notice in the newspapers extending over December and January, and I believe fewer than 60 people registered with the Ministry.

I then held a meeting with the Leader of the House, and I said that we must find some sort of a solution to break this deadlock. The Plant said they were not buying until they got a total embargo on all pork products coming into Barbados. The pig producers then said that we must ban all pork products coming into Barbados. The Plant then put a letter in the newspaper saying that if we banned all pork products the Plant would be embarrassed. That is the situation in which we found ourselves. The pork producers were saying that we should ban all pork products. A gentleman at the Plant rang me and said that he must have a complete market, and then the Plant wrote a letter in the Press saying that if we banned all pork products they would be embarrassed.

Now, I held a meeting with the Leader of the House and we came up with a formula. The formula was to remove the so-called excess pork off the market. They would not tell you that their members who were complaining to the Press were selling pigs to the BMC at $1 a pound. The Pork Plant telephoned the Ministry and said: "We will start buying on Monday at $1 a pound on hoof." I asked the Ministry to phone the plant and say: "No. I am calling an Emergency Meeting for Monday morning. Do not offer $1 a pound." I imposed the figures of $1.10 to $1.20 – more than what they got from the BMC and more than what the Plant intended to offer them.
6.50 p.m.

Since I have put out the figure, we have now got something like 2,000 registrations in the Ministry alone. Now up to this day the plant has not yet accepted the ten point programme I put up. I have been running in and out of the House up to yesterday with the member who is responsible for the B.M.C. trying to bring together a formula in order to get the situation solved. We are still trying to get the plant to accept certain conditions because they cannot buy the pigs, they have no money to buy, and the solution was put forward to use the money of the taxpayers of Barbados to save the whole situation, the plant and the pig producers. The B.M.C. is supposed to use the taxpayers' money to rescue both the plant and the pig farmers; so I don't understand what they are talking about.

Now when you talk about internal differences, as I said before, I believe the Leader of the Opposition raised it in here last year that there were differences existing between the staff and the Chief Agricultural Officer. I went in and I called all the staff together and I told them I did not want any differences; we can have our quarrels, we can have our discussions, but let them be basically on principle, come to a compromise and let the Ministry function. As far as I can see there seems to be now a harmonious relationship existing between the staff. I will do everything possible to get the staff together because I believe it is for the benefit of the country.

The hon. member raised the question of seedlings. We are not going to sell the seedlings and not seeds. When you begin to look at agriculture in Barbados, you will realise that there are numerous small farmers who grow a bed of cabbages, a bed of beet or a bed of tomatoes, a bed of lettuce or something of this nature, but the smallest quantity you can buy is an eighth of an ounce of seeds. You otherwise have to be one of those top notch gardeners who sow just so many seeds, put the balance in a container, put some ants powder with it, cork it down and keep it safe for the next sowing. What we are doing is what is done in other places, like the United States or in Trinidad. You provide a service where you propagate your seedlings and the small farmer who only wants to plant thirty heads of cabbages or sixty tomato plants can buy them from you and put them in. In that way the small

farmer gains four weeks if we propagate the seeds in the Ministry, he has not got to propagate them outside. It is a question of between July and September when our temperature sometimes goes to the nineties, when germination is difficult outside unless you take special precautions, and therefore if we provide a seedling service we believe we can push forward the production date. We should no longer have to import tomatoes in December because if we can raise seedlings in a controlled environment in the Ministry and put out the plant about six inches high about October, they should set fruit in early December and we should not get back to the position of importing tomatoes from Canada when Christmas comes.

I will deal with the Extension Officers if the hon. member wants that now. We have Agricultural Extensions under another Head when I will explain the situation. There is one other point I would like to make on the question of onions. You will realise what the Leader of the House has said. Despite the fact that Barbados' rate of production for onions is higher than Caricom, we are undertaking to do the entire marketing of onions. We found a situation where the old administration of the B.M.C. was telling the Ministry's staff how to dry onions with the result that the taxpayers were saddled with $109,000 in losses over two years because the onions were not properly dried. The B.M.C. as the marketing agent was telling the Ministry that they wanted them dried in bags, so the outer core was dried and the inner core was still wet, so we had $109,000 in losses and spoilage. What we have done is to bring in new rules to save the loss and try and control the production of onions to get the cost down. That is exactly what we are doing.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, having listened to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, I am sorry the Prime Minister is not here, but the only thing I can gather from what he is saying is that a shuffle is indicated, and if he does not move the hon. member from agriculture early, we will not grow a thing in this country.

The question that the sum of $924,403 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (1) Direction and Policy Formulation, – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, it is now 7 o'clock and I ask that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 7.45 p.m.

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

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

On Resumption:–

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply; to that it now reverts.

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

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HEAD 10(2) – AGRICULTURAL FARMS AND STATIONS

Head 10(2) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Agricultural Farms and Stations – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, Head 10(2) deals with the Agricultural Farms and Stations. The policy of the Ministry is to bring the particular stations back into operation so that they can be functional in respect of the development of agriculture, if we want to really see a vigorous agricultural policy. Under the last Government most of the stations were allowed to run down and nothing much was happening to them. For instance, at the Home Agricultural Station they had pigs mixed up with cows, it was an exhibition site, there were buffaloes and there was really nothing that one could say was an example of what a small farmer could do.

The new concept is to make the station specialise in some sort of development. One of the problems I have found is that at the Home Agricultural Station where they were breeding pigs the officer mentioned that there had been

several reports of deformed piglets being born, which has been attributed to.....*(Asides)*.... deformed piglets. At Groves Agricultural Station you have rabbits where it has now been discovered that the wrong type of rabbits were being reared there. They put in show rabbits rather than commercial rabbits. At Jerusalem I believe nothing much was being done.

Under the Capital Estimates you will notice that a sum has been put in in order to revitalise the Stations, and we are hoping to do some sort of specialist work at each Station which will become a demonstration unit for various farming organisations or farmers living in a particular area.

Those are the highlights of this Head. Here again, if there is anything else members want to know I shall be glad to explain.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to the Hon. Minister for giving me the opportunity to ask a few questions at this particular time and to express the grievance of the peasants in this island.

On numerous occasions the small farmers – and especially, I am not ashamed to say, in the parish of St. Philip – have been complaining about the cultivation of their lands. It does seem that there is not a large number of tractors, or that some of them may be out of order or under repairs, but I feel that it is the duty of the Government, and especially the Ministry of Agriculture, to do everything possible to assist these small farmers. It is a waste of time, in many cases, for small farmers to register their names at these various Stations, and in many cases four, five or six months pass and they get no information concerning the matter, when it is known that they have to pay the money in advance.

Now the position is this, gentlemen, that if you have a piece of land there is a certain time when you have to cultivate it, and if you do not cultivate it at that particular time, instead of the land being an asset to you it becomes a liability. You have to deal with certain periods, especially when you are planning for the rainy season, and therefore I would like to know what plans the Minister has to improve this system which I feel should be reorganised in such a way as to expedite matters for the peasants to have their lands cultivated.

I must say, Sir, that it is known that we are placing special emphasis on agriculture, and it has my whole-hearted co-operation, because it is my information that the land must be cultivated if we are to feed to a certain extent the inhabitants of this country, and therefore if you were to ask me at this particular time which Ministry I consider has top priority I would be tempted to say it is the Ministry of Agriculture. It is the linchpin of other Ministries, and if the Ministry of Agriculture fails all the other Ministries will fail, because we depend on the sugar crop which is still our major or chief industry, and therefore we have to be very careful, we have to do everything possible to encourage the peasants or the small farmers – I have been told not to use the word "peasants" but to use "small farmers" instead – but I do not think the title of the Bank has been changed, because if you want to get a loan I think the Bank still carries that title, and I would like to know from the Minister how many ploughs he has available for the cultivation of the small farmers' land. While it is true that I notice that he intends to purchase four new ones, I also want to know from him what is the number.

7.55 p.m.

I also want to know from him what is the number and where these new ones will be stationed. I am not being parochial in my outlook, but as you know, St. Philip is the largest parish in this island. Therefore I can only hope that the Minister has taken the points that I have made into consideration and that he will do his utmost to alleviate the hardships – and when I say hardships I mean hardships – that these small farmers suffer. I notice that he also has a small amount for an engineering workshop – a token vote. He has given me the privilege to say a few words. It is a privilege because I am not speaking under the particular Head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was under the impression that you were.

Mr. WEEKES: Anyhow, Sir, it deals with Agriculture, and the Minister has told me in camera that he has prepared to answer all the questions that I have. Having got that permission from him, I am seeking your approval also.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not concern itself with that.

Mr. WEEKES: There are a few points I want to make about the engineering workshop. I am saying from experience and having worked with the Ministry of Communications and Works for over five years, that we have one of the best workshops in this island at the Ministry of Communications and Works; and it is my opinion that that workshop should be reorganised in such a way that it would be in a position to do all the

work for the various departments; and I can only implore the Minister of Communications and Works and the Minister of Agriculture to discuss all aspects of the matter and try to find out what can be done by the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Now that we are talking about appointing all of these Commissions I feel that it is time that you appoint a Committee or a Commission, whatever you like to call it, to deal with all aspects of that workshop. I am referring again to the workshop of the Ministry of Communications and Works which, I repeat, is one of the best in Barbados; and it is not being used as it should be for the benefit of the other departments. Therefore, although you have a token amount, I will say to the Minister of Communications and Works that this is one department in which he could bring a lot of improvement by making that workshop more efficient.

It would be able to repair all kinds of vehicles, various equipment etc. But I repeat that it calls for a full investigation and for a Committee to be appointed to make recommendations to the Minister or to the Government for the improvement of that workshop.

Now, there is another point which I feel that the Minister should give some information on. I want him to explain what are the plans for setting up a revolving fund for the purchase and export of Black Belly sheep. I am asking the Minister to be kind enough to let us know his plans for that scheme.

I would also like him to give some information in the in shore fisheries research, and any other information that he can give which members of this House would want to know about.
8.05 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that members of the Government have recognised the points made by the member for St. Philip North. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! It happens all the time.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we are now after dinner and I did in fact mean to refer to the member for St. Philip although he has not yet spoken, and I expect that he would speak. I was about to say that the representatives of St. Philip do have an interest in agriculture, both North and South, and it does behove the Minister to pay special attention to what my colleague, the member for St. Philip South – I have it right now – has said. He is, I believe, now sitting in this Chamber, the oldest member and the longest sitting in Parliament, and out there we have one of the youngest also, the member for St. Philip North. He is young and progressive and forward-looking. I would hope that the Minister would pay especial attention to the words of the member for St. Philip South when he said that the Ministry of Agriculture, at this juncture, is perhaps one of the most important in the whole area of Government, and if that fails then the Government fails. These are very important words because from this side and throughout the country we will be looking, not for talk and not for explanations, but we will be looking for results and production. That is the challenge that that Minister faces. He was very expansive, very theoretical, and I would say that he gave the impression and we do have a feeling that he knows quite a deal about agriculture. We will give him that, but now the test is not talking from the Opposition benches.

Mr. Chairman, I can indulge in the luxury of that now, but you are in the seat now of making decisions and we want to see those results. If the farms and Agricultural Stations have been run down, as you say, by the previous Government, we want to see you running them back up. *(Asides.)* I know that you will be the first to use the bull pistol on him if he does not produce. I know that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross-talking, please. Carry on.

Mr. SANDIFORD: It seems to me that you have lost the first battle. In spite of all the talk that you say that in previous years more money was appropriated than was actually used, I note that the Ministry.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I would rather the hon. member say the first round and not battle. The battle is not yet over; let him say the first round.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you accept the correction?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I do now know why from over there they want to instruct me in the use of words. I am talking about a battle, and a were consists of many battles. I am talking about a battle and not the war. *(Asides.)* If you want to use "round", I know you are familiar with that terminology. You like rounds. I believe you were a pugilist in your own day – two minutes. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get back to agriculture. This problem that was raised by the member for St. Philip South is a very important one. The question of the ability and the capacity of the Government to meet the requests and demands for farmers in this country, small and medium, to have their land cultivated. Whatever great or grandiose plans may be developed, unless that land is cultivated the other areas of agriculture: the growth, the planting or the reaping for that matter cannot take place in as efficient a scale as possible. I am certain the Minister is aware of all of this and I am preaching to the converted. I know he has deep knowledge, but what I would like him to ensure is that, in fact, when the persons who are interested go and put down their names for that cultivation scheme that they can get the land cultivated within a reasonably short time. It is a problem and we are not generating any heat over this. We are just drawing it to his attention, and I wish to underline it because there are many problems in agriculture and this is one of them. In his attempt to run back up the Stations, I do hope that he would pay especial attention to this one.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the position is that the Stations will all be brought back into operation during the current year. We have put money in the Estimates to bring them back up. Although the Items mentioned by the hon. member for St. Philip South do not fall under this Head, I will answer them. There are some 21 tractors available to the Ministry under the Cultivation Scheme, and they are spread out over the number of Stations. If he wants the numbers, there are Jerusalem 2; Bullens 3; Sayes Court 3; the Home 1; Groves 4, and the others are scattered around. The position is that.....

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister explain why the Home Agricultural Station has only one?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: If you look in the Capital Estimates you will note a sum has been put in to purchase more tractors. I found a situation in which there were more applications than the Ministry could have serviced last year. The Ministry has also suffered by the fact that under the last Administration – I believe it is because of this system of Central Purchasing – you have about four or five different brands of tractors knocking around the Ministry of Agriculture. You have four or five different brands of implements and so on. I have already given instructions, and we have got the list completed. We are going around and we are selling out, in the first instance, implements which have been boarded and lying around the Ministry for the last 15 years. We are going to dispose of all of them based on what the Ministry of Finance says and what method should be used. I am trying to standardise the equipment. For instance, I am told that at Graeme Hall there are four tractors lying down each needing one part because they are four different makes. I have already told Cabinet that I want to standardise the total equipment in the Ministry. We will divide it properly between two sets of tractors so that if one tractor has broken down today and a second breaks down the next day, instead of having two tractors lying down we can cannibalise one get one tractor on the road leaving one lying down.

8.15 p.m.

I have also called a meeting of the Sugar Producers and the Barbados Sugar Factories Ltd. early in January and asked them to assist the small farmers in getting off their cane crops and also getting their land cultivated, because the Ministry cannot handle the total volume of cultivation which farmers would like the Ministry to do. One of the reasons is that the Ministry's charge is lower than what private enterprise is charging. We are looking now at some method of bridging the gap between what you pay the Ministry and what you pay to private enterprise to do your cultivation. I am hoping that with the Ministry's tractors working and the plantations who have got the necessary equipment in the area helping, we will be able to assist the small farmers in getting their lands cultivated in time for the planting season.

On the question of the agricultural work shop, we have found that when a piece of equipment from the Ministry went to M.C.W., there was a record that it stayed as long as four weeks before it could be repaired. This is the reason why the Ministry has set up its own workshop.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Did the Minister say four weeks or four months?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: We have had longer than four weeks. In starting the workshop at Graeme Hall the Ministry's engineering section has been able to put the tractors back on the road within a day or less, and that is how we are going now. If you look at a list which I can show the hon. member for St. Philip South or the hon. members on that side, you will see the number of tractors broken down and the problems with them. For instance, in regard to ploughs, here again you had a system in which the technical officers in the Ministry of Agriculture would write out specifications for certain equipment; it went to Central Purchasing and then Central Purchasing would order something which was not in keeping with the specifications sent by the Ministry of Agriculture. We have a case now in which the Ministry ordered five ploughs. Now that the ploughs have arrived they are something completely different from what was ordered; so when the cultivation period comes around and you hear of a shortage of equipment, it is not that the Ministry has not taken the appropriate steps to get what equipment it wants, it is that Central Purchasing or somebody has ordered equipment other than that ordered by the technical officers in the Ministry.

On the question of the black belly sheep, we have been having numerous applications from persons in and outside the Caricom area for these. We have set up a system where we have three officers in the Ministry regulating the export of black belly sheep. We have said that if the B.A.S. or anybody gets an order for black belly sheep that they should communicate with the Ministry and we will communicate with the buyer, we will put an advertisement in the newspaper informing the public at large that the Ministry will be buying sheep, we will look after the export for specific reason. Under the last Government there were serious allegations of persons who never kept sheep going around the country and buying sheep at $40 and $50 and exporting them at $300. We have got 12,000 landless farmers in Barbados, and some of them have got just as good black belly sheep as anybody keeping a herd. The Minister of External Affairs will tell you that his son kept black belly sheep. Somebody went to his son and said he wanted to buy a ram to keep in Barbados. His son sold the ram for I think $80, and within a week that ram was exported for $300, and the man had no shame and went back to buy the second ram to be exported. In these circumstances we heard complaints around the country of small farmers who realised that they had sold their sheep at $40 and $50 and they were then exported for $300, and I could not put the system otherwise than letting the public know that the Ministry is buying sheep, the Ministry's officers would go around, choose from everybody who had sheep for sale, because we did not want to buy all the sheep from one farmer and leave the other farmer up the road with his sheep, and then he complains that he cannot get in the export market. We are trying to spread the export over everybody. The Ministry cannot only look after a selected group; it has got to look after everybody who wants to get into farming, and we have to treat them equally and give equity to everybody whether with sheep, pigs, goats, cows or whatever. This is the system we are working. We have based the revolving fund we have put in on the export of 100 sheep. We need the cash flow and we can go out and buy 100 sheep and export them and then the money will come back in. The system we are working is that the purchaser will deposit his money into the Treasury, and when we know the money has come to Barbados, we will then make the necessary arrangements for the shipment of the sheep, and the buyer will be responsible for the freight etc. That is what we are doing when it comes to exporting sheep.

On in-shore fishing research, the Ministry is also responsible for fisheries. We do not have a qualified marine biologist in the Ministry. When we go to fisheries meetings and meet the Trinidad delegation, they have got a marine biologist; the Guyana and Jamaica delegations have a marine biologist. As I said before, the Ministry needs a lot of competent technical staff; we have not got it. We are hoping to retain the services of a gentleman who is a marine biologist and living in Barbados. We are hoping to bring him in on a consultative basis because I believe he is too old to be brought into the Service at this time and we are hoping to do a research programme. We have already set up an arrangement for the training vessel from Trinidad to come to Barbados during this year, and we are hoping to carry out three trials with the local fishermen to see what fish and how many fish there is east of Barbados. All the reports I can find in the Ministry deal with fisheries research south of Barbados, down through the Caribbean and off the banks of Guyana. There is nothing on the east and north-east of Barbados.

In Trinidad there are large catches of white fish and we are not doing that here. You will notice that there is a token sum. We are also looking at a larger type of fishing vessel. We have had discussions with Mr. Ralston from the Training Institute in Trinidad; he has brought plans and we are going to investigate the viability of the larger boat to see how it will function in the fishing complex.

Later this year we will build the Oistin complex and we are looking to run that on a cooperative basis, and we are also studying the effects of the small fishing boat in relation to the larger boat. We did not put a specific sum in the Estimates because, as I said, we have no technical officer in Barbados who can tell us exactly what type of boat we need and what size. We are in search for technical officers and when we have those and we have settled the size boat, then we will come back to Parliament for a specific amount.

When it comes to the farm school, I have found a situation in the Ministry where the other Minister or somebody who was responsible was asking for $1.2 million to set up the farm school. In our present situation we could not afford $1.2 million. I have had discussions with Dr. Erickson from New York State University, Farmingdale. He came down to Barbados in December.
8.25 p.m.

I have had discussions with Dr. Erickson from New York State University, Farmingdale, he came down to Barbados in December and we have discussed the whole training of Extension Officers in Barbados. I had a communication from him only this morning and I am hoping to have further discussions with him later next month. Here I will say I think the member for St. Michael North Central asked a question about Extension Officers; this is another problem.

You have six officers on the Stations and six Extension Officers to service something like 20,000 farmers in Barbados. It cannot be done. We are looking to bring Dr. Erickson in, and he is now in the United States looking at other universities hoping to get other qualified personnel to come to Barbados some time between June and July this year to set up a training programme, and we are hoping to increase the number of Extension Officers, and I am hoping for a figure between 18 and 20 Officers.

We are also hoping, and I have already said that I will invite the B.A.S. to send members into the training course which we have set up for Extension Officers, because I believe if the various plantations or large farmers have persons who are trained it will relieve the pressure on the Ministry of Agriculture, so that is the plan. We are not at this moment setting up a farm school, we hope to use Codrington as a training centre until we have better plans for a farm school.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are the questions which have been asked. I respect the member for St. Michael North Central for saying that the Ministry of Agriculture is an important Ministry. We have often said that agriculture should play an important part in the development of Barbados. When we have the number of officers available we certainly will do everything possible, all we need now is money.

Coming back to the cultivation scheme, we have already worked out that for the Ministry to do all the cultivation required of it we would need a revolving fund of some $3 million which would not only do cultivation but would make appropriate loans to small farmers. We are looking at this scheme, as I said earlier we are looking at crop insurance, because we want to tie the cultivation, the seedlings and the contracts to a proper insurance and have a revolving fund just as large as the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank whereby the small farmers can have easy access to money. Under the last Government there was the system of the farmer taking out insurance on his own life. We believe that the farmer should take an insurance policy on his crops therefore if there is a failure in the crops the insurance would pay for them and therefore it is easier for him to get that insurance than he can get insurance on his life for small farming. I have said that we should place greater emphasis on loans from the A.C.B. for cultivation purposes than for completion of purchase price, because we have a situation where many people have applied for loans for completion of purchase price when in truth and in fact they were not genuine agricultural projects, and we should place the emphasis on cultivation in order to get cultivation moving.

The question that the sum of $168,078 under Head 10(2) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Agricultural Farms and Stations stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until noon tomorrow.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

On Resumption:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: Last evening when the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, before the new Head is called, if the House would just give me leave, a question was asked yesterday by the hon. member for St. Michael South on the break down of Head 109, Item 2. I have got the information for him. I gave an approximate figure yesterday and I wonder, if there is no objection, if I could just indicate what they are. I also have a copy of the actual break down which I can give to him. Of the $12 million, the cement project is estimated at $1 million; the flour mill $1.6 million; Barbados Mortgage Finance Co., a little more than $½ million; Land Reclaimers Ltd. $1,000; International Seafoods Ltd. and the Joint Barbados-Trinidad and Tobago Shrimping Company, these are really associated with each other, the first is $3.4 million and the second $4.4 million; the National Fisheries Co. $1 million.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that it is not normal to give break downs like these, but we are trying with open Government. This same item last year no break down was given and that is why it was possible for the North Point and the Heywoods Project to absorb more than $1½ million out of this same vote. I am giving this break down in the hope that hon. members will appreciate that I mean what I say when I indicate there is not going to be any misuse of the vote as in my opinion there has been in years gone by. If such a break down perhaps had been given in the past, it would not have been possible for the North Point to have been bought without Parliamentary knowledge.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I thank the House for its forbearance in this matter.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I would like to express my appreciation to the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance for giving the information, and to thank him for the trouble he went to in order to get it. My memory is a bit short on this, but I myself do not recall that the information was asked for last year and perhaps it would have been given if it had been requested.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I should just like to point out that surely since there was no way of knowing in 1975–76 that the North Point was going to be bought, I do not know how it would have been possible to give the information at that stage. The reason why we did not do it last year is because as far as I remember we did not reach the Head.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I think the Prime Minister would know that any Government has a right to buy ten or forty North Points; that is a governmental decision and the people will deal with you. There is no magic about it. If we give you a break down and the Government as a Government finds that it wants to buy the Public Buildings, that is the Government's right. Don't you understand what Government is all about?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Just a little more cross talk. I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition added "and the people will deal with you."

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (3) AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (3) Agricultural Extension – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, under Agricultural Extension I believe the only matter which I think needs a bit of explanation is Item 8 for the sum of $240,000. This includes a grant for Gibbons' Co-operative which we hope will get going this year. Apparently they are having some difficulties. We have already written to them asking them to speed up their operations.

I beg to move that the sum of $987,061 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (3) Agricultural Extension – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he could shed some light on the present position with 4-H

Clubs and in what way they would help him implement his policy as enunciated some time ago.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The position with 4-H Clubs is that, looking at the whole set up you will find that the leader of the 4-H Clubs are all the same age as the members themselves. The projects, although designed to uplift the persons who belong to the club, are in such a way that everybody joins in producing a project. We are hoping to change the system and have real leadership where we have adult persons who have had experience in particular fields to come in as leaders of co-operatives. We are looking at the various sectors of agriculture and handicraft and the new emphasis will be that members of 4-H Clubs will get individual prizes for what they have done reather than a club prize because in that way you find certain members of the 4-H Club can sit back and do nothing and yet the club can be credited with any prizes awarded, but if you give individual prizes then I believe you will stimulate that competition between members that everybody will get involved. We have already had one such exhibition in the Belleplaine area which incorporated Belleplaine with St. Andrew and St. Joseph, and there is already a change where two persons have worked on individual projects and this is how the prizes were awarded, and I am told there is already a new interest in this sort of competition.

The question that the sum of $987,061 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (3) Agricultural Extension – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (4) AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (4) Agricultural Research – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,220,698 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (4) Agricultural Research – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (5) MARKETS

Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (5) Markets – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $330,662 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (5) Markets – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister is willing to tell this House what plans he has for the Six Cross Roads Market.
12.10 p.m.

As a matter of fact, the Six Cross Roads Market is in the constituency which I have the honour to represent and consequently you will expect me to display special interest. I am aware that the hon. member for St. Philip North has made certain suggestions to this Hon. House, but I still deem it my duty as the representative of the constituency to hear from you if you have any plan for that market at Six Roads.

Dr. CADDLE: While we are on the subject of markets, I would like to draw to the attention of the present Minister that some time ago a request was made by people who sell at Tweedside Road to the former Government for the erection of a market in that area, and some consideration was being given to it by the previous Minister of Agriculture. I would like to invite the present Minister to give us some idea if he is aware of these proposals, how far they have got and what is his general view about the need for a market in Tweedside Road.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister in charge of markets that since the road connecting Bridgetown with the Port has been built, what was formerly the back of the Cheapside Market has kind of become the front, and in truth and in fact it gives a very bad impression for a place marketing food, and I would like to suggest to the Minister that he and the Minister of Communications and Works could go into a discussion about modernising the frontage which faces the fish market, and also the surrounding roads. I understand that there are plans for that area, but I can hardly visualise any plan for

building on the lots of land facing the fish market and between the agricultural market.

I would therefore suggest that when you are laying out that a proper car park be made there, not necessarily just for people who come down and leave their cars, but for vendors who sell from their vehicles. Right now it is a bit of a mess in that entire area and it really could do with some reconstruction.

I would also draw to the Minister's attention that the conditions at the Fairchild Street Market are not proper. The roof is leaking in many places and it could be classified sometimes as being insanitary.

Another point is that it is very unfortunate that the former Barbados Labour Party Government who had the best marketing policies that have ever been produced for Barbados' agriculture and fisheries did not see fit to give the markets proper names. The Democratic Labour Party Government came in and they had a beautiful name, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, which sounds beautiful and throws away more money than any other Department of Government, but the Barbados Labour Party Government introduced two markets, the Fairchild Street Market and the Cheapside Market. I would also suggest to the Minister that proper names be given to these two markets, and as I said, a complete replanning of the area is needed.

The Eagle Hall Market needs a parking area. You will see that an industry has come up there, U.S. Industries, and in between that and the Eagle Hall Market there are some small houses on which I believe is known as Hanschell Land. This land should be purchased and made into a car park and it would relieve some of the congestion in the two markets in Bridgetown.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the member for St. Philip South caught your eye before I did and made one or two enquiries of the Minister which I would also have made.

I believe that the market at Six Roads was built about the time when that whole complex at Six Roads was developed by the Barbados Labour Party, and it has gradually as it appears to me fallen into desuetude, and in terms of the Government's stated policy in the Manifesto on fisheries, agricultural development and diversification, I would issue a call to the Ministry, not being aware of the details of their plans, but at this stage I would still issue a call to the Ministry that that market be revised and revitalised as an outlet for the farmers, butchers and the dairy men from the eastern part of the island, especially St. John, St. Philip, parts of Christ Church and maybe parts of St. George.

As I envisage, Sir, that market could be used as a decentralised depot of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. If at any time within this five year period the Six Roads area is to be developed, if at any time any other area if not Six Roads is to be developed as a sub-centre or a sub-city, then it seems to me, bearing in mind the present domestic housing development that is going on in St. Philip, that we have to cater to the needs of that population movement from other areas into St. Philip, and to that extent provide a basic amenity for them with as far as possible comprehensive facilities and services such as you get at a market in Bridgetown. If you are planning now to further develop St. Philip, then it is my submission that the market at Six Roads, having the basic structural form, should be so conditioned or reconditioned or redecorated or renovated as to make it a subsidiary market for the people from that area. It does not seem to me that we are asking too much of the Ministry. It would certainly be far better to make it perform a useful and productive function than to have it lying idle and empty.

I believe that it was part of our Manifesto – I have just borrowed this and I have not been able to look through it in any depth – except that we had promised agro-industrial development in St. Philip and St. Joseph, and as I understand it, we are going to develop the eastern part of the island in terms of fisheries and perhaps shell fish. Now again if you have cold storage facilities in the market at Six Roads you would relieve the persons who have produce to sell of the burden and the transportation expense in having to bring them to Bridgetown to the central Marketing Corporation. Six Roads would be an ideal site as a subsidiary collecting centre, and a possible distribution centre, because I see no reason why there could not be a depot of the Marketing Corporation there, because there is one by the Fire Station in St. James, and further down, in Speightstown, in St. Peter there is another depot of the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

12.20 p.m.

I am not aware. I believe that the hon. member for St. Philip South will agree with me that the Barbados Marketing Corporation has no outlet in St. Philip and the Eastern part of the island. I feel that if you are going to do it on an island wide basis, then immediate consideration should be given in St. Philip where you have the basic structural development already.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, in respect of the Six Roads market, this is being looked at in the plan for the overall development in Six Roads area. As the Barbados Labour Party said in its manifesto, we intend to develop Six Roads as a modern development area, and this will come into the plan.

As regards to Tweedside Road market, I have seen the file on this matter; and it appears that there are certain problems which will arise in respect of acquisition of land in the area where the market should be. I believe that the original thought was that it should be placed in close proximity to the area which is being used now by hucksters on the two side walks just up the main road by Fix-it-Right. There is a second thought that it should be moved lower towards the round-about near the Globe so as to serve people in the Halls Road area as well as in the Carrington Village area. These are two thoughts which will be looked at in the Ministry, and as soon as a final conclusion has been reached, based on the advice of the technical officers, we will certainly tell the House what is the plan for that area.

As far as the Fairchild Street market is concerned, again that area will be looked at because, as you will know, we are looking for an alternative site for the Barbados Marketing Corporation. When that is removed in the present area we will look at the total development of that area for a different purpose.

In respect of agro-industries in St. Philip, we have already taken steps on certain things that could be located in the St. Philip area. These are now in the discussion stage, and therefore it will not be appropriate to disclose any more at the moment. Six Roads will play an important part in the sector because it will take up people coming from the far east of St. Philip out into Church Village as well as on the West on the Southern side of St. Philip.

I have taken notes of the comments made about the Fairchild Street market, the Eagle Hall market and parking facilities. Already we are looking at the Eagle Hall market for developments which we are planning; and as soon as these plans reach a more advanced stage the House will certainly be informed as to what is planned for that area. We are looking at upgrading all the markets. We are moving the boxes and cans which are kept in the market and which we are told are the homes or the sources of rate at night; and we plan to build concrete storage facilities which can preserve the produce very much better than the containers used by people occupying the markets.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do accept what the Minister said about the Tweedside Road market which is long overdue. What we were thinking about was not only a market. The last Government had ideas about removing the Welches Road Post Office. I do not want him to concentrate on a market only. I want co-operation between the various ministries. Our idea was to move the Welches Road Post Office which is at a dangerous bend. We had the idea of a library and also the possibility of a clinic in that particular area.

What I am saying is that the Minister in looking at the scheme should look at these other ideas which we were thinking of and not in market alone. I think that if he sees old age pensioners being paid at the Welches Road Post Office which is on a dangerous bend he will realise how dangerous it is. I think that the Minister when he plans with his colleagues will find that the acquisition of land in that area will be more than justified.

I just want to thank him, and I want to congratulate him and I am hoping that early in his regime he will give us that long awaited market in Tweedside Road along with other things that the member for St. Michael North Central and the member for St. Michael South Central desire for the people of those constituencies.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition could tell us exactly where is the file dealing with the removal of the Tweedside Road Market. Where can it be found? I have found a file on the Tweedside Road Market itself in my Ministry and there are other thoughts beside a market, other matters which can be accommodated in any complex that is developed; and that is why the technical officers thought that if it came further into town at the corner of the round-about it could accommodate more things than simply a market. I wonder if he could inform us where these plans are likely to be found so that the appropriate Minister can look at it and we can get together and come out with a package to develop the area. My Government is an open Government and we are receptive to any ideas which would make for the general development of the country. If he can tell us exactly where we can look for the file – I do not know if it is a file of the Ministry of Communications and Works. I know that it is not in my Ministry. What is in my files is simply the idea of

purchasing the portion of land in Tweedside Road and take the hucksters off the sidewalk and put them in a market. I myself have advanced the view for a larger type of market. I have looked at the issue with the 4–Hers; and the young children now hanging about Bridgetown trying to sell things up to their faces – I have looked at the view of leaving an area open so that those who develop something can walk into the market and will not have to pay any licence to peddle their goods; but I would gladly incorporate his views if he could tell us where the file can be found.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, how can he ask me where a file can be found? I can only tell him that I do not have it at "Cherry Tree Cottage"; but I know that the former Minister, the member for St. Michael North Central, myself, members of the Ministry of Communications and Works and members from the Ministry of Agriculture paid a visit. We had a census done. As to where the file is, I really cannot help him. He is asking too much. When we went to visit it, that was our idea. Whether the Civil Servants put it down in writing or not I do not know. We were not concerned only with a market, but with the dangerous Welches Post Office we had the idea of incorporating a library and also a clinic over there.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, what I would like to learn from the Leader of the Opposition is whether there were more or less paying site visits to see where they could possibly line up an area for the removal of the Welches Post Office or if they had arrived at something concrete because in the course of a Ministry it is possible for you to see a number of things. You pay a number of visits, but there are just visits. I am quite satisfied on the basis of what I have seen that there was nothing specific about the Welches Post Office. There is no detailed plan that can be found.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: To answer the Minister about detailed planning, the Welchman Hall project is something similar. We visited Welchman Hall and we sought to acquire land. The Ministries were asked to co-operate. We wanted again to have a police station which will come under one Ministry as well as a library and a post office. I would not say that plans were drawn. It did not reach that stage because you have to acquire land. You have to go into the cost. The idea was that the Ministries were asked to join together at Civil Service level so as to come up with a proposal for final approval.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture two questions. In 1971 during the election campaign the people in Pine lands were told that there would be a market erected just opposite the office of the Ministry of Communications and Works. They were told this by the then member of the Democratic Labour Party.
12.30 p.m.

In 1976 my opponent representing the Democratic Labour Party was seen in the *Advocate* with people at Princess Royal Road on a site which was cleared, and it was then pointed out that the Democratic Labour Party intended to put a market on that site. What I am trying to establish here is whether there are any plans whatsoever in the Ministry of Agriculture for a market or work on the road opposite the MCW on that little park that is now called the "John Connell Park", or if there were plans at all for a market on the Princess Royal Road just opposite Blackman Field. I want to know the answer because in an election campaign you will hear politicians on that side talking about promises and saying that we cannot fulfil promises. I want to know once and for all if there were any plans so that we can expose the Dems for what they are. They were making promises at election time when there were no plans. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me, as far as he knows, if there were any complete plans that were afoot to put two markets, one on the Princess Royal Road opposite Blackman Field, or one on the main road opposite the MCW.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I would like to say to the hon. member that the Democratic Labour Party was in power for 15 years. If we had done everything that was to be done there would be no need for a new Government or any Government. You are in a building now and you did not build it. If the Government has the idea to give it, the people cannot get it all in 15 years, and they will not get it from you in 25 years. Every year the demands of people increase, and it is no sense getting up harping that we promised the people this and that. We promised them certain things, but it was a question of time. There is no condemnation that you promised somebody something and he did not get it overnight. If we had found oil; if oil were gushing from Barbados like the Middle East a lot of the promises we made would have been fulfilled. Your promises must be limited to the economic wealth of the country, and your turn is going to come. You promised things, too. Can you do in five years what you have promised in your Manifesto? We will wait and see. You cannot do it. Some will be in the planning stage, some will

be in a further stage, and some will be accomplished. Do not come now harping back on promises made by the Democratic Labour Party. If we had money we would have built it where we promised.

I am tired of hearing two things in this House. Firstly, a constant criticism of the member for St. John. I have read the debates in the House of Commons and I have never heard anybody mention Harold Wilson like I hear St. John in here. *(Asides.)* Well, if you feel he is a monster that is your business. Secondly, you are getting on as if the Democratic Labour Party was the ultimate in the Government. The point is that Government and human life are continuing evolutionary processes, and as people's hopes and aspirations and desires increase their demands will increase. Neither your Government nor our Government could meet those ever-increasing demands. Some will be met, some will be planned, and some will continue to be desired and requested. You must stop talking about this foolishness about "you were in power for 15 years." You will be in for 100 and you will still find demands that you cannot meet because of the limitations of finance. We have been in power for 15 years, and if we had done everything, then there would have been no need for you.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, all I am asking the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is if there is any plan. That is all I am asking. Is it another trick?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the hon. member has raised this question and has really brought forth from the Leader of the Opposition a statement of confession that I believe every Barbadian should take note of because there is a difference between the realism which has crept into his voice and his tones and his statements now that he is no longer in power and, indeed, his realism in this House now he is hearing the points of view of things that it was not possible for his Party to have accomplished. Now what I would suggest in instances like this is that that same realism be transported from this House to his political meetings because you will note that he says he has the Manifesto reading there, and he wants to see how much we can achieve in five years. He has just made a full statement. Government is, to some extent, an evolutionary process, and in my view there is still more need for a bit more revolutionary action in some aspects of our affairs. He believes quite rightly, and I do not disagree with him, but tell it to the country as it is outside that it will take time to accomplish various matters, and that they could not have accomplished all.

I am very glad that this question came up under markets, Sir. It had to take the markets to bring out the Democratic Labour Party's wares quite rightly, and I welcome the hon. member's statement. As a matter of fact, I am prepared to put it in gold, if I can afford it, and let him carry it on his platform and blazon it in the future in the next five years. Sometimes I hear hon. members talk, and I think they are trying to tell the people that we have been in power for six months and what have we done; they are transporting this into the field of the journalists who are not doing an analysis. I think this is one of the key speeches in the debate. Probably it is one of the most profound statements ever made by the Leader of the Opposition and a good analysis of the politics of the country. It is one that he should be proud of. It will go down in history, and it is one which his Party may well remember in the next election when they are asking the people to return us because they realise that we would have tried, given the constraints of the economy, to achieve the Manifesto in five years.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we are not going to allow the quick wit and the silver-tongue oratory of the member for Christ Church West to get away with what he is trying to do now. He has taken some words mentioned by the member for St. Michael South Central and is attempting to use those words in order to erect, or to construct, the theoretical base for his Party's explanation to this country later on ...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I have used the hon. member's words to explain why in 15 years, despite the three Manifestos of the Democratic Labour Party, they were unable to achieve everything. I am saying, as the hon. member did do some history, that if one uses the historical deductions and if one also uses an argument from those circumstances to this, is it not a record that one should try to emulate? Is the hon. member trying to tell me now that their record is not worth emulating?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am maintaining that you are not going to get away with that type of dialectic because what you are trying to do now is to prepare the base for when you are unable as a Party to fulfil the promises set out in that Manifesto – that is why you say that the speech of the member for St. Michael South, which you are trying to erect into some major statement of policy – it is not anything like that. It is a response to the question from the member for St. Michael South East.

12.40 p.m.

You are not going to use that kind of dialectic in order to do that. I would just like to say I have never dealt with the question of a market in Pinelands or a market anywhere else, and the hon. member for St. Michael South East did ask if there were any concrete plans. I have never seen any concrete plans; maybe there were plans on paper or there may be plans which reached only the stage of words; but we cannot take a promise such as the erection of a market in Pinelands which did not constitute one of the manifesto promises of the Democratic Labour Party – it was not written into the manifesto anywhere – and put that on the same basis as the things which are written down as solemn promises inside the manifesto. So we just want to make that type of distinction between some particular project which may be a minor project within the scope of the major promises of a country. Sometimes you have to default on those, but we are not going to allow the hon. member for Christ Church West to get away with that type of construction. He caught on to it very quickly and I give him that. He is very alert in these matters, but he cannot erect statements by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central into any major statements in these matters in this regard.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, was the hon. member saying (a) that the Leader of the Opposition when he speaks in here is not speaking on behalf of his party and the Opposition as a whole; (b) is he saying that the hon. member was making a minor statement; (c) is he a member of that party, part of that statement or is he now dissociating himself from it? That is all I want to know.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If you want to know that, you know I am not tangling with you. I am going to leave those questions right there. What I have dissociated myself from is the statement by the hon. member for Christ Church West who is trying to use what the hon. member for St. Michael South said in order to erect a theoretical base for explaining to the country why the Barbados Labour Party would not be able to implement its programme in entirety.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, let me say that I have not seen any plans anywhere in my Ministry dealing with the erection or otherwise of a market in Pinelands, but what I would like to say is that something has suddenly happened to the Leader of the Opposition because he has suddenly found it necessary to remind us that we must forget that his party was in power only six months ago. I remember that during the last Estimates they were still harping back when dealing with something in the Pine about the Barbados Labour Party and saying that fifteen years ago it had built houses without putting doors on them, but all of a sudden we must forget that six months ago there was a Democratic Labour Party Government in power. What I did find is that they were about to purchase an old building of the Telephone Company in St. Lawrence and they had already written to I.D.C. to go and refurnish it to put a market out there; but they were not thinking of the people in Pinelands, and this was not in the manifesto either. They went out and made promises in 1971 about a market in Pinelands, and again in 1976; they should have told the people that these were only promises for them in that area, but that they had not made promises in the sophisticated area, they were taking action. I can say that we have turned down the market in St. Lawrence. If there is any market to be erected it will be erected in an area where the most people can benefit by it, particularly those people who have not got motor cars and cannot travel easily into Bridgetown or elsewhere to do their shopping.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the Head we are discussing is Markets. As I understand it, the building at St. Lawrence was to be one of the outlets for the Barbados Marketing Corporation; it was supposed to be a supermarket outlet. That was the context in which it was purchased and not the context of a market in the sense he is making it. I just wish to make that clear to the Minister.

The question that the sum of $330,662 under Head 10 – Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (5) Markets, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (6) LAND DEVELOPMENT AND SOIL CONSERVATION

Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (6) Land Development and Soil Conservation – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,073,621 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (6) Land Development and Soil Conservation – stand part of the Schedule.

In this section there will be a continuation of the work which is being carried out, that is, the placing of check dams to hold the soil which

we take an in depth look and study into the entire Scotland District. We have not increased the budget tremendously this year. Some of the increase is due to equipment we are putting in for the further development of planting material, trees etc. which can be used in that area, but the major development in the Scotland District will take place a little later after we have done certain studies in conjunction with international agencies for the recovery of that one-seventh area of the country which keeps slipping away year after year. If there are any questions, I will be glad to answer them.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, under Head 10(6) Item 7 – Provision for rental of equipment, protective clothing, attendance at Board meetings, which also includes a token provision for grant towards removal of houses, I am wondering if the Hon. Minister could explain that aspect of the matter to us, and taking into consideration that he has a token amount, I am wondering if he is in a position to tell us approximately how much money he will need for the year for the removal of these houses. While it is true that he has here a token amount, I still feel that this House should be given some information concerning the amount which he may require. I know that he is not in a position to give an accurate estimate, but he may be able to give some idea of the amount it would take for the removal, or I may use the word, resiting of some of these houses.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has acted as Minister. He knows fully well that if Government has a plan and they do not know what the cost would be to carry out the plan, in order to operate during the year you put in a token figure, sometimes $1 and sometimes $10. He acted as Minister before and he knows that in that area you may find the land slipping from under a particular section and in order to go in and repair the section you have got to move one or two houses or you may have to move ten houses from the area. It is difficult for anybody to know exactly where the land will move from and how many houses are there, but if you want to do careful planning you always put in a sum to cover yourself. That is the situation as it exists.

On the question of the rental of equipment, I can say now that soil conservation have got some large bulldozers that are over twelve years old that have been rebuilt as many as three times already. They are uneconomical and when you take the mileage and the hours of these large machines and compare them with the mileage of a motor car, you will find that the machines would have run the equivalent of 120,000 miles. 12.50 p.m.

Any motor car of that age with that mileage is useless, but although the officers have called for a substantial increase in the vote to put in larger and better machines, we have held the vote down this year since we are doing a complete study of this area. If we find that we get through a feasibility study and we decide to work on a particular section, we will have to lease the land, we may eventually have to hire equipment if one of the existing machines breaks down, and you come with an urgent problem, so it is difficult to tell the hon. member exactly what sum would be required, because here again if the people move the houses themselves and apply to us we will make them a grant after they have removed the houses and they know what their expenses are, so we cannot forecast with any certainty neither can we forecast whether we will use any money, but we put a token vote to carry it over from year to year, and if needs be, as you well know, we will come back to the House for a supplementary to increase the token vote, but it would form part and parcel of the policy of the Ministry during the relevant period of the year.

The question that the sum of $1,073,621 under Head 10(6) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Land Development and Soil Conservation – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HEAD 10(7) – PLANT PROTECTION

Head 10(7) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Plant Protection – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $313,797 under Head 10(7) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Plant Protection – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HEAD 10(8) – FISHERIES

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $175,246 under Head 10(8) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Fisheries – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, could the Hon. Minister tell us how these grants are being made to owners of fishing boats? I have noticed that the amount has been decreased by $20,000; in 1976–77 it was $95,000 and this year it is $75,000. Can he tell us why the amount was decreased? Perhaps he could give us a little information, or insight, as to how these grants are made to fishermen or owners of fishing boats.

Only recently a boat owner in the constituency which I have the honour to represent lost his boat at sea, and you will forgive me, Sir, if I query you on this matter because I have a special interest in my constituents. I am asking the Minister to give us some idea how these grants are made, and perhaps he could explain why he has found it possible to reduce the amount.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire of the Minister if he could give his views on fish farming, or inland fishing, and relate that to the need for providing high class protein in the diet of Barbadians. I know a lot of interest has been taken in off-shore fishing, but I do believe that something should be done in the development of fish farming or inland fishing, and I would like to hear his views. I myself have pretty strong views on that matter, and it is a matter on which I have made suggestions in various ways to many people.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this question of fisheries and I do not think that the importance of the fishing industry to this country should be under-estimated in any way. My colleague, the member for St. Philip South, has raised the question of the administration of grants to fishermen where boats are lost, and this is an important matter because the whole viability of the industry and its development hinges upon the availability of funds to fishermen and the entrepreneurs who go into this particular area, and even more important it relates to the health and security and safety of those sea-faring persons who venture out in deep waters.

Each year, Mr. Chairman, the lives of fishermen are lost at sea and Barbados is no exception to this, but the type of insurance if any that may be available either on the lives of the fishermen or on the boats themselves present a problem in that the boat owners complain about the high rates of insurance for the boats, and I have reason to believe that a large number of fishermen, or certainly a number of the fishermen, who go out probably are not covered by insurance at all. There was a case recently, some time in December, of two fishermen from my constituency who went out some time in December, and to date no word has been heard from them. This is a situation I hope the Minister does not get the feeling that I am blaming him, I am not blaming him, I am talking now about the whole structure and organisation of the industry, and I am drawing the attention of this Hon. Chamber to this particular problem.

I believe that we may very well have to go back to the fifties for some real in-depth examination of this whole problem, I do not recall that any in-depth study of the problem and solutions to it have been given, and I would like to know from the Minister whether in fact any type of ex-gratia payment might be available to the families of those fishermen who bear the hazards of the sea in order to obtain protein for the people of this country, whether when in circumstances of tragedy lives are lost, whether the Ministry has funds or indeed if it has not will seek funds in order to make ex-gratia payments to the survivors of those fishermen in these types of circumstances.

I do believe that there is a good case, pending any examination of an insurance programme to cover these fishermen, that in these cases of hardship – there are children and there are mothers surviving, and wives – whether some ex-gratia payment could not be made to these survivors. I would like to draw this whole matter to the attention of the Minister and ask if he would respond specifically on these matters, and in particular to the question of the payment of ex-gratia awards to survivors in cases like these.

1.00 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, as one who represents an area which is responsible perhaps for a large product of the production of fish in Barbados, and as one who in the last 30 years has been actually engaged with fishing, I would like to answer the hon. member. I cannot

understand how the hon. member can today speak as he did after he has been a member of a Government that for 15 years consistently neglected this industry. The truth of the matter is – and it must be told to the public of Barbados – that the Democratic Labour Party ran down the Fisheries Division in the Ministry of Agriculture. That is a stark fact.

I would not call names in here about conditions in the Fisheries Division of the Ministry of Agriculture because people will say that I would be wrong. So, I will not call names.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would give way. I rise on a point of elucidation. I am not attacking that Government, nor am I criticising this Government, I did explain that in my constituency there were two fishermen who went out to sea in December and no word has been heard of them since that time and they are presumed lost at sea.

The Barbados Labour Party to the best of my knowledge did not have a programme of making ex gratia payments to the survivors of these fishermen; and the Democratic Labour Party, to the best of my knowledge did not have any such programme for making payments to such persons. I believe that there are fishermen from other constituencies who lose their life at sea, so this is not a party matter. I am making a point of elucidation. I am not making any speech. I know that the member has a very deep interest in fishing, but I am not raising this as any party matter. I was merely drawing it to the attention of the member; so there is no need to generate this heat on this matter.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to put the historical record straight. It was the Barbados Labour Party which changed the sail fishing boats into motorised boats. That is where we left off in 1961. Part of the essential function of the Barbados Marketing Corporation was to buy fish from the fishing boats in various districts and to be the marketing agency.

I, together with the former member for St. Michael South West who dislike the scheme and pour cold water on the scheme although in Speightstown, Oistins and other areas you had thriving fishing co-operatives and the only things that were left up there were a few fuel tanks.

In addition to that, the fishing co-operatives had an insurance scheme for which all of the fishing boat owners negotiated with James A. Lynch and got a reduction on the premium of the fishing boat hull, and we even went so far as to correspond with fishing groups in order to get a mutual insurance insurance society because Lloyds was charging in those days – I think it was at least 7 per cent a hull and we said that was too high a premium; and you would have to do what the fishing boat owners in England did – have a mutual insurance scheme by which you have reduced premiums and re-insure part of the risk with Lloyds so as to get a reduction.

All of that was done in the Ministry of Agriculture. Mr. Chase was the Co-operatives Officer, and Mr. J. C. King was the Permanent Secretary. They used to buy paints out of the co-operatives; but it was not us that poured cold water on it. They had it and they lost it. One of the most thriving industries that you had in the country was in Skeet's Bay, St. Philip and at Tent's Bay. Because of the mutual need the people there were strong co-operative people.

I have had to reply on this question of fishing. I remember that on more than one occasion I have had to get a legal tangle smoothed out in respect of fishermen. Under the National Insurance Regulations fishermen did not qualify – they did not qualify under the previous Regulations. There is an amendment now under the National Insurance Act Regulations. The classification of the type of employment has been amended to ensure that fisherman can pay a contribution on the basis of being self-employed.

It must be appreciated that very often when a boat goes out, the captain does not necessarily know who is going to go out with him because somebody may not necessarily turn up. There are people on the beach who get up on mornings about 4 a.m. looking for what they call a "jump off"; but the position is that because of the way that these things are promulgated on the beaches they are not paying their National Insurance contributions. They are not employed persons because the owner of the boat does not have any relationship of master and servant in relation to a fisherman, only in relation to the captain; and the previous Regulations were drawn in such a way as to exclude the fisherman.

It has now been amended. It happened with Seafoods too, because sometimes when a boat comes in here from abroad and somebody gets sick any other person goes on with the crew. You had the problem also of definition because of the fact that their method of earning wages was a sharing basis. So there was no category that you could pick out to say that you had to pay this amount of National Insurance because you earned X or Y dollars.

We are trying to get these things going. I agree with the hon. member that steps should be taken to ensure that people do not go to sea unless they are covered with some element of insurance. That is the way to deal with it – to see that that part of the National Insurance Regulations, now that it is amended, is dealt with adequately.

The Manifesto at Page 9 deals clearly with that. I will leave it for the Minister to deal with. As far as the grants are concerned, if you will look at the column of actual expenditure you will find that what was disbursed of the previous year's vote was not near the amount that was granted and that is one of the reasons, probably for the reduction. That in fact the people have not, because of the system – apparently the system that was introduced was that you had to go and repair your boat yourself and then reclaim the amount of money.

As part of our re-organisation, obviously that has to be reviewed because you are asking people to go and trust or borrow money or come to me and beg me to back a note. That is what happens – which I do not do. You have to go and show that you have done the repairs, then bring in the bills and then you collect back your money. I do not believe that that system is the correct system. I understand that you must have some system to ensure that you do not give the man the money and he does not repair the boat; but obviously it should not be beyond the ability of the people to devise a scheme to ensure that there is a particular estimate, that the estimate is X and you get your grant. On the question of fisheries we are very serious about it.
1.10 p.m.

You are either serious about it, or you are not serious about it. I am in a position to say that I know the Minister has done this. There are people with marine biological knowledge in Barbados, eminent people, and with the McGill Extension Services here in Barbados, people have provided Draft Reports on the question of marine fishing and there are other people who are willing to help. I know the Minister has an appointment set up with a Mr. Miller and others who will give some technical assistance. This is an area in which we have been applying for technical assistance from Japan. They talk about how much they export and so on, and they must give technical assistance, too, in this area. We want to see fisheries built up into something worthwhile in Barbados on-shore, in-shore and on land. The details the Minister will be able to give on that.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I will answer the questions as they were asked. Grants to fishing boats under the present Scheme are given at $300, or a total of half of the estimated cost of the repairs not exceeding $300. If a man spent $600 on his boat, he would get $300, and if he spent $600, he would only get $300. Last year we spent $63,837 on 239 applications. We have not put a large sum in the Estimates when it could not be spent. Although there is a $20,000 decrease the sum in the Estimates would still hold good based on the number of fishing boats as well as the number of applications that has been made. That answers that question.

With regard to Inland Fish Farms, I have had discussions with the University; I have had discussions with personnel from a Research Institution; I have had discussions from persons from the United States and we are setting up discussions with Mr. Miller, a Marine Biologist, who is now living in Barbados. We have held discussions with personnel from the World Bank, and we have told them of our Manifesto plans and when we recover the Scotland District, there are a number of underground streams and there are theories that the water can be utilised for inland fishing basins, etc. That is what we are looking at. We have also held several discussions with personnel in respect of our in-shore shell fish, the green turtle and various other shell fish which we have been told could be profitably grown here. We are also thinking of fish farms on the coastline in various parts of the Island. We are taking a very serious look into the question of inland fishing. We are also looking at encouraging fishermen – there are several fishermen from the Oistin area who have been coming to us in respect of assisting them in some way to purchase larger boats. We are doing this, and we have referred them to the Barbados Development Bank who is prepared to finance, with the Ministry's approval, the purchase of larger boats well equipped to do fishing further afield than the present size boats.

On the question of insurance, I have already given instructions to the personnel in the Ministry to refer the matter to the respective Minister to see if the Standing Committee cannot come up with a scheme to reduce the cost of insurance premium in respect of fishing boats as compared with what private Insurance Companies are asking for insuring the present fishing boats. I am looking at putting that into a total packet with a guaranteed contract for the supply of fish to the BMC, or to the Fishing Corporation when it is established, and your insurance policy could be used as collateral against buying your equipment, etc., in the fishing industry.

With regard to the question of fishermen who become lost at sea, there are two things that have happened here. I have already held discussions with three different organisations in Barbados and I have also asked Mr. Roston, the Training Officer in the Fisheries Institute in Trinidad, to investigate the type of equipment that can be used by fishermen – simple equipment that could be used by fishermen to keep them in contact with the shore base when they go to sea. A thing that surprised me when I went to the Ministry is that there are only two Fisheries Officers in the Ministry of Agriculture. Would you believe that in that office there is not even a VHF set that the Fisheries Officer, when he is in office, can monitor what is going on at sea. He has to go down by the Port or somewhere else to find out what is going on, and I think this is wrong. Unfortunately, one of the Fisheries Officers has been sick since Christmas and we only have one in the office. We have no qualified Officers in the Ministry dealing with fishing. I believe that if you really want a Fishing Department you need, at least, 1 Marine Biologist, somebody lesser qualified than a Marine Biologist, who knows what is going on at sea, or who knows the life of a fish, to advise the Minister on what he must do, but we are all groping in the dark. The Minister is not a fisherman, and I believe the two Officers working in the Fisheries Department have gained their experience merely by working there. I do not believe they have had any formal training in Biology or Marine Biology to advance the cause of fishing as I would like to see it done. This is why I said earlier that we are hoping to bring in Mr. Miller as a Consultant until the Government can afford to employ a proper qualified person in this Department.

You have talked about fishermen being lost at sea. I have had discussions with Mr. Roston about this, and I have already said to the Department that when fishermen are going to sea they should leave some sort of a direction as to where they are going and what time they hope to return. When you check around the beaches you will find that somebody only remembered two men pushing off in a boat one morning, and they did not say where they were going. When you send out a search party you do not know where to go, and you have no idea where the fishermen have gone. This makes it rather difficult to find them.

It may be a question of bringing some sort of Regulation so that people will help themselves and help us. If fishermen told their colleagues where they were going or they went out in pairs it would help a whole lot. I have had a situation where a man told me he likes to fish alone, and he does not like to fish with anybody else around him. When he is lost, it will take a day or two before anybody knows that he is lost. God knows what will happen to him during that time. If they fish within a certain limit of each other, then somebody will realise that something has gone wrong.

In discussing the Scheme for this year with Mr. Roston from Trinidad in which we hope to bring a training vessel up here, we hope to get six or seven fishing crews to go out as far as possible where the experts will tell them where to stay. They will line them out in a particular area; the ship from Trinidad which will be called the mother ship will come in to shore, take out provision and bring in the fish from them. I am told that fishermen do not like to fish close to each other. These are things one has to realise. We have to begin to educate the fisherman and let him see where his safety lies. Instead of one fisherman going out at a time, or two fishermen in one boat, two boats should travel together or something of this nature.

We have also looked at different types of flares which could be easily used. It is no use giving a man a sophisticated VHF set if he is not accustomed to it, or when something happens he panics and cannot use it. We have looked at various types of flares that you can just throw overboard and they will automatically give out an SOS. We have looked at data from Australia regarding a flare that as soon as it hits salt water it begins to transmit a signal that can be picked up by a passing ship or by an aircraft overhead. I am told that the signal can be picked up up to about thirty miles by the tower at Seawell. All of this will call for time to co-ordinate the action between the fishing boats, Seawell Airport, and some system in the Fisheries Department so that a Fisheries Officer can monitor daily things that are happening.

We have not yet dealt with *ex gratia* payments because we are looking at the National Insurance to take up some sort of liability and we are hoping to start a training programme telling fishermen exactly what we expect of them in order to do our best to develop the fishing industry.

1.20 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Just before the Minister closes, I wonder if he would really address his mind to this particular point. I am much heartened by his statement that that is a receptive Government and they are open to ideas. I am certain these proposals he has made will but

redound to the benefit and development of the fishing industry. That will take time to materialise and I am really wondering if he would seriously consider this proposal which I am throwing out. If the funds are not available in the item "Grants to Individuals" or the note could not be amended to include the making of ex-gratia payments, would he have to come with a special vote for this purpose to make grants to the survivors of persons who have been lost at sea, at least until he can sort it out with the National Insurance Scheme or any other insurance? I am really throwing it out as a proposal and wondering if you would respond to that. You can back date it to 2nd September.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was a Minister. He knows fully well that if you begin something like this as an ex-gratia payment you are opening yourself to creating a charity fund for every Tom, Dick and Harry. An ex-gratia payment is made when certain conditions have been put up to Government and Government decides that this is a cause which we believe we can help in. If on the other hand you have amended the National Insurance Act to give a fisherman the right to pay national insurance as a self-employed person, if anything happens they would have a right to benefits under the National Insurance Scheme. If they do not do that and you start an ex-gratia fund and put it in the Estimates, you are defeating the very purpose of allowing them to pay under the National Insurance Scheme, because they themselves would ask why they should pay under the National Insurance Scheme when, if anything happens to me, the Government already has got a fund for ex-gratia payments to my family. Then the next thing that would happen is that another section of the community would come up and ask you to put in an ex-gratia payment for them too, and you will go round and round in a circle with everybody wanting an ex-gratia payment included in the Estimates. You have to use your commonsense and wisdom in these thing. If you say you are a fisherman, we are looking at insurance for you; we are going to devise a cheaper form of insurance for your boat; we are going to allow you to pay insurance into the National Insurance Scheme so that it takes care of yourself and family. What else are you asking us to do?

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the hon. member that in relation to fishermen who have already lost their lives at sea or cannot be found, there is now no arrangement under which any payment can be made to their relatives, and the point we are making on this side is whether in the interim, until something more specific can be worked out, the Minister would consider making use of this vote to make allowances to those surviving family members of those fishermen who have gone to sea and lost their lives. This is not intended to be the answer to the problem. We accept his contention that something more permanent has to be worked out, but it will take time to be worked out, and until that has been done, what do you intend to do in the interim, bearing in mind that some fishermen have gone to sea and nothing has been heard about them, and that their families are in straightened circumstances. All we are asking you is to tell us what you would do in the interim until your definitive plans under the National Insurance Scheme have been worked out, which we accept and which coming from him we appreciate as something more worthy to be implemented. But until this is done, what can you do to alleviate the sufferings of those members whose bread earner, in this case the fisherman, has been lost at sea?This is a short term measure.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I would suggest two things: one is that any politician who knows of a relative who has been living in this particular position should carry on in the way he has been doing before, that is, start a charity fund and ask the people to depend on the good nature of the Barbadian to contribute to the fund. Secondly, let the family apply to the welfare division of Government and I am sure a very sympathetic hearing or consideration will be given to their cases by the appropriate Ministers. If they happen to be families of fishermen, I will support the family in applying to the welfare division and I would tell the welfare division to do everything that is possible to assist these families in the interim until we get the appropriate scheme going.

Mr. TAITT: Just one question. The Government had indicated that it would become involved urgently in the question of ship and boat building. I have not found it anywhere in the Estimates and I wish to ask the Minister whether in fact it was under his portfolio, and if there are any plans for the development of boat or ship building.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I believe the hon. member is making reference to something referred to in our manifesto, that we feel that certain types of boat building can be carried on in Barbados and that we will examine any constraints there are at the present moment which prevent such an industry from developing. We were referring in particular to the utilisation

of the Central Foundry dock and the areas surrounding there and I believe that one of the constraints about developing ship building and ship repairing in that area was the fact that the last Government would not make up its mind to renew the lease upon a reasonably long term basis. The Ministry of Lands has already been negotiating proposals for a reasonably long lease so that people who bring in the capital equipment would be able to amortise the equipment over a period of years.

Secondly, we have in our minds that as part of the Oistin re-development plan there will be an area in which boat builders will be encouraged to continue their traditional craft of boat building, and for the information of the hon. member Oistin together with Shermans in St. Peter, near Half Moon Fort and an area in St. Philip near the Crane are the three largest boat building areas we have left of the traditional type of boat. What has happened in boat building in Barbados is that the average size of the boat has gone up considerably. It is no longer a 22" x 24"; it is now a 32" x 34". In addition to that, in Bay Street experiments have been carried out successfully in the building of concrete hulls in Barbados. There are two concrete hulls which are in operation. Those are the areas we are thinking of in relation to that, and we are examining the position.

I understand that a course has now been instituted at the Polytechnic dealing with the craft of boat building. It is a skill which is confined to only a few master workmen left now, and they are quite difficult in apprenticing people. That is one of their problems. They do not like to apprentice people. The boat builder in Oistin is a gentleman who left and went to England; he brought back a lot of mechanical tools, but he likes to operate by himself and with his cousins, and I believe that the same thing operates in St. Lucy. Those are the areas and that is what we had in mind.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I may further say that in the Ministry we have looked at several designs and drawings for larger boats in Barbados, but we were told that those hulls are obtainable in plastics and acrylic, and what we have said is that we are looking for a design, even if we brought one in built of plastic that can be copied in traditional wood so that we can give employment to boat builders in Barbados, because the larger boat is running in the vicinity of $160,000 to $180,000, and we believe that if you bring the design here and construct the boats here, although it is a slow process, it would provide the necessary employment for people in the fishing industry or in particular areas. We are bearing this in mind as a development as well.

1.30 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: I do not wish to prolong the Minister, but I recall there was some discussion of our getting into the area of fishing using the feeder system where there were going to be refrigerated vessels held outside and there would be this mother ship concept. Is the Minister still thinking of going in that direction?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I have already said that this is what we are still thinking about. As a matter of fact, when you look under Capital you will see we have a sum for insulating the existing boats to keep them out to sea.

The Question that the sum of $175,246 under Head 10(8) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Fisheries – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS – HEAD 10(9) – LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT

Head 10(9) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Livestock Development – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to amend Item 5, "$25,751" should be deleted under Other Expenditure and "$25,752" should be inserted.

With that amendment, I beg to move that the sum of $1,167,215 under Head 10(9) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Livestock Development – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, some time ago when we were in Government the present Minister went to Canada with the then Minister, Mr. Joy Edwards, to get some cows for livestock development. I want to know what is the state of that cow fund, whether it has been paid up by those who had the Canadian cows, and how many are in arrears. You had a trip with Joy and I want to know if the cows are paid for, whether the people are being sued, and what is the exact state of this cow industry and the repayment by the persons who had cows.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I should also like to ask the Minister whether it is still the

intention of the Government to provide subsidies for pig feed. They had indicated in their Manifesto that they would as a matter of urgency provide subsidies for pig feed, and I am merely trying to find out whether it is still the Government's intention, since I do not think I have seen any indication in the Estimates of that nature.

While I am on my feet, there is also the question, and the Minister might indicate whether he wishes me to wait on this one, but there is also the question of the Dairy Revolving Fund, which is slightly different from what the Leader of the Opposition asked. This has to do with the provision of milk to the Pine Hill Dairy, and I know the Minister especially when he was on this side had a very strong view about how the Pine Hill Dairy should operate, and I am really canvassing him as to whether since he has taken over the portfolio there has been any change in the Pine Hill Dairy, etc. etc.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Livestock Development, last night when the Minister was winding up on another Head he made a remark that as far as the export of black belly sheep was concerned, if an individual in Barbados who bred sheep received an order he was not permitted to sell it himself but rather would have to pass over the order to the Ministry and they would then decide from whom these sheep were to be sold for export. If I should say anything that is not correct I would accept the correction from the Minister immediately. This to me is a very strange system of administration. I do not see that if the private sector is promoting any kind of export drive from Barbados, which the Minister of Finance will no doubt encourage because of the need of balance of payments and what have you, that this curtailment should be put on the private sector. *(Aside).* The Minister says I am making joke, but I am not making any joke.

The reason for it is simply, Mr. Chairman, that over the years a number of individuals have built up a clientele overseas, and after importing sheep from them they repeat orders or they introduce those sellers to other would-be purchasers. Some of these purchasers even come to Barbados themselves and visit the flocks, and they decide on the exact sheep they would like to buy. If they then go to the Ministry they are told they cannot buy the sheep they have selected but they will have to go to three members of the Department of Agriculture to decide what sheep they are to buy. I believe that the Minister is as much interested in the export of any commodity or animal or anything else from Barbados as anybody else is, but I believe his plan for curtailing the private sector is not in the best interests of the economy of Barbados.

Alternatively, I believe what the Minister should do is to use the Barbados Marketing Corporation in an export drive for black belly sheep. Advertisements could be put in the magazines dealing with livestock in Curacao, in Mexico, Columbia, St. Croix, wherever a market is thought to be, advertisements with picture of black belly sheep and all the advantages of having black belly sheep, and the Barbados Marketing Corporation could be an exporter just like the private sector, but I do not believe that hindering the private sector, to tell a man that after he has built up a clientele and secured an order that he cannot sell, he has to turn it over to the Ministry of Agriculture is in the best interest of the industry for black belly sheep. I just throw it out as a suggestion to the Minister that he use his Corporation, it is a marketing corporation, it therefore should have all the facilities and knowledge of marketing, to use that Corporation to fill any gap that he sees in the marketing of black belly sheep. I do not know if the former Minister in charge of the Marketing Corporation could say whether they have ever done any advertising outside, but I see no reason why pictures of black belly sheep could not be advertised and all their qualities, how many litters they produce per year and what have you, to encourage export.

Mr. Chairman, Barbados has imported livestock for years and we should be very happy that the time has come now when we can be exporters and not importers. I therefore would counsel the Minister not to discourage the private sector by telling them his Department must sell the sheep, but to venture into the marketing himself through the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister responds, there are some matters on which I believe there ought to be a clarity of thought in Barbados, and the matter on which my friend, the hon. member for Christ Church North Central has just spoken is a matter on which the two political parties do not have any divergence. I heard what the Minister said last night, and although the system which the Minister outlined may appear to be cumbersome, and although there is some merit in what the hon. member has just said about putting photographs in various places, etc., it ought to be made clear to all those persons in this country who feel that they can speculate on the backs of other people that that will not be tolerated, and I

am saying that we on this side will support the Minister in any effort to make sure that those persons who can only be described as the black belly sheep stealers, who go around and buy a black belly sheep from poor people for $30 and export it for $300 and $500, we will not divide as a political party on that type of exploitation and in whatever form it comes we will support the Minister.

We cannot have that sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, we were the Government that imposed the ban on the export of black belly sheep, and it was imposed precisely because of the reasons which the Minister outlined last night, that there are persons in this country who feel that they have a right, merely because they have access to capital, to go around and exploit other persons, and the people who spend the time working to rear the sheep, the people who have to mix with the sheep and deal with them, they get next kin to nothing for their labours.
1.40 p.m.

Whatever system is found, the development of the industry has to be a mutual development. It has to be a development where everyone who is involved in the Black Belly Sheep Industry can benefit. There is no concept of private enterprise when you are trying to develop a herd of sheep. Black Belly sheep have not reached the proportions where you have so many that you can afford to have people competing in the so called private sector. I think that the hon. member might have been misled in the information that he was given. I think that the Minister on this occasion is on the right track.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, it is all good and well for persons who are not deeply involved in this industry to make statements like the one which has been made by the member who has spoken; but there is a deeper implication in this. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, when I was in the Opposition I called for a full registration of the Black Belly sheep in this country. Up to now all those who preach cannot get up and tell anybody how many Black Belly sheep there are in this country.

Another point they must understand is to stop the foolish shouting about private enterprise. I was in Guyana in December to a CARICOM meeting – a meeting of Ministers of Agriculture. Practically every country inside the Caribbean and outside the Caribbean is trying to get hold of the Black Belly sheep of Barbados. Practically every country that you can think of has got plans to set up a multiplication unit to breed Black Belly sheep. If I follow that statement and let every Black Belly sheep go out of here – Barbados is a small territory. We do not have the land mass to expand as quickly as possible as like Guyana, Trinidad, Jamaica, Brazil and all those countries that are planning to multiply the Black Belly sheep to supply those other territories.

One has got to use a bit of commonsense in this issue and hold on to what you have; because the Black Belly sheep is indigenous to Barbados and you can find it nowhere else. The properties of the Black Belly sheep are such that we have got to capitalise on it. I have had discussions, Mr. Chairman, with people in the United States who are willing to pay $500 (U.S.) for a Black Belly ram. The Minister of External Affairs will tell you when he was in the U.S. last year that there is an international organisation willing to come into the Caribbean to further develop the Black Belly sheep, and other countries are trying to pull that organisation in that country and trying to get sheep out of Barbados to set up a $5 million multiplication scheme outside of Barbados. I am fighting day and night to hold that $5 million in this country.

When I hear people talk foolishness and I do not reply it is simply because my colleagues tell me do not get up and say anything. You know $5 million (U.S.) is a lot of money to come to Barbados and the organisation would like to come here; but it is because of these stupid statements being made day and night that the organisation is hedging. I was supposed to leave here next week to talk to people about Black Belly sheep in a situation where I can sit down and let them talk.

Who is losing, Mr. Chairman? In the last export of sheep you have only got to go about the country and ask the people who profited out of the last export of sheep. They exported without thought of what was happening. I have just had my Livestock Officer create a plan by which to develop the Black Belly sheep multiplying them as fast as possible, because I feel, Mr. Chairman, that Barbadians can make $500 (U.S.) per sheep. If somebody writes a man in Barbados and says he wants two Black Belly sheep, he comes to the Ministry. The Ministry says you send the two; but when you get an order for a herd of 500 Black Belly sheep, tell me the private enterprise or the private man in Barbados that has got 1,000 Black Belly sheep that you can let him export 500 at one time.

So this is the situation. People have got to understand. Stop reading the foolishness in the newspapers. Ask a question. You will get an answer and you will understand exactly what is happening about the Black Belly sheep. I called

the BFFC. I sat down and explained to them that I had two universities in the United States who were interested in Black Belly sheep in Barbados. They have said that they would like to fly in their technicians in Barbados. They would like to clean them up.

It is alleged that the Black Belly Sheep may have something which may not be accepted in the United States. The U.S. is very peculiar with its health standards. I am trying my best to do everything, Mr. Chairman, to clean up the Black Belly Sheep, multiply it and then let the Barbadians enjoy the benfits of something that is indigenous, and cannot be had anywhere else in the world. You therefore have got to employ some sort of control until you have got it going.

It is all well and good for those who want to make a quick half million, put it in the bank and sit down; but those who have nothing will still have to put their foreheads against the block and stratch their nails out in order to make a living. That is the system that I intend to work until the Prime Minister decides that that is not the system that he wants and he decides to change that or change me.

That is the policy that I will take on this issue. I do not mind what the papers say. I have a policy to run; and in the interest of Barbados and particularly of the 12,000 or 14,000 people in the country who keep two or three Black Belly Sheep, $500 (U.S.) a ram will carry that family a long way, and those are the goals I am striving towards.

Now when it comes to the cows from Canada, I will not worry to reply because the Leader of the Opposition asked the question and ran outside. I want to reply in front of him. It pains me to think that he wants me to tell him what I knew for three years, and I have not told the public yet. If he wants to hear it I will answer him when he comes back and I will tell him the truth about cows from Canada.

I know the problems that I saw in Agriculture when I was in opposition. In December last year I drew up myself a questionnaire and I asked the Chief Livestock Officer to circulate everybody who had cows from Canada. I asked their names, the address, the name of the farms, the number of imported cows they had, the progeny from the imported cows, the total cost of the imported cows, the sum outstanding to Government for the imported cows, what they owe otherwise to other persons in respect of their dairies, whether they wanted shares in Pine Hill Dairies, in what manner they wanted shares, whether as a private individual, whether as a member of a co-operative or as a member of the Barbados Agricultural Society. If they want these figures, I can send to my Ministry now and I can give them the whole outline that came back. I know who is paying and I know who is not paying.

If you want to hear something, a man like John Daniel who ordered 80 and does not have one today – a member of his political party. If he wants me to tell him, I can tell him all. I did my homework before I came in here; I have investigated the Pine Hill Dairies. I can tell you that the Board of Directors, including the Government Director who sits on the Board of the Pine Hill Dairies does not know the salaries of the top officers in the Pine Hill Dairies.

I have had an investigation done and I find one private individual who owns 18,000 shares in the Pine Hill Dairy, and the others 500 and 700. If they want to hear things that were created under the Democratic Labour Party Government, I can talk it. I have already said that in my view the Pine Hill Dairies can be run as a co-operative between the original shareholders, the dairy farmers and the workers at the Pine Hill Dairy.

The agreement in respect of the Pine Hill Dairy ran out since July last year, and has never been renegotiated. I have already put my views to the Ministry of Finance and negotiate on the basis on which I would like to see it. I believe that if a farmer has to get out of his bed at 3 or 4 in the morning and milk his cow and send the milk to Pine Hill Dairy, why should a man in Bridgetown who does not know the front from the back of a cow draw 15 per cent dividend at the end of a year from Pine Hill Dairies, when the man who produced the milk gets nothing or is losing money? And that was the object of sending out the questionnaire to find out what the dairy men owed in respect of the cows from Canada and what they owed in Bridgetown to work out a system which I believe was equitable so that their share of the profits of the milk plant where they were providing the milk was equitable.

The Dairy Revolving Fund? I have looked at that. There is the question of how far can the fund go. I have already had discussions with the Canadians. I have put up certain schemes to them for the further development of the Dairy Industry in this country; but it is only waiting for the co-operation of the very people who are in dairy farming to come in and sit down. I have said that I have got an open door policy. Anytime you want to come in and sit down and

let me hear what you want because I believe that if you develop the industry in Barbados you are doing good for Barbados itself. You are not doing it for me. You are doing it for Barbados.

If the Leader of the Opposition wants to know more about the cows, who owes, who paid and who is not paying I can send and get the files: and I can also tell him who got the horses, if he wants to know.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I do not really like to intervene in debates of this nature; but I think that the hon. member for Christ Church North Central after he has heard some of the facts outlined by the Minister and a few others that I am going to outline, will be well satisfied that within in the hands of the Cabinet there is a lot of good sense on this issue, and within the brains of this Minister lies the basis of that good sense.
1.50 p.m.

Now, I will never concede to anybody that capitalists must have an unbridled right to do as they please regardless of whether it could harm the eventual economy of this country or not. The Barbados Agricultural Society had better get that message straight, too. No matter whoever is pushing them at the moment to take stands against the Government, they must clearly understand that there has to be state intervention in this economy, and there will be state intervention in the economy regardless of whether they like it or not.

Now let us get the principles quite clear. When I went up to Washington one of the requests that I had from the Cabinet and the Minister of Agriculture was to look at situations in which he wanted to develop livestock, and he was particularly concerned about the Black Belly Sheep. There is such a thing as industrial piracy. There is now agricultural piracy going on in the world at large, and we had better understand it as a Third World underdeveloped poor country. There are countries with more resources who should be giving us aid and helping us, who want to use what resources they have to destroy what is available in the poor, developing and underdeveloped countries like ourselves.

What was the picture I brought back to him?There was a big charity group, but I am not going to identify the group, who was prepared to make some assistance towards Barbados. From the preliminary diplomatic assessment there seems to be something genuine about it. We are still examining it as he is still examining it. We were willing, if possible, to take the aid provided that the conditions of that aid were not to be to the detriment of this industry here. We have had a few people coming into Barbados, and I am going to name the places from which they come. The US Virgin Islands and Venezuela. They come here to buy the Black Belly sheep at exorbitant prices. What are they doing?They are using the Black Belly Sheep which gives you a litter of about three to the litter and sometimes four twice a year.

My son has managed to get four to a litter twice a year. This is a young boy of 12, who has an interest in agriculture. They buy the rams here and the ewes. They are using their petro-dollars and the other dollars from the United States in the U.S. Virgin Islands doing research and crossing in order to outwit us in the long term in the industry. I told this to Mr. Bethel myself, and I thought he had got the message through to a few short-term sharks who cannot understand that the interest of their country must come before their short-term interest from time to time. This really pains me because we have told him that it is a delicate situation. The Minister has asked that diplomatic efforts be put behind him in this matter. We are trying to look to another source for some long-term effort. Do you mean that the Barbados Agricultural Society and a few people in Barbados cannot understand that?

The Minister cited last night an example where my young son had sold a sheep for eighty something dollars to someone, who has no connection with rearing animals or the 4-H Movement, who sold the sheep to someone overseas for $300 (US). This is not fair to a child. As a result of that my son is now buying sheep. He said that if somebody is going to speculate, he is a sheep rearer speculating, too. I have had to counsel him on this issue, and give him some advice on the long-term interest. I am sure the hon. member was not aware of this otherwise he would not have put forward what he thought looked like a plausible case. In the long-term interest of a speciality for Barbados we must be careful on this. That is why when some of our sheep were sent to Taiwan we had some sort of limitation. There is no doubt about it. They are experimenting with them, too, and there is a great danger that unless we have a proper Herd Register that we watch where and how the sheep are being exported and to whom they are going.

We should get a fund of money to use for the research that is necessary into the industry, or we will never be able to satisfy our part of the bargain of the Food Corporation of the West Indies or, indeed, retain the industry for Barbados itself. In the long-term interest of the country, I welcome wholeheartedly the statement from the hon. member for St. Michael South East

that on this both Political Parties are together. Let the BAS stand against us in Barbados now. There was no minority in the elections. I think Eric Sealy got two votes at the last elections. Whoever ran as an independent got less than .1% on the votes. On this issue we have 99.9% of the people of Barbados behind us. If they are not interested in the long-term interest, then I would advise the Minister to form a co-operative, encourage a co-operative in sheep rearing, use State funds to increase it, bring in some of the workers whom they are using, and they will see how much private enterprise will stand up against that. I believe in State intervention, and this is one area that we ought to intervene very strongly on this issue.

Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what all of the noise is about. As I understand it, the policy is very clear. As the Minister responsible for exports, I have investigated the matter. There is a Committee that regulates, it does not prohibit it. What has happened is that many people are in the exporting business in Barbados and they do not understand a few facts about exporting. The Rules, as I understand, state that you must pay in Barbados before the sheep will be allowed to go abroad. The object of the Committee, as I understand it, is to ensure the amount of money that is paid for each sheep so as to establish a floor price; to determine how many are going abroad, and, thirdly, overseering it generally to ensure that your best do not go abroad, and that the people internally are not exploited. They ring me all the time, too, and I keep telling them that if they have some person abroad, they can write to the person abroad and tell him the conditions under which they can approach the matter.

I remember a case in which some person asked if he could send a letter of credit. I promptly rang the Ministry of Agriculture. A letter of credit is the same as cash. You cannot buy anything out of Japan unless you have an irrevocable letter of credit. One of them rang me the other night and said that they wanted a *pro forma* invoice. I had to say that it was a normal term of export. These people do not understand the sophisticated machinery that has to be gone through in exports if you want a *pro forma* invoice, I am positive the Ministry of Agriculture will issue a *pro forma* invoice because the countries from which the buyers come will sometimes insist upon a *pro forma* invoice as a condition of getting exchange control.

2.00 p.m.

There is nothing wrong in that. The truth is that they must learn a little bit about exporting. whether you have a monopoly export board or not, the basic position is that there is nothing to prevent them from exporting. They say that only nine sheep have been exported. All that has happened is that they have only been able to persuade nine people or one person abroad to comply with the conditions, but the conditions are not restrictive. Now there was a ban before but the Minister changed that.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, I do not see why the Deputy Prime Minister has to try to make a political point. We lifted the ban before we came out of power.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am not closing the debate. It is 2 o'clock and this is the normal time that I ask Your Honour to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

On Resumption:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (9) LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT

Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (9) Livestock Development – was resumed.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal on this debate and quite a lot has been said on the black belly sheep. I do not

claim to know anything at all about black belly sheep, but my contribution on this Head would be that I am genuinely concerned with the plight of the very poor man. By that I mean that I am expressing the feeling of the poor man because we have inherited a situation where the poor man, and I am speaking about the poor agricultural labourer and some who may not be agricultural labourers, has been accustomed for years to keeping a little pig, sheep, goat or cow, and we have seen the development whereby he is experiencing a problem, that problem being that he is unable to find a market for his livestock.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the situation is this: These people have been keeping these one or two or three or maybe ten pigs in order to supplement their income. Some heads of the home earn a very small income and you will find these people investing in the little pig or sheep or goat, and it is becoming a way of life in Barbados for the average poor man to keep a pig or so. But what have we found over the past few years?As I said, this is nothing new and it is not meant to be a criticism of the Minister of Agriculture; it is to highlight the plight and concern of those people and the concern which my party has got for these people, because when we came into power we found a situation where these people were unable to dispose of the live animal or even when they butchered these pigs they were unable to find a market because of the stringent legislation. There was legislation which forbade them from killing them without a proper sanitary or health licence. This was not the case a couple of years ago. For instance, when I was a boy, as one coming from the country, it was a custom for people at week-end or even around the holiday time, Christmas, Easter or Whit Sunday to kill a pig and have orders. They would ask people in the area to take maybe the head or a leg or a pound or so of pork, but during the regime of the former Government these people were faced with legislation and most of them found themselves unable to kill because they could not meet the requirements of the law then.

Now the situation has got a bit worse because you will find these people depending on the butcher, and the whole situation has led to some concern, because the butchers find that it is difficult for them to kill and sell at a competitive price, because you must know that the prices in the supermarket are sometimes below what the butcher will sell for, and therefore it has caused some drawback. He is now reluctant to take the volume of pigs from these poor people and as a result these people are faced with a genuine problem, the problem of disposing of this livestock. We have got to be concerned with these people because they are the genuinely poor people of this community. They are not the people who can join the Agricultural Society because I know members on that side belong to it and they are better off financially than these people to whom I am referring, but as I said, there is a genuine concern as to what is going to happen with these people, because I must say that these people depend on the keeping and disposal of these livestock in order to supplement their incomes. They are not myself who will be a little better off. These are the people I am talking about whose husbands or families are working for $25 or $30 a week or who get two or three days a week from the plantation owner. These are the people I am referring to, the carpenter whose wife has to try and get a little something, and in buying a little pig she regards this as an investment.

3.10 p.m.

He thinks that this is an investment, so he buys a little pig, or goat, or sheep for the benefit of himself and his children, so this is what I am talking about, because they find they cannot go and buy the sort of feed, they find this food wastage and they could actually give it to their livestock, so we have to be concerned about this, as I said, Mr. Chairman.

What we have seen over the past couple of months on our attaining office is that these people around Christmas time were concerned, some of them came to me over in Haggatt Hall, in St. George, even from your constituency, Mr. Chairman, and I must say that these people asked me what is my Government doing, because they had pigs and could not get the supermarkets to take them. This is the position, and as I said, we have to look at this aspect because there should be a genuine concern, not dividing on a party basis, but it should be the concern of all of us in this Hon. Chamber. We have to think and devise ways and means to help these people. I know what the Hon. Minister has done because I sat with him and I heard him at Cabinet expressing his views and I saw where he made a genuine attempt to relieve the situation, and I also know that it was after he realised the situation that he decided that he would make sure that the poor people were allowed to kill their livestock and take them to the BMC for them to relieve them.

Although there has been an attempt on the Minister's part to more or less alleviate the problem, the problem is still there and I see it from this angle, because if we are to develop a policy whereby we are going to encourage livestock we have to determine whether we are going to encourage these poor people to continue to keep stock. If

we are going to say that it is uneconomical, as I have heard this argument put forward, and I have heard it put so repeatedly, they have told these people who keep these pigs and they say it is uneconomical, they do not understand that to buy a pig and keep it for a certain number of months and continue to feed it they do not get back what they invested in the pig when they sell it. The average Barbadian does not care how much he spends on his pig, how much feed he gave it, he is interested that he gets back something when he sells it. When a fellow is about to dispose of a pig most of the time he has a genuine hardship problem.

I am seeing this from the real poor man level, you have to understand the seriousness of it. A policy on livestock development must outline what is going to be the position in relation to the poor man and his keeping of livestock. It must, because the Barbadian – I do not care what you do or say or how you feel – he is going to think that when he has $5 or $10 he should put it in a little pig, so that when the time comes around he can sell it and get back enough to pay fees, a piece of change to help his family. As I said before, I am not generally concerned with the Agricultural Society because I feel that members of that Society do not include people I am referring to, I am quite sure about this. If we have a policy we have to think about how we are going to involve the people, we have to think about the social concepts of Barbadians. Barbadians have this in them, they have actually developed this over the years, it is actually inculcated in the Barbadian way of life and we must accept this. It is no sense our saying we are going to adopt a policy which would eventually cause the poor man or deter him from this way of life. We cannot, because as I said, in an agricultural or any policy, educational policy, any policy at all must take into consideration the social concept and philosophy of the people of that country, so we in determining an agricultural policy must realise that these poor people whose social conditions are such that they feel they must invest in a pig or a cow, that they should have some sort of hope and I hope that what I am saying will actually be food for thought for the Minister of Agriculture.

I am confident that the Minister of Agriculture is the sort of person who will take no insult, who will not feel in any way embarrassed, or will not be afraid to take what I have said as a mere suggestion to help him in the formulation of his bread policy on livestock development in Barbados. We have to look at this, though these people might be in the minority they have to be satisfied, and I do hope that a policy is so devised and so publicly advertised that these people understand that we understand their position and that our policy when it is implemented will take care of them so that they will be able to keep their livestock and at the same time when they are ready either to butcher it or dispose of it live or dead, that they will feel happy to know that they are getting something for their labours. I think this should be the policy of the Barbados Labour Party and I hope that the Minister, having listened to me, will consider this and I hope that this will be the policy of our Party.

The question that the sum of $1,167,215 under Head 10(9) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Livestock Development – as amended stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HEAD 10(10) – ANALYTICAL SERVICES

Head 10(10) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Analytical Services – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, under Head 10(10) there is a typographical error, the figure "1" appearing where the figure "7" should be. The figure "74, 451" should therefore be amended to read "74,457".

I beg to move that the sum of $74,457 under Head 10(10) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Analytical Services – as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, for some time the previous administration had been considering merging certain laboratories together in a central laboratory but this has been bogged down by delays in the various departments concerned. It was proposed to merge the lab in the Ministry of Agriculture, the Public Health laboratory and the Forensic laboratory in one building under one administration, although an attempt would have been made to take care of the special peculiarities of each one of these laboratories.

There may be genuine reasons why this has been delayed and has not seen the light of day; however, what I am trying to get from the present Minister of Agriculture is what is the

present position on the centralisation of these various laboratories, whether he sees it as something worth while pursuing; if yes, how soon will we see something being done about it, and if no, what are the alternatives to these proposals.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I have had a look at this situation probably from the first or second week I have been in the Ministry. The situation as I see it is that there should be some merger, whether it is going to be a complete merger in one building or whether there is going to be a series of buildings.
3.20 p.m.

I have looked at it, and having had discussions with some of the attorneys involved, it looks to me that either we should construct independent buildings in the area of Culloden Farm where we have just completed the building of the Barbados National Standards Institute. The reason why I said so is that for the longest time when we were in Opposition, and as practising attorneys, we called for a forensic laboratory for the police which has never been developed.

When you speak to the Director of the Barbados National Standards Institute you will find that there are numerous bits and pieces of very expensive equipment which were given to them by various international organisations. Look at the Analytical Service in the Ministry of Agriculture, and you have other equipment. As you look around at this equipment you find several pieces of expensive equipment not utilised. It seems to me that you find each section scrambling after the same dollar to buy the same equipment which results in duplication, each section having the same piece.

I have discussed with the personnel in the Ministry the idea of preparing a document showing all the equipment available to Government which we would need, and showing what we would need to merge all these services together so that there may be a utilisation of the various equipment. There is one drawback in that the Barbados National Standards Institute is set up in such a way that it appears to be a private institution while it is still funded by the Government. Although private persons should subscribe to it, the Government finds itself, when it is in arrears putting up most of the money. The Government is contributing two-thirds, but whenever they fall short of money the Government had to make up the deficit.

My view, as I already said is that it appears that the Government will have to be responsible out and out for the Barbados National Standards Institute, and when money is available you can construct the other various sections of your laboratory in one compound so that persons can move from place to place and use that equipment.

You will note under Item 10 that the note provides for the installation of an animo acid analyser. I have already made provisions in the Ministry by which we are going to carry out tests on the animal feed which we are going to put on the market in Barbados. I have asked my officers to find out from the two feed mills what feed they are putting on the market and I have already handed to the Attorney General a request asking his department to draft the necessary legislation to make it an offence to sell something other than what we put on the label.

Now, in this particular case we are going to need the BNSI; we are going to need the Analytical Service in the Ministry of Agriculture; you are going to need facilities at the Pine. If you can put all of these in a particular complex, the workers will be nearer and it will be easier. I am therefore asking the Minister's officials to come up with their suggestions, and when that is ready we will tell the House what plans we have.

As I said, it appears to me that we will have to construct, either one large building, or two or three complexes to house the various sections, but have them in one compound.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit concerned about what the Minister said about the Standards Institution. What I recall on this is that the question which my colleague asked was being discussed; and that there was a meeting of all the officials concerned, including the gentleman who had come from UNDC to advise on standards. It was decided by the technical people that when the laboratory for the BNSI was open that that would be sufficient to take care of the needs of testing etc.

I heard the Minister say that he is getting ready to have tests of the inputs in animal feeds in his Ministry. As far as I remember, there was a piece of legislation that has been prepared in draft which the people at the Standards Institution had some time looking at and preparing a standard which, would become mandatory. It was my understanding that this would make the standard of production of animal feed in this country mandatory, which had been discussed by the Attorney General's chambers; and I am really at a loss.

In fact, I would like the Minister, perhaps in consultation with the Ministry of Caribbean

Affairs to confirm what in fact has happened with this very thick and heavy piece of legislation which was prepared in draft. It was prepared originally for the Ministry of Agriculture and then that Ministry had it sent back to the Standards Institution. It applied especially to the question of animal feeds.

It would seem to me that we were misled as to the Standards Institution which was built at a fairly high cost to the taxpayer, or that we were misled as to what that was capable of doing, or that there is need for agricultural cooperation so that we do not have this question of the continuation of testing going on in the Ministry of Agriculture, when the Standards Institution is supposed to bring an end to that kind of thing.

I think that the necessity for us to have a clear single area of standards and testing so that everybody can know what the position is; and again I do not know if the Attorney General can confirm whether there is not provision for the comprehensive Weights and Measures Bill which is to come down and which would form part of this. I wonder if the Minister would care to enlighten us on this.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: If the hon. member is speaking about the Weights and Measures Bill, that Bill has been amended and has gone to the Attorney General's office and has not come back to my office yet for a final analysis. What we are talking about here is that the Standards Institution can set up standards as to what goes into a bag of feed – pounds of this and pounds of that etc. What we are looking at is the animo acid analyser, what causes the development of the animal. Though the standards may be there, there may be crude protein according to the standard required but the protein may not be the same protein, or it may not have the same standard of the development that you want.

Animo acid whichI am told is the element in the feed that causes the growth of the animal, you have to do it on a separate instrument, that work is being done now at the Pine in the animal and human health section where you are seeing after the development of your grasses for feeding stock etc., but if you bring all these bits and pieces of equipment, you can move them from building to building, probably through a corridor, and do all your testing in one day. There are two different concepts – in the standard in itself and what I am looking at.

The question that Head 10(10) as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 10(11) – Meteorology – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 10(11) – Meteorology – stand part.

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

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

3.30 p.m.

HEAD 10(12) – CO-OPERATIVES DEVELOPMENT

Head 10(12) – Co-operatives Development – in the sum of $22,800 – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 10(12) – in the sum of $22,800 – stand part.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, earlier today some remarks were passed in relation to co-operatives, or the development of co-operatives in Barbados. Bearing in mind what has been said earlier today, I am asking the Minister if he thinks that $22,800 could really do anything meaningfully to start the type of co-operative development which has been alluded to here today. At the same time I would also like to ask him to tell the House what plans he has for the further development of co-operatives in this country. Maybe he can also say at the same time what were his reasons for the removal of certain co-operatives from the Registered List.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I think it will be useful for me, before the Minister replies, to make a few points on this question of co-operatives development. I want to say at the outset that, as far as I am concerned, the lip service which both parties have paid to co-operative development is an indication of how they feel about co-operatives. If you were to examine the provision in the Estimates for last year and you examine the provision in the Estimates for this year, not only would you see a reduction, but at the sametime the amount of money which is allocated, whether it was during the time of the Democratic Labour Party's reign, or at this present time, one would see that we have not yet reached the point where we are adopting a serious approach to this whole question of co-operatives.

I think that there is a role for co-operatives to play within our society but quite, naturally, it is a kind of development which has to be encouraged and nurtured, and we could as well be prepared and recognise that we are at the stage where we must sow the seed and begin at the beginning. The personal emoluments would indicate very clearly the position. There is provision for one Head of the Department, the Chief Co-operative Officer, and three Co-operative Officers. I think the establishment is about four, and there has been no increase in that particular area. Bearing in mind, as I said, it would seem as if both parties have committed themselves to the development of co-operatives within the society, one must recognise that there are a number of activities in this country which could go a long way if only the spirit of co-operation were evident and were existing within the society.

From time to time one has heard quite a bit about the co-operative movement, about money disappearing from certain co-operatives, about co-operatives starting one week and collapsing the next, and this is, in my view, due to a lack of leadership and a clear understanding about what are the clear indications of the Movement. There are a number of aspects to the co-operative movement, and I can say that there is money available in the international field for the whole question of co-operative development and training within this particular area.

As a matter of fact, I believe that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will be aware that in the ILO Office in Trinidad there is a project which is going, essentially, for trade unions called the ILO Geneva Workers Education Project for the Caribbean, and there is a sum of money about which the Trade Union Movement have, specifically, been able to impress upon the International Agencies which are funding this particular Scheme to put in for co-operatives development. Next week the Director of this particular project, the Caribbean Director, will be coming to Barbados and will be talking to us about providing an education programme for co-operatives.

In my view this is something which we have to develop together. As I have said, there is money existing there. I believe the officer is still there, but some time ago the ILO seconded an officer to look at the whole question of the development of co-operatives and he was attached to the Ministry of Agriculture. I think we have to recognise that it is an area in which we are lacking. We have to try to get some experience and develop some expertise from those people who have practised this particular kind of activity and see what we can gain from them. As a matter of fact, it is said that it can make a very important contribution towards the whole economic and social development, and it would have the effect of assisting to merge the society closer together. There are other spin-off effects which can be gained from this particular exercise.

I would hope that we would be able to see a deeper concern and a clear policy outlined on this question of co-operatives and not the kind of token approach which we have witnessed so far to be the hallmark of both parties who have professed from time to time their abiding interest and concern for the development of the Co-operative Movement in Barbados.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I have one point to make on this. Even though there may be technical assistance available to the Government from overseas Aid Agencies and other Organisations, I wish to counsel the Government about the type of person who is allowed in here or even in some instances performing in the field of Co-operatives. I have in my office a copy of an article written by an alien who is working in Barbados about Barbadians including a civil servant and somebody else in the most scandalous terms. It was published in a little provincial paper in Canada, and the person obviously felt that the report would not have filtered back to Barbados because it was not in a national newspaper, but I have the copy. The civil servant concerned, who was mentioned, has the original. I have a photostat copy. It cannot be right that these people could come into this country and make statements which are unfavourable about our people and still remain here and profess to be working. I think the Minister knows who I am talking about.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter on which the Government, obviously, has to make a fundamental decision. I have been actively engaged for about six years in co-operatives in Barbados, and I believe that I have repeatedly tried to point out that there is far too paternalistic an approach in relation to this matter. The truth of the matter is that no progress whatsoever will ever be made in co-operatives in Barbados until the law is amended and the dictatorial powers of the Registrar over the activities of co-operatives removed.

Secondly, as part of your Business Educational Programme, the form of the economy organisation, known as a co-operative, has to be explained, so that from an early age people begin to understand that a co-operative is

only another form of economic organisation similar to a partnership, a company, and the only distinction being in the manner of distribution of the profits.
3.40 p.m.

I do not understand why this has been buried in the Ministry of Agriculture all these years. Why should it be buried? This is an essential part of your business programme. It is another form of economic organisation. Why is it that a company does not have to have an inspector coming in and telling them how they must carry on their activities? He was so ridiculous that there could be no meeting of the Executive Committees held in these organisations without the Registrar trying to poke his nose into what was going on. We have too many provisions in the laws which interfere and inhibit the activity of the genuine leaders of the cooperative movement. By all means you must have control. The criminal law is there to control people who defraud people.

Secondly a major area is also the question of accounts. As I understand the cooperative law, you cannot have a general meeting unless you have the Annual Accounts and you cannot have the Annual Accounts unless the approved auditors audit them, and for years I have been trying to point out that you cannot expect one or two people to audit all the cooperative society books in Barbados, and what the law should make provision for is to set out a series of qualifications which you must have before you are a prescribed auditor, and if you have them you will be able to have in your society a corps of people who have these qualifications, they would be approved auditors and then the books can get going and you can go through the whole of that law and see all these things. If we do not change our attitude and regard this as part of a business educational programme and a part of the business law in the country and take cooperatives and the powers of the Registrar and remove this paternalistic approach that we have, we will never make any real progress.

I believe the organisation of the hon. member for St. Lucy at one stage thought of going into cooperatives. *(Asides)* The Union is the biggest. But I believe that when they had a look at the Act and the powers of the Registrar they could not take it. I would have thought they would have one of the best credit unions arising out of the membership, but when they had a look at the Act and the Registrar's powers they decided against it. Similarly there is great scope for cooperative housing. Even in capitalist United States of America many condominiums are built in a cooperative scheme. The Barbados Labour Party had cooperative labour and I believe one or two of the housing estates were built under that, where the basis of the cooperative was pooling your labour and things like that, but how it does get into agriculture at all I cannot understand. In the old days it seems to have been the idea that the peasant farmers were the only persons who had need for it and you tried to encourage marketing. You have transport cooperatives in Barbados; they do not operate genuinely as transport cooperatives; they operate as a capitalistic institution using the cooperative law. But the basic position is that you must go to countries like Canada, Vancouver, Western Canada where the farmers had to indulge in cooperation in order to market it, and you will see that it is treated there not in this paternalistic fashion, but as a particular form of economic organisation, an alternative to partnership, companies and things of that kind.

We also have to bear in mind on this question of training that there is a Cody Institute, Loughborough in England. There are many officers throughout the civil service in Barbados who have been trained in cooperatives. There are many people in the private sector in the credit unions who have taken advantage of these scholarships, so that we had in the Fifties many people who had gone on scholarships, but what we really need to understand is why have they left it. There must be something wrong with it that they have left it. I really believe that looked at in that light we can get something going, because there are great areas for it. We will reintroduce the concept of cooperatives in housing and in other areas too.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the first point is that the sum of $22,800 might seem a far cry from $59,788 which was voted in the previous year under this Head, but it has been reduced because the sum which was previously voted has never been used. If you refer to Head 10(3) you will note that a sum has been inserted of $240,000 which is also going to be spent on cooperatives if the particular cooperative societies finalises its business. They do not yet appreciate the benefits they can derive if they are registered as a cooperative. I have asked for the cleaning up of the cooperatives because as members on that side will know, in 1974 I asked a question about cooperatives. I have been worried about them from the time I came to Parliament, and out of the 81 cooperatives registered on the books I believe there are only thirty that are active; all the others never held an annual general meeting,

and those that are functioning have never had their books audited, and when you investigate you find one man who is working for about four sugar boards still doing the auditing of the cooperatives' books, and you get a report that when the books are submitted they are in a very bad state.

Everybody I have spoken to from the international field has said that while there is help to be given to cooperatives, they could not come in with the state of the cooperatives in Barbados as it was. When it comes to the I.L.O. Danido Mission, they had a Mr. Wiggins who was seconded to the Ministry of Agriculture. His term of office came to an end last month and they did not renew his contract, and I understand that they were dissatisfied with what use he was put to. I was trying my best to retain him here for a little longer, but I was told from Trinidad that they would re-assign him and the project had no more money. I do not know if those are the true facts. I asked them to try and keep him here because we have had certain plans for the development of cooperatives now. Joining in what the Leader of the House has said, I believe the Act needs changing completely. I have found that the people working in cooperatives do not understand the Act itself. I have had two cooperatives appear before me and when you listen to them and the problems which they encountered that caused the cooperatives to fold up, they were taught wrong what cooperatives were about and therefore it needs a complete cleaning of the cooperative section and starting from scratch if we want anything to happen. I want the cooperatives to go and therefore I have asked the present Registrar to wind up those that have never functioned.

Mr. Chairman, people have complained over and over again about how much they have lost in the cooperatives and in credit unions, and I have asked them to use the law, put in liquidators and clean them off. I said that after that I intend to create what I call a foundation, but what the Americans call a federation, in that you let the people form their own cooperative, they then appoint their own head structure which would then be in a position to employ auditors, employ teachers of cooperatives, and if those persons do not function they can be fired. As it stands in Government, if the cooperative officers do not work there is nothing you can do as you fully well know, and my view is that cooperatives have got to go in Barbados; it is the only way in the present economic situation of the world for developing countries to go forward.

3.50 p.m.

I believe the people themselves have to understand the benefits of cooperatives, therefore they must be taught from early. In our Manifesto we said that part of the co-operative training will be done in schools, and it is for this reason that I believe we should seek now to break the bone of Government over co-operatives and let co-operatives function and run their own business in the best way possible like businesses in Bridgetown. That is how I feel.

I believe that we should still have a Registrar of Co-operatives with certain powers, the powers in my view of an ombudsman. That will have to be decided as a general policy of Government, but I believe we should have a man who could supervise co-operatives with the powers of an ombudsman, that is, if somebody puts a few cents in a co-operative and they are dissatisfied and got no justice from the administration they can appeal to this gentleman who in turn could go in and investigate to see what is right and what is wrong. If he figures that it is a case which should be dealt with in the criminal courts he can recommend to the authorities, and if he feels it should be dealt with civilly, that he can also do.

That is the reason why I have started the cleaning up of the co-operative movement. I believe the hon. member who asked this question well remembers BANDCOS, because I remember him saying that BANDCOS was going to be the biggest thing in Barbados, and I believe he knows what has happened to BANDCOS. Until you have a system whereby the people in the co-operative movement who can be guided by persons who understand what co-operatives are about and look after the movement, then you are not going to get anywhere.

The question that the sum of $22,800 under Head 10(12) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Co-operative Development – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS HEAD 10(13) – AGRICULTURAL CREDIT BANK

Head 10(13) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Agricultural Credit Bank – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, under Head 10(13) – Agricultural Credit Bank, many people might have heard that the new policy which we are hoping to put through the Bank temporarily, because as it is well known in our

Manifesto we said we will amalgamate the various lending institutions so that agricultural credit can become much easier than it is, and we have already started by putting the emphasis on lending money for cultivation rather than lending money for completion of purchase. We have discovered that quite a number of persons have applied to the Bank for money to complete purchase price when in truth and in fact it is the whole sum of money they want, and at this time of our development we believe that the man with under 25 acres requires more borrowing facilities than he had before, and since with our idle land scheme where we are hoping that persons who have land lying down would bring it back into cultivation, I believe that more emphasis should be placed on the cultivation aspect than the purchasing aspect, and in that way we hope to keep the Bank going until the amalgamation comes.

We have also looked at another system whereby we are hoping that the Extension Officers in the area will be able to guide the Bank's officials as to whether or not an application for a loan is from a genuine agriculturalist or whether it is from somebody who wants to purchase a piece of land under the pretext of agriculture when in truth and in fact it is for a house spot or something of this nature. This is an Agricultural Credit Bank and I believe that the funding from this Bank should be used strictly for the development of agriculture.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $781,024 under Head 10(13) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – Agricultural Credit Bank – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I am indeed very happy to hear the Hon. Minister is concentrating on improving the functions of the Agricultural Credit Bank. Now, Sir, it is a fact that the large plantation owners have the Sugar Agricultural Bank in which funds are placed at their disposal for the cultivation of the plantations. I had the honour of serving as a member of that Bank for a few years and I would say that that Bank works well and the owners of these various plantations do not have headaches to get money to cultivate the plantations. Some of them on numerous occasions did not find it possible to repay the loans which they might have borrowed, and there is some method used, which is called a lock-up, and those people still continue to get money to cultivate the plantations although they have already borrowed money which they might have been unable to repay owing to drought or for some other reason.

In addition to that, they have money available to purchase equipment such as tractors, cane harvesters and everything that they need for the cultivation of the sugar crop. In that Bank even the factories now can get money to borrow to run the factories. I think the time has come when we should do everything possible to assist the small farmer. I regret to see that the amount has not been increased from last year's but having heard the Minister who has stated that he is concentrating on improving the conditions under which the small farmers can borrow money, I want to say how happy I am.

4.00 p.m.

Sir, I represent an agricultural sector of this community in my constituency and I am not ashamed to say that, therefore I will whole heartedly support those without whom I would not be a member of this House. I have no doubt that there are many of us who represent people in this House from the rural areas and who can vouch that the agricultural labourers made their contribution in sending us to this House. Therefore when it comes to the small farmers, I have a special interest in them. You may be a small farmer and may own approximately two or three acres of land and through a drought or unforeseen circumstances you may not be able to reap a certain amount at the end of the year. Consequently, that farmer has not got the privilege or the opportunity to go and borrow money because there is no lockup in that bank, and I would only appeal to the Minister to have a thorough examination of this bank.

Perhaps it would be best to recommend to the Cabinet that a Committee be set up or appointed including one or two small farmers to go into all the transactions and functioning of the bank and to recommend certain changes which would alleviate the hardships which these small farmers suffer at present.

Sir, I need not repeat what I said yesterday. In this Island especially at this time the Ministry of Agriculture is the most important Ministry. We depend on the sugar crop. We depend on vegetables etc. to feed our people and therefore, there should be no cheese paring approach in dealing with funds for the improvement of agriculture in this Island. Failing to do so, we will all suffer.

Let us concentrate on agriculture and do something tangible to improve the conditions in

the agricultural sector so that the community can derive an unestimable benefit and that this country will in the long run be in a position to be almost self-sufficient. I do hope that the Minister will use his influence on his colleagues and implore them and let them see the necessity for having funds available in this very important Ministry.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I said before the hon. member for St. Philip South is always reminding us that he is a representative of agricultural workers. I too represent them. I want him to understand that we on this side of the Barbados Labour Party are also proud to know that I, the son of an agricultural labourer coming from the country is here today to represent them. So, do not let him come here and tell us that he is alone representing the agricultural labourer.

There is something which bothers me sometimes. I cannot understand how members of that side who have not taken the opportunity to rectify certain situations can come here now and make recommendations to me. All that I am doing is to examine carefully the facts before me. They were in power for 15 years. A fund was set up called the Sugar Export Levy Fund. Everybody knows that that fund was derived from the agricultural labourers, their sweat in the sugar cane fields.

We would have expected them to use that money and provide some sort of fund whereby small farmers would have derived some sort of benefit; but it was not so in their regime. It may be all right for the member to come here and call on the Minister to give some kind of consideration; but we do not need any consideration from that side. When they were in power they took $2.2 million out of the Sugar Export Levy Fund and had it committed to the National Housing Corporation to be disbursed over there.

What is significant about that is that they would want to claim that it was for the benefit of the sugar workers. That was not the case because $500,000 part of the $2.2 million which was released found itself in the National Housing Corporation.

4.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, Do you not understand that the agricultural workers who sweated and toiled to put this money there did not derive the real benefit from the money? The money was used during the election campaign. Do you know who got the money? The people who did not work in the sugar industry. I can say this because they cannot challenge me. Neither one of those on that side can challenge me. I defy either one of them to get up in here and challenge me on what I am saying. Just before the election campaign that same money that the agricultural workers had worked and sweated hard to accumulate was released and you found people going over there who did not work in the agricultural belt having loans from it.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that they have received lots of requests from your constituency from St. George North and South, from Christ Church and even St. Lucy coming to me asking me to see whether I could negotiate a loan for them to help them with a house. I want to ask what housing has to do in relation to the Agricultural Credit Bank. *(Asides)* I am not off-track. You cannot come in here and talk about the Agricultural Credit Bank and talk about small farmers. The small farmers must get a house like anybody else. They have to live in a house. If a man is not comfortable in his little shack or in his board house, he cannot be expected to perform at his optimum as a small farmer. You have to make these people comfortable. But what have we seen? A situation developing in their tenure of office where they did not think that in order to generate interest in agriculture among the poor small farmers they should have seen it fit that those people were given every encouragement and that funds were available so that they could have their houses properly done.

People are talking agriculture and they are saying that they cannot get money in the bank. That is due to the fact that when that Party was in power they did not find it fit to respect those people and to realise that they wanted to be comfortable, too. I do not care whether it is BLP or DLP. I am saying that my Government has to consider that these people cannot be look upon as thinking in terms of cutting canes, loading canes, and reaping canes and injecting anything in the economy until it realises that the people need proper homes. Any money that comes from agriculture should go towards assisting them in having homes.

This brings me on to a very serious point, which the Hon. Minister has made. He has made the point that there would be, at some later stage, an amalgamation of these Banks. I welcome that because when there is an amalgamation of these various Banks surely the small farmer, the agricultural worker and so on would be able to go forward to the Bank and request a loan. I will see to it that, if he is qualified, he is given a loan. It is not so at the moment. There are several

people who are there queuing up asking for at least $1,000 or $2,000, or $1,500 in order to carry out repairs to their houses.

These are the same people that the member for St. Philip South has said today should be given encouragement and some sort of money should be made available to them to work their lands. I am aware of this. My mother, who owns a piece of land, has had a loan from the Agricultural Developmen• Bank. I know that the interest is 6%. What I am saying is that it was not easy for her, or any agricultural labourer, to go over at the National Housing Corporation and get a loan. They can try it now. There is no money over there now because the DLP Government did not realise that what they should have done was to provide funds whereby the same people whom they are calling upon to sweat and toil in agriculture should have funds made available to them not only for the development of their small plots of land, but also to enable them to have a house.

I must say that a man works in order to get money, to get a home, to get some money to pay sick bills, to educate his children, and to meet the expenses of his children. We are thinking about the social conditions of the farmers. What I am saying today is let us not come in here and think in terms of just the small farmers any more. Let us think in terms of making provisions so that the small farmer can have a piece of change to help him to build a proper home.

I am not satisfied with the situation in this country. I know full well that the Hon. Minister has indicated – I have seem him, I have spoken to him – that he has plans, and the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has discussed them with him. They are going to amalgamate these various Banks so that it will not be difficult for people who richly deserve loans will get them. I am talking about the small farmers. I am not talking about the other fellows and the civil servants. There should be funds set aside for the civil servants, and they should not be getting loans from the Agricultural Labourers Fund that is set aside. There should be a fund set up for that particular group of people.

What have we seen during the past Administration, Mr. Chairman? The money was there and the people who have been drawing from this pool are the people who themselves have downgraded those same agricultural workers. It would not be so in the regime of the Barbados Labour Party. I want to make a final point. The members on that side have misquoted me. Only two days ago I sat in here and heard an aside from a member on that side in that corner. He said that I suggested to whip Barbadians. That was said when we were discussing the Cane Fires Bill, but I never said that. I know what the member was trying to imply because he, probably, feels that the only person who can light a fire is a Barbadian. I never said that, and I would never suggest it. Barbadians have all sort of nationals here, and I would have been the last to suggest that Barbadians light fire, although it may be the case.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying that people must not distort the facts. People must try and understand what we on this side are trying to do. There is a bold, imaginative plan to amalgamate the Banks so that the people who deserve assistance will not only get it in agriculture but in homes. Mr. Chairman, that is my little contribution on this Head.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I used to believe that it was not necessary in a House of Assembly or Parliament to have Rules of debate, but every time I hear the hon. member for St. Michael North East I know why they have to have Rules. Twice he has made interventions today and twice he has managed to completely confuse all of us including himself. Is he North East or South East? I mean the hon. member who has just sat down. He is the hon. member for St. Michael South East. I find it very difficult to understand what he was talking about, and I am sure you, Mr. Chairman, must have had some difficulty.

What I managed to gather from him is that his mother was able to borrow some money for a piece of agricultural land, and now that he is in power she will be able to borrow some money for a house. It seems that we..... .

Mr. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like the hon. member to understand that my mother has a house. She needs no house, and I will assist her with that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to be insulting. I was saying what I understood him to say. He said that we appropriated $2.2 million when we on this side were in the Government. We took $2.2 million and put it aside. He said it came from the hard sweat and tears of the workers.

4.20 p.m.

The hon. member then spoke about $500,000 which found itself at the National Housing Corporation. I do not know if it walked down there, if it went on scooter, but he said that the agricultural workers have not been able

to get any of this money, but in the meantime he himself had indicated that he was the product of an agricultural worker. I would like to ask the hon. member if in fact the money that was loaned was loaned to Jamaicans, Surinamese or Barbadians of other nationalities he spoke about as he was concluding. As I said, I am confused, but I did not get up to deal with the hon. member's speech, because you would need a computer and a slide rule to be able to understand how to deal with it.

What I got up to do is to ask the Minister of Agriculture who has been doing very well for us today in his answers a very small question. You will recall that some time in September there was a great hullabaloo about four thousand acres being reclaimed by the Government from various and sundry people. I would like to ask the Minister what has happened to that 4,000 acres.....*(Asides)* The Minister says it is the wrong Head, and I shall wait until the right Head is called. While I am on my feet I have to draw to your attention that we might be short of a quorum and I do not think you have to go too far.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When it comes to the vote we can ring the bell.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Philip South spoke quite a long time about the assistance which should be given to small farmers, but before I answer him I must say here and now that I have sat with him on the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for some five years and I regret very much that now that the Bank falls under me as Minister he is no longer a member of that Board. He approached me about it some time ago and as far as I can recall he asked whether I had any objections to his sitting on the Board and I told him "no". I would like the hon. member to understand that at the beginning of this Parliament when we were selecting Board members, I had indicated to my political party that if the Opposition had put up the name of the hon. member for St. Philip South I would go along with it, because I think he was a good member of the Bank. I want him to know quite clearly that the Leader of the Opposition appointed someone else, and I think it is Mr. King, to the Bank and that filled the number of places. I want him to understand it is not this side that prevented him continuing his seat on the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, I must thank the hon. member for the information he has given me. It is the first time that it has been drawn to my attention, not one of my colleagues has told me that.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to his attention that the Boards for which you had to have Parliamentary representation were settled on the opening of Parliament and he was still I believe in North America completing his visit to Mauritius.

On his point about assistance to small farmers, as I said yesterday, I fully appreciate that small farmers are not getting the type of financial assistance which I believe they need, and that is the reason why I said I am looking at the development of an animal and crop insurance scheme. When we have got the scheme going we will then be able to tie a crop insurance policy together with your marketing contract to use as collateral to obtain financing for the small farmers. I hope then there will be no need to follow the pattern as set by the Democratic Labour Party of asking a man to insure his life to get money for working. He would know that in the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank it is a mere formality, that the plantation owner goes in and fills out a form, it goes before the Board and it is all settled in the space of minutes. For the small farmer he had a long lot of procedures to go through before he got the money, but one of the problems is that there has been a lack of repayment in the Agricultural Credit Bank, and I am hoping that when I can put together a farm insurance scheme and a marketing programme that we can have a turnover of money for repayment and this would solve part of the problem in financing the small farmer.

The question that the sum of $781,024 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (13) Agricultural Credit Bank – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS
(14) PRICE CONTROL

Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (14) Price Control – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $197,026 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (14) Price Control – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (15) PUBLIC UTILITIES

Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (15) Public Utilities – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $88,548 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (15) Public Utilities, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (16) BARBADOS MARKETING CORPORATION

Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (16) Barbados Marketing Corporation – was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $423,260 under Head 10 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (16) Barbados Marketing Corporation – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 110 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Head 110 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs –was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $5,175,827 under Head 110 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 11 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,165,754 under Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – stand part of the Schedule.

The only item I should like to offer a limited comment on is Item 17. I would like to inform the Committee that during the year we will be asking to supplement this Head in view of the fact that we will be bringing down a paper dealing with the reorganisation of the Law Reform Committee and the necessity to have a proper section dealing with the whole subject of law reform. At that time the Committee will no doubt want to discuss the areas of law reform in greater detail. I do not think there is any other unusual item which calls for comment under this Head. I merely say under Item 11 – Commission on status of women, the Commission is proceeding ahead and its report is expected by the end of the year.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I should just like briefly to say that I would like the Attorney General, because I have come in for a lot of criticism in here, to compare the staff I had between 1966 and 1971 with the staff that he has now and which my predecessor had and he will find that it is over double what I had to run this country with. I want in future whenever you refer back to my period that you understand that I had half the staff you have now to operate with, and I have had the pleasure of hearing you complain in here that you still need more staff, although you have a Deputy Director, Deputy Solicitor General, and a million Crown Counsel. 4.30 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there is just one item I want to raise a query on and it is Item 15 which deals with Grants to non-profit agencies and provides for a grant to the Film Censorship Board. If I remember correctly, the last Minister of Information who had the responsibility for this particular Board had appointed a committee to look into this whole question of censorship. As I understand it, it went beyond the censorship of films, and it is

important that we do something in this particular regard to establish certain basic principles as far as censorship is concerned.

A lot of people have expressed concern about the kind of films which are shown at our cinemas and the kind of films which are now gradually finding their way on television, and are linking some of the disturbances that we see or the anti-social behaviour which we see coming to the fore much more so than in the past in our society at present to the kind of films which are being shown in this country. Of course, there is no way of determining this kind of situation but we should try to develop a certain set of guiding principles which we should lay down for the whole broad area of censorship, whether it be books or any kind of materials which come into the country.

I am not that foolish not to recognise that we are living in a world where there are a whole set of influences which we cannot really escape, but what I am suggesting is that we have however to be careful not to go so far overboard as not to lose sight of certain basic principles which should guide us in our behaviour and generally speaking in the way in which we relate to one another in the society.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, hon. members have raised two points, and if I may take the more substantive point first, the point made by the hon. member for St. Lucy, the then Minister of Information and Tourism did establish a committee consisting of something like 14 or 15 people who have been looking into the whole area of film censorship in Barbados. That committee is operating, and I believe they have now been asked to look at the question of magazines and other publications as well, and I hope they will extend their work to looking at the area of probably newspapers.

The Committee was working without a full time Secretary, and this is always the problem that one finds with such committees. I have tried to talk to the Chairman of the Committee, Mrs. May Herbert, of Women in Action, who is very keen indeed, and as a result we have seconded to her a very capable young lady in the Ministry of the Attorney General, and I have been trying to collect all the Commonwealth material on the whole question of film censorship, and I am hoping that very shortly, within the next five or six months, the Committee will be able to put a substantive report before me so that I could discuss this and probably collect views in the industry, including the newspaper industry, before bringing down model legislation.

I see the Press is here and I will strongly appeal to the Press probably to put in memoranda on the question of censorship in general, and also to the Advertisers' Association to put up its views on the standards which should operate in advertisements, trailers and that sort of thing which the hon. member for St. Lucy so correctly talked about.

I think the Film Censorship Board itself needs massive re-organisation. It is operating under an Act that was passed back in the 1920s or 1930s, the appeal procedure is to the Minister and why it should be to the Minister I do not know, because I doubt whether the Minister needs to have the residual power other than in policy direction in dealing with appeals about whether a film should be graded A, X or whatever it is. It is totally unnecessary. Things like that I hope to change in the Act to set up a proper appeal procedure. Also, I must confess that the Act is inadequate in that we barely recoup the expenses of the people who are members of the panel which sits on films, and we pay the Secretary a negligible figure of only $120 per month, and she is out of pocket on several occasions in servicing this Board. I have just minuted the file in my Department recommending that the fees be changed; the last time they were changed was when the hon. member for St. Michael North Central was the Minister, I believe, when he doubled them and they have not been changed since 1972. I propose to make the film industry pay for the administrative time, because there is no reason why the taxpayers' fund should be subsidising the film magnates around the world and the cinema owners in Barbados. I am minuting the Minister of Finance to this effect and hoping that the Order will be made, it is an Order subject to negative resolution.

So far as the other wider issue of censorship is concerned, particularly the films on television, at the moment nothing is done about that. I did ask last week from the Secretary of the Board whether they ever looked at these and I was told no. I think the Board itself was surprised when I drew it to the Board's attention that under the Cinematograph (British) Films Act, 1934 there is an obligation on Barbadians to show at least 30%, or something like that, British films in Barbados every year. It is one of the Acts which show how Imperial powers carved out economic

empires for themselves and maintained economic strangulation on their black colonists overseas, and I have asked the Film Board to let me know very shortly their views on repealing that legislation even before the review is finished, because it is obnoxious to me as a Barbadian to see that we are tied down into showing a certain percentage of British films per year. The hon. members are a bit surprised about the existence of the Act, they are not the only people, very few people have looked at the Act, but I can show several Acts now on the Statute Book which are signs of British domination and how they maintain an economic stranglehold on the country.

In so far as my learned and hon. friend is concerned, I do not think he really meant me to take his suggestion seriously, but what he is really saying is that with half of the staff which my predecessor had he did 100 times more work – in fact it is probably 600 times more work – by way of law reform than my predecessor did.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I think my learned friend knows I am senior to him, and he cannot put words in my mouth. I did not say so, all I said was that I operated with half the staff that you have, I did not compare work load or production, so do not put anything in my mouth.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am interpreting my friend correctly, and I will tell you why. During my learned friend's regime as Attorney General it is a fact that some law reform was done, and I think there were about six Acts where real law reform was achieved. During the regime of my immediate predecessor only one Act dealing with law reform was done, although the distinction being during the time of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition he had no outside counsel available to him in the same way my predecessor did. So on the basis of this I am only saying that he did 600 times more work with half of the staff, but the point remains that because of the fact that enough was not done either under both my learned friends the task has now fallen to me to put the machinery in train, and it is an undoubted fact that there must be a scientific approach to the whole question of law reform.

I have brought a book in here which I am quite willing to make available to my friends to read on what is happening in the region of law reform and what should be done and how one goes about it, but we are going to do it.

4.40 p.m.

I know that I will have to support when I come to Parliament for an increase in the establishment on the drafting side so as to set up this committee.

The question that Head 11(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 11(2) – Registration Department in the sum of $90,472 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 11(2) stand part.

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

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

Head 11(3) – Crown Solicitor's Department in the sum of $17,489 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that Head 11(3) stand part.

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

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

Hon. L. R. TULL rose.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to move that Head 11(3) be recommitted.

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

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a point. It seems to me that there is some justification for moving the Crown Solicitor's Department from where it presently is and amalgamating it with the Attorney General's Department. I want to know the views of the Attorney General on that particular matter.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to expand on that a little bit. My friend from St. Michael North West and myself have been discussing this, and we feel that the Crown Solicitor's Department is an essential agency of the developmental functions of Government; and if there is a hold up in the Crown Solicitor's

Department of work, then it affects the pace at which the Government's development, the acquisitions of land etc. can take place.

I am counselling the Attorney General to have his eyes on this. As presently structured, the Crown Solicitor's Department is removed from the aegis of the Attorney General's Department which is at Marine House, and therefore the area of co-ordination is lost. They need to be closer to each other; and the Crown Solicitor's Department, in my submission, should have increased staff. Some of the run of the mill work that the Crown Solicitor has himself to deal with should be left to junior officers. Yesterday the Leader of the House talked about para-legal staff. I will come to that later because people who would not have the qualifications to be a practising attorney could be trained in para-legal work.

In relation to this, Sir, I think that it is time that the question of the settlement of accident cases involving Government vehicles be taken from the Solicitor General since so much of the Crown Solicitor's time has been taken up in settling these cases leading to a delay in cases of land acquisition and things like that.

I am not going to define the functions at this stage because I want the Head to pass; but it is time that you have greater co-operation between the Crown Solicitor's Department and the Attorney General's Department so that the time lapse that now exists between documents passing between the department since we have the Ministry of Housing and Lands at Marine House is reduced.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I share the views of the hon. member as an older barrister I do not think that there is any need for this dual function of Crown Solicitor and Attorney General. All I will say is that you make sure to get some competent solicitors who can do the work rather than continue to use or to train barristers as you are trying to do now.

There is no reason why you should have separate departments if a place can be found for a Crown Solicitor's Department at Marine House.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of people in my constituency I have had some communications with this department and I am sure that it will be agreed that the Crown Solicitor has carried out his duties with great distinction; but I would like him to pay some attention to people who live on the land immediately outside of the new development at Lands Ends. This is of more importance now that there is a tremendous amount of confusion and consternation; and I would like very much for these people to get a statement, a definite statement, of what the Government is going to do. Some of them are suffering citizens because of the many delays and uncertainties as to what is going to happen with their properties along that area.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, if I may deal with the point raised by the member for St. Michael South West about the Crown Solicitor's Department and the acquisition of land at Lands End I can only say that I think the delay is due to a difference between the parties on the quantum of price. Before I became Attorney General I was also interested in this question. Apparently there seems to be some argument about the question of price; and the former Minister was not satisfied that the price was a fair and reasonable one. I would suggest that the Government use its acquisition powers and allow the purchase to go on legally instead of holding up the matter.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: If the Minister would give way, Sir. I am told; I do know, but I am told that agreement had almost been reached, and that since the Minister got involved he has indicated that the price was too high. All I am saying is that it is creating tremendous strain on the person. Let us bring the matter to an early conclusion.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: If the hon. member will permit me to just come in briefly here. Agreement was reached with whom? If an agreement was nearly reached with the previous Government, it does not commit the new Government to any approach to an agreement. When I came in the matter was at a point where I was not quite happy, and I have asked for new negotiations. I take it that this is a very reasonable arrangement. I was not quite happy with what I found, and I have asked to have a look at the price again. I have said this repeatedly for the hon. member's benefit in the past, and I did not think he would have raised it so quickly again.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the persons who do the negotiations have remained constant. It is true that Ministers have gone out and new Ministers have come in. I would assume that the negotiations were between the Crown Solicitors or the people in the Crown

Solicitor's Office and the people concerned and, therefore, the change of Government is totally immaterial to what the Crown Solicitor considers to be a reasonable price, unless the Minister is now saying that he has invoked ministerial interference into what would normally be a negotiation between the Crown Solicitor and the people. I am not saying he has said so, but I do not see how a change of Government should make any difference to a negotiation on the price or the value of a property when the negotiator remains the same, unless the Minister is saying that he is issuing instructions to the Crown Solicitor.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I now see why the country's business went so badly under the regime of the past Administration. Do you mean that the Minister has no right at any stage to say he is not satisfied with how things are going? The Crown Solicitor can only act upon the authority of the Minister. The Minster gives instructions and he must act through his Permanent Secretary, and that is on the basis on which he works. As a matter of fact the Crown Solicitor does not advise me, and I want to assure the hon. member of that. The person who advises me in law, or a Minister in law, if you are not aware of this, is the Attorney General.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that the Minister is aware from whence he gets his power and who is his adviser, but, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister must also be aware that his role as a Minister must be separated from his role as Real Estate Agent.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member cannot help interjecting improper motives in every debate. What is my position as a Real Estate Agent in a private capacity to do with my duties as a Minister of the Crown on a matter in which the people's interest is involved. It is very improper, but he cannot help it.

Mr. TAITT: I made no attempt to be improper. The fact is that the Government, whether it is the Barbados Labour Party Government, or the Democratic Labour Party Government, or the Eric Sealy Government has agencies which are responsible for certain functions. The Crown Solicitor's Office, as far as I know, is the Government's agency responsible for negotiating. If the Crown Solicitor and the Chief Valuation Officer are satisfied that a value is appropriate, then it reeks of political interference, if the Minister now comes and says that it is not a fair value.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, quite seriously, I think the hon. member is in great difficulty because this is the procedure. When the Government decides to acquire the first notice is sent out through the Ministry of Land, then the Crown Solicitor comes in, a Valuation Committee meets, and proposals are submitted, but the Minister whose Ministry is affected and the Ministry of Land must have some input in it, particularly in the area when the Minister may know that not too far away 89cents per square foot was given, and there some people are claiming $9.00 a square foot. Obviously, you will have to ask them to go back and justify the basis of the valuation. With regard to this question about valuation, I cannot understand some of these people. The hon. member's clients have so much money at stake. The should consult his colleague over there and he, I am sure, will get the machinery going to put it before arbitration if there is any disagreement.

I keep pointing out to people that the Land Acquisition Act is very clear. If you disagree with Government's Valuation, there is machinery there that you can invoke. You must invoke the machinery.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, there is no need for the Deputy Prime Minister to get worked up on this matter. All I have said, Mr. Chairman, is that I have constituents who have indicated that they are suffering from great stress because this matter is taking too long. I really directed my remarks to the Attorney General who has demonstrated a capacity before he became a Minister, and even since he has become a Minister, to deal in these matters effectively. I ask the Attorney General to bring his great weight to bear and try to bring this matter to some sort of conclusion. That is all.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I give the hon. member an assurance that I will make an enquiry into the matter, and try to push the negotiations along speedily so that the private subject will feel that he is being properly looked after. I will get that settled as soon as possible.

The other points taken by my learned and hon. Friend from St. Michael North West, St. Philip North and St. Michael South Central are valid points. I think with the fusion of the legal profession that the only case that can be made

out for keeping the Crown Solicitor's Department where it is, and it is not a very strong case, is that they want to be near the Courts because they have to do searches from time to time. On all other grounds, I think the overwhelming case is as put by my three friends. There are very strong grounds for moving the Department and integrating it within the Attorney General's Department. It has been hoped that this change could have been delayed until next year when the current holder of the post has indicated that he may seek permission to retire and take life a little easier. He has given several long years to the Public Service.

My colleagues in the Cabinet have been pressing on me, and I have listened very carefully to their statements that in may cases it would have been tidier and better in order to push the legal work and also to provide for the future reorganisation of the Department as a whole. It allows, as the hon. member has said, if it is integrated, for a greater movement of staff, a broader training of staff, a broader exchange of staff and, probably, overall much more efficiency. From the staff position also it would mean that the younger people in the Crown Solicitor's Department would have a better opportunity at promotion than they now have. I have been very concerned about this aspect of the matter and, indeed, the other day I insisted that one of the members of the Department should go on a Legislative Drafting Course so that this competence would not only be in the field of the solicitoring aspect of the matter and that is all.

So far as para-legal staff is concerned, I am very glad the hon. member for St. Philip North has raised this point. It is a point of which we made quite a lot during the election campaign and, indeed, in our Manifesto, I think, there is some mention of the matter. I can report to the House that the Solicitor General, at my request, has formulated a Paper on the matter of para-legal training. A part of that Paper he is going to deliver at a Conference in St. Kitts on the 10th or 11th April on the whole question of legal education in the Caribbean. I have spoken to the Minister of Education because we see a very strong role for his Ministry to play in this, since it is expected that the para-legal training will be conducted at the Community College.

5 p.m.

The Community College at present does some papers in "A" and "O" level law and it would be necessary to expand this course for a three year training course, and the person will be qualified as a legal executive and be available to do the sort of work adumbrated by my learned friend, and at the same time we will improve the quality of supporting staff in the Ministries who put up proposals for legislation. It would also give a shot in the arm to not only the Crown Solicitor but to the Registration Department and we will be able to train better the people in the Registry as well.

As far as settlement of accident cases is concerned, essentially this is a matter for the Standing Insurance Committee and a lot of time is wasted in that Committee by the present machinery used. The Adviser on insurance has just made a report to the Ministry which I had an opportunity to see and they are reorganising the whole question of insurance, and I think that that reorganisation between this year and next year will see more speed. The Government is proposing to have an insurance board which will operate on commercial lines starting first with the insuring of Government vehicles as we now have and Government buildings, extending in areas like Civil Servants who borrow money from the Government to buy cars, and possibly also taking in the whole area of house coverage. This will have its own panel of legal advisers and an answer will be provided in the long term to my friend's problem. In the meantime I will ask the Solicitor General to assign a particular officer who will assist the Crown Solicitor to see if we can give some relief in that field. I think those are the only points raised.

The Question that the sum of $17,489 under Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General (3) Crown Solicitor's Department – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 11 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL – (4) PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General – (4) Probation Department – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $26,682 under Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General – (4) Probation Department – stand part of the Schedule.

In dealing with this Head, I think the hon. member had indicated a point to me and he wanted me to reply on it. It simply is that I acknowledge that this Department is

understaffed at the moment. In fact it is one of the best run departments in the Government, and I am pleased to say that it is headed by a lady of outstanding qualities and proves the fact that I have been making, that women are great producers in this country. She has done and her department has done some very innovative work in supervising community orders. Only today I saw two such orders that had been made where she has tried to reintegrate into the community people who have created offences and rather than having them sent to prison, she has taken them and got them to do community orders, and we have been supervising this. But there is a limit to which she and her department can go with the sort of staff available.

I should like to state that we have set up within the department a departmental committee on which the Chief Probation Officer, the Chief Prison Officer, various Social Welfare Officers and Sociologists are sitting, and we are looking at the whole area of penology, rehabilitation, punishment that whole area of penal reform, and we believe we can half the prison population, reduce the cost to the Government and improve the social integration of people in the community. I am looking forward to that report and I am sure that when it is available and concrete proposals have gone through to Cabinet, the House will welcome this because it is an area that I think many members on both sides of the House show some interest.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second the motion.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to mention one aspect of this question of penal reform to the Attorney General. He did not specifically speak of after care. If that was implied in his remarks, then I welcome it. I believe that when I was a boy at Dodds, not as an inmate, that is between 1948 and 1960, there was a Board of Visitors attached to the school there and there was also an After Care Committee. I think it functioned for a few years and then it seemed to have suddenly disappeared. It is important that we have a Standing Committee to look after the reformation and rehabilitation of the chaps from Dodds and the graduates from the prison after they graduate, because in a small society stigmas attach.

There is a very simple thing that I am not going to deal with when we deal with the Government Industrial Schools, but it is part of this kind of idea of penal reform, and I want to address it at this stage to the Minister of Education. Now the van which takes around the boys from Dodds has written on it "Government Industrial Schools" and it comes to town with a group of boys in it, and everybody stares and says "look at the Dodds boys", I would suggest to the Minister of Education at the appropriate time to remove that and put "Ministry of Education" on it because there is a boy there now who is an athlete of some ability and he was to run at the Stadium a few weeks ago, and he feigned sickness for two days so that he could not go and take part in the meeting at the stadium, because he said that when he got out of the van at the stadium everybody would look and tell him he is a Dodds boy. So in order to remove that kind of stigma, all you need to do is to change the lettering to "Ministry of Education" and ease the burden of some of these boys who have that stigma to carry with them not only when they are in there but in a harsh and in some instances facetious society like Barbados they carry it during the balance of their lives.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The point raised by the hon. member is well taken. I forgot to say that we are looking at the whole area of after care. My Ministry merely deals with the after care of people who have gone through Glendairy Prison, and I am not too satisfied with the prison, not the personnel, but the prison work done by the After Care Committee. If you read the Minutes, it is mostly X who is coming out of prison in a few weeks, asks for a dress or a couple of dresses, a pair of shoes, a handbag, and the Committee reports that they have given X $10. That is not after care as far as I am concerned, and I think the Chief Prison Officer recognises this. Indeed he has himself put up some concrete proposals which will be considered by this whole Committee in the reorganisation.

So far as the question of the Government Industrial Schools is concerned and the children there, that is a matter under the Ministry of Education and my friend the Minister of Education has indicated that he will deal with this, but now that I am aware of that question I will be inviting his Ministry to place someone on both our Committee as well as the Child Care Committee which we have going in the department looking at child legislation as well.

The Question that the sum of $26,682 under Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General (4) Probation Department – stand part

of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 11 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL – (5) PRISONS

Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General – (5) Prisons – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head stand part, I will ask that under the explanatory notes where it reads "Head 15(5)" that that be amended to read "Head 11(5)".

I beg to move that the sum of $378,862 under Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General (5) Prisons – stand part of the Schedule.

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

5.10 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on Prisons, apart from calling for an increase in the number of Prison Officers to make more proportionate – rather than is presently disproportionate – the ratio of staff to prisoners, I wish to counsel the Attorney General, since it was our call when we were in Opposition to ask for regular visits from psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers to be part of an integrated system at the Prison where we could give effect to group therapy ideas, and I wish to remind him that that was our policy when we were in Opposition and I hope that the Ministry will give urgent attention, notwithstanding the fact that he has earlier indicated that he is going to set up a broadly based committee running through the spectrum of lawyers, sociologists, church people and so on to report to him on the area of penal reform and make proposals, perhaps with some legislation. Notwithstanding that, what I am saying is, while we are waiting for that to take root and to report, in the interim there has to be an on-going process of psychological and psychiatric treatment for the prisoners.

I hope he is attending to this, and I would like to know what is the present state of this kind of treatment within the Prison regime.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, so that I will not delay the passing of this Head, I merely wish to recommend to the Attorney General that he finds the appropriate page in the records of the Other Place where Senator Wesley Hall made a statement on the prison in Barbados, the attitude to prisoners, and I recommend that he reads it. If he could apply this philosophy, I am sure that we would see a change in the attitudinal position of Barbadians to prisoners.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am much indebted to both my learned friends. I looked across at my very good friend, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, because he and I have made several speeches in this Committee on this very subject about the attitudinal factors operating in this community towards people who have gone to Glendairy, or indeed to the Government Industrial Schools.

At present there is only one social worker attached to the Prison, and that is the Probation Officer, who looks after social work in the Prison, and I think that we will probably have to look at this staffing problem. So far as psychologists and psychiatrists are concerned, they do not visit the Prison, the prisoners are sent to visit them, and there is probably a very strong case which can be made out for regular visits and group therapy of which my friend spoke. I am going to take the invitation of the hon. member for St. Michael South West seriously and I will look at the speech made by former Senator Hall on this issue in due course.

I can tell you that I am conscious of the difficult conditions under which the limited number of Prison Officers have been working, and when I visited the Prison I gave them an undertaking that the Ministry will be looking at the problem, and we have been doing so. I have recently got a letter with some degree of pressure from the National Union of Public Workers, who wrote me a letter on the 25th and by the 8th March I had not replied on the issue, and as a result they wrote to the Prime Minister complaining that I had not yet replied to them, but that attitude really does not help, because if there is one person who is very concerned to try to get conditions improved for the Prison Officers and an increase in staff it will be myself, and if they had had the opportunity to read this file they would see that the Department has been fighting the matter out, looking at the question of duty hours, the amount of money that we can pay, that the Government and the public of Barbados can afford to pay in additional duty to compensate them for hours, and it does not take the NUPW to give me only 13 days to put pressure on me. Because I am a smiling Minister and an easy, quiet Minister they believe that I cannot take pressure, but I can take the pressure, and I am not going to be jockeyed by any Trade Union or any employers' group or anybody into believing that in 13 days I have all the solutions to problems that have been there four years before I came into the Ministry.

I regret very much that they had to write that second letter complaining about my doing the work that I think has made greater progress under me in the last couple of years than at any other time. I am not criticising my friend, I have seen the files, he did a good job in this way. However, Sir, I will take all the comments into account, and I ask that the Head stand part.

The question that the sum of $378,862 under Head 11(5) – Ministry of the Attorney-General – Prisons stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
HEAD 11(6) – FIRE SERVICE

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $166,617 under Head 11(6) – Ministry of the Attorney-General – Fire Service – stand part of the Schedule. I do not think there is anything unusual in it.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I can say very much on this matter, I merely wish to commend the Fire Service for the work that it is doing, and I am not speaking in relation to cane fires or anything like that, I am not speaking on that particular issue. I notice they have caught some 15 year old Ministers; we did hear that Ministers were under surveillance as far as cane fires are concerned, and I notice some 15 or 17 year old Ministers were brought before the courts.

I am merely commending the Fire Service for the work that it does, and the aspect of it that is of particular interest to me relates to the work they do in pumping off water from areas which are subject to flooding. I can state that without exception when problems occur in my constituency, and this happens whenever there is a heavy downpour of rain, that invariably the Fire Service and the Chief Fire Officer and his Officers and men do give very ready response to my request for assistance in relieving my constituents of some of the problems which result from this flooding, and I would like to pay that tribute to them. I would like to know from the Minister responsible whether he considers that the Service has enough equipment and so on to deal with such problems, because the problem of flooding and drainage problems seem to growing, and I believe the demands upon the Service would be greater.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to begin by complimenting the Fire Service for all the outstanding work they have been doing, especially in relation to floods, as my friend from St. Michael South has said, and with cane fires this year. There was another big one today, about mid-day, in the St. George Valley. On behalf of the people of St. Philip North we wish to thank the Fire Service for what they were able to do within the limitations of water, the fact that there were not enough hydrants at the time in the parish, to save at least a part of the structure of the church which was recently destroyed.

Unlike the member for St. John, I wish to compliment the Chief Fire Officer for all that he has done for Barbados since he has been Chief Fire Officer. I hope the Hon. Attorney General is not too far, because last year I asked a question and got an answer and I am still dissatisfied with the answer, about the fire tenders which were brought in here some years ago, some broken down resigned buggies from Canada that they have at the airport.
5.20 p.m.

I was given some answer about they being necessary for the airport; but I am unhappy about the cost of these fire tenders and their serviceability because it appears to me that the fire tenders – I had a look at them a few months ago – do not have any particular exceptional capacity for holding water. It seems to me that what you needed was a larger tender capable of holding 15,000, 20,000 or 25,000 gallons of water; but we have not seen one of them at Seawell. Perhaps if they had a fire tender large enough to hold that quantity of water the St. Philip Church could have been saved.

I do not know if there is any information in the Attorney General's Office, or I could ask the Minister of Finance; but I want to know about these fire tenders brought in here and what was the reason for this in contra-distinction to the representation made by the Chief Fire Officer for which he was wrongly abused by the member for St. John on T.V.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would be very short; but I do not think it is really fair after this putting a curb on the recent spate of cane fires in the last two weeks for the hon. member for St. Michael South to get up and pour ridicule on the Police and the Fire Service by saying that they have only caught a 15 and 16 year old. He is saying that we on this side had former Ministers under surveillance, but the only Ministers they could catch was a 15 and 16 year old.

Anyone who understands what was involved, not what was alleged in here and outside about people perhaps getting together and putting the idea in the heads of others to light fires would realise that it is unlikely that they would walk about with matches. The way you do these things is to possibly put it in the minds of innocent people. I would have preferred the hon. member to deplore the activities of anybody who would use 15 or 16 year old boys to do their dirty work.

The crop season starts and there are no cane fires. Then there is this large number of cane fires in some areas. Stern measures are taken and certain statements were made about people under surveillance; and the cane fires stopped. Will hon. members tell me that that is without significance as far as it reflects on the Government's security measures? When they see that there has been a spectacular reduction in the number of cane fires, can hon. members doubt that it was surveillance of the Police which has reduced the spate of cane fires? In view of what was said in here about the steps the Police were taking, it is extremely wrong for the hon. member to try to reflect on the integrity of members of the Force especially when we see that the security force, especially in a couple of weeks now, have held down the number of cane fires and brought a number of people to a sense of responsibility.

I would like to say a word of praise not only to the Police and the Fire Service but to those who have come forward and given information; and I think that we should be condemning those wicked persons who have been involved in this type of mischief.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to clear the record. I do not know why the Prime Minister seems to be so jumpy. He seems to be unstable. I did not cast any reflection. I do not know how he can imply that I cast any reflection on the Police or on what they were doing.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. If the hon. member is criticising this surveillance on people and the Attorney General and I are responsible for it, he is casting a reflection on those responsible for it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am not pursuing this particular matter. The Prime Minister is obviously sparring for a contest; but I will restrain myself. I am very glad that the number of cane fires have been reduced although I heard that in St. Philip North there was a big one today. I nearly made the point that blame was being cast on ex-ministers. You may be privy to secret information, but I am not. I heard that ex ministers were under surveillance and then in here they were castigated. I do not know why there is always sparring on this.

I want to make it clear that I would be the first one to come and say yes you are right when I read in the newspaper that there were some ex ministers who were lighting cane fires at some particular point. We still have free speech in this country. I do not know why the Prime Minister should get up and say that he would prefer me to say this or that. I am big enough. I am 40 years today. I am big enough and old enough.
5.30 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr, Chairman, the only person who seemed to have understood what my hon. colleague said in the way in which we understood it is the Prime Minister. We were all in here today going along very well when he was out of here. As soon as he comes in, he comes in as if somebody charged him up like a battery. He flies in here now and looks for the first opportunity to become contentious.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what are you speaking?

Mr. TAITT: I am speaking under the Head of Fire Service. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague showed any ridicule, perhaps, the quality of the language which my colleague used.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with the Fire Service.

Mr. TAITT: I am dealing with the Fire Service, Sir. The fire generated especially by the Hon. Prime Minister. Perhaps what happened is that my colleague spoke with such intonation that he did not understand that my colleague was, in fact, throwing ridicule on the allegation which has been made, and which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, even as he was responding to my colleague still in a very sneering and subtle way suggested that it is entirely possible – if you were listening as carefully as I was, Mr. Chairman – that we might have – I say we because he cannot pretend to exonerate us who sit here from the Democratic Labour Party – he tried to suggest that we might have been suggesting to young 16 and 17-year olds to light fires. He put it in the terms controlling the minds of people.

Let me put it this way, Mr. Chairman. Every time the Prime Minister speaks in this mood, I am reminded of one of those old women who always has somebody in court and

quarrelling about land, and every morning she sees somebody at the pipe she is quarrelling. I am not here suggesting that the Prime Minister is an old woman. I am not suggesting that and that is not my intent. I am merely drawing reference to the kind of contention which it reminds me of – a contentious woman at the pipe quarrelling all the time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is your contribution!

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering where the debate was going. The hon. member for St. Michael South reminded us that he was 40 today, and I suppose we should congratulate him in having reached a sensible age. They say that life begins at 40, and I do not know whether he took the opportunity of speaking on the Fire Service to remind us of his firing power or lack of it, but I took note of the points he has made. I want to reply first on the question of cane fires, and I am glad that I have been given the opportunity to speak on this particularly today. It is a fact that I was informed just slightly after lunch that the biggest cane fire, since the Cane Fires debate in this House, took place today where we lost 100 acres of cane in the Bulkley Valley. That cane fire started at Carmichael's and spread to Bulkley. Now the biggest fires have occurred in the Bulkley Valley, and although the police have stepped up surveillance in that area, I directed today that this be doubled in the Bulkley area. If the people who are coming from outside, or are inside, do not understand I am hoping that the police will have success in bringing them before the Court.

Now I want to clarify my position on cane fires. The position is that I accept implicitly the words of the police as they have advised me as to the type of causes involved and the sort of situation that they are working on. I have 100% confidence in them on this matter. Their position has been backed by the Chief Fire Officer and his analysis of the situation. I wish that politicians will not get in any House, either here or above, and try to undermine the police powers in this respect. I have had a lot of criticism, and the police have had a lot of criticism about the sort of powers given to them in the legislation, and when I examined the Laws of Barbados it was nothing new.

Contrary to what the hon. Senators said, they were talking about a situation that they did not completely understand. This Senator Enid Lynch, that distinguished lady, had to teach Senator Connell the Laws of Barbados relating to juveniles and their punishment and the Cane Fires Act. When one gets that level of debate one will always get the public at large talking about these things. There is no doubt that it was a necessary piece of legislation. In fact, from the information available to me – I do not have the actual figures – but the 8th was the debate in here, and up to today I think that the cane fires were something like 63 acres. The bulk of burning this month took place prior to the Cane Fires legislation and today it is the biggest fire that has occurred at any time since that legislation.

I have told the police that wherever they have anybody to bring them before the Courts, get the DPP to prosecute, and there will be no political interference in the trial. The Magistrate is entitled to have his discretion. It is not a mandatory sentence, but I hope that the police with the DPP will lead evidence before the Magistrate to show where we do have a problem, and that the Magistrates will exercise their discretion in such a way as to use the Act for preventitive purposes as it is intended, to some extent, to be used on occasions such as this.

I am, again, using this opportunity to appeal to the public of Barbados to be sensible about their own economy. It is not the economy of the Minister who is in charge of Agriculture, myself, or the Leader of the Opposition. It is the economy of the people, and regardless of whether they like it or not, if they continue to burn it, then all of us are going to suffer together and none of us will be any better off. Why they have chosen the St. George Valley for this wanton destruction I do not know. They are only harming themselves. I cannot stress too strongly, again, that there must be some proper response from the public at large to the appeals which were made from both sides of the House on this particular issue. I regret that I did not have a word myself to say in the Senate and could not have been called before the Senate in order to explain the legislation. I think that some of the speeches made in the Senate by two Senators in particular did a lot to undermine the valuable unanimity which had been achieved in here and the approach we took on this question of cane fires.

Now, the hon. member for St. Michael South and the hon. member for St. Philip North did compliment the Fire Service on what they have been doing in flooding. I have been assured by the Chief Fire Officer that the

equipment for pumping out water is adequate and, therefore, he has made no further request at this stage for additional equipment in this field. The member for St. Philip North did raise the question of the St. Philip Parish Church fire. I can assure him that since he has asked questions on hydrants, the Fire Service has been in touch with the Waterworks Department, and already 11 additional hydrants are being placed in that area, and I am told that the Waterworks started work on that today.
5.40 p.m.

In so far as the St. Philip Parish Church is concerned, I have had a detailed report from the Fire Service and Chief Fire Officer and he has pointed out to me that had his recommendation for a rapid intervention tender been accepted some years ago, it would have been possible to have saved the St. Philip Parish Church. What happened was that he had used a tender that did not have sufficient water capacity. It should have carried 100,000 gallons, and you will see that in the Estimates at Item 10 we have under Head 111 made provision for this additional vehicle, and the cost of the two additional vehicles will take up something like $247,000 of that vote.

Now I have seen these reports before the St. Philip Parish Church disaster and I had responded to the officer's words because I read through the files. Seven fire tenders were bought at Seawell. They had been disused tenders which were set up for sale at an auction and bought by the High Altitude Space Research Corporation. The Government bought them at a cost of, I believe, $70,000 each and then reconditioned them, and the Chief Fire Officer had recommended two vehicles instead which would have cost $571,000 new. Instead these seven vehicles were bought for $490,000 between them then there was an additional cost to put them right and they have never performed the job for which they have been bought. In addition I regret to say that they now need parts and HARP have reported that the parts cannot be got in Canada. The Minister of Civil Aviation is affected. In fact my Permanent Secretary and the Chief Fire Officer are shopping around to see whether we can find some parts to service these seven vehicles, otherwise we will have to condemn them and the public of Barbados would have lost over $½ million.

Now what I found strange about that transaction is that although it was essentially a matter on which the Chief Fire Officer's view ought to have been taken, he was by passed, one of his junior officers was consulted, he handled the transaction. The then Prime Minister's office was in charge, the Minister in charge of Fire Services had very little to say on the issue, and I honestly do not understand what form of administration or ministerial Government that was at the time. The file made sorry reading, and subsequent events have proven the Chief Fire Officer Clarke right, and I want to say that the tirade I heard about him on television by the then Minister of Finance, the hon. member for St. John, was totally unjustified, and if he is a big man this is the second occasion that he should withdraw his attacks on civil servants as he has done so often. Indeed had he listened to Chief Fire Officer Clarke, today I would not now have the problem of having to shop around to find spare parts for condemned vehicles, possibly getting a Board of Survey to condemn them and ask the public to pay a bit more money. It is events like this that I think undermined the collective concept of Cabinet responsibility, because I am satisfied, and I do not make these remarks too lightly, but from my look at various files in my Ministry I am satisfied that the hon. member in his position as Prime Minister really was a bully in the way in which he ran the Government of this country and a lot of things went wrong because of that. There was much too much personal intervention. I said it in front of his face before I became a Minister. I have read files both in External and on the Attorney General's side which satisfy me that he had coward civil servants, some of them were afraid to express their views, some of them did like the Chief Fire Officer Clarke and he got abused. Some of the Ministers seemed to be afraid to ask too many questions of him. I hope never to see that form of Government in Barbados again. I do not think any Minister regardless of who he is and how good he is, Minister or Prime Minister, should be above being criticised by his fellow Ministers and taken to task and must respond to that criticism, and if the hon. member for St. John wants to know why his party lost, I think it was because he was much bigger than the country and if he had listened, his party might still have been in power today.

I speak very strongly on this because I am dissatisfied with the problems that have occurred, and that is why I have responded in the Estimates and the present Minister listened to my plea before the Estimates Committee on this matter, and I am happy to say I will set about to put the Fire Service along with the assistance of the Chief Fire Officer and the men on a

proper footing, including the introduction of women right into the firing line.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be very long. I just want to say that I join with the Government again to appeal to the Barbadian public to stop burning the canes. I would like to make another appeal. I heard for the first time, as the Minister said, that we had a cane fire today of 100 acres in the Bulkeley valley. As I say, the public must realise by now that that is pure stupidity, and fires however caused whether through carelessness, deliberately or otherwise is a sign of treasonable activity. I cannot support that. No responsible side can support the burning of one of the basic economies of this country. But as a lawyer I was a bit perturbed. I do not think the Attorney General, however he couches his statements, can lead me astray. He said he hopes the magistrates will exercise their discretion in such a way as to prevent cane fires. What does that remark mean to a trained lawyer? You are presumed to be innocent until proven guilty, so I cannot see, except this is asking magistrates to be pre-disposed, that a magistrate has any discretion in a criminal case.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member knows some criminal law and makes some pretension of knowing some civil law, but the hon. member must know that I was talking about the sentencing policy and that a discretion comes in. Any magistrate who is even the simplest of magistrates would know the standard of proof in a criminal case, but it is in the area of sentencing that he has a discretion, and I went on in the debate to say that the sentence was not mandatory, and the hon. member must not therefore bring the debate down saying that I am telling magistrates to presume that somebody is guilty before he is proven guilty.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Even if the Attorney General is talking in the sense of sentencing, he knows it is improper for the Crown in any criminal case.....

Hon. H deB. FORDE: I refuse to accept that I have made any improper statement. What is the hon. member going to tell me, that as a Minister in a debate on cane fires I said that the police is entitled to lead evidence to show the spate of cane fires and it is one consideration that magistrates must take into account? Is he trying to tell me that that is not a proper statement? The hon. member must know that although he has been practising law longer then me that I am also conscious of my duties.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I have been a Crown Prosecutor for donkey years, longer than you. I have been on both sides, Crown as well as defence, and he knows that the Crown does not interfere with sentencing at all. Even in the Assizes the Crown does not get up and say.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member must know if he remembers his law that the Crown must lead evidence when it has to put the public's interest and I will speak to the Director of Public Prosecutions and request that in the public's interest evidence as to the spate of cane fires must be led. That is all my statement means and it must be taken into account. What is wrong with that statement?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As I understand it, a man goes before the Court; he is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty; the Crown leads evidence and the Judge finds on the facts beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty as charged. It is then a matter entirely for the magistrate at that point. I have never seen a policeman get in the dock and tell the magistrate that in this case you should send him to gaol, do not fine him.

5.50 p.m.

I have a youngster to defend who is charged with setting fire to canes, and I shudder to think.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. That is highly improper.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will all hon. members please sit. This is the end of this. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: This cannot be the end, on what ground)? Your behaviour. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: What behaviour)? The shouting, and you are also answering the Chairman back. Be silent in here! I will hear the Hon. Attorney General.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I want to reply to the hon. member. Now the hon. member understands that for him to get in here and refer to a matter that is *sub judice* is a breach of the Standing Orders of the House. The hon. member must also understand – I do not want to go on with the case – but as I understand it the matter which he is dealing with and which he wants to discuss occurred before the change in legislation, so he is not being fair to the Committee either, but I think the hon. member must understand the Standing Orders of the House, and he knows

that the matter he was dealing with does not come under the change of the law, so what is he getting up to talk about?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: It is not, Mr. Chairman, what I know, all I am saying is that remark is subtle pressure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You had to withdraw it just now.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Do you mean you are not going to let me finish so that you can hear what I was going to say?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You just referred to subtle pressure on a Magistrate, and you withdrew that, and you are continuing. Please be seated.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On what grounds? What rule?

Mr. Chairman rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am on my feet. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Are you ruling me out of order)? You have made mention of a matter which I understand is *sub judice.*

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, what is the Standing Order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It will not be discussed, you are out of order. Will you please discontinue your speech.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On what ground? There must be a rule, name the rule to me where you can ask me to discontinue my speech. I want to hear the rule.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I move that Head 11(6) stand part, Sir.

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

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Oh, no, you are not speaking before me at all. Either the question is put or I will continue to speak. It is as simple as that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

The question that the sum of $166,617 under Head 11(6) – Ministry of the Attorney General – Fire Service – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

HEAD 11(7) – POLICE

Head 11(7) – Ministry of the Attorney General – Police – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head stand part I would like to make the following changes:

Page 48 – Item 7

Delete the figure "64,000" under column Other Expenditure and insert the figure "37,000".

Delete the figure "5,126" under the column Increase and insert the figure "21,874" under column Decrease.

Insert now Item 9A Upkeep of Animals Code No. 034,022. Insert the figure "27,000" under columns Other Expenditure and Increase.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Just one point, Mr. Chairman. These were not among the amendments which were handed around; if he would go a little slower I would like to take then down. I have taken down all the amendments circulated and I have them in my book; would you please be a bit slower?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member may not have a copy, but I am told that they were circulated. However, I will go slowly to accommodate the Hon. member.

"Page 48, Item 7, delete the figure "64,000" under column Other Expenditure and insert the figure "37,000". Delete the figure "5,126" under the column Increase and insert the figure "21,784" under the column Decrease.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You can go faster now, I have just had a copy of the amendments.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It is a good thing today is not my hon. friend's birthday, Sir.

Total Other Charges

Delete the figure "72,283" under column Increase and insert the figure "94,157".

Delete the figure "6,188" and insert the figure "28,062" under column Decrease.

Total Recurrent

Delete the figure "2,190,453" under the column Increase and insert the figure "2,212,327". Delete the figure "6,188" and insert the figure "28,062" under the column Decrease.

Total Expenditure

Delete the figure "2,190,453" under the column Increase and insert the figure "2,212,327".

Delete the figure "40,397" under the column Decrease and insert the figure "62,271"

Explanatory Notes

Insert 9A – Includes provision for purchase of animals.

Those are the amendments under Police, and I beg to move that the sum of $1,699,390 under Head 11(7) – Ministry of the Attorney General – Police – as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, as I understood the recent cane fires legislation, dealing with Police and what was being said by the Attorney General earlier, take the ordinary case. The police pounce upon a person setting fire to a field of canes. They bring the evidence of the plantation owner – I as dealing with Police and how the police bring their case, do not look funny, this is how the police would solve their case, Sir – they bring all the "I see" witnesses, they deal with the circumstantial evidence, and all that the Attorney General is saying is that the Magistrate is not entitled to take judicial notice of the fact that there is a spate of cane fires causing wanton destruction to the economy, so you lead the evidence from some person qualified so that the Magistrate will now have positive, direct evidence before him and he is not being asked to take judicial notice of a matter which he cannot take judicial notice of. That is all he was trying to explain to the Leader of the Opposition, and as a senior counsel, Queen's Counsel, I thought the Leader of the Opposition and former Attorney General would have appreciated that point, because he knows very well that in sentencing you cannot in your judgement as a judicial officer say that the reason you have imposed a particular sentence in a harsh way is because you know, let us say in an accident case, that there are a lot of accidents happening in Barbados, and that is why in this particular case you are going to take away the man's licence or some such thing. You cannot do it, it has been done and overruled in the Divisional Court of Barbados. You have to lead evidence so that the Magistrate would have a proper factual foundation from which to come to a conclusion in the exercise of his discretion. That is all that was being put by the Attorney General, as I understood it.

6.00 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I think that we can continue without legal argument. We do not need any prolonged legal argument. I rise on this Head dealing with Police. I would like to start off by complimenting the Police of Barbados. It has done over the years a tremendous job for the people of Barbados, and we have been extremely fortunate. I have lived in a country for 10 years where the Police Force cannot be said to enjoy the confidence, generally speaking, certainly of the minority of the population and where good relations between the Police and citizens are quite often infinitesimal.

I think that we in Barbados have been fortunate to see our Police Force falling away from what we used to hear – that the qualification was more brawn and less brain and that other people are showing a serious interest in making policing a career. If I had been given an opportunity to chose carefully, what I would have like to have been was a first class detective. (ASIDE: You would have arrested Barrow by now?) I would have exercised much more discretion than my friend from St. James who has spoken about what he would like to do if he had the opportunity.

However, Sir, even in times of crisis we have been able to lie down in our beds with the full knowledge that the Police Force of Barbados under the direction of a number of senior officers who take their duties very seriously are protecting us and we can rest.

Among political parties points are made from time to time against individual policemen; but generally speaking, I think that the political parties and indeed all Barbadians acknowledge that the Police Department is something of which they can be proud. You can therefore understand that if I make a comment on the current mode of the police in Barbados, I am doing it not so much from the point of view of a politician, but as one involved with the police in Barbados.

Before I do that, I think that it is necessary for me to outline the position which unfortunately has been taken by a few members of the force arising out of comments made in this House. I know that the rules of the House preclude me from debating the question; I asked a question and one or two members of the Force have seen it as an attack on the Police. The individual concerned happened to be from the constituency which I represent and which involved the Police. I think it is only desireable that there should be an official clearing of the air so that the Police themselves can be protected from any insinuations which may be cast at them from time to time by not well meaning persons.

I think that the Attorney General, himself an Anglican, knows that there are some persons who live by faith of their convictions; and if at any time in my public life I feel that the Police Department is not behaving in a manner which is not in consonance with the interest of the people of this country I would stand up outside or inside and state my conviction.

I have nothing but admiration for the majority of the members of the Police Force. Generally speaking the Police Force has done a good job and is doing a good job; and the Attorney General himself took the point that whenever there is an outcry in this country there should be a clearing of the air. When one of our national newspapers can publish an article affecting this department in the way it did, then it is the duty of those of us who sit on this side to ask the Government to clear the air in the interest of the integrity of the department. The fact that the person mentioned is said to have died of natural causes is neither here nor there.

Mr. Chairman, when I was in the Other Place the two hon. members who are now on the front bench of the Government had a number of things to say about the manner in which the Police Department was being run. It is not my intention to repeat all of those things; but I hope from looking at the Estimates as they appear to us that the Attorney General has been given counsel and that steps are being taken to deal with these matters. In the interest of brevity I will not specify them at this point. When we come to the Capital Estimates I will deal with one or two of these matters.

However, I will say quite shortly that the Attorney General and indeed the Government must be aware that there is a dark mood among younger members of the Police Force on the manner in which the debate on police pay was carried out in this House. With permission I will quote from the Official Report of this Hon. House. On Page 6338 of the meeting of Friday, 19th March, 1976, when Mr. Adams was speaking, he said:—

"Bearing in mind all I have said, I would just say, not at length but very seriously, that at the present time I believe the Police have a pay claim. I do not know the details. I know it is so many million dollars the Force is claiming. I would not like to see any attempt made to play politics with the pay claim of the Royal Barbados Police Force. I would be irresponsible and indeed would lose respect for myself as well as the respect of others if I said the Police are claiming $2 million, you had better give them $3 million. That is not what I am going to say. It must be treated as an industrial claim just like any other, but I would not like to see this claim delayed and delayed so that at some last moment close to an election the Police are told: Well, see the Government has given you $X. The Police are entitled to a pay claim and if Eric Sealy was in power they would get it far less if the Democratic Labour Party or the Barbados Labour Party, who are the only two parties who can form a Government in the foreseeable future, are in power."

6.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, that was at least six months ago. The pay claim is still being delayed, and it is my submission, and without reference to what they are going to say that the Democratic Labour Party Government did or did not do, from their position over here it was their contention that the policemen should get what is due to them. I am saying from over here now, Sir, that the time has come for them to settle with the police so that the police can get on with the business that they are accustomed to getting on with in this country.

I am surprised that the Attorney General, who went to the Police Association and who made a brilliant speech, according to him, and who told them that he would see, if I remember correctly, that the Prime Minister keeps his word — all I am asking is that the Attorney General, who has responsibility for this portfolio, sees that the Prime Minister keeps his word. Let us see that the Prime Minister keeps his word, and let the people get what they have been asking for, which everybody seems to agree is legitimate. As I said, Sir, it makes no difference to me that they are going to say when we were in the Government we did not do it. They were put in power to correct all of the wrongs which we committed. *Interruption.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, they think that by pounding the table it is going to affect what I have to say. They told the people we had committed a wrong. We have brought down this, and we have run down that. They now have the opportunity to correct all of those wrongs. Mr. Chairman, among the wrongs that they pointed out from this side of the House was that we were deliberately delaying the payment of the teachers, the civil servants, the old age pensioners and so on. It is all right for the Prime Minister in his moment of weakness to lead them like a pack of sheep. Knocking the table is easy, Mr. Chairman, but when we get around to doing what they promised that is getting difficult. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, in the same way that they said the pensioners should get $20 or $25 and then they said to them: "We are going to give you what the Democratic Labour Party promised." In the same way they told the teachers that they should get whatever they should get, and then they said: "You will have to settle." In the same way that the National Union of Public Workers were led to believe that if they would put this Government in power all would be well and they would be in the land of milk and honey, in spite of the fact that immediately after one of the distinguished and high-ranking members of the National Union of Public Workers was elevated to a higher post, the whole question was put quietly and peacefully to rest. We heard in the newspapers that there was a meeting, and that they no longer are interested.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Police.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member is getting very irrelevant at this point. This debate is about police, not public workers and a whole range of other people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is well taken. Please stick closer to the debate.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I hear you say his point is well taken, and it leads me not to make the comment I was going to make about what he has said. If he is saying that the police are not public workers, then God help us in this country. He is the kind of person that is teaching in this country, and every time he opens his mouth in here I feel saddened that I did not follow the advice that was given and let him go and do something else.

Mr. JOHNSON: On a point of order, Sir. I do not think that it is in order for him to make a reference to me as he just did. I will deal with him in due course, but I think that you have to caution him not to attack me during the course of this debate. He is out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think he knows better than that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I think it is gross impertinence on his part to address you in those terms.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you starting another speech?

Mr. TAITT: If you wish, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No, we really do not. Not at this stage.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that the policemen are not public workers. I talked of the National Union of Public Workers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you continuing your speech?

Mr. TAITT: I am continuing, and I am coming towards a conclusion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, talk about the police.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is wrong. The police are not part of the National Union of Public Workers.

Mr. TAITT: I never said they are a part of — I never said that he — I said they are not public workers. They can try their best. Mr. Chairman, you have observed from the time you have come in here what their tactics must be, but in truth and in fact, Mr. Chairman, it is going to take another 17 of them to daunt me. The fact is that they made promises to the police in this country. They made promises to almost every single group in this country, and one by one they have been letting those groups down very gently.

I bring counsel to the Attorney General that there are a large number of members of the Police Force who are very concerned about the manner in which they are now being treated by this Government. I hope that the Attorney General will bring his great persuasive powers to bear on the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance so that whatever is the settlement they are going to offer finally, that they will make that offer as early as possible so that the matter

can be settled. I hope that when they make an offer, it will be one that is acceptable to the policemen and not something like $22 a month when the police are asking for $110.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the Hon. Minister responsible for police to have a review of the functions of the police. When I happened, as a Minister, to be responsible for the police I started such a review. I would like to impress this on the Minister because society has changed, life has become more complex, and while it might have been all right in days gone by for the police to be responsible for carrying out a variety of functions: crime detection, surveillance, trafficking and so on, I think we now have to look seriously and see whether some of these functions could not be transferred to other bodies thereby releasing policemen to do work which we consider more essential to what they have been set up for.

For example, if you take traffic, a case can be made out for the institution of a system of Traffic Wardens thereby relieving the police of that burden. If you take Immigration, a case can also be made out for having separate Departments for Immigration thereby relieving the police of that burden, and by so doing you will be freeing the police who are now taken up with that type of functions to do more essential work. It is quite likely that one may be able to effect economies by so doing. I do not know. It is just that I happened on a previous occasion to be looking into this matter. I had not been able to complete it, but I feel this is the type of exercise the Hon. Mnister could look at very carefully because something could come out of it.

The other thing to which I should like to draw his attention, although I notice that mention has been made of it in the Capital Estimates, is that I feel one has to look very carefully all over at the quality of Police Stations, the siting of the present ones, and the need for new ones taking into consideration the shift in population in Barbados with the consequent development areas in different parts of the country.
6.20 p.m.

When I was Minister we started to look at the District "A" complex and I must say I am a bit sorry to see that it has not got off the ground yet. I realised that there was a large amount of land in Station Hill not being properly used and when you look down in Central Station you saw all that congestion and very little room for expansion leading to a lot of dissatisfaction among the police, and a lot of other problems, and I felt that a lot could be done in that area for proper development and more stations and relieving the congestion in Central Station.

In addition, when one looks at Oistin, you will see where there are serious problems traffic-wise and otherwise, and I feel that one should look seriously at the relocation or building of a new police station in that area. Again the Holetown project has not seen the light of day, and I would like to know why because this is something that has been in the offing for a very long time, and again I am distressed to see it has not been constructed. When you get into St. Peter there are serious problems especially with the entrance to that Station and so far nothing has been done, although I am aware of the fact that when I had the responsibility for this department, these matters were under serious discussion, and I hope that the Attorney General in his reply may be able to allay my fears or give some explanation as to the future policies in relation to the functions of the police, the siting of the present police stations and the siting of new police stations in Barbados.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to deal with the matter which has been dealt with by the first speaker from our side of the House, and he has dealt with this very eloquently and very cogently. I wish to look at Item 11 – Grants to Public Institutions – and to express a few brief words on this particular subject. In respect of the first matter I do hope that all effort will be brought on the present matter involving the police and that the matter will be brought to a conclusion as soon as possible. I believe that the Minister will use his very good offices and I have not known him to make promises and not make a strenuous effort to fulfil them. The policemen are waiting for the fulfilment of that promise, and I am certain that he will bring all his qualities and talents to bear on this particular matter, and we are certainly looking forward to a speedy conclusion and settlement of this matter because make no mistake about it, the police represent a very important institution in this country and that is why I am directing my attention to Item 11 – Grants to Public Institutions.

From time to time there are suggestions and proposals made that the police force should be increased in terms of its numbers in order to deal with the problems confronting this country. I am not dealing with that particular matter. If there are shortages of manpower then the only way to deal with shortages of manpower is an increase, but at the same time it would be wrong to believe that the social problems confronting this

society and which lead to criminal activity as well as to the break down either of law or order can be dealt with by an increase in the police force by itself. Now I know that there is a sum of money provided for the operating expenses of the Regional Police Training Centre. I know too that from time to time members of the Royal Barbados Police Force are sent abroad for training, but I believe that generally speaking these are persons who are at or may be approaching the upper rungs of the high command of the Royal Barbados Police Force, but there is a serious problem in this country and it is that generally speaking at the supervisory and middle management level there tends to be a shortage of trained manpower, and there tends to be a shortage of training institutions for people in the middle levels, those who have got over the initial training such as provided by the Regional Police Training Centre and those who are approaching the topmost rungs who may be sent abroad for training as far as Hendon or wherever they may be sent.

I believe the time has come when at least for the police force and this may apply to the fire service, I do not know, some consideration should be given to the institution here in this country of courses at the supervisory and middle management level for those persons who would fall into these categories or are about to go into those categories in order that that middle support can be strengthened both in terms of the capacity for motivating those whom they have to supervise and also to bring to bear on the problem of law enforcement and the administration of justice as far as the police is concerned, trained minds, trained skills and so on. I would like to throw out this suggestion that institutions or training courses can be set up locally to deal with this particular matter. I believe too that we would not have to think in terms of going to some far off or far-flung places to find persons to give the necessary instruction in this area. I believe there are many excellent ex-police officers whose talents and experience could be brought to bear on this particular matter. I would not wish to be too expansive on this particular one; it is a matter which I have thrown out in conversation with the present Commissioner of Police and I certainly hope that some consideration can be given to this matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as I have sat here I have been debating whether it may not be time to clear the air on this entire matter of the police duty allowance which I must confess is a matter with which I have only become thoroughly familiar in the last few months; and to deal with this matter completely and not in the casual and meretricious way in which it was dealt with by the hon. member for St. Michael South West, it is necessary to go back many years, but I think in the interest of the police and the public, since the matter has never been fully canvassed as far as I know in public, I should go back those years and set out the situation.

Prior to 1960 paid grades in the police force were on the same par as persons of similar qualifications entering the teaching service or entering the public service as clerical officers, but in 1960 or early 1961 representations were made that this should not be so and that special responsibility attaching to the police officers should be recognised by allowing them to enter the service at a higher pay level than persons with similar qualifications entering the teaching service and the general service.

6.30 p.m.

I do not have the file and therefore I cannot give exact dates, nor indeed do I think that hon. members would press me for precise dates in 1961 when decisions were taken, and precise dates in 1961 and 1962 when decisions were communicated to the Police, or implemented, but sufficient to say that by 1962 the principle of a differential rate for police offices was recognised. Prior to that, I believe that the entry point for all persons qualified to become clerical officers, police officers or teachers was, I think, then $100 per month, but subsequent to that the police were given an increment.

Now this matter has not arisen only in Barbados. Particularly there were British examples to follow, and a Commissioner, somebody came down and made a report, and in the course of his report he indicated what had been evolved over a period of time in Britain as the three factors that should govern police pay. The police themselves are thoroughly familiar with the formulas, Factor A, Factor B and Factor C. They are probably more familiar with them than I am, and in any case they are complex, but broadly speaking, Factor B and Factor C take into account the responsibility carried by policemen and the longer hours of work which they have to serve than other public officers – public officers, I would not say 'other' public officers, because there is a distinction that should be drawn between public officers pure and simple and policemen – and it is out of this distinction that this has arisen.

Factor A is the qualification and is what is common to all, Factor B and Factor C relate to responsibility and hours of work. Factor B and Factor C over the years have come to be applied in the Police Force so that I believe, and really hon. members must not in the absence of a calculator and exact scales hold me to precise amounts, but it may very well be that persons entering the Police service may get as much perhaps as even 40% more than persons entering the teaching service and entering the general service. This supplement is based on long hours of work, it takes into account long hours of work, and it takes into account the peculiar dangers and responsibilities which the office of policeman attracts.

Now it had been thought, I suppose up to 1971 or 1972, that with the establishment of the appropriate percentages for Barbados to be assessed under Factor B and Factor C, that the matter was settled, that a differential had been set which would be the future difference in pay between what policemen got and what teachers got. It was accepted that police should get more than teachers and clerical officers who I think are still on the same level, and the amount more it was considered was accepted, but as the five day week came to be implemented in Barbados – and I say this with great respect to the Police Association – what I regard as a logical error began to creep into pay bargaining, for very generally it was assumed that the five day week in the public service meant less work, meant shorter hours. The five day week has never been intended to mean shorter hours, and still does not, it means that the hours you formerly used to work on Saturday are now divided between other days of the week.

This logical error, although it may very well have been a mistake to approach new police grievances from the point of view of that error, it started to dominate the police applications for pay increases from about 1973, but it served a very useful purpose, error or not, for it highlighted that some policemen undoubtedly worked very long hours. There is a dispute between the Establishments Division of my office and the police in the widest sense, not just the Police Association, for the Police Association is supported in this dispute by the hierarchy of the Police Force very completely and fully, and it is normally the Assistant Commissioner of Police who leads the police negotiating teams. Throughout the police they argue that these hours of work are extremely long for men on point duty, although perhaps not quite so long on men in other areas and although the two things have been confused yet it may be – and I must say that it is, we have come to recognise that it is – there is some merit in the claim of the police however they have arrived at it, that the hours of work for the Police Force in the widest sense are too long.

The normal solution to an overworked Police Force is to recruit more policemen, but the police have been working these over long hours for some years now and we cannot recruit policemen retroactively. Therefore the police's claim for a duty allowance to recognise these excessive hours of work not only has a future component, it has a past component as well, and these facts bring the story up to date to 1976.

It would be easy for me to try to poke fun at the hon. member for St. Michael South West and say that his Government had been negotiating from 1973 to 1976 with the police and had come to the conclusion that they did not merit a duty allowance, so how can he quarrel with us where we have already offered one. But that is not really the end of the argument, it is true, because about a year ago these matters were concluded adversely to the police by the Establishments Division and confirmed by the then Prime Minister. A final submission it appeared was made by the police, all these matters, the differential under Factor A, the fact that the police get paid so much more than similarly qualified teachers and clerical officers and so on, all these factors were considered, they were put to the then Prime Minister with a request for his concurrence that the police claim for a duty allowance be rejected, and he concurred and asked that the police be tactfully notified. That was subsequent to the debate which was read out by the hon. member for St. Michael South West.

Again, it would be very easy for me to leave the matter there since I am confident that the hon. member for St. John has no recollection of anything that has happened since then, and will have no accurate knowledge or recollection of it. His response to all this will be to deny that he ever refused the police duty allowance, and then when I read it out in here, the recommendation, and read out the concurrence in his handwriting, he will either stay out of the House or he will find some quarrelsome rejoinder, but the fact is it did not stop there even during the old regime. New representations were made, and the Chief Establishments Officer very properly re-opened the entire matter, and at that stage they shifted a bit away from the idea of the five day week. I think the Police Association recognised that they had got obsessed by the five day week and by extraneous submissions which could be ill-supported, and they came up with a schedule showing the hours of work of policemen.

6.40 p.m.

The Establishments Division disagreed with the hours of work as put forward by policemen and carried out its own analysis. It established to its own satisfaction, and I must say to my satisfaction that no policeman is really called upon to work 60 hours a week. That figure is not really an active duty figure. It contains considerable periods where work consists of being uncall, of waiting around, or time occupied but you are not actually engaged in work. Therefore it is not actually the slave driving exercise as it seems to be when you hear that policemen are working 60 hours per week.

Nonetheless, in the course of all this it was recognised that the police probably had a grievance, particularly the men on point duty who have these very long hours of assignment – maybe not the whole 60 hours – but they have long hours of assignment, and also some other varieties of police officers. Members of the CID do not have long formal hours of attendance at the CID to deal with routine matters; but they have an enormous liability to be called out at night, and have to work through the night when they would prefer to be at home sleeping or whatever; and all this has to be taken into account. The detective service is attractive, but it is also onerous. The gazetted officers have very long hours because they are really always on call as the Attorney General and I can confirm. At the very top level the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner are always on call and I imagine that they spent very long hours during the recent excitement in the last six months in Barbados working.

Now, this was the beginning to be worked on when this Government came into office. My first impression when reading the relevant files was that I confirmed the confusion reached by the former Prime Minister that the Police had no case; but if any Minister has put pressure on me for any reason whatsoever, I will say that the Attorney General has put pressure on me to consider the claim of the Police, the Fire Service and the Prison Service. They have not been so dramatic, but we will deal with them on the same basis as we deal with the Police.

The Attorney General made me re-write it. In the course of discussions with the Attorney General and the Chief Establishments Officer I met with the Police Association and other representatives of the Police led by the Deputy Commissioner. I promised them that a decision would be reached very soon on duty allowance, contrary to what is implicit in the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South West that a decision was reached and that the Police are entitled to a duty allowance and all that remains to be worked out are the details.

The preliminary offer made by the Government and trumpeted in the Press, in so far as I can judge, more or less accurate since there are still areas which divide the Police Association from the Establishments Division. There are many branches of the Police Force where the Establishments Division feels that the hours of work are by no means onerous.

I do not want to identify these particular branches. It would be invidious. I would say that a man in the detective service and those on point duty work very hard; but there are some people in the Force who do not – as far as I can judge – work 30 hours a week. Therefore the Establishments Division is unprepared to accept that if you are given a duty allowance for additional work that that duty allowance should not be related to the additional work.

Now it is tossed up and tossed down. In other words some feel that point duty policemen and detectives should get additional duty allowance, whereas other branches of the Police Force who do not have to do additional work should not get any or so much. The Police on the other hand point out that the Commissioner of Police can transfer a policeman from one duty to another, and I think that very cogently they suggest that there are policemen over the last few years and in the future who have been shifted and who are liable to be shifted, and it will be a difficult exercise to go through a policeman's career and to see what work he has been doing over a period and what the entitlement to duty allowance should be.

That is one area which I believe still divides the parties; and then indeed, obviously the quantum of the duty allowance is also a matter which divides the party. I myself will say that my opinion is at present that the duty allowance should not be regarded as a raise of pay pure and simple. A raise of pay was negotiated and settled and paid. I do not now believe that duty allowance should be regarded as just another 3, 5, 8 percent or whatever over and above the raise of pay. I think that some greater analysis must be made.

On the other hand, I know that there are policemen who feel very strongly that the Force is a unit, and anybody wearing a police

uniform should be treated just like anybody else who wears a police uniform. Equally then you get another answer to that, and that may be how an individual purporting to be a representative speaks; but the chap on the beat in the hot sun in Bridgetown for the last three years, walking about Bridgetown in the day and walking about Baxters Road in the night may very well feel that a writserver in St. Andrew with only 130 civil writs to serve in the course of a year, and collecting baby money from only 40 people should not be entitled to the same amount of duty allowance as he.

All these matters have to be balanced in negotiations. I am glad to say that it appears that these negotiations are being carried on with the understanding by all parties that this is a difficult area that we are dealing with and to have a solution which is bound to be unsatisfactory to some of the parties. I would like to praise the Police Association for its relative restraint, notwithstanding the sensational stories in the Press – a relative restraint with which they have dealt with what most of them must regard as a festering sore over many years. I would also like to praise the Chief Establishments Officer for the flexibility which he displayed when he advised the course of action and had it concurred in by the then Prime Minister in re-opening negotiations upon having the facts presented to him in a different way.

I hope that no hon. member will in any way prejudice or exacerbate – I mean hon. members on both sides – the delicate relations of those responsible for law and order by trying to put in an "O" whether for political purposes or even sincerely which will in any way disturb the relatively smooth running of the relations so far. About the outcome of the negotiations an offer has been made. I myself cannot advise whether a counter demand has been made formally or only indicated informally or what; but I will say, and this may be taken as a statement of policy, that duty allowance is not intended to be a permanent raise of pay for those who get it; because I said at the start, the correct way is to increase the number of members of the police force. It is better to increase employment, to get more people occupied in this country than to give more money to those already employed. I say that bluntly. We will be serving two purposes by increasing the strength of the Police Force if some of its members are over worked. You are improving its efficiency by improving the hours of work of those who are being asked to do too much, and giving employment opportunities to suitably qualified persons in Barbados.

All of us know that there are boys qualified to enter the Police Force, boys with certificates who are knocking about, who are unable to find a job at the present time. We know that there is some good human material in Barbados being under utilised at present; and the police must understand – this is a firm warning I want to give them – they must understand that this Government's policy at all times is in the direction of spreading employment rather than improving the standard of those who already have. If there is a choice, the Government's policy will always be to spread. Coincidental with the negotiations which are going on with respect to the duty allowance, assessments are being invited from the police and will be considered by the Establishments Division for an increase in the establishment of the Police Force, and put an end to the excessive hours of work especially by point duty policemen and patrol men.

6.50 p.m.

There are other areas where the establishment of the Police Force is being examined. We have heard of the Harbour Police. Who knows what will happen in that direction? Certainly, I think that, at the very least, certain Regulations relating to the Harbour Police will be introduced. There are also other areas which have been canvassed in the Press regarding the transfer of the writ-serving services of the Force from the Police Force to the jurisdiction of the Judiciary. I myself feel that this is a very necessary step. I have had representations made to me by the Commissioner of Police. He has put both sides. He has put the side for retention, and he has indicated his appreciation of the side for letting them go. I have considered that, but I am certainly, as at present advised, convinced that the best thing is to release those policemen. This will mean some new recruitment of policemen because I am sure that some of the present writ servers will stay with writ serving rather than to get into uniform and find themselves in less congenial work around and about Barbados. This will lead to an increase in the establishment, I have no doubt. I believe, indeed, that whatever comes out of the Harbour Police negotiations there is going to be an increase in establishment there.

Mr. Chairman, this matter started out as a very political one. I would like to think that I have been able to indicate that all of us have some interest in depoliticising it because the police are in a very delicate situation *vis-a-vis*

the rest of society. They do not take industrial action, and upon the police depend the stability of the law and order of which any Barbadian can be proud. We are a very law-abiding society. This is one of the few societies in the world which could have up a notice at the Port of entry in this country stating: "A policeman is your friend." Very generally a policeman is regarded in this country as a citizen in uniform rather than as an enemy whose path you must not cross. I would hope that all hon. members will assist the Government in this particular matter of the Police Force by lending the voice of reason and informed useful suggestion rather than the voice of faction and destructive criticism.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would just take the opportunity here to praise the Hon. Prime Minister in the way in which he has presented his case, stripped of the usual verbal aggression with which we have been accustomed here in recent times. I hope that I can look forward to see this type of presentation more often because I think it would lead to a better relationship in the House of Assembly and, maybe, get a better spirit in the country to underline some of the things which need to be done in the best interest of the people of this country.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am much indebted to the Hon. Prime Minister for giving, particularly from the establishment side, a complete exposition on this matter. I think it is very necessary to exercise some restraint in negotiations, particularly when one is dealing with the Police Force which, after all, is the main vehicle through which we do maintain law and order in the country. That is why I have been very hesitant to rush to the Press with statements. I would only like to say that the police reaction to the offer from the Chief Establishment Officer was dated 14th March, 1977, and it would have reached my Department a few days later. I do not believe it has yet been drawn to the Prime Minister's attention because his Department is now looking at the points and putting up their findings to the Minister; so that when we meet and talk beforehand with the Ministers together we would be in a position to look at the situation just as my Department are advising me on the stand I should take on some of the further representations which the police have made on this matter.

Although as I said the report came to us on the 14th March, 1977, I think the Acting Commissioner then, quite rightly, also put his comments on the offer on the 18th which did not reach us until the 21st. It is stamped the 21st in the Department, and it was drawn to my attention, I believe, on the 22nd. I was surprised that somebody in the Police Force would have gone in to one of the newspapers over the weekend with a long article on "Why we rejected Government's offer – the Police Story, etc." I do not know whether they were taking the stand that this is a matter in which the more pressure and the mobilisation of public opinion one way or other is going to mean hurrying of the situation on.

I would like to make a few points. One of the first things I did when I went into the Department was to ask my very competent Permanent Secretary to get out the file for me on this matter, let me see what was the story and what was his point of view. We then quickly responded to the police request for a meeting, and I made representation to the Chief Establishments Officer. We had chats with the Chief Establishments Officer and, finally, with the Minister. Although, of course, as Minister responsible for Establishments as well as Finance, he has to keep the complete over-review of the situation before his face, he did say quite clearly to the police that he was convinced that they had a case for some allowance and they would be hearing from him on the matter. I think you can see that in one meeting with the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance and Establishments they got a firm undertaking on a matter within a period of less than six months, whereas this had been festering between 1973 and October or December it was, 1976. I bring these facts to show the hon. member that we are going to put right, as he says, or to correct all the wrongs that they have been committing. We will do that.

Even although, I believe, the police can find no firmer or more sympathetic advocate of their case than I am, and I know they know that, I think I have had to say to the police when talking to them that they must bear a few things in mind. One is that it is an undoubted fact that the police pay did go ahead slightly of people with similar qualifications. This is an undoubted fact because of the formula that was worked after the Commission set up under, I believe, Mr. Justice Fields. I appeared on behalf of the police at that Commission, and their case, I believe, was listened to with sympathy. They did not get all they wanted, but it has meant an increase in their position, so much so that the police themselves abandoned the formula in some earlier negotiations with the former Minister of Finance, the hon. member for St. John.

7 p.m.

What happened at those negotiations was that they said they had a case for duty allowance and they were told that if circumstances changed warranting a renegotiation, they would be listened to. These circumstances had changed in 1973 and the changed circumstances were, as the Prime Minister said, a five day week. They have been making representations since then to get recognised the principle of their entitlement to a duty allowance and then the quantification of that duty allowance, and of course the payment of the duty allowance. Now if the pay is retroactive I believe it is going to exceed $3 million if the amount the police asked for is granted. It is about 35 per cent on a constable's salary which is an additional $105, and if you stretch it over the force it would come out at over $3 million. As I said to them, it is difficult for the economy as it stands to afford back-pay to that order just now. I meant that and I believe most of the policemen understand that, although like men they feel they should get something, and that they should not be asked to pay too much more than their fair due to the public.

Now the other point about it is not only the back-pay element but for how long we are going to continue this, and they have been given a firm assurance that we will continue it until there can be a change of circumstances, that is, either an increase in the force by doing what the hon. member for St. Michael North Central said, readjusting police duties in some areas, which we will do, – we have been consulting with the police so far on this – and secondly an increase in establishment.

Now I want to talk a little bit about an increase in establishment because hon. members will wish us to keep the police if we can out of day to day politics of the country. It is not in the interest of either political party to think that we can discuss matters pertaining to the police in any form of partisan manner at all. I am saying this seriously. If there is one thing we can do with the police, the military and para-military forces is to keep them out of the thing. When we debated it, we said so at the time. Now I have heard various statements being made about an increase in the police force, some reaction about creating a police state and your first answer to a problem is to have more policemen. The case for an increase in the police force existed prior to 1969 and indeed in 1969 when the then Minister for Establishments, the Rt. Hon. member for St. John reacted, he gave the police only a token of what they asked for. I think it was about 100 men odd. Then in 1972 only five more were added and no more had been added since then. But it is obvious that there has been a case for an increase in police establishment pre-dating our coming into power, and therefore I find it mighty strange that we can hear now that we are creating a police state, and we are only bringing in more policemen in order to control people because we do not believe in freedom and we are scared of the people. That is completely irrelevant; it is not founded on any proper analysis of the situation and I as the Minister in charge of police have been urging and I will continue to urge on the Prime Minister when the circumstances allow it increasing the police force over a period of three years. Firstly, it is going to create additional employment; secondly it is going to help with relieving the duty allowance problem; and thirdly it is going to help in relieving men from working long and unnecessary hours and helping to maintain law and order. It is not made out on any basis of any police state. I think that the Dean once again showed greater prescience although in simple language a better analysis of the realities of the situation in Barbados than is being shown by other people who unlike the Dean are political animals. I can assure hon. members on both sides, the hon. members for St. Michael South and South West, that very shortly I hope that the Prime Minister as Minister responsible for Establishments will find time even to meet with the police again, and I am hopeful that a satisfactory solution will be found not only that will satisfy the police – it may not satisfy them totally – but will take into account the wider interest of the public, and if the economy increases their case will be more strongly argued by me as well in the future for as long as I remain having responsibility for them.

A few other points were made and I do not want to delay members very long. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central talked about a review of police work. The Prime Minister has mentioned some fields in which this is being done and we hope to do so. The hon. member for St. Michael South West raised a particular case on the question of looking at complaints against the police. I can assure him that the Coroner reported in that case that the man died from natural causes and this has been the finding of a court of law. To that extent the name of the police has been cleared in the incident, and I hope that the newspaper concerned will give as much publicity to that aspect of the matter as to the other.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You are not correct on that. Up to this morning I spoke with the Coroner.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am telling you my information.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: It is *sub judice.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: My information is that that is the finding. If my information is incorrect, all I can say is that I was given incorrect information. If no finding has been made, then it should never have been raised on your side of the House, and I would have expected you to do your duty then as Leader of the Opposition in not making a comment on it so that I would not have replied on it. Do not get up and say, like it is any big thing, that I am not correct, you spoke to the Coroner. At that stage you could have passed the hon. member a note or before I replied to it pass me a note and I would not have spoken on the matter: so don't worry to smart under any blows you have got already. *(Asides)* I am no Sir Oracle, but the hon. member apparently is smarting under blows. I will ignore the hon. member and get on. All I am saying is that whenever that matter has been settled through the law courts, if there is to be an action or it is going before somebody else, I intend as Minister responsible for police as I have already done to ask for a report and investigation. If it has not been settled then I will ask that this debate remain only within this Chamber because I am sure the hon. member for St. Michael South West when he raised the matter made mention of the fact that a coroner's inquest had said that this was the position, and I am sure the hon. member for St. Michael South West would not have said so if he knew the matter was *sub judice.* He is not being any Sir Oracle nor am I being Sir Oracle. The hon. member is so petulant and facetious this afternoon.

I want to finish off on one other matter, middle management courses. At present there is at the Regional Police Training Centre some refresher courses for six months given to middle management in the police force, but I am going to take the hon. member's comments back to my Ministry. The Permanent Secretary is here and I am insisting that in these debates the points made be looked at, and I will follow this matter up and investigate in what manner we can improve the situation. If a course is being given we will investigate whether it is satisfactory and what further action we can take in relation to it, and I am certainly very thankful for this. I hope he will impress on his leader the necessity to be as helpful as that instead of being contentious and childish about matters of this nature.

I want to make a further amendment. In the note to Item 11 – delete the words "The amount of $4,120 per student is recoverable from the British Government", especially since the exact amount is not yet known.

I am indebted to hon. members who have spoken for the advice which they have given, the type of advice I would welcome sometimes coming from the Leader of the Opposition.

The question that the sum of $1,699,390 under Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General (7) Police – as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

7.10 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the time is now 7.10 p.m.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting until 8 o'clock p.m.

On Resumption:–

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When this sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it now reverts.

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

MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL RESUMED

HEAD 11(8) – TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

Head 11(8) – Ministry of the Attorney General – Town and Country Planning – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $106,165 under Head

11(8) – Ministry of the Attorney General – Town and Country Planning – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, there was some time in September, I believe, a report that the Government had reclaimed some 4,000 acres of land, and I just wanted to find out whether that land has been cultivated and what crops have been planted on that land.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I think, Mr. Chairman, to answer that, various notices were sent out by the Town Planner acting under the Act and we have had representations put in by some of the plantations, I do not know how many they are, and some of the other land owners affected by the revocation orders. They are now being processed in the Department, and under the legislation I am proposing to set up a tribunal to hear the representations. I am hoping that we can persuade Mr. Acting Justice Johnson to be head of that tribunal so that he and a panel could advise the Minister on what steps should be taken on the matter.

In any event, I understand that since the modification orders several persons affected by the orders have brought the land which had not been developed back into agriculture. There are other areas of land that the Town Planner informs me will probably be affected by these orders, he has now prepared some additional orders, and in due course I will have to adjudicate on those on the advice of the panel on the other matters.

Mr. TAITT: Is the Minister in a position to give us a definitive position on how many acres are involved, because the newspaper reports say something about 4,000 acres. If he is not I can appreciate that, but the newspaper reports say some 4,000 acres and I would like to know what the real position is.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I regret that I have not got the file on that here. I will get the information and pass it on to my friend, the hon. member, in due course.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: For what it is worth I will just say this. I have kept a fairly keen look on the lands in my constituency in St. Thomas in respect of which the revocation orders were made, and I am very pleased to be able to say that the gentleman concerned has no doubt taken to heart all his friends' jokes about "you have nothing to complain about, you have Barber Green roads now to bring out canes" and he has replanted some of the fields at Edgehill and near Shop Hill with cane, I presume in time for the 1978 crop.

Mr. TAITT: One question, Sir, since the Prime Minister has spoken... *(Asides).* I see, Sir, he was speaking as the hon. member for St. Thomas. What I really wish to find out here now is this. In an earlier debate the Prime Minister had indicated that he was not proceeding with the CDB project which involved, I believe, a decision had been made, and it involved a large quantity of land in St. Thomas. I should like to ask whether other lands have been decided upon for the carrying on of this project or whether the project itself has been abandoned.

I believe that the funds available for this project would have to be committed by a specific time, otherwise Barbados was in danger of not getting the funds for the particular project, which I am sure the Government would agree is a project very vital to the agricultural development in the country, and I wonder if either the Minister or the hon. member for St. Thomas, speaking in that capacity or as the Prime Minister, could let us know what the status is on that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member may be assured that the CDB funds will not be wasted. There was never any question of abandoning the CDB project, all that we were going to abandon was the purchase of an unsuitable quantity of land in an unsuitable place at an unsuitable time in unsuitable circumstances at an unsuitable price. That is what we were going to abandon, we were not going to pursue what I believe was a purely political decision made to help one of the then Government's political friends in return for support designed to remove the then Leader of the Opposition from his parliamentary seat, and I say all this without any fear of contradiction. More suitable sites are being sought and the CDB project will go ahead in due course.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I wonder if the Prime Minister would indicate whether he has been able to read the file and discover that the decision to site the particular facilities on that land was a recommendation of the Caribbean Development Bank itself and was not a decision of the Government *per se.* As a matter of fact, when I was in the capacity as Minister responsible for the Marketing Corporation I had put up some

resistance to siting the operation in that particular location and as a result of a site visit by all the persons involved, including the Caribbean Development Bank, who headed a high powered committee, who submitted a report and who were adamant that for the reasons of location, for all the reasons connected to the economics of the project that this was the best site. I myself had some reservations, and I am just wondering whether the Prime Minister is in a position to say – I wish him to indicate that this is in fact not a decision made by the Government *per se* so much as it was a firm recommendation and a re-recommendation by the Caribbean Development Bank people.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: All that I can say is that I am not aware of the facts alleged by the hon. member for St. Michael South West, and I welcome his assurance that he was not primarily responsible for the decision. If the CDB was really the moving spirit in putting – and we are talking about the BMC depot, there is no point going on talking secrets, this is open Parliament – if the CDB was responsible for recommending that the BMC's depot be squeezed into a space next to Barbados Packers and Canners, right next to a thickly populated suburban part of St. Michael and St. Thomas at a price of $20,000 an acre when the land had shortly before been bought for between $1,000 and $2,000 an acre, then I would have to say that the CDB is as guilty as the hon. member for St. John says the World Bank is guilty in another context, since the CDB itself has indicated to me that it was not satisfied with the site and has taken a leading part in identifying three other sites which they say would be more suitable, and from which the Government intends to make a choice.

That is all I can say, but I will just assist the hon. member by saying this. The BMC depot was supposed to be next to Barbados Packers and Canners. That is what we are talking about.
8.10 p.m.

I know that the hon. member was very closely concerned with Barbados Packers and Canners, not in an investment sense. For what it is worth I do not know if anybody is speaking untruths on him, but as one of the highest executives of that factory told me, it was not true that all the people had to get a letter from Happy Bryan if they wanted to work there. We only took people recommended by Mr. Brandford Taitt, and I believe that he meant the hon. member for St. Michael South West. Only people recommended by the Minister of Trade? You do not call that political partisanship in hiring? We do not call that choosing yard fowls?

Anyhow, do not mind that. I would be, I think, a political idiot if I were asked to believe that the Democratic Labour Party Government had nothing to do with the choice of Mr. Charles Reds Packer's land for the Barbados Marketing Corporation at an enormous profit when the following things are held out to me. Mr. Reds Packer gave the Government a parcel of land at Bridgefield and handed it out in such a way as to give Mr. Happy Bryan maximum publicity in St. Thomas. Mr. Reds Packer never denied giving Mr. Bryan the sum of $6,000 to help him in his campaign against me in St. Thomas. Mr. Reds Packer made all of the vehicles of Cane Garden Plantation available to Mr. Happy Bryan to carry his supporters from meeting to meeting, and one of the drivers was perhaps Mr. Bryan's principal canvaser in that part of St. Thomas. All of the vehicles were covered with DLP slogans.

Do not ask me to believe that the DLP in proposing to give Packer $1,000 for $600 or $700 worth of land, and give him permission to open a supermarket opposite and other Town Planning favours on good agricultural land, and giving him permission to cut up land across Canewood which he has cut up. I see Barber greening going on and houses going down even now. Please do not ask me to believe that that had nothing to do with Mr. Packer's contribution in attempting to get me out of my seat.

I have only been in politics for 10 years, but I believe that that is long enough to have seen backs being scratched back to back, front to front and so on. Please do not ask me to believe that it is only the Caribbean Development Bank that led Government to choose the site that does not have enough water for the purpose needed, a site which is too small and is next to another food processing business not of the same type, is near to people's home and too far away from the areas where vegetables are mainly grown in this island and which already carries too much suburban traffic to give access to heavy agricultural traffic as well.

I am not an idiot. We well understand that the whole thing was intended to be Democratic Labour Promotion especially concentrating on an area intended for the destruction of the then Leader of the Opposition. So do not tell me about the Caribbean Development Bank. In fact I would just like to congratulate the hon. member on apparently making it appear in the files that it was the CDB's idea in the first place, if the files do so reveal.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am not even going to ask him to withdraw that, because to use his own words, every time that the hon. member for St. Thomas speaks I take what he has to say with the greatest of reserve. Mr. Chairman, the facts of the matter as I recall them are that a Committee was set up chaired by Dr. Yankee from the Caribbean Development Bank. He prepared a report and submitted it. On that Committee was the Director of Finance and Planning and a number of other high ranking officials in the Government.

They submitted this report and as Minister then it came to me that this site was chosen by them and they had adumbrated the number of reasons why this was an ideal site. I must tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I do not honestly believe the hon. member when he says that he is not aware that the information was on the file. I invite the Hon. Prime Minister to get all the files related to it because when the reports came to me I myself had some doubt as to whether that was the best location, and I sent it back to the Committee which had composed Dr. Yankee, Mr. Hurley of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the Director of Finance and Planning and/or his representatives. They resubmitted it to the then Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and insisted that that was the best site for the location of what was to be a wholesale emporium for the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

I have to state for the records of the House that I do not believe the hon. member for St. Thomas, whatever might have been his political difficulties; and if the member for St. Michael West or the Minister responsible for Caribbean Affairs are in any way acquainted with these facts, I will invite them to get up and give the light to the nonsense which the hon. member for St. Thomas spoke. *(Aside)* You cannot say nonsense now?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you referring to the hon. member for St. Thomas as a liar?

Mr. TAITT: If the Hon. Attorney General thinks that "nonsense" is now unparliamentary and that is acceptable, I will withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will withdraw the remark about lying.

Mr. TAITT: Whatever it is that you wish me to withdraw, I will withdraw it unreservably. Will you tell me what it is that you wish me to withdraw?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The lying part of it. The inference that the Prime Minister was telling a lie.

Mr. TAITT: I am not saying that he is telling a lie. I am saying that I do not believe it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Unless I heard you wrong.

Mr. TAITT: As I said, I treat everything that the hon. member said with the greatest of reserve, because it is clear that if he calls for the files and reads them he will see that the report was resubmitted. It was necessary for us to go on a site visit and it was decided early a Saturday morning after we visited the site, because there were reams of paper prepared by this high level Committee of Civil Servants and Dr. Yankee from the CDB claiming that this was the very best site.

I know nothing about Mr. Reds Packer. I honestly do not know him. To tell you the truth I would not like to be Mr. Reds Packer right now bearing in mind the attitude displayed by the Prime Minister towards him. I can only say that I feel a certain sympathy towards Mr. Reds Packer bearing in mind what the Prime Minister said. I agree with the Prime Minister that he is not a political idiot and therefore Mr. Reds Packer must know which God he is serving. That is his problem. My point, Mr. Chairman .....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Although we should not refer to anybody in the Public Gallery, I think it is only reasonable in the light of the rather perhaps mischievous gesture by the member for St. Lucy, to indicate that as far as I can see Mr. Reds Packer is not in this room at the moment, nor have I ever seen him in here.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Prime Minister to point out the person at whom I pointed.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, as you know, immediately after dinner these things tend to happen. Quite seriously I wish to reiterate that the Committee that was established by CDB made a recommendation for that site, and they re-made the recommendation; and they were adamant. The Director of Finance and Planning himself wrote a definitive minute, as far as I can remember, to the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance indicating that this was the best site.
8.20 p.m.

If the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance indicates that the Caribbean Development Bank now tells them that there are three sites which they have discovered that are better than this site which they so adamantly recommended when I had the honour to be the Minister, I can only say that I shall have

henceforth to treat anything the Caribbean Development Bank puts out in this regard in the same manner that I now treat anything which I hear from the hon. member for St. Thomas.

No doubt these same sentiments will apply to the Spring Hall Development project, which it has been indicated that the Government made a policy decision to discontinue, but in truth and in fact we have been led to understand that it was precisely because the Caribbean Development Bank had indicated that Barbados was in danger of losing the money that the Government decided not to continue the project. I will sit down at this point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I just want to have a matter here clarified by the Hon. Minister responsible for Town and Country Planning. It is to deal with the tenants on the Belle Land opposite My Lord's Hill. Some time last year the tenants in that area informed me that they were offered the spots which they occupied for purchase by the owners or directors of Belle Plantation. What is significant about the whole issue is that there is a lack of proper roads in that Belle tenantry. In view of the policy as pronounced by my Government, I would like the Hon. Minister to inform me – for the benefit of the people who are living there, because as I have said before they are suffering for a road, and at the same time they have this problem of being asked to purchase the land on which they now live – if it is the responsibility of the owners of Belle Plantation to put in a road. If it is not the responsibility of the owners of Belle Plantation to put in a road, then I would like the Hon. Minister to have the matter investigated so that it would not be possible for the owners of this Plantation to sell the land to these people before a road is properly put in. We would like to know if they do not have to put in a road, so that I could ask the Minister of Communications and Works or the Ministry of Lands to have the road done for those people.

As I have said, the situation is very ticklish. I am not aware of what is happening in this particular situation since there is one policy preventing the Belle Plantation from selling land, and some of these people have already committed their money to the purchase of these spots.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I think I had better state what Government's policy is. In our Manifesto we have enunciated a policy that we would try to work out a scheme whereby plantation tenants, the people who live on house spots on plantation tenantries, would be able to purchase and own their lands and there would be what we call a statutory title given to them. As a result of this, the Cabinet has set up a Cabinet Sub-Committee consisting of the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance, the Minister of Housing and Lands, and the Minister of Agriculture, and they have been meeting with various public officials and owners of plantations represented by the Sugar Producers Association discussing the manner in which a scheme can be worked out for people living on the plantations to own their particular house spots. To this extent the Government hopes to give security of tenure to the plantation tenant as well as to extend the categories of persons owning land in Barbados.

Now, several plantations other than the Belle are affected by this policy. I could think of Drax Hall in the constituency of the hon. member for St. George South. So far we have had quite a good response from some of the plantations and, as a result of this policy, I have directed that the Town and Country Planning Office should not go ahead, at this stage, granting requests for subdivision of plantation tenantry lands until the overall Government policy is known. If there are people on the Belle Plantation tenantry therefore, in due course, they will be part of this overall arrangement. I am hoping that the Government's policy will be put into execution by the end of this year or, certainly, very early next year. In so far as the balance of the Belle subdivision is concerned, the Belle is one of the plantations which have been affected by the Revocation Order made by the Chief Town Planner to the extent that that matter is *sub judice.*

I think that hon. members will understand that it is the Minister who has to adjudicate finally on the matter, and they will not wish me to make a pronouncement one way or other. I have asked the Town Planner to take into account, in his Revocation Orders, how far he would allow within the constraints of general policy guidelines persons who have already purchased their house spots to go ahead with their development. Having said that, I am deeply conscious that some people are going to produce agreements for sale that are predated. They are made now, but predated some time ago. Obviously, in any review or inquiry which goes on it will be necessary to, probably, subpoena the books of Solicitors and other people to prove whether or not these cases are genuine, and I hope nobody will bring cases that are not genuine before the tribunal. I would wish the tribunal to summon people and take their evidence on oath, and I really would not like to think that they are

not aware of the Promissory Oaths Act, or indeed the Perjury Act of Barbados.

I know that some of the plantations and some of the people affected by the Revocation Orders have, despite the Revocation Orders, gone ahead and done work as part of the subdivisions subsequent to the Revocation Orders. I am legally advised that that should not be taken into account. If you have tried to pretend that a subdivision has taken place, despite the Order, this should not happen. We are going to rush ahead with the Tribunal because, obviously, we would not want to delay the position for so long that there is not certainty of title, but I must caution people who are buying spots from areas affected by the Revocation Orders that they may be liable, I am not saying it is a certainty – but they have to be careful in taking a title or an agreement for a sale in such circumstances where they are not sure whether they will, eventually, get a good title or not.

8.30 p.m.

That is the most I would like to say under this Head. My aim and the Government's aim is to get back into agriculture our good agricultural land. We are also conscious of the fact that some Barbadians would want to get into agriculture. Wherever possible I will try to prevent further fragmentation of the good land of Barbados, but I am also deeply conscious of the fact that I have to look at individual cases particularly where testators are leaving their land under wills for sub-division between their children. I had a case recently where a man died prior to 1960 and the family had actually gone on to the spot and were working their individual lots as part of a small peasant land holding cultivating vegetables. This was in Christ Church, and under the new policy they may have been disallowed if I took it rigidly. I went with my Permanent Secretary, the Town Planner and the agricultural people, we looked at it, we were satisfied that this was a genuine case, and that the *de facto* position only wanted *de jure* approval, and that was allowed. But cases that are not genuine we will have to refuse. I am hoping that when we have got the position under control that there can be more flexibility in the system, but the Town Planner has now done a survey and he is satisfied that he has given permission for several sub-divisions over the past ten or twelve years which has still not been taken up not only in agricultural land but other building lands which have not been sold, and I am hoping that the Minister of Agriculture who is not here at the moment would advise the Cabinet on what legislation is necessary to prevent an inflation in the price of agricultural land.

I said I considered $8,000 an acre unreasonable for agricultural land. The rate of return that someone could get on this would make it an unattractive proposition unless he is going in for just having a big house and having the land in the back or waiting for subsequent sub-division. I believe that the Government is urgently examining the possibility of looking at some control in the price of agricultural land unless there is a more realistic approach to the whole question in Barbados. Agricultural land must not be put beyond the reaches of the small man, in particular the small peasant farmer in this country who really wants to carry out genuine agriculture rather than to speculate and make money out of our natural resources.

The question that the sum of $106,165 under Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General (8) Town and Country Planning – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 11 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (9) ECCLESIASTICAL

Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney-General (9) Ecclesiastical – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $26,987 under Head 11 – Ministry of the Attorney General (9) Ecclesiastical – stand part of the Schedule.

I hardly think this Head should excite much debate. I will just say that this year the grant to Codrington College has been transferred from the Ministry of Education to Ecclesiastical, and it has been increased by $2,000 per year.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second the motion.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Under Item 1 which is a token provision, I would like to say to the Hon. Minister now responsible for Ecclesiastical affairs that this matter had been hanging fire. I had responsibility for it. I do not think the Ministry was altogether to blame. I think this matter should be dealt with as early as possible. It is a promise made by the last Government that the schools should be handed over in good repair at the earliest possible time, and I was trying my best, heathen as I am or thought to be to get this matter settled with the Church before I left the

Ministry. Now that the files have gone to the Attorney General, I do hope that he will during the course of the year or as soon as possible get a reasonable assessment of the cost of repairs to the Good Shepherd School so that this matter can be settled.

I am glad to see that a grant of $6,000 is being made to my alma mater again. You will remember in the last Resolution for this amount was one which I myself, heathen as I am or thought to be, had introduced in this House before the dissolution.

I hope that especially on the question of returning these schools to the Church something will be done speedily so that they can at least get some money to assist them in the furtherance of the work of God and the coming of his Kingdom here on earth.

Mr. TAITT: As the Hon. Attorney General himself knows I have been attending the other Parliament during the last few days and I think that the Attorney General had better be aware that the Church feels very strongly, that is, the Anglican Church, that the Government and the people of Barbados have been using church property for some time. Apparently in 1969 when the negotiations were set out, the then authorities in the Church were not as strong as they could have been in making representations for what was truly theirs, and the result is that the Church property has been used by way of schooling without any compensation, and I learnt to my horror and with some regret that no rent has been paid for use of the church properties and the only condition was that at such time as the Government had finished using the schools, they would return them in a proper and fit state. I think the Attorney General is aware of what happened with the Good Shepherd School, but by and large I hope he is now aware that the Church is likely to come and ask for in the final settlement some sum of money that would in some way make up for the rentless years. I think the Attorney General is very well seized since in his other capacity I am told he was one of the advisers in this matter, and therefore I need not say anymore.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am much indebted to hon. members for making a comment on Item 1 under this Head. I think hon. members will see that there is a token vote of $10. Originally when we were discussing the Estimates a particular figure was mentioned which we were going to ask the Estimates Committee to put in, and after consultation with advisers in the Ministry we thought it better not to put in a particular figure since the figure we had in had been based on information that had been before the Ministry of Education some previous years. I have had discussions with the head of the Anglican Church, the Lord Bishop, and I have also spoken to people in the Methodist Church because some of the Methodist Schools are affected by this situation, like Vauxhall, and some of the Moravian schools are also affected.

I have in my hand here a memorandum dated 23rd March, 1977 in which the Permanent Secretary in my Ministry is reporting to me that he convened a meeting of representatives of the Ministries of the Attorney General, Education and Communications and Works on March 17 to discuss matters relating to the reversion to the Church of properties formerly used as schools by the Ministry of Education. So that there is already discussion going on concerning this matter and surveys are being done with quantity surveyors involved.

8.40 p.m.

In relation to Good Shepherd, Good Shepherd I regret to say has gone too far now and the Church has informed me that it is unlikely that they can rescue that building. What they have asked for instead is a Capital grant to assist them in resiting a church or a community hall in the area to serve that section of St. James, but I can assure members that the Government under the Anglican Church Act has a legal obligation to put right the schools which are at present used, belonging to the Anglican Church, at such time as they are handed back to the Church. There is no such legal obligation in relation to the other two religious denominations involved, but I consider that there is an equally strong moral commitment, and this Government will honour that commitment. I would like to say that despite whatever strictures may be levelled against the Church for some of its actions in various times in the history of this country, or indeed in the history of the world, one must recognise that in Barbados the Church has made a tremendous contribution both in physical resources, manpower resources, financial resources and moral resources to the educational development of this country, and that when we are assessing the Church those who speak so lightly, and sometimes so blasphemously, and sometimes so unadvisedly concerning the Church should bear this in mind. *(Aside).*

you keep a vehicle for two or three years and it rusts away in the back of the Central Station, it is worth little or nothing when the Government Auctioneer seeks to dispose of it. In view of the fact that Item 7 under this Head consists of $149,000 odd for the replacement of vehicles, I think that some consideration should be given to disposing of these crashed vehicles quickly, so as to recoup some part of this $149,000.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am much indebted to hon. members for the comments which they have made. I will bear very carefully in mind the comment made by the Hon. Leader concerning the St. Thomas development; and indeed his speech has given me another bolt to my arrow to use in the department in order to get an extra relocation sooner than I would have expected of the District D Police Station. I can assure the hon. member that there is the closest collaboration between my Ministry and the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works. We are in very frequent and clost conversation on several matters of planning; and he has himself taken a note on the matter; and certainly my officials are here and have heard the comments and I am sure that they will make sure that during the year I do something about it.

As regards incarceration at police stations, I think that the hon. member is on good grounds. The rooms formerly used for people being held in custody leave a lot to be desired; and in any re-development I will ask the planners to pay particular attention to this in order to have better facilities and also to be interviewed by their lawyers in private.

In so far as the Public Mortuary is concerned, the site mentioned by the hon. member for St. Michael South is not the site being chosen for a Public Mortuary. It is hoped to beautify that area and make it a free park so that we can have a lot more greenery in the area, and improve the constituency of my learned friend, the member for St. Michael South Central and provide an area for convalescent people to relax and young people to court and old people to believe that they can court too; go occasionally and hold hands and things like that.

So far as the Public Mortuary is concerned, truthfully I have not yet assessed whether it is a high priority as against the Forensic Laboratory. Perhaps Mr. Chairman, you will forgive me and the Committee of the House will forgive me if I use comment to say how sorry I personally am, and the Government certainly is, and I am sure hon. members will be, to hear of the death of the late Dr. St. Clair Ashby who was a tower of strength indeed to the country in carrying out a lot of work dealing with inquests and a considerable amount of work that should have been on a forensic laboratory. We regret to learn of his death, and I am sure that hon. members will want me to express the feelings of the House on this matter to his relatives and widow.

I am hoping that during the year I can develop plans and identify aid sources for the forensic laboratory. My preliminary thinking on the matter is that a forensic laboratory should be developed as part of the overall Regional Police Training Centre, and have some significance in relation to this. If it is possible, we hope to approach the British Government for some input in this field.

As far as the crashed vehicles at the police station are concerned, the Minister of Health drew this to my attention in Cabinet last week, and I have not had the opportunity yet to draw it to the attention of the Commissioner of Police; but we plan to get rid of the crashed vehicles and clear up that area as soon as possible.

The Registration Office has given me cause for great concern. There is no doubt that there is a lot of overcrowding there. The Registrar has tried as hard as he could to get expanding facilities for staff; but the situation is really still untenable. I know that we were toying with the idea of re-developing the Synagogue House where the Waterworks was formerly sited; and there is the alternative suggestion that we should look around in the area and see if there is a suitable property that could be bought as part of a crash programme. I am still to be advised on this matter. I trust that by the time the next Estimates come around I would have found a solution to this problem so that I can report in a more concrete way on this matter.

I agree with my friend, the member for St. Michael North West that we are losing a lot of revenue by keeping our company files in such a bad state. The first draft of the new Company Act is now in my Ministry and I intend to circulate it; and I hope that that would ensure some improvement in the administration of the Act as a whole.

The question that Head 111 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

9.00 p.m.

MINISTRY OF CARIBBEAN AFFAIRS, EXTERNAL TRADE & TOURISM

HEAD 12(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Ministry of Caribbean Affairs, External, Trade & Tourism – Head 12(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, before moving the passing of the Head, I would like to draw to hon. members attention that there are a number of amendments which I am asking to be made under Head 12(1). These amendments have been circulated. There are as follows:

Page 51 – Item 14

Delete the figure "84,328" under column Other Expenditure and insert the figure "109,328".

Delete the figure "212,672" under the column Decrease and insert the figure "187,672".

– Total Other Charges –

Delete the figure "340,345" under the column Other Expenditure and insert the figure "365,345".

Delete the figure "249,672" under the column Decrease and insert the figure "224,672".

– Total recurrent –

Delete the figure "391,035" under the column Other Expenditure and insert the figure "416,035".

Delete the figure "258,104" under the column Decrease and insert the figure "233,104".

– Item 15

Delete the figure "585" under the column Other Expenditure and insert the figure, "5,585".

Insert the figure "1,741" under the column Increase.

Delete the figure "3,259" under the column Decrease.

– Total Non-Recurrent –

Delete the figure "585" under the column Other Expenditure and insert the figure "5,585".

Insert the figure "1,741" under the column Increase.

Delete the figure "3,859" under the column Decrease and insert the figure "600".

– Total Expenditure –

Delete the figure "391,620" under the column Other Expenditure and insert the figure "421,620".

Delete the figure "172,223" under the column Increase and insert the figure "173,964".

Delete the figure "261,963" under the column Decrease and insert the figure "233,704".

– Summary –

Delete the figure "616,044" against Total Expenditure 1977–78 and insert the figure "646,044".

Delete the figure "89,740" against the Net Decrease and insert the figure "59,740".

– Note 15 –

Amend the note to read "Provides for the purchase of chairs, typist chair, calculators, desks, typewriter and cabinets".

I beg to move that Head 12(1), as amended, stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that.....

Mr. TAITT: Not yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I looked at you and I saw you trying to make up your mind. Anyway, carry on.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, you are a genius. You can see me trying to make up my mind. I merely want to ask the Minister if he is going to call the Capital Head immediately after because I do not wish to go into a long debate on items which properly belong to Capital. Could the Minister indicate whether it is his intention to follow on?

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: It is.

Mr. TAITT: You go ahead.

The question that Head 12(1), as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 12(2) – INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Head 12(2) – Industrial Development – in the sum of $191,314 – was called.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 12(2) stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on this question of industrial development and, particularly, with regard to the grant which we have here for the Industrial Development Corporation, there are a number of points which I would like to make as far as the whole question of industrialisation is concerned. First, I want to indicate that the last Government and the present Government seem, to my mind, to be following almost the same path as far as industrialisation by invitation is concerned.

Now, this is a development which took place out of the Puerto Rican model. There are a number of difficulties and, indeed, a number of problems which have arisen as a result of pursuing this kind of industrialisation programme from the point of view of the very serious leakages which have taken place within the economy. I had an opportunity to make reference to this and, indeed, to issue some degree of caution on the whole question of the thrust of our industrialisation programme. Quite naturally we have to be aware of what we want to achieve within the society – aware from the point of view of (1) the question of what do we intend to gain out of any industrialisation programme which is pursued by the Government through the Industrial Development Corporation. I am not at all certain that when we examine the kind of industrialisation programme which has taken place, and when we look at the returns coming from that we have benefited as much as we should benefit after having pursued this policy.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we should very seriously, at this stage, make some assessment of where we are going and try to give some future direction to our industrialisation programme which will bring more benefits to the society from the point of view of diversifying the skills and ensuring that people in Barbados have a greater opportunity for participating in any industrialisation programme which is being pursued.

Now, it is all right for us to say that there is money overseas and that we spent a lot of money in attracting foreign capital here but, as I pointed out, there are certain drawbacks which necessarily arise from this particular thrust.
9.10 p.m.

One of the points that I would like to make or indeed to sound a note of warning on is this; I am sure that the Chairman of the Industrial Development Corporation who is sitting in Parliament with us probably recognises this, the very serious problem which is faced as a result of the activities of multi-national corporations within particular societies and especially within developing societies, and we must in our industrialisation programme be very careful that we do not attract the kind of corporations which are going to cause a number of problems.

Now the hon. member for Christ Church East asked me "such as"! I would not attempt to give him a lecture on the problems which the multi-national corporations cause in a developing society, because I would have thought that from his illustrious training and background and from the high office from which he pontificates from time to time he would be aware of the numerous problems which the multi-national corporations pose, not only to developed countries, but also to developing countries. Now it is very simple....*(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not let them disturb you.

Mr. GREAVES: I am being heckled. I do not mind being heckled outside, but I feel in here we should be able to get on without this heckling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you being heckled by the hon. member for St. Michael South West?

Mr. GREAVES: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I am being serious. There a number of problems and we should be aware of these problems because as I have said this causes a number of difficulties from the point of view of the way in which they are able to exploit a particular situation. Now I know there is a certain attraction which can come from bringing a big operation with all sorts of outlets in various

countries where you might say there is a ready market available and you have access to the marketing facilities and to the finances of these big corporations, but it is known in developing countries and it has been proven beyond the shadow of doubt that the way in which they are able to shift and transfer their funds they are able to put the squeeze on developing countries in particular. As a matter of fact, there are some multi-national corporations which are so big that even from the point of view of the amount of money they are able to control, they control money far in excess of what some Governments in developing countries are able to control; so this in itself presents a particular problem. We have to recognise that a number of these companies use the developing countries as a way of escaping taxes and are not particularly interested in the development of the indigenous people or indeed making a real contribution towards the particular economy. They are not interested in making that kind of contribution, but just would be using a place like Barbados in an attempt to escape some of the taxes they would have to pay if they were operating in circumstances where the technical know-how and skills in that area were much more developed than in our particular case.

We have to recognise this as a very important point, and furthermore Mr. Chairman, we should bear in mind that we have been faced in the past with situations where as soon as some factories experience some kind of economic difficulties, in spite of the promises which they made, close down. If they cannot get what they want, then it is quite easy for them to just pull up and leave because we have been providing factories and sometimes all they are required to do is probably to bring down the machinery; so that they have no loyalty to the country in which they are operating, and this is the concern which I am expressing, because I am not in any way trying to dampen any kind of drive or enthusiasm which there is and which industrialisation would naturally produce, because we recognise that we have to diversify. What I am really questioning and where I am once more sounding a word of caution, is the type of industrial programme that we are pursuing in this country, because in the final analysis it must be the kind of industrial programme where the people in Barbados will be able to reap the maximum benefits.

Now you must understand, Mr. Chairman, as I am sure you do, that the kind of concern which I am expressing is from a view point where I have come into contact with industrialists and recognise from the trade union point of view the kind of attitude which is often displayed by some people who come here and set up factories and operate. Let me give you a simple example of what I am talking about. I will not go into the numerous difficulties experienced by workers in a number of these factories, but suffice it to say that there are a number of difficulties. There is a young lady who was working at a factory and who wanted to go up to the United States of America to visit a relative just for two weeks. She has been working at the factory for well over a year, almost two years. The policy of the factory, according to the Manager, is that as long as a person is working there for over a year there would be no problem in getting a job letter which she would be able to take into the Embassy, but when he was confronted with this, he refused to give her a letter. Now it is a question of attitude. You might very well say what has this got to do with the Industrial Development Corporation or with industrialisation. I say it is something to do with it from the point of view of the kind of attitude and the kind of person whom we are attracting to our shores. We have to be very careful because we in the final analysis would want hopefully to create a situation and climate within Barbados where workers would feel that they would want to give of their best in any work situation, because there can be no industrialisation unless there are workers involved.

It is true that it is a question now of whether or not we have the kind of technology available in the world which will enable us to continue with the kind of projects which can be called labour intensive projects, because since the machinery and technology are developed in the developed countries, quite naturally they will be developing the kind of technology which will be suited to their particular environment.

9.20 p.m.

Since machinery and technology are developed in the developed countries, quite naturally they will be developing the kind of technology which would be suited to their particular environment, but at the same time we have to recognise very clearly that part of the thrust of industrialisation, and the whole reason for industrialisation, is to provide more jobs for people and at the same time to widen our base from the point of view of diversifying our economy. In so doing we have to ensure that the kind of climate in which people work, in which workers operate, is the kind of climate which will make them give of their best, and naturally this is to do with productivity, but I do not want to go

into that at this stage because I am sure that from time to time they will be able to deal with that particular point.

The other point I would want to raise is a point which has been raised by the hon. member for Christ Church East, and of course he was taken to task by the Prime Minister for this already and I do not think I need to castigate him again on that particular one, but as you would realise.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can come back again, you have another one or two minutes to finish off the fifteen.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Now that the hon. member's time has expired, this is an appropriate time for the break.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 12.00 noon tomorrow.

I would like to inform the other side that there are a number of Resolutions which have been circulated which are consequential amendments to Civil Establishments Orders which we propose to do tomorrow. After the Estimates, after 9.30 p.m. , we will be asking the indulgence of the staff just to stay on and finish them and tidy up.

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

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

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. Last evening when the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply; to that it now reverts.

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

MINISTRY OF CARIBBEAN AFFAIRS, EXTERNAL TRADE AND INDUSTRY

HEAD 12(2) – INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,191,314 under Head 12(2) – Ministry of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade and Industry – Industrial Development stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, on the Head – Industrial Development – we have been hearing quite a lot about industry and its relation to our economy, but I must say that it is not, in my opinion, true to say that industrial development in Barbados has succeeded in the manner that it was set out to do. Under the Barbados Labour Party we were at pains to create industrial parks and to set about to develop industry in this country. With an economy of sugar, and a new development in the industry of tourism, it was necessary that the Barbados Labour Party found ways and means of injecting another source of revenue which would off-balance some of the economic imbalances, but we went out of power in 1961 and the Democratic Labour Party assumed office, and what have we found after 15 years? We have found the situation where industrial development has not gone far enough; there is nothing for us in Barbados to boast about as far as industry and its development is concerned.

It is true to say that under the Democratic Labour Party a couple more industries were attracted to the shores of this country, but it is also true to say that we have had, and do have with us, a situation which developed during the regime of the former administration which we can only describe as appalling in the sense that many industries have been attracted here and are still paying what are considered relatively low wages. It is no sense for us to think in terms of industrial development when people today cannot take home a very decent wage at the weekend. We cannot think in terms of industrial development if we are going to have this with us, but there are several factors which may have contributed to this, and in my opinion we will have to arrest them, we will have to set the record straight, because if industries and industrial development are to be achieved and are to become meaningful in Barbados we must understand that we have to attack it in a very positive manner. A very positive approach must be taken as far as industrial development is concerned, not only attracting industry.

Ever so often I hear people claim that we have been able to attract ten or twelve industries to Barbados. This is not all, what we must consider and ask ourselves is if the industries which have been established in Barbados are really attaining the goals that it was intended under the Barbados Labour Party to attain, and that is not so. We must carefully consider the question of trained people to the same skilled level or to the professional level, and if we do not bear this in mind, if there is not the process of a well thought out programme in order to effect this, our industrial development will not attain the goal it has set out to attain. It cannot, and we must today examine industrial development in this light, because in the United States in order to develop industries, in order to attain what they term as industrial development, in the mid-nineteenth century money was spent on the 15 year olds and over, they were called upon to attend State schools, and it was only after this was being done, until after these people were professionally trained and graduated with some skill that they were able to push America in the foreground of industrial development. We must understand that, and we must take a lesson from the United States, because they did not move in industrial development until they took the initiative to make it compulsory that all 14 year olds should be trained in the skills, and we have to understand this.

We have a situation where we have recalled the 14 year olds to the schools and we must understand that they have a vital role to play in this respect. Let us not fool ourselves, we must understand once and for all that we must train these people in skills, in the crafts, so that later they will come out and make an input into the industrial sector. What have we found? Industries have been attracted here, those responsible for the industries come to Barbados, they have to recruit people, and we find a situation where they come in, they invite the labour and then the people whom they select are not trained and therefore we can catch them by offering them cheap wages, but if we in Barbados had taken the initiative and trained these people in the schools – Independent as well as Government schools – in the colleges, not only at the 14 year level, but it must start in the primary school as well to get the young people accustomed and aware of what industrial development means in Barbados. This old conventional idea of education must stop, and the Minister of Education must understand that this is a pointer for him.

12.10 p.m.

The youngsters must be aware in their teenage of the vital role which industry plays in Barbados. Ever so often, Mr. Chairman, you go to the Industrial Schools. What do you have there? Boys and girls being trained in the crafts, being trained to do needlework, to do pottery, and mason work. But when they leave school, ask yourselves how many of them pursue the skills they have been taught in the schools? We must concern ourselves with this because we must now have a new approach, new thinking by which these children when they are taught a skill are not led to feel that they are taking up an hour or filling in a gap.

It must be realised that these people are now taught a skill so that they can become skilled persons and the professionals of tomorrow. This is vital and necessary in order to develop industries in this country. We cannot achieve industrial development without that. I am tired of hearing people talk of industrial development when they do not understand that the very training for it is not present. One of the criticisms that can be levelled, and a valid criticism at that, at the former Government, is that it did not understand that it was time to train those children who were thrown out of school. I called upon them repeatedly to do this and we have seen the effect on industrialisation in this country.

Boys and girls must be taught agricultural science in this country. In pursuing this approach to industrial development, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Caribbean Affairs must work hand in hand so that they will achieve the goal in industrial development; because the Ministry of Agriculture can assist in planting some of the necessary raw materials that we today have got to import.

The Ministry of Agriculture has got at its disposal a very well-equipped technical staff and a very up to date scientific laboratory; and that must be placed at the disposal of the Government if we are supposed to get the best results from industrial development. The Ministry of Education too must understand that it can play a vital role of having industrial handicrafts placed on the syllabus of schools.

Mr. Chairman, when I look at the vote I will say that I have no criticism against the Minister; but I would say that I am looking forward that in the years to come more money is made available so that we can have people trained. More people must be trained if we are supposed to achieve our goals in developing industries in Barbados. It is a must and I do hope that it is done in the next Estimates.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be very long. I listened to the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Trade. The Opposition is concerned about providing employment for the people of Barbados, and the Opposition wishes the new Government well in obtaining as many industries as possible to employ the young people of Barbados; but all of his theories do not get us anywhere. All of his lecturing to the Ministry of Education is not going to bring in one industry. What he says does not deal with the industrial development of Barbados, although it may be important.

What about the thousands of young people, 20 per cent or so that he says are unemployed? Nothing that he has said indicates that they are bringing in an industry next week. What the young people want is work. What the Ministry of Education has to do is to train them in the fields where they can make their contribution to development; but we are talking about the duty of the Barbados Development Corporation and the Ministry of Trade. He has not said how they will bring in another 20 industries in 1977–78. He talks about England and America sending them back, but that has nothing to do with it.

What I want to hear from the Parliamentary Secretary is what steps the Government has taken in the short time that it has been in power, if any, to bring industries into Barbados. When I hear the Parliamentary Secretary talk, it strikes me as if he has a lasso and he will go to America and lasso industrialists or go to England or Germany with a lasso or a shot gun and bring them here. I want to hear deeper thinking from the Parliamentary Secretary. I want him to tell us that he has done an in depth study as to how industrialisation has gone hitherto and what steps they have for painting the pattern of industrialisation or enticing more people to come in.

All of this hot air about taking in 14 year olds does not help us to get one more industry. When you send back a 14 year old to school it is not going to bring in an industrialist. What I want to know is what steps his Ministry is taking in co-operation with the IDC. I am sure that that was not the pattern of the speech made by the hon. member when he was Chairman of the IDC. He will deal with it from the point of view that he has taken over, that he has studied the pattern and looked at the plans and that he as Chairman recommend to the Government a change in direction, a change of policy in restructuring the corporation or enticing industries.

We have this idea in Barbados that industrialists abroad are waiting with bags in their hand to catch British Airways, or Luthansa or Air Canada to come to Barbados. Throughout the whole world today, especially in the last two years, there has been a continuous shortage of capital for investment. In any capitalist thinking they are prepared to come to any country which will offer them the best terms and conditions for the money which they intend to spend. So we have got as a Government and people to put our heads together – it is particularly the Government's responsibility – to see what amount of money industrialists are willing to invest in Barbados without sacrificing its integrity, without sacrificing its sovereignty, without making our people hewers of wood and drawers of water; how we can get some of that limited money which people abroad have to invest.

I thought that the hon. member, apart from telling us that he is looking at enticing people from abroad would have told us that he is trying to see if he can get local businessmen who are prepared to invest money to create more job opportunities. All of this ranting and raving about what the Democratic Labour Party did has nothing to do with unemployment. I would like to know what the Ministry in conjunction with IDC has done to bring into the island more industries in 1977-78.

I would like him to tell the House. Do not get into this thing if you do not understand what is going on. We need to find work and we can train people according to the industries that we bring in, because we have a very intelligent work force. What are we training people for when you do not have the industries? If the Minister or the Chairman of IDC has got people who are coming in a particular field, then the Ministry of Education can put on programmes to meet the needs and demands of the industrialists who are coming in. Are you going to train people to walk about Broad Street and lime?

I am sure that the Chairman of the Board in the absence of the Minister will tell this House what is his conception as to what future development is going to be, and what the Industrial Development Corporation up to now in his short time and in the future intends to do to entice people to come into Barbados. I have heard this lot of talk in Barbados of people coming from abroad and the Democratic Labour Party has been accused of bringing in people here and advertising cheap labour. I personally have never seen an advertisement that Barbados had cheap labour; and I certainly would not be subscribing

to any advertisement which advertised our intelligent work force as a cheap labour force; but Barbados has still got to be realistic. When you consider what people in America get for cleaning the streets, what teachers get, what policemen get, you cannot relate wages paid by industries in Barbados to wages paid in industrialised countries.
12.20 p.m.

When a painter or an electrician in America gets so much money per day or per hour Barbadians in a new industry coming in cannot expect to get that, nor am I condoning that they should get the lowest possible wage. Therefore, it calls for intelligence, for commonsense, for a sensible approach to the request of application of any industrialist in Barbados to see that the workers of this country are not exploited by any incoming country. We cannot put the blame on the industrialist alone for paying low wages. Let us be brutally frank in here. Our constitution guarantees to every citizen of this country the right to join a trade union, and it is amazing in this country in 1976 and 1977 there are thousands of workers in this country, who for reasons best known to themselves, will refuse to join a trade union. Can you blame a Government for that? Can you blame your Government or my Government because girls in the Industrial Estates refuse to join a trade union, or refuse to coalesce or to come together in their own interest?

One of the functions of a trade union is to see that workers in an industry get reasonable wages and reasonable conditions of work. It is amazing the number of workers in this country who are still in 1977 afraid to join a trade union for their mutual benefit and advancement. As long as you get that situation in any industry, you are sure to get exploitation of the masses. What does that spring from? It springs from the basic point that you have more labourers than you have work; therefore, the workers are afraid that their bosses will hear that they have joined a union and find an excuse for firing them, and bring in somebody who is at the door waiting to come in.

The question of industrialisation, Mr. Chairman, is not a simple sort of activity as the Parliamentary Secretary wants us to think. The question of industrialisation of Barbados calls for solid, new thinking. You cannot give it. I am looking for the Chairman to bring some to it, and not you. When you spoke you did not indicate to me that you are *au fait* with the demands and the needs of the Ministry to stimulate, to attract, to cajole, etc., in order to bring in industries in Barbados. I want the Chairman and the Minister to understand that any scheme in this country by your Government to improve the job opportunities for the unemployed people of this country will meet with the whole-hearted support of the Opposition. You can rest assured on that. We all live here, and unless we are all wearing blinkers we are all conscious of what our problems are. I have always, in my last few years, conceived of Barbados' two main problems as housing and of employment or unemployment. These are priorities and, therefore, any step taken by your Government to improve the job opportunities of the people of this country will receive the support of the Opposition. Why I got up is that I do not want the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Trade to think that when he gets up and makes that speech he has solved anything, unless he has a southern lasso that he is going on a trip to lasso industrialists and bring them in at the end of a rope. It is not as simple as that.

Mr. Chairman, it calls for clear, analytical thinking and an analysis of every proposal that is put up to the IDC, or put up to the Government, to make sure that in the final analysis the Government is not exploited, and the Government does not in any way sacrifice its sovereignty or integrity, and that the workers are not exploited. This calls for a clear head, new ideas, proper vision, and I say on behalf of the Opposition good luck to those whose tasks it is to entice and bring in industries that my people and our people may continue to have their self-respect by gainful and profitable employment.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the Chairman of the IDC will reply in the absence of the Minister and, therefore, before he gives his reply, I would like to say a few words on this Head. I am, indeed, very happy, Mr. Chairman, to know that the present Government has found it possible to carry on where the former Government left off at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip. You will remember, Sir, that during the recent elections there was a controversy about who did this and who did that. The time has come now when action has been taken, and I have no interest right now in who used his initiative to start a project or who did not. I can state here that the hon. member for St. Philip North and I get along remarkably well, and I would like to hear from the Chairman or the Minister what plans they have

for Six Cross Roads, a constituency which I have the honour to represent in the House of Assembly.

As you are aware, Sir, St. Philip is the largest parish in this Island and people, especially the young ones, a few of whom have been fortunate in working at various industries. They have to travel long distances to reach work. They have to leave home very early on mornings to be punctual, and if we have industries in that constituency they will be of great benefit to the youngsters of that parish.
12.30 p.m.

The former Government had started that project and I must commend the present Government for continuation of the same. This is of special interest to me because you are quite aware, Mr. Chairman, that in this Island our biggest problem is unemployment of the various youths who are leaving school annually. If you want to find out the problem which we have to face in this Island, you only have to go to these newer secondary schools around 3 o'clock when the children are leaving and you will see the large number who will be the men and women of the future. You can only ask yourself one question; where are we going to find employment for these, and therefore it calls for planning. This is a problem which either party can appreciate. To say that a particular party has been in power for fifteen years and it has not done this or that would in my opinion be a bit misleading, because when we consider the number of young people who are employed in the few industries which we have, we still have to give credit to the former Government, and the present Government has the opportunity to build on the foundation which we have laid. You have to think in terms of training the youth, but of paramount importance you have to try and encourage industrialists to come to this country so that the future generations will be employed.

Sir, in the past we depended on immigration. These avenues have almost been closed to places like Canada, the United States of America, and you will remember that when England opened up the flood gates how many people went to that country. I am indeed happy to see that the United States Government is doing a little to ease the situation by allowing the close relatives especially brothers and sisters and husbands and wives and so on to live permanently in the United States. However most of these avenues have been closed and therefore we have a gigantic task to find employment for the youngsters. It is nothing to boast about with one side claiming it can do this and the other side claiming that they did not do anything; all these things are very well to speak about, but let us get down to the issue and face the facts. Let us realise that it is a national issue and put our shoulders to the plough. The onus will fall on you now and it is my fervent hope that you will do all you possibly can to create an atmosphere which is conducive to those who are willing to come here and invest their money to assist us in creating employment for the future generations in this country.

I can only hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Chairman of the I.D.C. – I must give credit where it belongs – who has been making a very favourable impression in this House will be in a position to improve on where we the members of the former Government left off and where we have done all that we possibly could when we were in power to create employment for a reasonable number of youngsters. I wish you all success and I hope that you will not in your speeches make it a political football because it is an issue which we all have to face as people who are employed can become very disgruntled and can upset the apple cart in this Island, therefore it is for us to do our best and not make it a political issue claiming that you can do more than somebody else has done. That does not help us.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the present Government success and I hope they will improve on where the Democratic Labour Party left off.
12.40 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to the speeches that have been made so far, and I wish to say that I am very pleased with some of the directions they have taken. I am also very pleased that despite the campaign rhetoric of the Government Party they have decided that in the area of industrial development in Barbados it will be business as usual.

For some time now there has been a lot of rhetorical discussion about the role of foreign capital in the development of developing countries, countries like Barbados, and a number of views have been taken on the one side and on the other. I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, very briefly to remind hon. members

of this distinguished Assembly that all of those countries which are now described as developed countries have at some time or other benefited from an influx of foreign capital. In the case of the great United States it was capital from Europe, in the case of the Soviet Union in was capital which went in from Europe, and latterly from the United States, and in the second half of the twentieth century when a large number of developing countries burst upon the international scene as entities in themselves, it became apparent and clear that new and different models of development would have to be found in an urgent atmosphere, since these countries do not have the luxury of 200 or 300 years moving from a state of under development to a position where the quality of life of their citizens can be considered to be acceptable.

, Looking at the Estimates, and bearing in mind that we do not speak on the two Heads which have passed, I myself am not impressed with the reduction in expenditure so far as the Industrial Development Corporation is concerned. To my mind it shows a lack of boldness in the approach towards industrialisation. When the new Chairman came to the Industrial Development Corporation I remember seeing in the Press that he indicated that he would open new vistas in the area of Europe, that he would be seeking to improve and increase the numbers of investors who came from the European side of the Atlantic. I do not believe that this is likely, given what appears to be a chintzy approach, as I am told that they have actually reduced the amount of money made available for promotional purposes. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is somewhat shortsighted.

The Chairman of the Industrial Development Corporation, as indeed his Minister, has entered upon the scene to find the Industrial Development Corporation in what can be described as a sound condition, and under some directive that it should re-evaluate itself with a view of redeploying its personnel and improving and increasing its effectiveness and its productivity. I understand that the Government is continuing along these lines and that indeed attempts are going to be made to expand the Industrial Development Corporation and to redeploy it along the lines which we when we had the opportunity had set out to do. I wish to congratulate the Chairman and the Minister on their show of good sense in leaving a good thing alone; now all they have to do it seems is to convince the Minister of Finance.

The Industrial Development Corporation has always been fortunate ever since the beginning of its major thrust around 1965 to find a number of competent and committed persons who were willing to become involved in its promotion efforts, but I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come for the role of the IDC to be reviewed and redefined. It is necessary I believe – I have always believed – that the IDC should play an even greater role in our infrastructural development in this country. I think we must be careful that the Ministry of Finance, especially the Planning Section, does not by its very nature become so involved in areas that are properly areas of implementation, that we have large problems of plans and not much implementation. I think that projects such as the cement plant, I am convinced that Barbados will soon have to have a national refinery of one kind or another, one size or another, with participation by the Government; I believe it is properly an area where the Industrial Development Corporation – an expanded Industrial Development Corporation – could be involved. It is true that areas such as the flour mill have seen the creation of separate corporations, but I still think that the role the Industrial Development Corporation should play, and it has demonstrated its capacity to pay before, must be one of overview and taking the leading role in these kinds of development.

To any one who might say that we had an opportunity to do this I can merely state that this was in fact on the drawing board, and that the Industrial Development Corporation's new Managers, new Minister, will find that they are batting on a good wicket. I believe the Industrial Development Corporation must be properly staffed, and here I share a view expressed by the Prime Minister, but for a different reason. The Prime Minister, I believe a few days ago, indicated that the persons who function in the Industrial Development Corporation cannot hope to have their cake and eat it too, but I think he missed the point which his colleague from Christ Church East was trying to make, and I have to say that I share the view of the new Chairman of the IDC, the hon. member for Christ Church East, that an Industrial Development Corporation, indeed any Statutory Corporation, must have the flexibility and the capacity to carry out its function as set out in the Act. (Hon. L. R. TULL: Not when you were Minister). That this was so in those areas where the competence of the Board demonstrated that they had the capacity is a fact.

I find that there is something wrong however, Mr. Chairman, with the kind of concept which could see an agency like the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation have its General Manager earning $30,000 a year, but the General Manager for the Industrial Development Corporation – and I am not here speaking of the person, I am speaking about the concept – the General Manager for the Industrial Development Corporation, surely in a developing country, must have a rating at least equal to a General Manager for the Broadcasting Corporation, and indeed while I have reservations about whether it is desirable for a General Manager of the CBC to earn $30,000 a year, the point I am making is not the quantum so much as the position, the relative relationship between the one and the other.
12.50 p.m.

Very slowly in this country, through a process which can only be described as bureaucratic administration technique, the role of the IDC has been brought into the ambit of the Civil Service structure. I maintain, Sir, that it is better for an industrial development corporation to have five very experienced and capable persons than to have a career person who will be in the particular job for 20 or 30 years.

This is not to say that opportunity ought not to be given for a career within the Industrial Development Corporation or similar statutory corporations. What I am saying is that the modus operandi of corporations should be divorced from that of the Civil Service *per se* as much as possible so that the flexibility and the ability to get high quality expertise on short notice will be available to the country as a whole through the particular corporation.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, it can be argued that this is only one kind of management technique, and that somebody else will have another view. I merely put it forward for what it is worth. One of the areas which has blossomed forth as an area for development is the area of handicraft. I noted that recently the Minister and the Chairman when they opened a handicraft exhibition, explained as much as politically possible and let it be known that the emporium and the handicraft concept had been going on for some time.

I wish to suggest, despite the fact that the Government party did not make a play of handicraft in its manifesto, I am very pleased to see that the Government has adopted handicraft in one of its areas of development. The potential for handicraft in this country is limitless. What must be done is that there must be a linkage between the agricultural sector, the handicraft sector and the tourism sector. There must be a clear understanding that items produced in this country for use by tourists should not be duplicated or substituted for by imports from other countries.

I am glad to see that the development plans for handicraft which we left in the Ministry appeared to have been implemented lock, stock and barrel without any change. I am not saying that to claim any kudos, but rather to indicate that where the Government demonstrates commonsense, or where the Government becomes involved in a project which we on this side consider to be of benefit of the community at large we are going to support it.

I wish to say a few words on the question of exports.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have one minute more.

Mr. TAITT: I will crave your indulgence. Anyone who has been involved in the responsibility with the question of exports must know that our salvation must lie in our export ability. I know that the Minister has changed the concept in terms of style; but it is not a matter which style is being used. I have no quarrel with the Minister's change of style or the change of principle; but I think that we all agree that it is the duty of exporters to find the best market and also to produce the best quality products in this country.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going to be able to compete within the Caribbean community if our quality is not good; but more important if we are unable to find markets in the Caribbean community, there is a wider community out there waiting for products produced in this country. We have demonstrated time and time again that Barbadians are capable of producing quality products so long as they have proper guidance; and I am convinced that our people must go out and find new markets.

This business of Jamaica and Guyana – I think that the leaders in the Caribbean, the younger and perhaps the newer politicians have a duty to the young generations of the Caribbean. I beleive that not to support the concept of a regional approach to development in these Caribbean islands is really to play havoc with the lives of generations to come. It should be obvious to every thinking person that we are not going to be able to survive except as a single unit.

It is clear that Jamaica and Guyana have balance of payments problems; and it is a waste of time ranting against them, for if they do not take the steps they are taking we will have no market at all because their economy would be destroyed. It would be better for us to give Jamaica and Guyana a short period to recover so that they will have a market to which we can send items eventually. Today it is Jamaica and Guyana. Tomorrow it may be Barbados. I am glad to see that immediately after taking up office the Minister responsible for industry made a strong statement of commitment to regionalism. Because, Mr. Chairman, our exporters here must know and understand that the regional efforts that need to be exercised from time to time. The European Economic Community after 20 years is still having fractures, still having difficulties.

If we are going to provide the kind of leadership which will be required in the coming decades, it will be necessary for us to explain to our people that the difficulties which are being experienced now can be likened to apartheid until we reach the point where we join together more strongly. When we consider that the Caribbean Community has been put together by some of the best talent in this region, when it beholds us not to make cheap political strife by suggesting that one Caribbean country is worse than another.

I will conclude by saying that recently the Prime Minister indicated that the difficulties between Guyana and Barbados might have been caused by something which the hon. member for St. John.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Mr. TAITT: I will speak later.

1 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. Would the Marshal ask the gentlemen over there to keep less noise!

Mr. WARD: When the Chairman is speaking. Are they Ministers in there?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Carry on, please.

Mr. WARD: As I was saying, Sir, I regard the Industrial Development Corporation, on which the hon. member on my right is the Chairman, to be the most difficult of the Statutory Boards. Going overseas and obtaining industries, all or most are entirely different one from the other, is by no means an easy job because the statistics, the background and the knowledge, the knowhow and the education differ from industry to industry.

What I would like to draw attention to at this time, Mr. Chairman, is not the industries from overseas. Right here in Barbados we have an industry that has been serving us now for almost 100 years, which is on its way out, to put it in no uncertain terms. Recently we have extended the Deep Water Harbour in Barbados, and we had a golden opportunity to revitalise this industry. I am amazed that the planners of the extension of the Deep Water Harbour did not take advantage of that opportunity. The industry to which I refer is dry-docking. It might not be known to many members of Parliament, but the screw-lifing dock that we have, which is the one and only one in the world like itself – there were only two, as far as I know, and the other one is not functioning any more – is going through great difficulties. The whole system of docking a vessel is remarkable in itself, and it can almost be classified as an antique. It is a remarkable piece of engineering, but in truth and in fact it is on its way out. When the Deep Water Harbour was being extended it was a golden opportunity that Barbados could have had what is referred to as a graving-dock. A graving-dock is the one with flood gates, and the water is pumped out of it.

You can talk about bringing industries from overseas, but most of them will be at the pleasure of the head office in Toronto or San Francisco, but as far as a drydock is concerned it is the property of Barbadians, controlled by Barbadians, and we are not depending upon anybody overseas deciding to close or open an industry as the case might be. Added to this, because we have had a dry-dock for nearly 100 years numerous Barbadians in all spheres of docking are knowledgeable, and it is a very labour-intensive industry.

As a young man I worked at the dry-dock, and I would like to give a few statistics. I would like to suggest to members to take their sons and daughters to have a look at the screw-lifting dock because it is such a remarkable piece of engineering. It was designed to lift ships of the weight of around 1,000 tons. I am told by Mr. C. G. Crawford, who was then the Manager of Central Foundry, that the dock actually lifted, during the war years, a vessel in the vicinity of 1,300 tons. As I say, it was designed to lift a 1,000 tons. Today that dock is not lifting anything above 600 tons, and this is the reason why the former Government, who had the planning of the extension of the

Deep Water Harbour, should seize the opportunity to get the technical knowledge because a graving-dock would require some skill in the building of it. We could have put down an ultra-modern dock here in the vicinity of 1,200 tons. I would like to emphasise 1,200 tons because if you just talk about putting down a graving-dock someone may say that we are going in for ocean liners, which would be uneconomical and we would not get that kind of business.

When I was at Central Foundry as a young man, Mr. Chairman, we used to get vessels from Columbia, Venezuela and all of the neighbouring Islands. Sometimes you could get two vessels at 500 tons, but we used to get them around 1,000 tons. They cannot come to Barbados any more because the dock is simply incapable of lifting anything in the 1,000-ton range. What amazes me is that we have an industry; we know about it; plans are made for the extension of the Deep Water Harbour; we have the dredger here, which would have to cut down a certain depth because they would have to rebuild and come up and, of course, it would have to be insulated and so on. I believe that the dredger is going to leave here shortly, and we have not seized the opportunity to extend the knowledge that we have in docking at the Deep Water Harbour.

Now just in case anybody should interpret me to say that I am suggesting scrapping the existing dock, I believe the present dock which lifts boats like shrimp boats and smaller vessels should continue doing that work. I am not suggesting the abolishing of the existing dock but, definitely, Mr. Chairman, this dock, unless vast sums of money will be spent on it, and even then it will be a risk, because there is greater risk in lifting a boat out of the water than having pumps remove water and letting the boat rest on a craddle. Within a short time we will not have the number of people who work on the dock working there any more. I would have thought that the Minister of Labour and Industry at that time when the Deep Water Harbour was being extended – they talk about a Flour Mill and I am in agreement with it, because this will stop foreign currency from going out of the country – would have given serious consideration to the dock.

A dry-dock, Mr. Chairman, brings money into the country. It is just not a matter of saving money from going out. One docking can run into several hundred thousand dollars, when it comes to a metal ship which wants repairs done to its engine and so on. This is a golden opportunity that this country has lost. I would suggest to the Chairman of the IDC and the Minister of Trade to go into a feasibility study of doing it even now. The Hon. Prime Minister has told us that instead of having the number of acres reclaimed that was expected, he has about 13 more acres, or something to this effect. We could have put down an ultra modern dock with a very modern engineering shop for marine work. Barbadians know about marine work and they know about docking, but the opportunity is slipping through our fingers quickly.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only industry that I have in mind, and I know that others would like to speak, but I am disappointed and amazed that the former administration did not find it possible to include a graving-dock at the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to mention the importance of the Industrial Development Corporation in terms of how difficult it is to manage because that would force it to take a distant second place to the Barbados Marketing Corporation of which I am Chairman. I would rather prefer to look at the Industrial Development Corporation in its true perspective as the only agency for industrial development in Barbados, and as such it rightfully assumes the foremost position which it should enjoy. I am forced, for the instruction of the member for St. Michael South West, to point out that it was the Barbados Labour Party some years ago that recognised the need for industrial development, and I do not mean this as a criticism of the Democratic Labour Party. It is merely a historical observation. It was this Party that initiated the industrial concept as we now understand it in Barbados.

1.10 p.m.

It was this party that initiated the industrial concept as we now understand it in Barbados and under the Democratic Labour Party it went on to be where it is today. There are a number of criticisms which one can level at the achievements of the Industrial Development Corporation over the last fifteen years, and again I do not mean to introduce partisan politics into this criticism. I am simply pointing out that I believe that there is something significantly wrong with the method of conceptualising the importance or the role of the Corporation. It does not appear to me on analysis that we in Barbados have yet

sufficiently formulated in our own minds the role of the Corporation, the kinds of industry we want to attract to Barbados, and how we can go about attracting them. We seem in the first place to be placing a disproportionate amount of emphasis on labour intensity. We think for example that it is sufficiently okay to attract an industry simply on the promise that it will provide two or three hundred jobs and we make no apparent effort as far as I can determine to measure the capacity of that business to withstand the short term rigours of development.

If we were to follow what has gone on for the last several years, it would become fairly obvious that a number of the industries we have attracted to Barbados and which we had hoped would have been here to continue that promise of providing jobs are no longer here. Off the top of my head I can call industries like General Dynamics, Datacraft, Plessey Memories and a number of others which are only memories now, and I believe that the major failing with respect to the recruitment of those industries was the fact that we emphasised the job above the other essential ingredients which should go into decision making with respect to recruitment of industrialists.

I saw in the New York Times while I was resident in New York advertisements appearing on behalf of the Industrial Development Corporation which said nothing more than that industry should come to Barbados because we have cheap labour to offer, and I have heard the hon. member for St. John make a remark which I suppose is reasonable if you look at it on face value, and it is that cheap labour is better than no labour at all. The moment one assumes that posture, one assumes a burden, a psychological bondage that forces us to negotiate from a position of weakness when we approach foreign industrialists. I think there is something that needs to be pointed out, and it is that most foreign industrialists are sophisticated in negotiating and they can extract favourable concessions from persons who are sophisticated in negotiations let alone those who are mere fledglings in the art of international negotiations, and frequently they extort from us, I can use no better word than that, conditions and terms which are not in our interest at all and which serve only the short term interest of the company, because most of them so far as I can determine have only come for the short term. There are people who have come down here on speculation and I would like to point out people who come down here with second hand factories, not factories so much as two or three machines of one sort or another. I can recall just perhaps two months ago I encountered a man from North America who came down to Barbados to do a film. He never left Barbados until very recently, but he had managed to go into the Barbados Development Bank and get a promise of $35,000 to set up a manufacturing company making industrial uniforms without any collateral at all, and he was seeking to get industrial incentives from the Industrial Development Corporation for an industry that did not exist, and to use his own language to me, he said:– I suppose I am one of those persons who make people feel comfortable – "I stole four sewing machines from a man." He did not mean that he actually stole them. He meant that he had bought them for next kin to nothing, and he went down in Brighton and for a time managed to fool people into believing that he was an industrialist, and I suppose it is a tribute to this Government that right after the elections the loan which had been negotiated for $35,000 he did not manage to get disbursed, but that will give you one example of what has passed for industrialisation in Barbados during the past years.

There are others who have come. We have gone up to North America and talked to them and told them to come down to Barbados, we give them factory space, we give them "cheap labour" and they abide here for a while and then disappear. I am appealing to this Government of which I am a part to recognise the need for action immediately to recruit the kind of personnel who would make the Industrial Development Corporation the kind of organisation it should be. I think unless Barbados begins to open its eyes and recognise that we have been relying too long upon half-baked theoretical economists, until we come to the point where we must recognise that we cannot continue to place our business destiny in the hands of non-business persons, I fear we are going to be in a bad way. I am making the plea that this Government recognise the need to find trained business personnel, people in disciplines like finance, marketing, business economics, international business law and contracts, and those kinds of business disciplines, so that we can send up to North America and negotiate with North American industrialists in terms that are favourable to Barbados. Until we do that, we are going to get outmanoeuvred by those people every single time around.

Now we must recognise that in attracting industry to Barbados the promise of jobs alone in my view is not enough. I would like to see us start thinking in terms of the marginal contributions that these businesses can make to the tax revenues of Barbados. The tax holidays are entirely too generous in my estimation. Ten years as a maximum time is a long time for these tax holidays, and if you were to look at the behaviour of businesses that have come to Barbados over the years, you will discover that very few have managed to go on beyond this ten-year limit. It is industries like British American Tobacco Company, Banks Brewery and others that lend revenue so that the business of Barbados can be carried on, and it is entirely unsatisfactory to have people come down to Barbados, make absolutely no tax contribution and disappear after five or ten years and leave us with empty factory space at the Airport or at Wildey as we now have.

There is another tendency which unless it is killed with a fair degree of urgency will continue to do us serious harm; and I must take issue with the Hon. Prime Minister on a matter which is being canvassed fairly vigorously by the existing Chairman of Statutory Boards. 1.20 p.m.

My colleague, the member for Christ Church East, indicated in a speech that he made earlier this week that there is entirely too much interference in the business of Statutory Corporations by members of the civil service hierarchy, and by "members of the civil service hierarchy". I mean persons who have traditionally felt that they have the conventional wisdom on all matters affecting the ultimate destiny of our country. Civil servants must recognise that in so far as it relates to the day to day administration of public affairs they perhaps have no peers, but in complex matters like business a civil servant unless he is trained in business is a mere fledgling and he cannot fully appreciate all the complexities that inhere in decision making as it relates to business.

I would like to see this Government get the courage to allow Statutory Boards the freedom to choose their staff without the encumbrances through which they now must go. There are a number of reasons why urgency is indicated. In my own case, when we were negotiating with a financial controller for the Marketing Corporation, by the time I heard and by the time we had cranked up our cumbersome mechanism the man had been snatched off by somebody else, because we had to wait for the long process of decisions from the Minister and back down to the Board beyond a certain salary limit. If we have confidence in entrusting the destiny of a corporation in the hands of a Board and its Chairman, we ought to give him discretionary authority to appoint all levels of staff in that corporation so that decision making is not unnecessarily encumbered by the kind of pace at which civil service matters generally progress.

I would like further to caution us against the fallacy of imitation. Mr. Chairman, do not look at your watch, I have only been talking for two minutes and a half.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can assure you you have three minutes more.

Mr. JOHNSON: I would like to caution us against the fallacy of imitation. We tend to believe that because industrialised countries are rich, that in order for us to accumulate riches in the same fashion we must be following exactly the same road. Because the United States has large industries of one sort or another, we get the feeling that in order for us to develop we must have those same industries. I think it should be fairly obvious to us by now that there is a significant difference between North America and Barbados, and we must be careful that in attracting industries from abroad we attract industries that are compatible with our long range goals, and industries that are compatible with existing industries in Barbados which form the mainstay of our economic structure.

I would like to make one further plea, that we must begin to search for industrialists where they are. I am sure that the Chairman of the IDC has already made some useful forways abroad, but I have attended some international trade shows, international shows of one sort or another at the New York Coloseum and other places in metropolitan New York where from time to time, and as frequently as every year, every class of industrialist assemble in one place to demonstrate their wares and to look for new contacts abroad, and I have attended some of the things staged by the former administration at the Hilton which amounted in my view to nothing more than elaborate feasts. I used to go down and get some of the steaks too, but I do not believe that I could be regarded as an industrialist, and large sums of money used to be spent to attract Barbadians abroad for what I would regard only as political reasons, and the money that should have been allocated to seriously canvassing the

industrial climate overseas was dissipated in doing things that had nothing at all to do with the business in hand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time please.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, in winding up I would like to summarise what I have said. One, we must change our emphasis and begin to recruit for reasons other than labour intensiveness. We need to concentrate on the revenue aspects of industrial development, we must begin to look for the persons who are going to be able to give us the inputs we need, and finally, Sir, when all these things are done, we must begin to search for industrialists where they are and make certain that compatibility is one of the watchwords in our search.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to all the members who have spoken in this debate, and I am particularly grateful too that except for a few brief moments the tone of the debate has been quite, dignified and reasoned for the most part.

Because of the time limitation I will not be able to do more than point to the new directions in which we are hoping to move the Industrial Development Corporation and to put many of the ideas canvassed by hon. members in what I regard as proper perspective, and I want to begin with the argument used by the hon. member for St. Lucy, that for the most part this administration has been doing the same as the former administration as far as industrial development is concerned.

As I understand his submission last night, the gravamen of it was that there is a continuing of the same, more of the same, and it is with that that he found fault for the most part. This I believe to be untrue and inaccurate, and I can only demonstrate that by contrasting what we have been doing in terms of plans and hopes with what has been done in the past, and I think that out of that brief analysis will emerge the view that the former administration's emphases were too narrow, that their focus was too restricted, and that the staff available to the IDC was too inadequate to do the job at hand. By that I mean that they, the former administration, concentrated almost exclusively on recruiting from the North American market. This has been so for the last 15 years, I believe, or thereabouts.

There is only one promotion office now in the Industrial Development Corporation overseas, and that is the office in New York, and that office is supposed to service the whole of North America – Canada and the United States of America – and for the most part that office has concentrated on garment industries and electronics assembly. To a large extend they have been reasonably successful in bringing to Barbados electronics assembly, because right now in Barbados we have three or four of the very biggest names in the electronics industry, but clearly that cannot be the Alpha and the Omega of the industrial development focus of this administration. We feel that there is room for us to diversify the sources of our industry and to that extent we have been looking at Europe as an area from which we ought to be attracting investors. In May we will be going to Europe with an investment mission comprising not only of the Minister and myself and industrial development officers, but also of members of the private sector.
1.30 p.m.

I wish to emphasise that that mission will also comprise members of the private sector because that in itself illustrates one of the emphases of this administration. Increasingly we must concentrate on joint ventures whereby industrialists will be here, and have as their marketing partners, for instance, the local industrialists who will have as their marketing partners industrialists from overseas, whereby industrialists from overseas will allow local industrialists to participate in the equity; and we feel that is one way in which we can begin to get around the problem to which the member for St. Lucy adverted last night. He said that many of the industrialists that come to Barbados do not have sufficient loyalty to the land, and he said that they are occupying space that has been provided by the Government, and at the first sign of difficulty either in their business or in the country they pull up and go. We feel that if we have a joint arrangement that that will help to involve local Barbadians in these ventures, and also help to secure the test of their loyalty.

Now, apart then from going to Europe, we think that we ought to go more vigorously at the North American market, and concentrate on things other than the electronics industry and garments; and we have been thinking very seriously about opening offices in North America elsewhere than New York. I believe that some time this year an office will be opened in the Mid West or in the western part of the United States.

We used to have an office in Canada in the past, Mr. Chairman. That office has been closed, and we will have to look again at the question of

whether it makes sense to have an office in Canada; because we must understand that the majority of industries in Canada are owned by the U.S.A. In a book which has been recently published known as "Silent Surrender" by a former professor, demonstrated quite conclusively that about 85 per cent of the industries in Canada are owned by industrialists in the U.S.A. So that obviously when you canvass thoroughly the market in the United States you by definition canvass the market in Canada.

There will be a new direction also in the question of strategy because in the past we emphasised for the most part what is known as the "scatter shot" approach. We go to a city and we do a promotion exercise hoping to attract someone. Now we are using the "shot gun" approach, selective and concentrated. If we decide, for instance, that we need pharmaceuticals, what we do is to prepare a profile of the pharmaceutical industry, and we sell it to people who are involved in that industry, and hope that out of that selective approach we can get them to come to Barbados.

The member for Christ Church North Central made a point about the dry dock industry; and although I do not know anything about dry docking, I think it is illustrative of the need for the Industrial Development Corporation to promote industries in Barbados; and that too is a new direction in which we have been looking. We believe that we should not only be concentrating on inviting industrialists from overseas, but in promoting local investors, or inviting them to invest here. This is one of the things that should be investigated by the I.D.C. We feel that it is time for the I.D.C. itself to play a more vigorous role in industrialisation in Barbados.

For example, our clay products in the Scotland district have never been fully utilised, and I think that there is the possibility of having a clay industry established in the Scotland district. There are several other areas that recommend themselves; but I want to illustrate that that is a direction in which we could go.

A lot has been said, Mr. Chairman, about the disadvantages of industrialisation by invitation. Indeed there are disadvantages. I think that it ought to be recognised that for the foreseeable future, the next 10 or 15 years, or even 20 years, it is very unlikely that we in Barbados are going to be able to abandon industrialisation partly by invitation. So that I think that there should not be any running away with unrealistic ideas that we can just abandon that strategy of industrialisation.

I want to say too, Sir, that I do not agree that we should be emphasising the revenue advantages of industrialisation as opposed to employment opportunities. I think that the hon. member for St. Michael West misreads the enormity of the unemployment problem facing the country, when he suggests that the disadvantage to the country arising from the erosion of our tax base by offering a few tax incentives ought to be reversed to the point where we should be asking them to pay tax, withdraw the incentives. He advised that by implication even if he did not say it specifically. He did not emphasise the employment opportunities. He is arguing that he never said that; but by definition he has said it; because when once you emphasise revenue and do not simultaneously emphasise employment, it seems to me that it is very difficult to get the proper mix whereby you can emphasise both simultaneously.

I want to say too in relation to the remarks made by the hon. member for St. Lucy that it is in a sense misleading – I use the word in a way not to cause any provocation – it is in a sense misleading to give the impression that we at the Industrial Development Corporation do not emphasise when we are speaking to industrialists that they have to recognise the workers' union, that they have got to be good citizens in every respect.

We are aware of the disadvantages of industrialisation by invitation. Not everyone who says I would like to come to Barbados is accepted. We lay down ground rules. We at all stages make it clear to the industrialists who want to come here that they have to behave in accordance with the laws of the land and must be good, proper citizens, or else we would have to part company with them. There are a lot of companies that have been abiding by these rules even far more than we have asked them to do in terms of seeing after the welfare of the workers. I do not want to be invidious by calling any particular names; and when I refer now to the company of Playtex I am only illustrating the point that I am making. The conditions for the workers are so good at Playtex, in terms of air conditioned facilities, the fact that many of them can take home over $100 a week, that there is a canteen on the premises that is subsidised by the management to the tune of $7,000 a year where girls can get a good meal every day at pepper corn rate virtually. Conditions are so good there

and at one or two of the other industries, that the girls have not seen it as in their interest to join the Barbados Workers' Union.

As I said, I am not trying to be contentious in making this particular point, but it is a fact that these girls are not unionised. I think that there is some link between the fact that they are not unioned and the conditions their employers offer at their work place. I am not trying to stimulate any controversy. I am only trying to make it clear that we do emphasise ground rules. We do screen and we do insist that people coming here do their best to see after the welfare of their workers and to make themselves, good, proper citizens.

I think that I have got a signal from the Chairman that my time is running out. I would only like to make it clear in conclusion that industrialisation is a slow process. That the first thing that we have had to do in the Industrial Development Corporation is to get more staff.
1.40 p.m.

It does ring hollow, indeed, to hear the members of the Democratic Labour Party emphasise the urgency of promoting industrialisation only for me to have gone down there to find out that the organisation had only two Senior Officers at the level of dealing with industrialists. It had no Deputy General Manager, and it had not the range of Administrative staff that is necessary to man a Department such as that. No one should be in any doubt about the size of the Industrial Development Corporation. We are responsible for handicraft promotion in this country. Until recently we were responsible for export promotion. We are responsible for bringing in industries to Barbados. We have an office overseas. We have a Construction Division of over 200 workers. We are responsible for the maintenance of the real estate which we own in this country, which I believe is something approximating $50 million. All of that is the responsibility of the Industrial Development Corporation. The first thing we have had to do was to appoint staff, and we believe that by the end of April we would have a complement of staff big enough to go ahead and realise some of the new goals which we have set ourselves at the Industrial Development Corporation.

A point has been made that not enough money has been provided in the Estimates for the Industrial Development Corporation, and that there has actually been a cutback. I do not think that there has actually been a cutback, but I take the point that if we are to realise these goals we will need much more money for promotion than has been provided in the Estimates. I have the assurance of the Minister that as soon as we have completed our review exercise, which will take the form of a new Industrial Development Plan and Strategy, he will be anxious to look at the case for giving us urgently enough funds for us to set about realising our objectives.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, there is a question which I tried to find out from the Chairman, and I do not think he has given me any information on it. Now that the Minister is available, I have no doubt that he may be in a position to tell me something about the matter, if the file is available. I want to know what are the plans he has for the development at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip. You are erecting buildings up there which we had started, and I am grateful for that, but I would like to know what comprehensive plans are there for Six Cross Roads, which is a very densely populated area. I would say that it is actually the central part of St. Philip in which you can have several amenities and projects going on in that area. I can only hope that the Minister will be in a position, or you, Sir, will be able to give a little information.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, may I indicate that no disrespect was meant when I omitted to talk about Six Roads. We are in the process of completing a building at Six Roads – 7,000 square feet – and already there are three persons who are looking at the building, and have indicated an interest in it. We also have phase 2, which will consist of a multi-user block at Six Roads. I have been told up to yesterday that that is likely to start in April.

Again, without wanting to be contentious, I think I should set the record straight by saying that when I went to the Industrial Development Corporation very little had been done about realising the much-talked-about goal of making Six Roads an Industrial Development Centre. It fell to me and it was my fortune to make some of the final decisions about getting that project off the ground. I do not want to get into the argument about who started what. It is necessary. Six Roads, in future, will be one of our industrial estates, and I think it will be a big one and a healthy one, too. I just wanted to set the record straight in relation to the stage at which planning had reached when this Administration took over.

Mr. WEEKES: Thank you.

Mr. GREAVES rose.

Mr. TAITT: I am grateful to the hon. member for St. Lucy who has graciously allowed me to speak, and I speak not to go into contention with the hon. member for Christ Church East because I think that the Six Roads Industrial Park is now history and should so remain, my friend from St. Philip North and his former comments notwithstanding. I rose on this occasion, Mr. Chairman, to just inject a little more realism into what the member, who has just sat down, has said. He indicated that the new areas he would be going into would include joint ventures. I wish to draw to his attention, specifically the member for Christ Church East, Mr. Chairman, if he would accept the information, that local industrialists have been involved in joint ventures, and the concept of joint ventures cannot be described as new.

Now, examples will come easily to mind: The Pine Hill Dairy, Barbados Packers and Canners, the Flour Mill which is to be established, Barbados Feeds Limited, etc. These are only some of the areas where we had concentrated on joint ventures. If he would examine the staffing structure which the IDC had before it was somewhat savaged, there was a Projects Officer. There was a post equivalent to what is now going to be called the Deputy General Manager. His responsibility was to prepare projects. I believe the holder of that post now resides in the post of General Manager of the Barbados Development Bank, but his responsibility, as I recall, was to prepare projects specifically for joint ventures.
1.50 p.m.

His responsibility as I recall, was to prepare projects specifically for joint ventures, but as the hon. member will discover, it is one thing to have the plan for the joint venture, it is extremely difficult to find a market and the partner. I think the hon. member is aware that in so far as the IDC becoming more involved in investment is concerned, we created the concept of what is called the 500 factory, a factory which would be designed to demonstrate that Barbadians can come together in a larger factory for the production of garments and have a partner in the North American market, and the IDC would in fact invest in the project and get it off the ground. I hope that is the project which the hon. member is going to continue.

On the question of promoting industry in Barbados itself, Mr. Chairman, again the recent history of the IDC would conform that there are industries set up in Barbados which were in fact promoted by the IDC which are owned by Barbadians, and some that come easily to mind are Catelli, Mapps Garments; – I am sure the hon. member can see the product of Mapps Garments almost each time I walk into this Honourable House, and I am sure he will agree that it is the epitome of quality produced – and more latterly Coopers, a Canadian Company that is in fact producing hockey gear, has been induced to consider the production of cricket gear in Barbados with a view to having a joint venture, and again I hope that the IDC is pursuing that because as far as I know we would soon be producing cricket balls and bats and gloves in Barbados with the stamp of Slazenger or one of the other people in England.

On the question of the staff of the IDC I do not think it is fair for me to say here on the floor of the House how long it has been since we had indicated to the IDC that we thought the time had come for them to do an evaluation of themselves with a view to preparing a staff reorganisation; but I find it necessary to refer to the manifesto of our political party which has said that we proposed to reorganise the Industrial Development Corporation to provide even greater expertise, to stimulate and further develop the Barbadian industry, and we went on to say specifically, industrial engineering, advisory service and development of local projects for joint investment would be added features of the IDC programme, the manufacture of new projects would be seriously researched and explored, and as the hon. member talked about the clay deposits in Barbados, that is precisely the kind of area we had in mind. I was convinced, Mr. Chairman, that we in Barbados could produce ceramics of the highest quality once we put our minds to it, and we get the necessary expertise.

I do not think I wish to trade this and that with the hon. member any longer, but I would like to conclude by referring to something which time did not permit me my first time around to refer to. I talk of the relations in the Caribbean and I address this more so now to the Prime Minister. Earlier in this session, I believe it was the Prime Minister who indicated that one of the reasons why relations are somewhat cool or at a low ebb in the Caribbean had something to do especially with regard to Guyana with the Rt. Hon. member for St. John. That may very well be. I am not an oracle myself, but I submit that if there are cool relations between Guyana and Barbados that part, if not all, of the reason must or might have found expression, indeed it must have in a debate which took place in this House some time ago.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All having to do with industrial development?

Mr. TAITT: It has to do with Caribbean regional integration. I refer to the House of Assembly debates of Tuesday, 3rd February, 1976, when they were speaking about a matter in this House and on page 5915 Mr. Adams is the speaker and he said:

"Mr. Speaker, there are few things that disgrace a country's political life, whether we have a two-party system or a one-party system which means that you have elections and electoral irregularities. I venture to say that if Mr. Burnham in Guyana had nationalised bauxite, socialised the economy or co-operated or whatever verb the business is, his activities would have passed unnoticed if he had gradually carried Guyana into the Communist camp, had he not decided to fiddle the elections and carry out perhaps the largest scale electoral fraud in the Western Hemisphere."

After an intervention by Mr. Walcott who pleaded with the hon. member to withdraw the remarks, he went on to say after the Leader of the House intervened and drew to his attention that this would have been an interference with the good relations in Caricom:

"Now that is one thing, but when he spoils it by going on to use the words "unfounded, false and vicious", he is putting himself entirely out of court.".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The time is now 2 o'clock and on motion by the Leader of the House I shall ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, you do not do it so. The Standing Orders are suspended. If the Leader wants to suspend the sitting, he gets up and asks if the hon. member would agree to it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you be seated? I cannot have two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am rising on a point of order. I can see with you, but let it be according to the Rules of this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I draw to the attention of the Leader that it is 2 o'clock.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, you anticipated me. If the hon. member would give way, it is now 2 o'clock and this is the usual time that we take a break.

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

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

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

2.00 p.m.

On Resumption:–

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When this sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

MINISTRY OF CARIBBEAN AFFAIRS, EXTERNAL TRADE AND INDUSTRY

HEAD 12(2) – INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT RESUMED

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Michael South West.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I was making the point that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister had indicated that one of the reasons why relations between Barbados and Guyana had soured had to do with something which the hon. member for St. John had said or done, and I quoting from the Official Record of Tuesday, 3rd February, 1976 at page 5915:

> "Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there are few things that disgrace a country's political life, whether we have a two-party system or a one-party system, which means that you have elections and electoral irregularities. I venture to say that if Mr. Burnham in Guyana had nationalised bauxite, socialised the economy or co-operated or whatever verb the business....."

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. As I understand it, the hon. member is speaking on the Head "Industrial Development". I submit that the political relationship between Barbados and Guyana can have nothing to do with industrial development. The hon. member must wait until we get to External Affairs where we can deal with him.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, this Head is under the overall Head of Caribbean Affairs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is Industrial Development. You will not be permitted to continue on that line, you are being really irrelevant. You will have your chance when we come to External Affairs.

Mr. TAITT: I am sure that the Attorney General in due course when he reflects on what he just said would agree that to say that relations between Guyana and Barbados have nothing to do with industrial development is not a position he would want to take.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are bringing into the debate the whole question of Barbados-Guyana relationships.

Mr. TAITT: I am making the point, Mr. Chairman, that export is vital to Barbados and that one of the problems we have with export to Guyana has to do with relations between Guyana and Barbados, and I am going on to develop what might account for the cool relations between Barbados and Guyana.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. The hon. member has missed the Head. The question of export is dealt with under Head 12(1) – Item 14; the hon. member really should have spoken on this point under the preceding Head. This is the point I am making.

Mr. TAITT: I am prepared to wait, Mr. Chairman, but I would make this point. The Hon. Attorney General might not have been in here when a tacit arrangement between the Minister for Caribbean Affairs, the Chairman of the IDC and us on this side agreed that we would do all the speaking on the IDC Head, but it is all right, I will wait. It is only a question of whether you let me put it in now or whether you let me put it in later.

Mr. GREAVES: I did not expect, Mr. Chairman, that I would have been getting into this debate here today, but when the member for Christ Church East spoke he indicated very clearly that he was going to set out to disprove a lot of what I had said, and as you are undoubtedly aware, he ended up by restating some of the points I made, and quite naturally he also demonstrated quite clearly that as I had pointed out there has not really been any change in the policy as far as industrialisation is concerned.

One point I would like to take the hon. member up on is the point which he made in a rather gloating manner. He did say that he did not want to stir up a controversy, but I believe that this was said probably with his tongue in his cheek somewhat because I do not think that one would expect a statement like that to escape without some comment. I am referring to the statement which he made about Playtex and where in his gloating manner he indicated that workers at Playtex did not see it fit to become members of the Barbados Workers' Union. Without in any way divulging any of the membership of the Barbados Workers' Union, I want to give him the assurance that if he thinks that workers at Playtex are not members of the Barbados Workers' Union he has another thought coming, but we will let that stay for the time being.

What I am a little concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is what I detect as what could possibly be interpreted as a new departure, the new departure being the feeling and the satisfaction which the member for Christ Church East seemed to have got at information which was conveyed to him that the workers at Playtex have not joined the Barbados Workers' Union. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, and we are talking about industrialisation, so there is no point in ringing up your face or anything like that, because I am on this point and on what industrialisation can do, the kind of problems and difficulties which are encountered in industrialisation, and I want to say very clearly that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to point out that when you question my shaking my head, I was just thinking to myself that you are in fact misrepresenting the hon. member for Christ Church East, because nowhere in his speech did he show any excess gratitude or feeling of joy and delight that workers at this particular place were not members of the Union. You are certainly misrepresenting the facts.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to enter into a debate with you in the Chair, the only pity is that you are not over there making that speech from over there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You carry on, but please give us the facts in your speech.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, it is for the member for Christ Church East if he thinks that I am misinterpreting what he is saying to say that, but what I am saying is that I am

interpreting what I understand and the feeling that he conveyed to me, the gloating feeling of satisfaction.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: On a point of order, Sir. If I may just be allowed, I would like to say again for the benefit of the hon. member that as far as the Industrial Development Corporation is concerned, we always emphasise when we are dealing with prospective industrialists from overseas that they have to abide by the laws and practices of this land, and that they have to recognise the Barbados Workers' Union or any other Union that the workers may wish to join.
2.55 p.m.

I would find no joy in any situation which workers were not allowed to join the union of their choice. I appreciate that the hon. member for St. Lucy may wish to misrepresent the situation so as to find the basis for a speech in which to attack me; but I never said any such thing.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that the member for Christ Church East said ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

Mr. GREAVES: Now what seems to be a more precise and clear statement from the member for Christ Church East – I think that we can proceed. I wish to make the point that I hope that any person who is coming into this country has to recognise very clearly the points that he has raised; but I do not see any significant departure between the two parties as far as industrialisation is concerned.

The member for St. Michael South West in his reply to the member for Christ Church East indicated very clearly that the parties were pursuing the same kind of path; and this is further confirmed by the member for Christ Church East when he indicated that there was no point to canvass in Canada when it is acknowledged that about 85 per cent of the industry in Canada is U.S. investment; and it is for that reason, I am told, that the Democratic Labour Party closed down the office in Toronto.

I want to make the point, Mr. Chairman, about the way in which we go about to develop a climate and find what kind of encouragement we can give to our local resources. I did not say in any part of my speech that we should abandon our attempts to bring capital here. All that I have pointed out is that we have to be careful with the kinds of companies that we attract here, with the kind of people who come into the country and who would use the kind of opportunities to exploit the situation. I was sounding a word of caution.

So that having said that, the identification given for example by the hon. member is the kind of exploitation that I am talking about. The Democratic Labour Party quite rightly identified this as one of the areas in which the new industrialisation programme would be taken a very serious look at, and the member for St. Michael West has found out that handicraft needs to be developed. These are areas that need to be developed because I think that there is a tremendous market to be gained from them; and I would say that I hope that in the years ahead the Industrial Development Corporation would pursue a policy which will resound to the benefit of the people of Barbados.

We should not be at all worried by the member for St. Michael West when he indicated that the industries which we attract here are the industries which would not create jobs; but this is part of the programme. One of the objectives; but in our zeal to create jobs we have to ensure that the kind of conditions under which people work, their wages and the whole environment in which people work is the kind that we would want to encourage for the people in this young and developing country of Barbados.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in reply to points made by hon. members under this Head, I think I should deal first with the actual facts in relation to the budget of IDC. As I see it, the amount voted in 1976–77 under Capital and Recurrent totalled $3,980.08. The amount voted in 1977–78 is $4,883,314. It may not have been appreciated by the hon. member who raised this point that since a new organisation is to be responsible for export promotion, that the particular amount which was formerly shown under the Head as Grants to Public Institutions for IDC in respect of export promotion is now shown in the Ministry Head.

Mr. TAITT: If the Minister would give way. The hon. member for Christ Church East took the point that I have made and did explain it and I would save the Minister the trouble of going down that road. I do not think that he was here when the Chairman of the IDC took the point.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the hon. member is satisfied because I make no bones about it – we were not happy that all of our industry attracting efforts

were concentrated in North America. After talks with the Chairman and the General Manager, it has been decided that a new plan will be provided by IDC for the approval of the Ministry for submission to the Ministry of Finance and ultimately the Cabinet whereby a more vigorous promotion effort will be undertaken. As part of this exercise the mission which the member for Christ Church East spoke of in respect of Western Germany will take place.

I myself have been having discussions with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of External Affairs with respect to areas such as Scandinavian countries and even London. We also have decided to have a look at some of the incentive legislation that we have at the moment, particularly in the area of international business legislation. The international business companies legislation at the present moment has not proved to be an inducement to any large number of companies. I believe that there are three or four companies operating under the legislation.

What we have discovered too is that there is a type of activity which would suit Barbados in that it would provide employment for people with the particular type of skills that we have here in abundance, mainly young people who have had some sort of secondary education and who might be willing to provide services.

We in the Ministry have put forward an amendment to the International Business Company Act whereby a section of the Act prohibits a company from being eligible for the low tax rate of 2 per cent if the company uses services originating in Barbados; because what we see is that the whole object of bringing these companies to Barbados is for them to make use of the labour that is in Barbados to perform the services for export abroad so to speak.
3.05 p.m.

Things like the grinding of optical lenses; performing laboratory tests; performing data processing services, and all of those things.

Obviously, we believe that when that amendment goes through we will be able to have another type of inducement in our legislation whereby we can encourage people to come to Barbados. We must remember that we are fortunately situated, geographically speaking, and we have a good communications system. I do not believe that it is beyond the bounds of possibility for us to attract companies here to have those services perform for them abroad. As I said before, this is precisely the type of activity that our people who have emigrated abroad have performed well in, and have earned a good reputation for Barbadians abroad, not only in the United Kingdom and in the United States, but in other areas of the world. Now that we cannot get in those places because of the immigration policies over there, we have to decide in our mind that we have to do something about the matter here in Barbados and try to get companies here formed who will provide these services on a contractual basis abroad.

We, also, have had a lot of discussion on the question of exports. There is no doubt about it, Sir, that one of the constraints on industrial development in a country like Barbados is the fact that we have a very small domestic market. Whether you look at it from the point of view of import substitution or not, 200,000 people, or 250,000 people, and if you add on another 100,000 or 200,000 for tourists is a very small market. We are competing in a world with countries who are in much the same sort of economic development stage as we are in, but they are able to offer a much larger domestic market so that the inducement of import substitution will be greater. We have, therefore, to depend upon exports to a very great degree.

Our experience under Caricom – I am not going to engage in a debate on the position of Caricom because the stand of the Barbados Government is very clear. Nobody from any sector in Barbados or anywhere can put a pistol at our head and try to force us to condemn our fellow members in a Caricom country who have balance of payments problems, and who are acting in accordance with the terms of the Treaty. Nobody can do it. I said so in January; I said so in February; I said so in March, and I am saying so again. I want to say that I think the stand we have adopted is justified because the assurances given to us certainly in respect of Jamaica during the ACP Conference has now been publicly proclaimed by the Government of Jamaica, and I believe that the manufacturers in Barbados are satisfied. That is not to say, of course, that if we find evidence of *mala fides* in the sense of our Caribbean country members not acting in accordance with the spirit of the Treaty that we would not be as equally vocal in our criticism of them.

I think we have long passed the stage where the journalists, business men, or anybody else who want to promote a boxing match between politicians in the respective territories should be entitled to succeed. That cannot happen in our relations because, as I said, the Caricom Movement is a much deeper Movement than just a trade association.

Now, there has been a lot of talk, also, about the type of industrial development that we have had. I want to say that we in the Ministry have just, after a great battle, received some recognition from the Ministry of Finance in the form of a reorganisation of the Research Department in the Ministry of Trade. It was a long battle, but we have managed now to have the post of Senior Economist upgraded to the post of Chief Economist. I wanted an Economic Adviser, but I had to settle for a Chief Economist. We have also had an additional Economist added, and one other staff, so that we can create a Research Section within the Ministry itself which will carry out two broad functions: It will carry out overall review of our existing position in relation to economic development in so far as industrialisation is concerned, and together with IDC they would be able to identify the constraints that we have in so far as incentive legislation is concerned, and together with the Export Promotion Council and the Ministry of External Affairs they will look at the International Treaty constraints against exports in Barbados. This is the essential type of machinery which we feel is necessary before any fundamental change can take place in the strategy of industrial development we have in Barbados. At the same time we have already been able to identify a few areas where we feel greater emphasis should be placed. One is, of course, the linkage in respect of the building industry and industrial development in Barbados. It was one of our earliest industries, the claybrick industry. That was one of the first industries during the Labour Party time that was given any kind of fiscal incentive.

We now know as a fact, as a result of the geo-technical studies and the geological investigations carried out for the Cement Plant, that there is an abundance of clay here, so that nobody has to do that investigation any more. It is there and, therefore, we can now look at that industry in particular and have discussions with the existing manufacturers in that industry and have an in-depth analysis of the reason why so many people need these products, we do not have them and our manufacturers are not expanding. With this expanding staff we can now do specific investigations, and that is one of the areas in which we intend to spend part of our time at an early date.

We also have the question of the linkage with the handicraft. Nobody has to sell handicrafts to me. I live with handicrafts 24 hours of the day. I know about it, and I have seen what can happen in handicrafts, so nobody has to sell that to me. *(Asides.)* For the information of the hon. member, we have appointed a Marketing Officer in the Handicraft Department. We have been lucky to be able to attract to the post a young Barbadian who has a degree in Marketing or an associate in Marketing from a Polytechnic in Canada. I understand it has a good Marketing School. He is back, and we intend to see that handicraft marketing is promoted to the hilt.

Every time an Ambassador or a High Commissioner comes here, the Hon. Minister of External Affairs insists that I have to see him, and we keep questioning and trying to find out and discover whether there are markets in the countries from which the Ambassadors and High Commissioners come, and we keep trying to discover what are the Treaty constraints. All of this on-going exercise is taking place. I, also, feel that as part of the Industrial Programme that we have a responsibility, not only in industry in the narrow sense hitherto, but we have a responsibility for developing agro-industries, the fisheries industries, and industrialised building systems. That overall approach is being adopted.

We have already had discussions with some people who want to establish in Barbados an industry. They are doing a feasibility study now. It is an operation dealing with the production of vegetables for canning and things of that kind.
3.15 p.m.

We have already been having discussions with some people who want to establish in Barbados – they are doing a feasibility study now – an operation dealing with the production of vegetables for canning and things of that kind. We will continue to adopt the attitude that we have to have a linkage between the various sectors of the economy. I am happy also to report that as a result of discussions we have had with the Indian Ambassador here, there is a proposal before the Ministry of Finance, and I have no doubt it will receive favourable consideration, that one of their industrial engineers will come to Barbados and review the situation particularly in things like textiles and having hand looms for spinning or small spinning mills for spinning things like cotton, and they will be able to come and survey the industrial development that we have had and see how we can encourage what they call cottage or village type industry.

Now nobody can underestimate the value of industrial development in Barbados. It is part and parcel of the strategy that we must adopt

if we are going to make any significant dent on the unemployment in Barbados. I know that the Trade Union is, like I am, obviously concerned to see that people who come here are made aware of the tradition of Barbados and the long struggle we had in Barbados for our workers to achieve dignity and a reasonable standard of living. On the forms there is a questionnaire which sets out very clearly the attitude of the Government in relation to Trade Unions and I know that every one of the people who come here are certainly reminded of these facts. So that I do not think we can get into any debate in here that the Government or any particular officer in the Ministry is trying to tell people that we are not aware of the rights of the Trade Union and that our labour relations policy is contrary to the policy of the Barbados Workers' Union. I keep telling the hon. member for St. Lucy that the Barbados Workers' Union was founded by the members of the Barbados Labour Party; we have nothing against the Barbados Workers' Union; they may have something against us, but we have nothing against them. A large part of their members obviously supported us, if not we could not be here today. The Barbadian is a very independent minded person, so therefore the fact that one or two members may have political differences does not prevent the individual members from going and exercising their own thing. So we are not going to have any argument over that. I will give the hon. member the assurance that if he can at any time point to any particular industry or company which denies the Barbadians their Trade Union rights, it will be fully investigated and the matter referred to the relevant authorities in Barbados whose duty it is to monitor these things.

Now on the exports, I think I should mention a word on this, It is true that we have reorganised the export promotion. One of the reasons for that is that it is fashionable and it seems definitely to have been the experience of many countries in the world that export promotion is a highly specialised area, and that it is better dealt with by a separate organisation. I myself had come to this view before I went into the Ministry and then we had the opportunity of getting from the European Commission an expert, a gentleman who set up the Irish Export Promotion Board and who was general manager. He was in Jamaica having a look at their structure and while he was there we managed to get him to come over to Barbados for a week to have a look at our structure. He had a look and he put in a report. We discussed that report in the Ministry and with the officials of IDC and coincidentally the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation's adviser arrived in Barbados in February of this year and he put in his report, and although we did not show him the report of the gentleman from Ireland, he produced a similar sort of concept; but we had already taken a decision to create an Export Advisory Council consisting of all the relevant organisations, and we have the staffing arrangement, and the idea is that that will operate for a year during which time Mr. Rettie the Commonwealth Fund Technical Cooperation's adviser will train the staff, and by the time the year is over we will be able to convert the staff and the Council into a permanent autonomous body.

In the meantime the Attorney General will be having a look at the relevant legislation. We do intend to have a definite thrust this year on the question of export promotion, but it is not only industrial goods, it is also trying to promote some of our agricultural produce. We understand that there is a market for what they call winter vegetables in England, vegetables that can be grown here, things like egg plant, cucumbers, squash and melons. We understand that Geest Industries are interested in that. We have had correspondence and we have opened a channel of correspondence in relation to them and one of the good things about approaching this in a comprehensive way is that it provides this essential linkage that we have been talking about, and I believe that part of our marketing problems in relation to agriculture may well be solved if when we are good at producing that we can produce efficiently, we will get a market for it and we will preserve some for ourselves and export the balance. I believe you will then be taking advantage of all the best conditions, because you will be producing it at the optimum time.

Although we have separated the Barbados Marketing Corporation, there is a link, a continuous dialogue going along between the Marketing Corporation and the Export Promotion and things like that, and it can only function and work if all of these bodies work together. That is one of the reasons why we have the Export Advisory Council. We have the Ministry of Agriculture on it, we have a representative of the Ministry of External Trade on it, we have invited the Trade Union, we have invited the Manufacturers Association and we will even invite the Barbados Agricultural Society because they perform a similar function

in relation to being a producer and an industrialist.

Now the other members have dealt with most or all of the other points. We have had an additional amount of money put in the Capital Estimates. One of the things we have found is that it is the experience of IDC that if you have a number of factories there not necessarily commited, when people come the lag of time between coming, going through the investigation and starting is reduced because you have the factory there to receive them, so we are trying to step up our factory building programme.

We are also looking at the establishment of a free trade zone, and Mr. Rettie is an expert in this area. We feel that again as part of creating more employment in Barbados that a number of traditional crafts like tailoring can be provided within a free trade zone if we can have an area in which goods and materials for small people can be brought in without any question of policing problems you get with a duty free scheme.
3.25 p.m.

There is a constant battle going along between the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Industry as to how we can provide a system whereby people in Barbados who are engaged in small businesses, who are carrying out an activity which results in a change, they are not large enough, for instance, in the garment industry, to get the total duty free import but they are significant, because when you have people making custom built things they get a very much higher price for their labour than when they produce it on a factory scale, but the Ministry of Finance and the Customs always give you problems about policing. How are you going to police it? They have problems, they claim, with policing the garment manufactures at the present moment, but what we want to see is an area demarked where once you carry on your business in that area and you sell in that area, that you will be able to get duty concessions and there will be no problem in relation to policing.

We have some other problems in relation to the Ministry of Finance which we have identified as constraints upon local production, and I will mention one because it illustrates the absolute need for this on-going research on your local resources, and that is ethyl alcohol. We have two stills in Barbados which can produce ethyl alcohol. It is known that ethyl alcohol can be used in the pharmaceutical industry, and it can be used in pesticides, aerosol and things of that kind, but under our laws at the present moment in Barbados we have found that if a manufacturer imports ethyl alcohol he gets it duty free, but if he uses Barbados alcohol he has to pay excise duty, so that it is a disincentive for him to use the local product, when at the same time we want to promote the linkage between one section of industry and one section of manufacturing in Barbados. Again we are putting up proposals.

We have the same thing again with things like solar heating. One of the problems in relation to the pricing of solar heating is that they have to pay duty on the importation of the steel and the pipes, so we again have to look at that and we have to get down in our research department and put up a proper paper to the Ministry of Finance saying if you give these concessions you will be adding so much in raw materials that can be used, and things of that kind. We could only have done that if we had the staff, and we have the staff, not enough, but we have more than we had before.

On the question of appointments, I have not said much on this in the past, but I certainly have two or three Statutory Boards under me, and whenever they put proposals to me about staff, we read them, and I can say that very rapidly they have been concurred in and sent back down. We do have now at the IDC some staff adjustments which I believe will be helpful, we have had some regradings because when I went there and read through the file I asked for a list of the appointments outstanding, we found that there were a number of offices vacant which had been advertised but they did not seem to have attracted the calibre of people that the Board members of IDC and the Staff Committee felt would be suitable for the jobs, but we have been able now to upgrade the salaries of some of the posts and we have been able to create the post of Deputy General Manager. As a result of that four new appointments can now be made.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we in the Ministry of Trade this year are carrying out an in-depth look at all that has been going on with a view to identifying with our approach the constraints that exist both locally and abroad, and I would like to thank hon. members for the tone in which they conducted this debate, because I believe that this Head has been conducted in a far less acrimonious manner than some of the other Heads, and I want to give them the assurance that we in the Ministry of Trade are always open to and welcome ideas. We have a better staffed Ministry now and we have a very enthusiastic Parliamentary Secretary, as you

may have heard, and if you cannot get me I can assure you that if you get him he will find me.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just before you put the question, one question I want to ask the Minister. Did I understand the Minister to be saying that he has a new and different National Export Council? If I remember correctly, there was a National Export Council; I am understanding him to say he has a different one. While I am on my feet let me say that I am glad to see that he has won the long battle for getting the research section in his Ministry upgraded. I do not know if the officials in the Ministry of Finance have changed or if it is that something new has happened.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member will give way, it is that the Great Combination is combining.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, we have managed to carry on the debate so far without any friction and I would prefer to keep it without friction.

I also wanted to make the point that I am glad that the Minister in the course of his reply did agree that geophysical and other studies have been done in relation to the cement plant, and that arising out of those studies they were able to find the clay deposit, because I am sure, Mr. Chairman, you have heard in this House that there had been no information and any studies done in relation to the cement plant.

I have a few other things, but in the interest of getting on with the debate I will not bother with them now.

The question that the sum of $1,191,314 under Head 12(2) – Ministry of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade and Industry – Industrial Development – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE – HEAD 112 – MINISTRY OF CARIBBEAN AFFAIRS, EXTERNAL TRADE AND INDUSTRY

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $6,541,072 under Capital Expenditure – Head 112 – Ministry of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade and Industry – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF CARIBBEAN AFFAIRS, EXTERNAL TRADE AND INDUSTRY

HEAD 13(1) – CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM DIVISION

Head 13(1) – Ministry of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade and Industry – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of amendments before I move the passing of this Head, and I will draw hon. members' attention to the sheet.

Page 53 – Item 16 –

Delete the figure "2,000" under the column Other Expenditure and insert the figure "72,000".

Insert the figure "70,000" under the column Increase.

–Total Other Charges –

Delete the figure "2,217,471" under the column Other Expenditure, and insert the figure – "2,287,471".

Delete the figure "200,605" under the column Increase and insert the figure "270,605".

3.35 p.m.

Total Recurrent – delete the figure $2,923,810 under column Other Expenditure and insert the figure $2,993,810. Delete the figure $825,480 under the column "Increase" and insert the figure $895,480. Total Expenditure – delete the figure $2,930,890 and under the column "Other Expenditure" and insert the figure $2,890,000. Delete the figure $830,160 under the column "Increase" and insert the figure $900,160. Summary – delete the figure $3,813,771 and insert the figure $3,383,771. Delete the figure $880,317 against the net increase and insert the figure $888,360. Those are the amendments, Sir.

Before I move the passing, Sir, I would like to point out that this is from the 1st of March this year. The Civil Aviation Division and the Tourism Division have been merged and they now occupy the offices at Bay Street. It is my belief that this is a wise move because in the context of a small

country like Barbados there is a close inter-relationship between the tourists that come here and the areas from which they come; and we believe that since most of them come by air, that the same organisations in Government should be aware of the inter-connection between these two aspects of industry.

We also have the problem which was much criticised by the Opposition now in Government – the cost of maintenance of certain equipment at the Airport. I myself have carried out an examination of the contract – the alleged contract because one has not been signed – and I was totally dissatisfied with it; and as a result the contractors have been notified of the dissatisfaction of the Government; and I will say no more than that negotiations will soon be started for a review of the terms and conditions under which those services are to be provided.

In respect of the Caribbean Airways there is an agreement between the Government and Laker Airways which has been reviewed and certain changes have been made to that agreement which, in my view, make the arrangement a much more palatable one than it was. We now do have two agreements – one with the C.A.B. and one between the Minister of Civil Aviation and Laker Airways. We have one agreement between the Government of Barbados and Laker Airways; and we have collated the differences between that agreement and this agreement and we will be laying it on the table of this House for the information of members. The position is that we have signed it on behalf of the Government of Barbados and it has been transmitted to London for signature by Laker Airways. One of the more salient changes is the fact that the company is now under an obligation by covenant to train a number of Barbadians in the cockpit because we believe that that is an essential feature which one has to get across – the idea that this is only a temporary arrangement until there is sufficient skill in the country to have your own national airline.

The situation with Carib West is also another matter of grave concern. We have appointed a new Board of Directors; and negotiations are going on now with the minority shareholders and the people from whom they rent their equipment. It is to be appreciated that Carib West does not own any airplanes. It rents its equipment. There are a number of problems in this area which have not been fully ironed out; but I can say that certain changes have taken place in the economic viability, and there is still scope for cutting the style of spending in that airline.

It is claimed, and I believe that it can be verified, that there has been up turn in the financial position of the airline in the last six months. Nevertheless, the airline is acutely short of capital – both working capital and otherwise. It is a cause of great concern. With the spending constraints that we have, we found that we have been landed with this company which was not capitalised properly, and certainly in its first two or three years of operation has been proven to be a total economic failure.

Nevertheless, the Government of Barbados does not feel that one can just dump it, so to speak. Before one makes that decision one has to examine its role as an aid to exports and things of that kind. We have also put in a request to the Caribbean Development Bank and I understand that they have lined up a person in Colombia who is an expert in airline financing and who will do a feasibility study of the airline.

In respect of cargo airlines, I myself have personal views that the time has certainly come when we should have in the Caribbean an institution similar to the West Indies Shipping Corporation contributed to by all of the Governments. I cannot see any difference between transporting goods for industrialists by sea and transporting them by air. I am a firm believer that nothing will be viable unless it has the whole Caribbean market.

I want to say that nobody is going to put a pistol to my head anyway. I want both the operators of the equipment and others to understand that these decisions are working decisions that have to be taken, and they cannot be taken at 24 hours notice; and that we are alive to the fact that transportation by air of certain types of goods is becoming increasingly popular, and indeed many people regard it as absolutely necessary for certain types of transported goods; but none of these countries in the Caribbean, with the exception of Trinidad, can afford to underwrite situations which call for drains upon the Treasury. We have a lot of other programmes; and there is the question of evaluating the relative merits, and the question of allocation of sparse resources. I hope that they understand the position of the Government of Barbados in this respect. We hope that the expert coming from the Government of Colombia will be here this week or next week and that the study will start immediately.

3.45 p.m.

In so far as tourism is concerned, there is another Head and I think we will deal with it under that Head.

I beg to move that Head 13(1), as amended, stand part.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I shall not be very long, Mr. Chairman. I am really refreshed to hear the Hon. Deputy Leader of the House. I take it, and he will probably give me a breakdown, that this $72,000 or a large part of it is to pay for the Cubana Inquiry. I see the Note says:

"Incidental to the investigation of accidents and accident." I wonder if this is not to help pay for the Cubana Inquiry. Will the Minister tell me how much the Cubana Inquiry cost, and give me a breakdown of the various Commissioners and the amounts to which they are entitled and the Government has agreed to pay them?

When I was in the Government I heard so much about Freddie Laker, the International Bandit, from the Opposition then, that I want to know how much he has saved the taxpayers of Barbados by signing one agreement instead of two. I was very surprised to find the Prime Minister opening International Airways in Bridgetown and the glorious things he said about it. I could weary this House for days of the criticisms of the then Barbados Government entering into a partnership with International Caribbean Airways. I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as he then was, refer to Freddie Laker in some very scathing terms. I wonder how he could have gone in the building after he had said the things he did. I want to know how much you save in your signing one instead of two agreements and received back for the taxpayers of Barbados in what was characterised as a very unsatisfactory venture by the then Democratic Labour Party.

Then, of course, Carib West may be described as the El Toro Airline. We hear so much fuss about El Toro; your pal, and your buddy El Toro. People do not state facts in this country. At that time, if I am not mistaken, the Leader of the House was Legal Adviser to Carib West. He was Legal Adviser to Carib West when you heard all of this big fuss about a private letter left back between people who were friends. You cannot write your friends in Barbados and leave the letter in any Ministry because you will run into trouble. Some day you will hear that you gave away taxpayers money on a private letter.

The Minister himself now, as Minister for Civil Aviation, is admitting that there is a place for Carib West in the scheme of things. All it needs, he says, is proper financing, and he is getting an expert to look at it. I thought by now it would be scrapped; the aeroplanes would be at Seawell, or sent back to the charterers, and El Toro would be either shot, executed, or guillotined. When you are on one side of the fence it is sweet, but when you are on the other side you have to face realities and you talk with the other side of your mouth. This will be passed. We are not opposing it, but I would weary the House for days on end with the things we heard when we were in the Government about Freddie Laker and the Government becoming a shareholder, and so on. He is now opening the building. One agreement is signed and sent to London to be signed by the Airways. You are bringing down an expert to look into El Toro Airlines to see how the Airlines could help to satisfy the needs of industrialists in ferrying cargo from one place to another. Those are just comments. Nobody is quarrelling with the Government for reviewing or looking over any agreement entered by the Democratic Labour Party. That is your privilege and your right.

That is why when my learned friend was talking about the Minister of Communications and Works – if an agreement is not signed any Minister over there has a right to say I want to see it renegotiated, or to start it again, if he can. I see nothing wrong in that. One Government cannot bind another, unless there is a binding legal agreement. Any Minister, or any Government, is free to reopen an agreement once it has not reached a point in law where it can be considered a binding agreement, or it can be argued that you are falling from a legal agreement. There is nothing wrong in your asking for prices down at the Harbour for houses to be reviewed. If the people are foolish enough to take less, better luck to you. If they say that I was offered this and I want this, then you can compulsorily acquire it and let the Court decide. You are entitled to do that. I would just like to hear about the Cubana. I would like to hear how much we saved by the new one-signing instead of two-signing with Caribbean Airways, and I want to know about El Toro's Airline Carib West.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there is just one point I want to raise. Some time ago when we dealt with a matter relating to Civil Aviation, I raised the question of whether or not investigations had been carried out concerning the accident with the Liat Airline when one of the employees was killed at Seawell Airport. If I remember correctly, the hon. Member for St.

James, who replied at that point, indicated that investigations were going to be carried out. I want to find out whether or not any investigations have been carried out and what have been the results of such investigations.

As you would appreciate, Mr. Chairman, we have to guarantee the safety of employees wheresoever they are employed. The Attorney General pointed out his concern which we all share, and that is to see that our workers work in as safe surroundings as possible. Certainly, I would hope that we are in a position today to hear something about the progress, if any, about the investigations because this is a very important matter. This is the second occasion, as far as I can recall within 10 years, that we had this kind of accident taking place with Liat Airlines. Even although, within that time or period, there are only two accidents, I think, nevertheless, with this kind of situation it is some matter for concern, and I would hope that the Minister, in his reply, would be able to give some indication as to what is the situation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the hon. member for St. Lucy. I was not in Government at the time, so I, therefore, never said that an investigation was going to be carried out. If he is talking about the incident at Seawell Airport, I said that an investigation should be carried out. At that time I do not think I was in the Government, so I could not say it was going to be carried out. *(Asides.)*

Mr. GREAVES: Just for the purposes of the record, if I remember correctly, the accident that I am talking about which the Hon. Minister replied to, and he is now attempting to duck out of, took place....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am not attempting to duck out of anything. Duck out of what? If I am wrong, I am wrong, and I apologise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. Would I duck out of something with you? You are too light, man, I said I misunderstood you. It is not the first but the second accident. A little cheap nay-nay investigation what?

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, this is the way in which he regards this important matter. It is cheap and nay-nay. We are talking about....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I am saying that you are cheap and nay-nay. A little nay-nay argument you are putting up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I will not have both of you gentlemen on your feet. Sit, both of you! Be seated, please!

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I was really hoping that you would call on the hon. member for St. James to withdraw "cheap and nay-nay", without my having to ask you....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I say that your argument is cheap and nay-nay. *(Asides.)* I say that he is cheap and nay-nay. What is wrong with that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have both hon. members on their feet. Be seated! Will the hon. member for St. James take his seat! There is no need for either of you to continue this type of conduct. Please continue with your speech.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I cannot continue unless I get the hon. member to withdraw his remarks. If you have any doubt about whether or not the member for St. James referred to me as cheap and nay-nay, I am asking you to call for the records.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I will withdraw cheap and nay-nay. I will say cheap and nippy.
3.55 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to proceed unless you ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark "cheap and nippy". It is unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I call on the hon. member for St. James to withdraw the remark.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am going to withdraw the words "cheap and nippy and nay-nay".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And take your seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Don't tell me to take my seat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you want to make a contribution to the debate, you are quite in order.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Learned Attorney General for being present today, because if he were not I do not believe we would have had that kind of decision.

I would hope that the Minister would be able to give us some indication as to the progress or indeed the results of this investigation and that

he will be able to set up a better system to ensure that the safety of the worker in any area of occupation in Barbados is maintained.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions to ask the Minister, but before I begin, let me say I would like to put on the record that this side of the House has a very high regard for the officials who officiate in the civil aviation division of this Ministry, and we would like to congratulate them on the kudos they have been bringing to Barbados by their consistently high performance at international conferences.

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister spoke I think I heard him say that there were going to be new contracts at the Airport for services. Am I to understand that these new contracts will include services such as those of the workers' canteen at the Airport which I am told within a few days after the Government came to power steps were being taken to dislodge the present incumbent. Could the Minister tell us the status of that situation now and any others? *(Asides)* Mr. Chairman, am I going to be protected from this onslaught from the front bench?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, what the hon. member has said is whether the Minister would tell him the status of the situation. The hon. member is famous for what we call at the Bar statements at large. If you will remember, on the question of the buses he said there were people who could build buses, but he never called any names or gave any information. Yesterday I think he came in here with the same thing. He knows certain things, but he would not say them. Now he is asking about somebody being dislodged and what is the status. Whom is he talking about and what situation does he mean? Let him be very positive if he is not afraid of what he is about to say.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have no doubt that the hon. member will give us the details.

Mr. TAITT: In the same way that they discovered that there was somebody who could build buses as I said, it is their duty as a Government to discover at least something. Let me tell him of the situation. There is a poor woman called Norma Jackman. *(Laughter)* I am not going to drag her name across this debate. She had the contract as far as I know for the canteen. (Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Do you know that?) Mr. Chairman, protect me from the Minister of Agriculture. He is a good friend of the lady, so he knows more about this than I do.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. The only way he would know I am a good friend of the lady, Mr. Chairman, is if he met me there when he came and I was there before.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. TAITT: That too is a fact. On one occasion I had been to the restaurant and he was there before me. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go down that road. I wanted to ask the Minister if he was referring to those kinds of services or whether he was referring to the services like Seawell Air Services etc. I do not intend to get into that area, and I also noticed that there has been recently an advertisement for an Airport Manager.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There seems to be a misunderstanding somewhere as to what services you are referring to.

Mr. TAITT: Not with me, Sir. I am speaking the English language and I think the Minister to whom I am addressing the question understands exactly what I am trying to find out, and I would like to know whether this advertisement for an Airport Manager means that the present Airport Manager is not confirmed in his post. I really do not know and I would like the Minister to confirm it. It is a very simple matter.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, a number of questions have been directed to me, and I will answer the last one first. The present Airport Manager has retired. He has come to the end of the period where he is entitled to serve in Government. He has reached the age limit and he has retired and the post has been advertised.

Now in respect of the question of services, the particular contract I had in mind was the one which was the subject matter of a particular service, and I think I said it was the service performed by S.R.C. in the maintenance of certain equipment. In respect to the other contracts at Seawell, I have seen all of the contracts and I have given certain instructions in relation to them. These instructions relate to ensuring that people who have obligations adhere to the contracts. As far as I know, the particular contract by the particular person is still in existence. The position in relation to that is that one must remember that that area is being bulldozed in the future as part of the Airport development programme. I do not want it to be said that we closed it down when in truth and in fact that area is scheduled for demolition, and in accordance with our style of Government in the

future, we will advertise and every citizen of Barbados will be entitled to apply. As to whether they get the contract or not is a matter for the Tenders Committee.

Let me reply in respect of the investigation of the accident until the Leader of the Opposition comes. An investigation by the technical advisers pursuant to the regulations has been carried out by the technical section of Barbados' Accident Investigation section and the report is to be submitted to the Ministry shortly. It has been written, but it has not been formalised, that is, typed and bound up and things like that. As soon as we receive a copy we will inform the hon. member if there are any points on that. But I want to make one point clear, that certain aspects of security is the responsibility of the airline. There is a question of training and safety standards and the relationship between employer and employee. I believe that LIAT is a unionised situation at Grantley Adams Airport, so that the hon. member has another area in which he can take up this matter. But I agree it is a matter of grave concern to us that those two accidents should have occurred.
4.05 p.m.

I believe that LIAT is a unionised situation at the airport, so that the hon. member has another area in which he can take up this matter, but I agree it is a matter of grave concern to us all that these two accidents should have occurred, and anything that we can do from an airport point of view to prevent them, I can assure the hon. member that we will be doing it.

Now on the Cubana Commission, the actual cost is in the vicinity of $65,000 made up as follows: The three Commissioners' fees $37,600; $15,000 for the Chairman, $12,000 and $10,000 (all Barbadian dollars), all subject to tax. The bomb expert $7,308; forensic examination $6,000; witness' air fare for Commander Harvey from Jamaica $695 and hotel accommodation $695; 35 witnesses gave evidence, and their hotel accommodation and fee for giving evidence $1,525; stationery, printing, and typing, photographs $2,800; the administrative services – secretary, stenographer, interpreter – $7,864; refreshment for Commission hearings – the breaks for coffee and things like that – $2,000; $65,952.

The report, as we understand it, has been written but it is being bound and compiled in Canada. The Commissioners have delegated certain aspects of the responsibility for the report and the contents of the report in certain narrow sections to various people. Commissioner Went, I understand, was delegated to report on matters relating to security provisions and Commissioner Howes' responsibility is dealing with the mechanics of getting the report out. That is the information.

Now on this question raised by the hon. member. I do not know, I said very clearly in here that the Government has been able to make some changes in the existing agreement between Laker and the Barbados Government. I do not know what was said in here before, but the agreements that were in existence which I found were two. One was specifically prepared for the consumption of the CAB, and one set out the true relationship between the Barbados Government and Laker, and I dislike and I was bitterly critical of the fact that any Government should be part and parcel of an arrangement in which before another foreign Government a situation was presented when it was not what the true situation is, so I disagree with that because I do not think it is moral, I do not think it is right. I feel that if you have an agreement with another party in relation to an important matter like that, that it should all be embodied in one document, that you either believe in what you put into it or you do not believe in what you put into it, and I do not think you should have a front for the CAB. I am not part and parcel of that.

We have had two significant changes in the agreement. One is that never before in any agreement or memorandum of understanding was there any obligation by Laker at Laker's expense to train Barbadian pilots. We knew that they had hostesses, but that is not the material part of an aeroplane, the material part of an aeroplane is in the cockpit, and under the present agreement the obligation is that they must train at least two Barbadian pilots per year, and we have two up there training on the DC 10s. *(Aside).* That was not in the agreement. I am telling you, I have just checked it.

Mr. TAITT: If the Minister will give way, Sir, could he confirm whether there was an understanding, because I seem to have heard at some time during this whole business that arrangements had been made for Barbadian pilots to be trained by Laker. Could you tell me whether you found an understanding, an exchange of letters or anything at all?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I said that there are two documents which were found. One was for

the consumption of the CAB and one was a memorandum of understanding, which was an agreement. There was also a written agreement, and in neither of those two documents was there any obligation, any covenant as part of the mutual covenants of the agreement that they would train people. That is what I said, I do not know whether he may have told them in a conversation like how the former Minister of Finance used to carry on Government Business, that he would do it, but I am talking about the written documents, and it is in there now that they covenant to do this, so when it goes before the CAB they can say it is part of a binding obligation to do the wherewithal necessary if the Government of Barbados decides that it wants to take over the airline that it will have staff that can run it. There is a big difference between that situation and the other one.

Another salient point is this. The overall agreement of course only had eight years to run instead of ten, and secondly, the obligation to lease Laker aircraft under the old agreement was for ten years but now it is cut down to five years, because one of the points that were made is that it is a perpetual obligation and neither Air Jamaica with Air Canada or any of the others.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister will give way, on the question of cutting down to five years, that was in the works. Again, that is something which was in a discussion going on between Laker and ICA.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I do not know, it may have been in the works, but I do not know what kind of works, it was not in the agreement, and if the hon. member knows Mr. Laker, he is a man who is a tough, difficult negotiator. He has taken on the CAB, he has taken on the British Minister of Civil Aviation and took him before the Court of Appeal, and if the hon. member is prepared, dealing with such a person with such a reputation, to have it in the works on an understanding and not have it in black and white that is the hon. member's business.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am not prepared to deal with anybody, I asked a simple, straightforward question based on information that I believe came to me when I was in another capacity and the Minister is now talking about if I want to deal with Freddie Laker. I do not want to know Freddie Laker, I would deal with the Minister but not Freddie Laker.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Sit down please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You see, one of the things the hon. member refuses to concede is the fact that the other agreement is an agreement which had a number of unsatisfactory features in it. It was rejected by the CAB because they said it was a sham, and we have been renegotiating in consonance with the well established precedents that have passed the CAB and which are consistent with the national dignity of a third world country. The other one was not consistent with it.

Now on the question of Carib West, Sir. It is true that I used to do some legal work for Carib West, and if you look in the list of creditors you will find that I am still there. *(Aside).* There is no hope of recovering it so you could as well write it off. The basic position is that the Carib West arrangement was the subject of bitter criticism because of the fact that it was arranged not along businesslike lines, it was arranged along lines of friendship, and I have repeatedly said in here that you cannot conduct Government's business upon the basis of personal correspondence, meetings in Miami or anywhere, you have to conduct your business along the lines of black and white in which each side puts forward its respective propositions and you have the input of your technical advisers, or if you do not feel you have competent technical advisers you have the input of services that you hire and you do a proper feasibility study and an evaluation of the proposals. That was not done in the case of Carib West, otherwise it would not be in the position now in which they themselves tell you that it was under-capitalised from the very beginning. That is the position.

We have also said, and I have repeated it, I have said it to Carib West people when I used to work for them, I have said it to other people, that I believe that the only way a cargo carrier would be successful in the Caribbean area is if the Government of Jamaica, Air Jamaica, if BWIA, if the Guyana Government and all of them decide that they treat the carrying of goods by air in the same manner as they treat the carriage of goods by sea and have one Corporation dealing with it. That is my view, I believe that that is so, and what we have done is – if we were a reckless Government, if we did not have respect for law and order, every one of these agreements that we had before we would have said the last Government dealt with them, we would tear them up, we are not dealing with

you at all – but we have not adopted that attitude.
4.15 p.m.

We have not adopted that attitude. We recognise that these agreements were entered into and this Government will go on and honour them whether it is the B.L.P. or the Z.L.P. The question of the integrity of the Barbados Government is at stake and you have to try to get around some of the bad features.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Is the Minister suggesting that his Government is Z.L.P.? There can only be two Governments – D.L.P. or B.L.P.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There are 101 ways in which a Government can maneuver. We are bound by the foolishness that they signed. That is one of the problems. You cannot expect that if you have a 10 year agreement you can get it for two years. You have to recognise that the freedom of maneuver to get out of some of these things is very limited; because people confront you with an agreement that has been already signed and what you have to do is to see if you can persuade them to change some of the provisions; because as Mr. Laker said, when you are dealing with a Government, it is not so much a question of law, but of goodwill between the parties; because there are 101 ways in which a Government can frustrate an activity.

I hope that this survey in respect of Carib West will be carried out. I believe that you need an air carrier, and I believe that the best way to do it is in the manner which I have described.

The question that Head 13(1) as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 13(2) Tourism for the sum of $3,850,000 was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 13(2) for the sum of $3,850,000 stand part. This is a grant to the Tourist Board. The amount that we actually will spend is more than that because of the fact that there is $225,000 which we hope to get from the E.E.C. as part of their aid to Barbados. A part of this relates to industrial development and export promotion; but since we did not have a programme to spend money in that area we are now devising a programme in accordance with parameters set by the E.E.C.; but the Tourist Board had a programme which was.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Would it not be.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, please do not behave like that. I am getting up on a matter of principle.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please take your seat. Certainly the hon. member must know better. *(Asides).*

Mr. TAITT: You cannot treat me like a child all the time in here. Can I not get up on a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You may now do that.

Mr. TAITT: I wonder if the Hon. Minister would give consideration to the fact that if he is receiving a grant of $225,000 he might well consider a vote for the sum of $4,075,000. The $225,000 will be put in on the revenue side. If he seeks a vote for only $385,000 there may be some question of whether the financial rules have been adhered to.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I take the point raised by the hon. member; but the Ministry of Finance is satisfied that this is the correct way to do it. This has always been done with their approval, and this is the way they see it should be done.

I beg to move that Head 13(2) stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to spend a long time on this Head; but I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us if, in the six months that he has been responsible for the portfolio of Tourism, he has detected any change in the direction, any change in the policy or even in the quality of the number of tourists coming to Barbados. I make that statement because a mere three years before he became a Minister, speaking in the Other Place – I am looking at the Official Report of the Senate Debate of Thursday, 24th March, 1974, at Page 467, Senator H. B. St. John was speaking. He said:–

"Let us deal with Tourism. Never has any country been so fooled about the impact which Tourism has made like Barbados. I would like to see a real review in Barbados: a real inquiry into the Tourist Industry because while a lot more

people are coming, we only have to pass Oistins and you will see what type of people they are. They are walking bare foot, lining up for the buses and even competing with Barbadians for flying fish. Their contribution today to the economy of Barbados is, I think, in doubt. I am not suggesting to you to chase them out, but to be realistic and know that when you see an increase in the number of visitors passing through Barbados you cannot use the same multiplier that you used in the past, and fool people about the contribution which Tourism is making to the economy. They do not have any money, and this type of visitor is becoming increasingly abundant in Barbados."

I want to know whether in the six months that the Minister has taken over the portfolio whether there has been any change in the type of people coming to Barbados noticeable to him. He went on to say: "I think that the only thing to say is that they are still perpetrating the fraud that there is a Board of Tourism in Barbados. That is nonsense, and we all know that. I do not detect any fundamental change in Government's policy as to where we are going from here, and what type of tourists we want. Are we going to allow hippies, surfers and ne'er do wells (Aside: Streakers?) I have not seen them yet, at least not in public."

That was a statement by the now Minister not very long ago; and I am asking him quite seriously what steps he has taken to change that situation which he so vividly described.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to state what steps were taken because it is obvious that the hon. member does not appreciate it. The first major step was to merge the Civil Aviation Division with the Tourism Division. One will know what is the airline cost, what is the hotel costs and from where people are bringing visitors here.

Secondly, we have had several meetings with the Hotel Association, dealing with the question of tour operators because – and it is the package type of operator to whom I refer – because we find that before the guest even leaves Canada or the U.K. as much as 25 per cent of the total package is left in those countries, never to see Barbados, in promotion, advertising and agency commissions.

4.25 p.m.

So when you look at the dollar, if you see a $250–tour advertised to Barbados, 20% of that never sees the light of day in Barbados. We have been investigating the matter, and I have pointed out to the Hotel Association that the service they perform, particularly the wholesalers, is nothing more than the Board itself could perform at its headquarters in those areas.

Dealing with the question of where the visitors come from, we have analysed with the Research Department and we are keeping very close watch upon the situation because of the fact that we find we had a large dependency upon Canada and particular parts of the U.S. The Board has just come back from a promotion tour of Western Germany. We feel that we should spend more effort in Germany, and part of the EEC contribution will be used to carry out a Research Programme into the potential from the European market into Barbados so as not to have all of our eggs in one basket, namely, North America.

We are also looking at the actual contracts signed by the Tour Operators with the hoteliers in Barbados. We have had a seminar with the Hotel Association on this. This is very important because the Tour Operators had a type of contract with which I have expressed dissatisfaction when I was in another place in which the hoteliers are under an obligation to keep rooms for the Tour Operators whereas the Tour Operators can cancel those rooms with very little notice and only pay in a 14–weeks period a cancellation fee of one day or two days. I said that that was totally unfair and we should go towards the situation whereby just as the hoteliers are under an obligation to keep the rooms, the Tour Operators are under obligation to provide guests or pay a much better cancellation fee because you will appreciate that very often those rooms could be utilised. They cannot contract the rooms to somebody else because of the obligation that they have, and they do not get early cancellation notices. We have already, and I believe that you will find the wholesalers in Canada and the Hotel Association in Barbados are having continuous discussions and the Minister's views have been made very clear on that.

At the Board itself, I do not want to say what I came and found, because a lot of people would be shocked. Why I said that there was no Board at all was because it was a Board that I could not understand. I came and found people who had as much as 296 days owing to them by the Board, and three or four senior officers on the Board had never had any leave for eight or ten months. I regard that as a shocking state of

affairs. One of the first acts we did was to send the people on leave. You had people who had been adorning a job for ten or twelve years. I do not believe that is right. I believe that if you are in the promotion business, you doing work similar to work in the diplomatic business. You have to be able to be shifted periodically because when you are in one market all of the time you tend to become satisfied with that market. The whole aspects of public relations in the Barbados Tourist Board I deplore, and I have already said that openly to the Board. I am not telling them how to change it, but I have told them that, in the area of public relations, I regard it as totally unsatisfactory to have an arrangement in which a nonexistent firm has a contract with the Board to provide public relations in the form of one man. That is foolishness, and I have already told the Board that I would expect that they will do something about it.

We have also had a lot of discussions with the Board in dividing North America into the North, South and the West because, apparently, there is no doubt about it, marketing in the United States of America, the hon. member will know that the South has a personality of its own and it is more nationalistic, so to speak, within the narrow confines since the latest results in the United States of America. They have their own method and their own style, and it is different from the North-East. I feel that efforts should be made, and we are definitely trying to get an arrangement where, at least, this year upon an agency basis we can start in the Miami/Orlando area to try to attract people who come in from California, Texas, etc., and use Miami as the gateway. We are doing the same thing in Montreal. In Canada everybody knows. If you talk with anybody on marketing in Canada, you will be told that the French have their own style. They regard it as an insult to be marketing out of Toronto, and you have to do something there.

We had in additional money for the Tourist Board in respect of promotions, but the Ministry of Finance axed it. They had their Budget constraints. We managed to get an increase over the last year, but with the Budget that we have we want to try and diversify the areas of promotion. There are a lot of other matters in respect of the industry that we need to deal with. Some of these things we are taking up with the Police. I do not want to mention them now because it is fairly obvious. When I heard yesterday that the Establishment of the Police Force had not increased since 1972, and when I think of what the situation was and the inducements and the blandishments that are open to our young people from 1972 to now, I begin to understand some of the criticisms that I was hearing in certain areas which even reached the newspapers.

We are also having some problems with some of the people who come here that they only come under the guise as tourists. We have a number of other environmental problems in Barbados, and we are doing something about the environmental problems because the Minister of Health is doing something about it. A part of the complaints that we get from the Tourist Industry was the large amount of unclean spots and the bad garbage collection service in Barbados. We are taking up all of those things with the Ministry of Health, and I am happy to see that response has already come in the form of a number of people, certainly in the Maxwell area coming down on that road, have already started to clean up their spots. They are cleaning up the vacant pieces of land. There is a drive on in Barbados in respect of this.

A lot more specialised employment could be had because these people have skills and they get good money for cleaning up areas. They can get mechanical saws and so on, and you can plant plants and fruit trees. All of that is happening here in Barbados. People are enclosing and policing their land a lot better, because they seemed to have had an idea that if they had a vacant spot of land they had no obligation to the community at all. They could leave it there; people would dump garbage on it; the rats would go there, and so on. All of this is part and parcel of the tourist industry and the environment that we are dealing with. Obviously, the results of what we are doing will take some time, but initiatives have been taken to provide greater liaison between the sections, as I said earlier. We are having an in-depth examination of the Tour Operators and their role; we are having a look at the environment; we are also having a look at the present hotel legislation together with the Development Bank. The Development Bank has raised this point as to whether the present incentives are not the incorrect ones now, having regard to the pattern of how the visitors come to Barbados by Tour Operators and whether it is right to continue giving hotel aids for 10 rooms, or whether you should not raise the minimum to 20.

There is also the other question of the use of the condominium legislation for a special series of incentives like Jamaica and others have in the Condominium and Resorts Act, which we do not have. All of these matters are being investigated.

What is more now is that we have a vigorous Chairman of the Tourist Board who is responsible to the electorate of Barbados. He is in here and he is in Parliament, and the hon. member can query him as to what he is doing.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of querying the Chairman, since he has to report to the Minister. I will continue to query the Minister. I wonder if the Minister could tell me a little more specifically what steps he plans or envisages to take to determine that none of the types, which he has previously described, come to Barbados?
4.35 p.m.

With this in mind I wonder if the Minister is aware of the literature on the German tourist that has been circulating through Europe and other places, especially the German tourist as the tourists relate to Spain. I am curious that the Minister in response to the question of his attitude to near-do-wells etc. quoted the German tourist. If I remember correctly, the literature written about the German tourist as he or she behaves in Spain and places like that does not suggest there will be any improvement on the quality of tourist as described by the Minister when he was in the Other Place. I wonder if the Minister would care to comment on that.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, one must remember that price plays a very important part in this matter. The price I believe of a holiday for two weeks between Germany and Spain or certainly between England and Spain is around £89 and £100. The price of a holiday out here from Germany is much higher than that, but there are a number of matters that we have to take into account. I feel that if the hoteliers in Barbados had decided in their minds that they were not going to compete with one another with tour operators whether they come from Germany or otherwise, they would have been able to get a better price for their hotels, and the average price of a holiday in Barbados may have gone up and outside the range of some of these types. In addition to that we must have vigorous enforcement of some of the laws which are in Barbados. If people come here and indulge in certain conduct and go to certain night clubs and do certain things at those clubs and the laws are not enforced, Barbados would become a place which has a reputation in those people's market place that you can do this and that in Barbados, and that is one of the matters that we have been taking up with the Attorney General, and steps are being taken to ensure that the laws that are passed by this Legislature to deal with certain types of activities in Barbados are enforced.

The attitude we want to portray abroad is that we are a people who welcome tourists, but there are certain types of behaviour that we do not tolerate and I hope that both in the attitude of the Barbadians themselves and in the law enforcement agencies in Barbados they will be sufficiently strong as to convey this clearly and distinctly. I believe that when you go to another man's country that most people try to behave in a manner which they feel will please the people in the country. It is only when the people in the country do not care how they behave that they decide in their minds that they can behave as they like. I am trying to get this across as part of the tourist promotion image of Barbados.

Mr. TAITT: I take it that the Minister is not saying that this sort of attitude was not the attitude of the Tourists Board before. I take it that he is saying that he intends to intensify this type of activity and I applaud him if that is what he is saying, and I can assume that we can now look forward to the closing down of certain establishments in Barbados unless they behave in a certain way, and I hope in so doing he does not interfere with the night life of any of his colleagues in this House.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not understand what the hon. member is talking about. I walk up and down the Garrison and I see that the streets are lined nowadays with certain people. I know there are laws on the Statute Book and also that the police enforce them.

Mr. TAITT: If the Minister would give way, could he tell us what he is doing up and down the Garrison at that time?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member wishes a tour of the borders of my constituency and the constituency of the hon. member for St. Michael South, at any time the two of us would join hand in hand and bring him and educate him how proper constituencies are run. If he wants to know that, he can come at any time.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member would give way, I am very glad to hear that you have a colleague on this side who does the same thing.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member should know that we are really concerned about the foreign element that is intruding into prostitution on the streets of Barbados. We are very concerned about it. It has implications not only for ruining the tourist industry, but it has very serious security implications. I cannot say any more than that we will have a drive on the streets and around the hotels to ensure that we

clear up this sort of thing and enforce the existing laws.

So far as other people who may come to our shores are concerned, the last Government amended the Drugs Act and we are making sure that we enforce those to prevent hard drugs, particularly cocaine and other forms of drugs not so hard from becoming any business in Barbados. There are certain things that I cannot say in debates such as this, but I am prepared to speak to the hon. member privately as a member of this House and without disclosing anything that may affect state secrets on the matter, but I can take him into my confidence on these matters.

Mr. TAITT: I take the assurance of the Attorney General.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I am extremely pleased and would thank the Opposition for the confidence they have shown in both the Minister of Tourism and myself, because if you would notice, the hon. member did attempt to censure the Minister on some previous statement he made, but there has really been no remark or criticism of the present administration on tourism in Barbados, so therefore we can take it that it has their approval. We appreciate this very much indeed. We are rather flattered. As all the citizens of Barbados can see, the existing winter season is indeed a good one, and I believe that when the figures are shown, not only the number of guests visiting Barbados but the revenue from tourism during the winter season will have gone up considerably.

As to the summer, the Minister did not mention and I would like to inform the House that immediately after he became Minister of Tourism, he negotiated a fare from New York to Barbados which is referred to as a G.I.T. fare, Group Inclusive Tour, which means that in the coming summer season tourists from New York will be able to come to Barbados at a cheaper rate, and this should be a tremendous boost to our summer business. I mention it because we were amazed that the former Minister of Tourism never saw fit to negotiate for this particular tour which the American Government had granted to other West Indian countries, therefore I would like the House to realise that immediately the Minister accomplished a very great boost to the summer tourist business. There is really nothing of any great significance to speak of about the summer season other than that we have just completed two tours, one to Europe and the other to the United States, and one starts in about five days to Canada; and the Hotel Association and the Tourist Board got together and brought out a package deal which is extremely attractive and which we believe will assist in the summer tourist season, but there is one point that I recently found out when I was in Europe which I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Finance especially, and I believe it would boost the tourist industry in Barbados as far as Europe is concerned. There are two currencies in particular I am thinking about. I am thinking about the German Mark and the Swedish Kroner. When people come from Sweden or Germany they are advised by their travel agents to convert their money into American currency to come to Barbados and they are doing this, but keeping in the back of their minds the strength of the German Deustsche Mark and the Kroner, they tend to bring along their own currency.

4.45 p.m.

In other words, when a German travels any part of the world he takes his mark because it is such a strong currency that he can get it converted at a very good exchange rate in most countries of the world, and what I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Finance is that in Barbados the commercial banks readily change US dollars, Canadian dollars and pounds sterling at what we would call a reasonable rate, but when it comes to the mark or the kroner they give such a low rate of exchange that it discourages people from exchanging their own currency. Many a tourist runs short of the American dollars he has exchanged when he comes to Barbados and would gladly change his national currency, but the commercial banks, as I say, give a very low rate of exchange.

I believe that the Minister of Finance, through the Governor of the Central Bank, could issue instructions to the commercial banks to give a better rate of exchange, and I will give an example of what happens, Mr. Chairman. If a guest comes here and after having spent his American currency, or most of it, he finds he would like to spend more money, when he goes to the commercial bank he is so discouraged that he takes his mark or his kroner back home, and if the bank would give a proper rate of exchange on these two currencies the Barbados Government would be that such better off. I had interviews with a couple of bank managers in Barbados to find out why these circumstances existed and they tell me the cost of repatriating the currency to the respective countries is very high, not only with the insurance but also

postage and other expenses, and also the fact – and I am sure the Attorney General is aware of it – that in recent months money repatriated to the United States of America has never reached its destination. It has got as far, I believe, as Miami and it is causing the banks concern, so under these circumstances banks do not really want to deal with these two currencies.

What we are finding is that the Bahamas, Bermuda and St. Lucia will readily give a fair and proper exchange for these two currencies. I am therefore suggesting to the Minister of Finance that he instructs the commercial banks to give a better rate of exchange, and I believe it would improve and help the economy of Barbados.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be long, but there was a very serious question raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South West, and though it was dealt with by the Minister I would like to take up this issue, because it is causing a bit of concern. We have heard about the police not having really shown any significant increases since 1972 or so, and I am appalled because in a situation where you find crimes allegedly committed around the hotels, this can really hurt the tourist industry. I am concerned because at one time I felt that the culprits concerned were Barbadians, but I have been told by another school of thought that we have to look very carefully – and I was looking around for the Hon. Attorney General – but I would like him to listen attentively to what I have to say because it is a very serious thing.

I have been made to understand that there are some so-called tourists who come in here and book into the hotels....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. If the hon. member has this very confidential information, perhaps he would convey it to other members quietly. I can assure the hon. member that the police are very aware of the situation and we are taking some steps now, and I do not think it is necessary that it should be made public.

The question that the sum of $3,850,000 under Head 13(2) – Ministry of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade and Industry – Tourism – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE – HEAD 113 – CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM DIVISION

Capital Expenditure – Head 113 – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – was called.

Hon. H. B. St.JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $17,175,630 under Capital Expenditure – Head 113 – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

HEAD 14(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 14(1) – Ministry of Communications and Works – Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I want to move the following amendments which were circulated earlier in the Session:

Page 56 – Note 7 –
Insert Note 7 to read "Includes provision for payment of outstanding arrears of telephone bills".

Head 14(8) – Water Resources
Page 63 – Note 9 –
Amend the note by adding the following words "Includes provision for payment of commission to Government Savings Bank for collection of Water Rates."

Note 11 –
Amend the note by adding the following words, "Also includes provision for the purchase of a Cash Register".

Mr. Chairman, this Head is quite simple, and I beg to move that the sum of $7,606,903 under Head 14(1) – Ministry of Communications and Works – Direction and Policy Formulation – as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

HEAD 14(2) – PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Head 14(2) – Ministry of Communications and Works – Public Buildings – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,917,000 under

Head 14(2) – Ministry of Communications and Works – Public Buildings – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Head 14(3), Roads, Car Parks and Bus Stands for the sum of $7,430,000 was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to move that Head 14(3) stand part.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, the onus falls on me to deal with all aspects of this Ministry; but time is not available and therefore I shall be very brief in my comments. They say that I am Shadow Minister. What that means I do not know. When there was remuneration attached to the post, and when it carried status I was Parliamentary Secretary; but now that there is no remuneration, and no status, I am called the Shadow Minister.

I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that the laughs will not fall on me for injecting a little humour in this debate today; but we cannot at all times have an antagonistic approach to matters dealing with the affairs of the people. I have no apology to make for the statement I made because I think that you are all aware that I have an allegiance to the people of St. Philip. They are the people who put me here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask a few questions and to make a few brief remarks. Before the last Government was defeated, there was a plan for the improvement of street lights throughout the island. I would just like to know from the Hon. Minister if he has come across these recommendations and if he is willing to install street lights in the various districts from time to time. I know that as a new Minister he will have top priorities to deal with; but I am still appealing to him not to forget the various districts which have been recommended by the former Minister and his Parliamentary Secretary, and approved by the former Government. It is his duty, Sir, if he had seen these files, and I look forward to his whole hearted co-operation.

I do not expect him to cut his nose to spoil his face; and again I repeat that he will have his priorities; but in the long run we come here to represent not a few parishes or a few constituencies. We have come here to represent the whole island. In my view the Minister of Communications and Works is not there to represent his constituency or his colleagues' constituencies. He is there to represent Barbados as a whole.

I do hope that he will do everything possible to take the constituencies from darkness into light and let them share some of amenities of this island, realising that all are called upon to pay taxes, direct or indirect.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister the last occasion on which they negotiated the exchange of a road. Permission was granted by the Government to put a new road into what is commonly known as Bats Rock. In fact the road became public property because of use for nearly 100 years or so. This road leads to one of the finest beaches in Barbados. Since the university development and Paradise Heights etc. near to Bats Rock many people are afraid to go to Bats Rock even during the day and they are even more afraid to go there at night. Recently in the Advocate Newspaper was a picture showing an over growth of bush; and when people go to Bats Rock they get their clothes snatched and their cars raided.

I have a plot of land and the company that did the transactions is known as Bella Nova Limited; and there is a relatively short distance of road which could be built. It is obliquely opposite a side entrance to the Lazaretto, and if the Government put this road in it would serve both the population of Barbados and the tourist industry; and I believe that after putting a road there the tourist industry might even take on the building of facilities on the beach. I therefore make those few suggestions to the Minister so that he and his engineers can possibly make a survey; and I hope that will be done before very long.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I noticed that the Shadow Minister who never had a chance to sit on the front bench when his Party was in power in now there and we welcome him. *(Cheers)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what my friend from St. Philip North is getting worried about. We see that there is a certain weakness over on the Government side, and we can lend them Mr. Weekes to give

them some strength over there. I am certain that they will welcome it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member is merely using a pun. He says that there is a certain weakness, meaning that the hon. member, Mr. Weekes is there. *(Laughter)*

Mr. SANDIFORD: I merely wish to take the opportunity to draw to the attention of the Minister the Head 14(3), Road, Car Parks and Bus Stands.
5.05 p.m.

I merely wish, quite briefly, to draw to his attention that there is need for a considerable amount of maintenance work on the roads in the constituency of St. Michael South which I happen to represent, particularly in the Bullens Avenue/Deighton Area as well as some continuation of work in the Dalkeith Village area as well as on the side of Beckles Road, that is on the same side as the St. Michael's District Hospital. I merely wish to draw that to the attention of the Minister. Some work has been done, but there is need for a continuation of the work. I can give the details to the Minister so that he can be aware of it, but I am merely drawing it to his attention at this stage.

While I am on it, as far as bus stands are concerned, let me repeat a point which I have made recently. It is that as far as the bus transportation system is concerned, there appears to be no meaningful connecting link between the several bus stands in the City of Bridgetown. I believe that there should be instituted a sort of City circle service which would link the bus stand on the Princess Alice Highway, the Lower Green, the Fairchild Street, and a circular service could be instituted which would connect not only these bus stands, but it, possibly, could go up Bay Street, Jemmotts Lane, with a stop for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and touching on other major points within the City area. I am certain the details can be worked out, but I just throw out the suggestion for some type of link. A small bus could do it, or even a couple of mini buses. I think this is, if I may say so to myself, a worth while suggestion which merits some kind of consideration in order to facilitate movement across the City of Bridgetown.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is in a receptive mood, I will take this opportunity to draw to his attention that early in the Session when we came in in September, I had raised the question about a road in Passage Garden. The Minister had given me the assurance that work had not been stopped by any directive from him, but in truth and in fact the water had been installed in this road in Passage Garden. If he would check with his officials in the Ministry, he will find that a tour had been done of the area and the then Minister had expressed shock that the roads could be within such close proximity to Bridgetown and be in such bad shape. The road in Passage Garden, especially, is in a deplorable condition. First Avenue and Second Avenue, Richmond Gap, are roads which were also surveyed by the team from the Ministry of Communications and Works. Again, water has been installed in these roads for some long time, but no attempt has been made so far to lay a surface of any kind. I am not asking for high-quality, high-level Barber Green. I would settle for a passable surface hardened by any process, so long as the persons in those areas are able to have relatively free access especially when the rains descend.

Now, in the area of Upper Goodland, there is a drainage area, I think you know, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the Minister is aware that there is a sort of alluvial plain in the whole area of Richmond Gap/Goodland going towards the sea, and because of the amount of housing which has been put there since the North access road was cut, the water which had a natural right of way through a series of gullies and tracks now finds its way into houses, under cellars and that sort of thing. I believe the Ministry has been doing some work in terms of sinking wells in the area, but there is a road in Upper Goodland, particularly Fourth Avenue, Goodland, which had – I think the officials confirmed that no repair work had been done on that road for something like eight or nine years. I think it is uneconomic to leave the road without repair. I know that the Minister will be trying to satisfy 24 constituencies. I know that the money from the Ministry of Finance will not permit him to do everything for everybody, but I am asking the Minister if he would just take a look at the reports which are fresh in his Ministry and do his best to give some assistance to some of the suffering people in that area.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, as a former Minister of Communications and Works, I am not getting up asking for anything. I think when I had the honour to hold that portfolio I did more than enough, not that I saw the results for any concern in terms of votes, but I am going to make a prediction now. Of all the people on the front bench, the Minister of Communications

and Works, when history is written, is going to be one of the best. I am making a prediction. I would like to tell the Minister although I was facetiously referred to as Minister of tar roads and other terms which the then Opposition thought were derogatory. The Ministry of Communications and Works is a vital Ministry in the economy and in the country of Barbados. It is a Ministry that touches the lives of every single person at some time or other be he prince or pauper. The Minister's job is not an easy one in Communications and Works for several reasons. For one thing, he is dealing with a Ministry which is basically labour-intensive and so, like the Minister of Education, he does not have any MA's and BA's, Diplomas, LCP's and ACP's, and 4 'O' Levels. He is dealing with the type of person who has to earn a living, and because of the nature of the Ministry itself he has to deal with the humble man and the common man.

Now, the whole question of the Ministry is that he has to find some method of motivating people. It is a Ministry in which a lot of money can go down the drain very easily. It is a Ministry in which you can lose material, you can lose time, you can lose labour, and from the very nature of the Ministry itself, you could create in the public's mind an impression that you are not getting value for money. The people who pass and see a man at a sign or on the road doing nothing immediately assume that this is taxpayers' money going down the drain. The Minister has to be very careful that he gets value for the money which the taxpayers are spending in this Ministry.

As I often say, you do not keep a dog and bark too; therefore, he has to rely on his staff. This is where, I think, the Minister has to be very careful. He must not only look at the staff at the highest sections in the office, but he has to look at the staff of the Supervisor A, Supervisor B, Supervisor C, right up the line. The success of the Ministry which he holds depends on the quality, dedication, and the commitment of these people.

There is need in Barbados in terms of street lighting, in terms of Traffic Signs. There is also a need for a greater and an intensive continuation of these programmes. Under the Democratic Labour Party, I think if you go to the higher regions of the country, say, from Shop Hill, or even from Bathsheba or Horse Hill, you can see the significant contribution in street lighting that was made by the Democratic Labour Party. Even although they talk about 15 years of Democratic Labour Party Government, in this area of street lighting, in this area of improvement of roads, I think this is one area in which we have made a significant contribution to Barbados.

5.15 p.m.

There is a need for a great number of traffic signs at several junctions in this country, and I am glad to see that a traffic sign which I was trying for four years to get in the Ministry is now going up at the junction of Jemmotts Lane and Bay Street. You will be surprised that for about four years I was trying to get a sign at Belmont up by Government House and down at Jemmotts Lane, but I am glad to see that you at least have achieved something that I tried four years to get.

Then of course, as you know, the street lighting programme was held up during the fuel crisis, and I think you will find that a lot of people require these street lights, and I hope you will sympathetically consider the requests of the members not only on the Government side but of the members on this side for extensive street lighting in the areas which we recommend. Of course I see that Light and Power is applying for an increase, and I do not know what effect this is likely to have on this particular programme.

As I say, I think the Minister will understand that he will have a problem if he takes over the buses as intended by Government in June. The question of bus stands and bus depots will be very important and therefore he has got to pay much more attention to the Fairchild Street bus stand. When I was in the Ministry there were plans to try and do something with them and I am glad to say that at least before I left we were able to bring some order even although I will sumbit that the Fairchild Street bus stand and even the Lower Green bus stand are not satisfactory as bus depots, and therefore I want the Minister to give considerable attention to this since the Transport Board will be the owner of all the buses. I think you will remember that in 1970 we lost a lot of buses because of heavy rains, and I think the Minister should get a study going on where he is going to locate the other buses which he is having in due course.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just briefly I would like to draw something to the attention of the Minister. I believe it concerns the Minister of Education as well. Around the schools I have noticed that a number of motorists are travelling at extremely fast speeds. Now the one I know about specifically is the school Wesley Hall on King Street. I believe that if you had the international sign for school on the road on both sides of the school, motorists might be inclined

to go a little slower. I quite frankly am terrified each time I go in King Street and see goods vehicles, trucks and cars zooming past at about 3.05 p.m. when very young children are coming out of that school. I know there is a scheme which, the Y.M.C.A. has with the long stop sign, but I do not believe that that scheme can be stretched to all of the schools, and especially for the elementary and infant schools I think it would be very desirable if we could have some kind of international sign signifying that a school is nearby. I think that some programme on television in the Government Programme reminding motorists of their need to be careful as they drive by schools could be useful.

While I am on my feet I asked when we had the Government and I believe it was discussed and was in train, I do not know, but there is a very huge school at St. Leonards, St. Leonard's Boys' and Girls', and when they come out on evenings they have to cross what is popularly called the Harbour Road. I am sure the Minister himself and you, Mr. Chairman, have travelled on the Harbour Road and the tendency on the Harbour Road is to equate it to a race track and there is a touch and go situation between the school children and the cars coming from town around 3 p.m., and I have wondered whether there should not be some crossing at the Richmond Gap junction for those children coming from St. Leonard's schools. One of these days, if we do not have some kind of crossing, some child is going to be murdered by some motorist whose intention was merely to get to his house as fast as possible. I draw this to the Minister's attention for what it is worth.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I am in agreement with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who has placed a lot of emphasis on the street lighting programme. I do think this is one area in which the Minister should speed up operations because I have been getting quite a number of complaints about people lay waiting where there are no lights and committing several crimes, and I do think that street lights would act as a sort of deterrent in this respect, and I do hope that as money comes along that the Minister will look into this area.

Now I just want to deal very briefly with an area where I feel the Government can save some money in the long run. There are two roads, one in Reece Road and one in Parkinson Field. In the Reece Road area I have noticed that every month you will find workmen doing some job, and I feel that something must be done. Perhaps a proper survey has not been carried out on that particular road, and this is causing repetition of the same job; but there is something really wrong and I would like the Minister to look into this matter where every month you can find workmen going back on the same thing. The thing about it is that the same thing happens whenever there is a downpour. I think that with a proper study done on that road we should be able to get the road done properly once and for all and save some money.

In Parkinson Field no provision was made in the beginning for buses to pass through, but now that we have got the extension to Wildey area and we have buses passing through Parkinson Field to go into the Wildey development and that road is now a very busy road, what I have noticed is that the road which is the second turning on the right is always being repaired. It seems to me that the weight of the buses is causing the road some problem and there have to be constant repairs. I think that if a proper survey was done at this particular area that perhaps the road could be dug up and proper foundation work done so that when you surface it you would not have to be going back every two or three weeks. What is significant about that particular area is that the bus goes around there and can cause an accident. Sometimes the hole is very deep and with a big bus passing through, at some time the steering can easily get out of control from the bus driver and cause an accident. It would in the long run be detrimental to the Ministry because it would have to pay claims as a result of the accident to people who may get injured.

5.25 p.m.

I have been seeing in the past – and this is no criticism of the former administration – but I have been seeing workmen in the past repairing roads and not putting proper sidewalks and so on. They would build roads underneath the actual level of the ground and then when the rain falls you find a lot of mud comes down on the road, such as you will find opposite the Ministry of Communications and Works where the water comes out of Midway Lane right in front of the Minister's office, although that road is done fairly often, and I would like in the programme of the Ministry of Communications and Works a proper study so that when roads are being constructed that this sort of thing does not happen, that when rain falls the mud would not come on to the road, but rather there is some proper drainage or some part of the edge of the road built up to about six inches or so, so that the road would be free from the mud and slush.

One thing I want to say before I sit down is that I am really a little concerned, though I know that some solution would be found to the problem, that for 15 years I cannot really say that anything has been done for the constituency of St. Michael South East, especially in Haggatt Hall. The roads in Haggatt Hall were not done since the Labour Party went out of power. Take roads like Mapp Hill and Mount Friendship. I will say that about three quarters of the road at Mount Friendship can be used, the other part is broken away, and as I said, though it is not meant to be a criticism of the former administration, the representative is the man who is supposed to get hold of the Minister in charge or come to the House and ask for the things. If he has not asked I am not blaming the Government, but what I am saying is that as the the representative of that constituency I am aware of the problems, I am not going to ask the Minister to rectify them straight away. I have told my constituents that he has other areas, that they cannot expect everything all of a sudden, but I know the Licorish Village area has to be done, I know Deane's Village has to be done and Station Hill has to be done, but I hope that they will bear with me and with the Minister too until a later stage when we can have enough money to do the roads in the constituency.

As I said, I just wanted to draw to the Minister's attention these things, I am not asking him to do St. Michael South East straight away, but there are some areas which need urgent consideration which can avoid the Government lots of money in the long run which all of us as taxpayers would have to pay.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with roads I would like to say that in this island there are tenantry roads, other roads and roads in general which the poor people of this country must use daily. We have been dealing strictly in most cases with the highways.

A few days ago I heard the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister state that on the whole we may have too many roads in the island and especially he did mention the parish of St. Philip. I am not here to refute his statement, but what I am here to point out to you, Sir, is that these tenantry roads are used by the very poor people, and especially the agricultural labourers of this island, they and their children must use them daily. It is a fact, Sir, and I think you are aware that something has to be done to alleviate the difficulties and the inconveniences which these people suffer in case of heavy rains. I know that it takes funds to do these things, and I am aware of the resources of this country, but I think that if we could do something to help them by using marl fill on those roads, some people may say, and especially the engineers, that it is not durable to use marl fill, but you are relieving a situation. Marl fill can last for approximately three to four years and it takes approximately one-eighth of the month or less to use the marl fill than to build a road, and therefore I can only appeal to you to take a special interest and to consider the suggestions which I have made here today.

You also have, Sir, in other districts where peasants have their lands. These small farmers inherited the land from their ancestors and some of them have stone buildings. If you were to ask the engineers they would tell you we would have to resite those buildings and bring them nearer to the highway so that the people can enjoy the amenities of life and it would be less costly to the Government. But, Sir, firstly, you cannot move old wall buildings, rubble stone buildings in many cases, and therefore I can only appeal to you to do all you possibly can to include and to ask the Minister of Finance for a reasonable amount of money to use marl fill on certain roads, especially where the soil is very shallow. In some cases, in certain parts of St. Lucy, St. Philip and Christ Church you get nine inches of earth and if you use marl fill I can assure you it will be a big saving to the Government.

Now I am dealing with roads and there is one point I want the Minister to listen to carefully. The district where I reside, I know you are not responsible for it. Whether it be called Penny Hole, Cent Hole, Pound Hole or Gemswick, I want you to realise that that road was being repaired. I know you are not aware of it, and that since the election the repairs on that road have come to a dead standstill.

Secondly, the buses used to travel on that route and at present the buses do not travel on the route. I know you well, Sir, and I know your people are from St. Philip, and you for one moment would not tolerate that, but I feel that regardless of the name – the changing of the name does not matter to me – but I feel that you should draw it to the attention of your officers that that road is in a deplorable condition, it was being repaired before the election and since the election the work has been discontinued, the bus does not travel there, and in some cases children have to travel a mile to catch a bus.

5.35 p.m.

I am asking him to look into the matter carefully. I can vouch that he is going to deal with him immediately. Thank you, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to put in any claim for the roads in St. Thomas, or street lights or anything else. I just want to draw to the attention of the hon. member who has just spoken that you must understand what is meant when you say that Barbados has too many roads. Barbados by and large, except perhaps for Honkong and Singapore has more roads per square mile than any other country in the world.

It is not only because of the density of our population, but because in many cases the roads follow old boundary lines between individual owners; and when roads were being laid out they continued along these boundary lines; and of all the parishes where this is significant the largest parish, St. Philip, found itself with most of the roads of this sort.

You will find in St. Philip that there are many roads if you are going from me to the hon. member you have to turn left to go to where the Minister of Education is sitting. Then you turn right to the Clerk and turn left again to the Reporters and go back around like that. This is because the distribution of land ownership was such that people used to take these roundabout roads 200 years ago; and now you still find people who will not give you a pass through their land.

On many of these roads you have to go around three sides of a square. When I say that there are too many roads, what I mean is that it might be better perhaps in many cases to take the bull by the horns and acquire the land that would enable you to straighten out some of those roads so that you do not have the constant, repetitive cost of maintaining three sides of a square without going to the fourth side and laying down a proper standard once and for all; and you would save a lot of time.

I am not talking about major highways acquired for industrial purposes. I am talking about roads to facilitate people. We have examples of this in an island not far away – Martinique – where both hilly conditions and a multiplicity of land ownership has led to similar road configurations in the past. Those who know Martinique now and who knew it 20 years ago will recall that to go to Trinite there used to be a very twisting, turning road and the island authorities used to keep making it up and repairing it, this being the most important cross country artery; and then they decided that enough was enough and they built a straight road from Trinite which cut the driving time in half and which was a lot less expensive to maintain than it was to maintain the old twisting road that went south, north and so on than the new road to Fort de France.

While I do not think that this is an infrastructural priority in Barbados, I think that it is an important consideration that must be borne in mind in the future; and I would like to think that the technical officers of the Ministry of Communications and Works are saying when they look at the repair programme that now and again it would be better to seek to straighten this or that road; to abandon as a main road 600 yards of road and build a piece 300 yards along, and therefore do not spend excessive amounts of money on maintaining the 600 yards of road if our ultimate objective is to straighten the road out.

I have seen the road works plans of the Ministry of Communications and Works, and in many cases it seems to me – I say so with no possible reflection on the present Minister, and no reflection on the technical officers either, because they can only make their plans within the existing framework – but it seems to me that in many cases they are taking existing roads and repairing them along a scale programme and thinking that this is all that is needed for an improvement programme.

Improving roads does not mean just resurfacing roads. It should also take into account the re-aligning of roads on a long term basis, and coincidentally with roads which go around the island in a clockwise or anti-clockwise direction or whatever it is, they should be identifying roads that do not require the same level of maintenance.

Lest the hon. member think that I am picking out St. Philip as an area where there are too many roads, let me say that there are some redundant and yet well surfaced roads in St. Thomas. There is a road that goes past Mangrove Pond, properly knows as "Mango Pond". Mango Pond used to have a tenantry in the last century and a large estate house. Now the only resident is an old gentleman, getting on in years, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Prescod. It is not now an estate house. It is a small house; and he was an employee of the estate and he lives there out of tradition.

It is an area from which the population has entirely gone except the gentleman; but there is over a mile of road connecting Highway 3A and

3B that runs from Mangrove Pond Road. Its only use is as an estate road to bring out canes. I will say that although I am their representative for St. Thomas, when Mr. Prescod goes that road should no longer be repaired. It is only used for estate trucks; and I believe that people park there not only in the evening but in the middle of the day, it is so lonely and desolate.

This is the sort of analysis that has to be made so as to see that we are not expending money merely because a road is there without having due regard to the road itself. When I think of Mr. Boxill twice having that road repaired during his tenure as Minister of Communications and Works when he never gave a road to the people of Vaucluse Tenantry and Ham Pond, and was heard to say to one of his technical officers who repeated it to me, that he is not making any road for the people to come out and vote for Tom Adams – when I reflect on these things I consider that the consideration which we give to the repair and supply of roads are not considerations based purely on economic and physical planning grounds. I hope that the technical officers will harken to these words. I know that the Minister has already taken them to heart and is pursuing a vigorous programme of revision of our real road repair programme needs.

Mr. WARD: With your kind permission, Sir. I would like to draw something to your attention.
5.45 p.m.

I would like to draw something to your attention, Sir. We have about 2½ hours to deal with as many Heads as we have almost been dealing with in five days. I just draw that to your attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. There is a thing called the guillotine.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am sure he wanted to draw it to the attention of the Hon. Prime Minister as well.

Mr. WARD: I believe the proper procedure is for me to address the Chairman, and you can do your own thing.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping to get through with this Head more rapidly than we are getting through with it, but hon. members have probed me on a number of points, and I think it is just proper that I should reply very briefly to them. I just want to say, and this is globally speaking, that neither roads, water, lighting, nor transportation under my Ministry will be dealt with any political consideration. I want to be on record as making that abundantly clear.

As far as the road in Gemswick, or Penny Hole, is concerned, a report was made to me by the Transport Board that, because of the unsuitability of the road leading in, the wear and tear of the buses was very great, and it was strongly recommended by the Manager of the Transport Board that, until the road was put in order, the buses should be temporarily withdrawn, and I agree with that on that consideration. I am not quite *au fait* with the position with respect to the actual road work up there, but I am aware that the workers up there were liming and not producing. I want to be on record as saying this here in this Honourable Chamber now. I will be no party to.....

Mr. WEEKES: I would like to associate myself with all that the Minister has said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is a point of support.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: What I want to say, however, is that I want my position and the position of the Government to be abundantly clear. If people are to work for money, then they have to produce. The Ministry of Communications and Works under my administration will not be seen in the light of a welfare Ministry, because even the present Minister responsible for Welfare has sought to change the title of that Ministry, and I do not want it to be attached to Communications and Works. I was in the country only this morning. I was in St. George, and the workers of Communications and Works seem, to have a snack of feeling that they must work four days a week and hardly four proper days. As soon as they saw my motor car every man started to work. The country is not going to accept that condition forever. They have to produce, and I am not encouraging them to think otherwise. If they do not produce, there will be no provision of work, and I am not going to support any situation where people are not giving something for the money which they earn when the week comes. I would wish that all members of Parliament would join in making sure that the people who work in the Government Service give of their best.

I go to work on mornings at eight o'clock, and sometimes I am there in the office until ten or eleven o'clock. I am not suggesting that people

must do this, but I would wish and hope and pray that they see the need to produce, especially in these developing countries, more than they have been producing. We have to look away from the question of having too much free time. There is too much free time on our hands. I did not prepare to speak at length, I was hoping that I would have said certain things when I got to the Capital side of the Estimates, but members have, more or less, probed me to speak.

For example, the member for St. Michael South referred to the question of a circular bus for the City. We have already taken that into consideration, and the Transport Board are working on the matter. I can assure him about that. As far as roads are concerned, just let me know if there are any problems, get on to me if you are finding difficulties getting through the ranks of the civil servants, because you can have several bottlenecks there, and you know this better than myself. Just get directly on to me, and I do not have to tell you how to do it. Always copy your letter to the Minister, and the letter must come there. At least I would hope that the letter will come to me and I will get the information there.

Now, the thrust of the Ministry for the future under me will be in the productive side of road building. I am going to be thinking very seriously, not forgetting the tenantry roads and highway improvements, but I will be looking in terms like the Spring Garden Road and such areas and be thinking in terms of areas on the East Coast Road and areas for developmental purposes. We have for a long time been working on the tenantry roads and areas like that. While they will not be forgotten, we are of the view that the developmental side of road building needs a new thrust and I am prepared to give it that. There are a number of other points that have been made, but I will deal with those points when we get to the Capital side of the Estimates.

Mr. WEEKES: I am not going to take up your time, Sir. With regard to that road at Gemswick, or Penny Hole, or whatever you call it. When I was in the Ministry, I noticed that annually large sums of money would be spent on repairs to that road every six months. I recommended to the Engineers that asphalt mixed be used on that road, and you would not have to spend the money annually for repairs to the road. As you know, Sir, it is a hardship for children to be travelling nearly a mile to catch a bus to get to school. I can only appeal to you to discuss all aspects of the matter with your Engineers. I would be glad if you would pay a visit to the area and see the condition of the road for yourself, and I would be willing to meet you. This is no political mileage because I am on my way out. I have served the people well, and I do not want any more popularity. I still want to see that the people are served well. The people have sent me here, and because a change of Government has come about, I do not want them to think that the Government has victimised the people of that area. Please do your best to deal with this matter expeditiously because it is of paramount importance to the residents of the districts.

The question that Head 13(3) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

5.55 p.m.

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (4) VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT WORKSHOP

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (4) Vehicles and Equipment Workshop – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $2,516,410 under Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (4) Vehicles and Equipment Workshop – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (5) DRAINAGE AND SAFETY

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (5) Drainage and Safety – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $905,000 under Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (5) Drainage and Safety – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (6) TELECOMMUNICATIONS UNIT

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (6) Tecommunications Unit – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to move that the sum of $32,558 under Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (6) Telecommunications Unit – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (7) ELECTRICAL ENGINEER'S DEPARTMENT

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (7) Electrical Engineer's Department – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $189,763 under Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (7) Electrical Engineer's Department – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (8) WATER RESOURCES

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (8) Water Resources – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $8,462,069 under Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (8) Water Resources – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend that department of the Ministry of Communications and Works. During the time I was there I must say that it rendered efficient service, and if you were to ask me which department in M.C.W. has rendered efficient service I would say that without any contradiction it is the Waterworks Department. There is only one criticism and I am glad the Chief Engineer is here, and it is that when you have burst pipes I do hope that something will be done so that these pipes can be repaired without delay. I know that the Chief Engineer is not fully responsible for that because he has subordinates, but I am still drawing it to his attention having worked up there, because I can still hear a few complaints, but with that exception, the department gives no trouble, and I want to commend the Chief Engineer and his staff for all they have been doing for this community in that department.

Mr. TAITT: Just one quick question on water. The Minister is probably aware that there were plans as far as I remember in the Development Plan for a reservoir to be constructed in the area of St. Stephens. Do you wish me to wait until the Capital Head comes up to ask that question?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I can assure the hon. member that this is still going to be so and I want on behalf of the Waterworks Department to thank the hon. member for St. Philip South for his kind remarks.

The question that the sum of $8,462,069 under Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (8) Water Resources – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (9) PORT MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (9) Port Management Division – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $336,907 under Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (9) Port Management Division, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 114(1) MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

Head 114 (1) Ministry of Communications and Works – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I want to move a few amendments. In note 8, substitute the word "consultant" for the word "architect". In the note to Item 9, delete "50 completed buses and 50 chassis units" and insert "40 completed buses and 20 chassis units". Also delete "50 bus bodies" and insert "20 bus bodies".

I beg to move that the sum of $9,751,176 under Head 114(1) Ministry of Communications and Works – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, just to make a very succinct point. I would like to say first of all that unlike the hon. member for St. Philip South I am not on my way out. We are in here for some time. We are very grateful to hear the assurances from both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Communications and Works that the programme of works for the Ministry of Communications and Works will be done on the basis of need and requirement rather than any other extraneous considerations. I wish to make the point that for several years now the people in Dunlow Lane have been deprived of an adequate road system. Now this is an area which is reasonably densely populated. It is right within the environs of the city of Bridgetown, and I believe even before I had the honour to represent theat constituency when it was in the constituency of a former member for the City of Bridgetown, Mr. Elliott Mottley, representations were made for the provision of a paved road surface at Dunlow Lane. We have been able certainly after several representations by myself to get the first phase of a road system in Dunlow Lane and that has been completed, but for some reason or another the remainder of the road programme has not been carried out.

As I understand it there was some problem about the acquisition of land. I am not certain what is the position in respect of that, but I do hope that there will be provision in here or that provision has been included in these Estimates for the continuation of that project for the Dunlow Lane area.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of following the shadow from St. Philip South, but there are a number of comments I have to make on the Ministry of Communications and Works generally in terms of its projected capital expenditure for 1977–78. Now the Minister has said, dealing with roads and I appreciate what he has said, that under his administration a thrust will be given to developmental and, I believe he said, productive road building, and that tenantry road development will be to that extent de-emphasised. I hope that tenantries are not forgotten. It is all well and good when you are talking about the infra-structural development of a country and the high visibility content that major highway development will have.

6.05 p.m.

I hope that tenantry roads are not forgotten. It is all well and good when you are talking of the infrastructural development of a country and the high visibility content that major development would have. It is all well and good to talk about that, but the poorest people in this country, the people without basic amenities in the rural areas, live in a tenantry situation, and as a Government we have to attend to their needs as matters of priority. You find in St. Philip and St. George – the member for St. John says that St. John needs nothing – but certainly in St. Philip and St. George with which I am familiar, one of the great problems which people in tenantries have is not only the condition of the road, but they always draw to your attention when you are canvassing or you drop in to see somebody in an area, they always say this road wants doing, water settles, mosquitoes breed and for them most importantly, doctors cannot visit them if there is an emergency, or it is very difficult for them to get out at night and go to doctors, because sometimes there are no street lights, and the physical condition of the road makes it virtually incapable for them to satisfy certain basic essentials, and so I am still counselling the Minister to be aware of these things. Perhaps he needs to have a survey done island-wise of the most pressing tenantry road needs.

It goes further than this. In the Party's Manifesto we have talked about the introduction of a new Tenantries Act with a view to giving people in plantation tenantries the right to own the plot of land which they have been renting

from the plantation all their lives. It seems to me that it makes sense and it would dove-tail nicely with that policy to give the people the right to own the tenantry land if at the same time we develop the roads in these tenantries, or at least make them more properly passable than they are now.

I can think, Sir, for example of Thickett in St. Philip North. At the moment MCW has fulfilled an election promise of mine, and an election promise of the DLP for the last 15 years, to construct a road from Three Houses-Bayfield Road over the hill to what is called Three Houses Hill, leading right across to Blades Hill. They are doing a fine job in the construction of that road and I can say to the Minister that the people of Three Houses Hill and Blades Hill are well pleased in him and his Ministry, but below that road there is a little tenantry, Thickett, which probably has about 200 people. It needs, and has needed for all the years, a proper main and surfacing. Similarly, Vineyard Tenantry Road, I asked some questions in here last year during the time that they were planning my political demise in the short space of time I was in here. I was playing shots every Tuesday, and luckily the Minister will have on file somewhere in the Ministry the whole gamut of roads and mains that I asked for in St. Philip North, and all he has to do is to refer to the questions I asked last year and he will see where there is a need for urgent repairs.

Similarly Edgecumbe Tenantry and Sunbury Tenantry. We have laid a main in Sunbury Tenantry, the road now needs to be done. On Dodd's land, since we have become the Government, the Ministry has put a main in Dodd's Land, but now we have to do the road, and I would like really as a matter of policy to see that as soon as a main is properly put down, the week after the road people go in and do it, because what happens now is that you dig up the road, you put down the main, you heap up rubble on one side, you encroach on the amount of road that people have to travel and it remains like that. They just sweep it back down, try to level it and go on, and that road may remain there for a considerable time. I would like to see greater co-ordination. When you put down a main, finish off and resurface the road or do whatever you have to do with it to make it properly passable.

I know, Sir, that in your constituency – and one of the dangers of being Chairman of Committees is that you cannot even get in a plug, you have to sit and listen, but I know that you are as aware as I am that in St. George North – and I want to draw this to the Minister's attention – there is need for road improvement in Workmans, in Thorpe's Cottage, in Belair and in Redland Tenantry. At the moment there is a road from St. Jude's Corner through Ashbury Plantation to Ashbury and Golden Ridge Tenantry. The owners of Ashbury Plantation have closed the road, and on your behalf I would ask the Minister to consider running a new road from St. Judes, passing through Superlative, and on to Ashbury and Golden Ridge, and I think that would cover the needs of the people in the St. Judes – Asbury – Golden Ridge area.

On the question of flooding, I see ample provision made for drainage, but I must counsel the Minister even though he has assisted me in the Well House – Water Hall area by sinking a well, there is still need for an additional well to take off the excess water. That is an area that really floods when we have heavy rains, perhaps even worse than the bottom of Mapp Hill into Chapel Gap. I wish to compliment the Minister. I have been hearing, from people who should know better, in the last couple of days, I came in here on Tuesday and some chap met me downstairs in the yard and asked what this Government is doing. I want to let him know that he does not come in here, otherwise he would hear that since this Minister has had responsibility for the transport system, and since representations have been made to him through myself and people in my constituency group, the service on the Bayfield route, after some initial teething problems, and– I am going to say this openly – after some sabotage which we were getting in the Transport Board, and which we are still getting in the Transport Board, and we will have to make changes, Sir, despite that the people who are now served by the Bayfield route are well satisfied with the work which this Minister has done, and I am on their behalf also well satisfied.

6.15 p.m.

There is one area of transport that is parochial to the member for St. Philip South and myself. There is an area at Kirtons which formally used to operate as a kind of bus depot for buses coming to start in St. Philip and perhaps finishing in St. Philip. There are a number of persons in St. Philip who work at the Transport Board, but they have to come down at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning to get a bus. I would like the Minister to consider. I would say from June, when the system is going to be changed and there is going to be a take over of the private concessions to return to Kirtons as a bus depot.

Similarly I believe that the member for St. Lucy and His Honour the Speaker will appreciate having some depot placed in the norther area. I do not know where. There is a little place below the church and the school, but you need one in the central as well as one in the East to cater to the needs of the workers who live in that area to prevent them from having to get up at all times of ungodly hours to go and catch a bus.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to endorse the remarks made by the Minister in calling for better work attitudes on the part of persons who work with the Ministry of Communications and Works. People feel that when they work for a Government Department, especially when they have been sent to work in that department by a politician, that they can give supervisors who are non politicians and public servants no end of trouble because if they are given orders they say "you did not give me this job, and I will complain to Mr. So and So." So that the authority of the supervisors over these people is seriously diminished. Even those who come in without politicial assistance or patronage still think that they can go back as long on this job as possible. I will get my berries at the end of the week.

In June last year I asked a question in this House about a pontoon in Church Village which was in a state of collapse. The then Minister, the member for St. Michael North Central, acted on it immediately and sent people from the 14th June to shore up this pontoon. In November this year the men were still working there although what they had to do could have been done in a month's time. One morning I asked them when they were going to finish the road. The Leader of the Opposition knows the corner which is just before you get to the bath. You would know that they have all kinds of things on that road and you have to be careful going around that bend. I asked when you will finish this and the supervisor said "soon". I asked how soon is soon? I came down and told the Minister that I did not like the way the work was progressing I do not care if they cursed me behind my back. I was glad to see that by talking I was able to get the work completed.

But, Sir, the Minister cannot do all. The Chief Technical Director cannot do all. It is on a lower level – the men who have to supervise the work. If they go to work on a little road in St. Philip at 10 o'clock and by 2 o'clock they are finished for the day, no work can be done and the Minister will have to issue a direct edict. I do not want to be a popular politician. I want to save every possible cent that the taxpayers of this country give us and that we vote here for useful productive work. I have nothing to do with being popular. I can go when the people say that they are finished with me. I speak on matters that affect my conscience and should affect the conscience of those who are working.

I am sure that the Minister will issue the necessary edict in order to see that proper work hours are kept. I do not know if it is being done, but if you say that a particular road is to be repaired, it should be measured and costed and that cost should be contingent or how long that work is going to take. You tell the men when they start that this work is scheduled to take six weeks. You will allow them two more because they will pull some slack here and there; but if the road is scheduled to take six weeks it should not take more than eight, not three months as happened down there.

You go to England and you see that people from Barbados will work like Trojans if not like slaves in the snow, the hail and the sun doing work for people of a different complexion; and in this country they are not doing it for themselves. These people have no cause to worry. The longer they take, the more that work becomes unproductive, and the more they can get hurt because there is a greater chance of the vote being exhausted and they being laid off; but if there is an honest turn over of work there is no need to worry.

There is another aspect. There are people who have been on the temporary staff for a long time. I know a man who has been there for ten years and he has complained to me. That cannot work. The time has come when the Ministry and the Department must look at those people who have been on the unestablished staff for so many years. I will talk again before you put the question.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, just one brief statement. On behalf of the constituency of Christ Church West and particularly the people of Fordes Road and Worthing View, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Minister for re-acting and responding so quickly to their needs. I do not think that the Minister is aware of this; but I have been told by the people living in that tenantry at Worthing View that the former senior member for the parish of Christ Church, now Mr. Edwy Talma, when he first entered Parliament in 1946, he promised them then that that tenantry road would have been fixed. Thirty years later he left Parliament without having carried out his promise.

Thanks to the Minister, within a few weeks of our Government becoming the Government of this country, he has managed to get the work started and almost completed in that area. I want to put it on the record of this House for future Ministers of Communications and Works that the present Minister has carried out in six months a promise which a former hon. member and a Minister in the former Government was not able to achieve in 30 years. I have made a promise to the people in Ventnor Land and I hope that in a few weeks work will be started there.
6.25 p.m.

Within, I think it was two or three days of his becoming Minister of Communications and Works, he did a personal tour with some of the young, bright people in his Ministry; saw the needs, and that work was done rather rapidly in that area, and I agree with the comments made by the hon. member for St. Philip North. It is not usual to get very good and quick work coming from some workers in some parts of the Government Service. I am not saying all, but some.

I was very pleased that this has happened in my constituency and, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, I was a perennial beggar here for Christ Church West. He knows that. He gave me a little backing down in September Square and the former Prime Minister wanted to take him to task, but he showed residual reserves those days but he still went ahead with it. I would like to tell him that that has now been maximised, and this Minister has certainly responded to the need. I am quite sure that he will reply on the question of Tenantry Roads but he himself, I know, understands that if there is real need, he will do something about it. I believe that this is the policy which he has been trying to follow so far.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I have been an advocate of a reformed policy in relation to Tenantry Roads for a long period of time. I remember once suggesting, and I have told the Hon. Minister about it again, that he should invite all members of Parliament to send in at the beginning of the Financial Year the proposals that they have for their respective constituencies, and they should go and have them checked and see how the greatest number of people could benefit within the limited amount of money that is available. I believe that that is a good approach, but I also would like to see people encouraged to help themselves in some of these tenantry roads.

It ties in with the point made by the hon. member for St. Philip North in respect of the Government's programme for buying tenantries. When the details of that is worked out, it must be remembered that the people who will own the spots in the future will also be owners of that portion of road that fronts their spots to the middle of the road. If they get their spots at a very reasonable price, I feel that a little self-help could start coming to Barbados and that part of the labour content of the programme to repair and put in shape those roads should be provided to be matched by equipment from the Government, some materials from the Government, as well as supervision and advice. Unless we have a new approach along these lines, it is going to be impossible, in the context of the economic position of Barbados, for us to carry out the number of miles of roads that we used to carry out in the past. Of course, as hon. members, have said, an increase in productivity would also help.

I feel that we are at the beginning of a really new approach towards this question of subsidiary roads in Barbados, and we need one. There is no doubt about it that these things are taken for granted today. People take these things for granted today and we do not have, with the other demands, as much money to devote in this area as we had in the past.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, it must be extremely nice not to have to parish pump. *(Asides)* I am not accusing you. You fellows are ticklish. I do not have to parish pump. I can tell you that. If the Minister looks at Item 7, he has a very small minuscule figure of $1,351, and the Note says:

> "Office Accommodation – Provision required to continue construction of extensions at the Ministry. It also includes work on canteen, car park compound and frontage, and completion of Office Block."

The figure is very small, so I hope that the block is completed. It is $1,351 for 1977-78. I may be wrong, and he may have an explanation for it.

Looking at Item 3, Mr. Chairman, I can only assume that the Speightstown by-pass road will be started in this financial year. I hope the land acquisitions and the designs and everything that is necessary have been done. The Democratic Labour Party Government had token votes in the Estimates for a long time. In this particular case the only token vote is the Oistin one, whereas the Speightstown by-pass seems to be ready to start. That would be a good thing, and I suppose it will tie in with the Heywood development.

For a long time I felt that a good source of revenue to Barbados would be a proper system of parking meters in Bridgetown. I think the Minister will discover that we have made investigations and we have had consultations on what type of parking meter system would be best for Barbados. Whereas Barbadians complain about a lot of things in Barbados when they go outside they do not complain. I think it is high time, since the people demand and require greater improvement, that this aspect of development should be pursued vigorously so that in every street in Bridgetown where people park they should be made to pay 5 cents, 10 cents, 20 cents as the case may be. That would be certainly a source of revenue from which we could continue to improve the whole question of roads and other necessary improvements.

I want the Minister to look at the whole question of parking in Bridgetown and the cost to people who use valuable land in Bridgetown as garages. There are people who park on land in Hincks Street, next door to the Bank, at $10 a month or some ridiculous figure on land which is valued highly, and it is time that that be stopped. I find that new buildings can go up in town, the stores are not required to provide parking, and then people can use valuable land worth $40 per square foot and pay $10 a month to use it as a garage for eight days a week. This is something where the Government can get more revenue towards improvement.

With regard to parking systems, there may have to be adjustments to suit the over-ground or underground electrical system. This is something that needs urgent investigation in order to collect revenue for road improvement as well as complete parking in Bridgetown where people use Government's valuable land, whether it is Fairchild Street, whether it is by the Cathedral, whether it is Hincks Street, as garages.
6.35 p.m.

I am glad to see that under Item 6 that in my constituency at the Pine and Belmont Roads and Halls Road we are likely to get a traffic sign.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the difference between the Estimates for 1976 and 1977 is only roughly $500,000, but I am sure the Minister will discover that for the needs and requirements in the area of capital development for the items he has here, he will have to come to this House for a colossal supplementary vote if he is to do what the people of this country require.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, this Head has pulled almost everyone in and I do not intend to prolong it, but the Minister will no doubt be aware that the tenantry called Hanschell Tenantry at Eagle Hall has been the object of a lot of discussion. I believe that the owners of the tenantry and those who are now sited on the tenantry are agreed that they wish to sell and purchase the land respectively. The Chief Technical Director and indeed a number of officials and the C.P.C. have met and we have had with the Town Planner a lot of discussion. The Town Planner has approved the sale of one sector of the overall tenantry which is on the southern side of Eagle Hall; the tenantry on the northern side of Eagle Hall has been the object of discussion between the Town Planner, the Chief Technical Director and I believe the Hanschells who own the property. I am asking the Minister if he would take a look because the owners of the tenantry as well as the tenants have been waiting for some definitive answer from the Government and it is in the technical area that the hold-up has been. It has to do with some land wanted for a lay-by on Black Rock Road itself and as to the number of properties that would have to be deleted. I would appreciate if the Minister would take some interest in this in conjunction with his colleague the Minister responsible for Planning so that some final decision can be made on this tenantry, so that the road system can be improved and so that those persons who live in Hanschell tenantry can finally make payments. A number of them have gone ahead and put down fairly firm foundations in repairs to their homes in the clear expectation that they would be able to purchase the land, and I think it is over seven years that this matter has been pending, it was near to completion in August, and I hope the Minister will be able to see that it comes to a final conclusion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have less noise in the Lobby.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in relation to the Hanschell tenantry, the position is that there are three Ministries involved, the Ministry of Housing and Lands which is responsible for the Tenantry Control Act, my Ministry and the Ministry of Communications and Works. I think it is correct to say that there will be some re-alignment of Eagle Hall Road and the widening of these roads, but it may well be possible very soon to allow these people nearest to the road which would be on the north eastern side to go ahead and get conveyances for the areas which they want to buy. In the other parts of the tenantry the problem here is that some

spots have two and three houses. People would rent a house spot and then bring on their daughter or relatives and what not and they are at present contravening the existing standard for a house spot under the existing regulations. I have indicated to the Chief Town Planner that wherever there is an existing tenantry and a *de facto* situation that we can, provided the overall amenities do not suffer as a result, relax the conditions to have similar plots within the 2,400 square feet. We could get it slightly below that. Originally it was 1,600 square feet and it is now 2,400 square feet.

I believe that I advised the Chief Town Planner who saw me along with some representative from the Hanschells to call a meeting of the three Ministries involved to see how soon some headway can be made on this. I give the hon. member my word that I will follow through that to make sure that the administrators act on it, but I think that so far as the Minister's part of it is concerned, his Ministry wishes a re-alignment in a very busy area, and we believe this can now be achieved even if we do not get the whole thing done at one go.

Mr. TAITT: I thank the Attorney General and I assure him that in the last plan that was put in, there were only seven plots which are now required to be moved; three of those persons are dead and the other four I do not want to say anymore about.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member could use any influence which he has on those four so that if they would concede that if there is a breach of the Tenantry Act some arrangement will be made for resiting them, then we can go full speed ahead.

Mr. TAITT: As a matter of fact, if the Minister cares to know, Mr. Hanschell on the last occasion indicated he was prepared to put them on a proper site.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, this is my eleventh year and my third session in here, and whenever it comes to the Ministry of Communications and Works, when I was in the Opposition you had to go cap in hand to the Ministers asking them to help you with your constituency. I observe that even the Attorney General who sounded the praises of the Minister of Communications and Works has in the meantime begged for a little something. I would be failing in my duty if I did not put in my plea also. It is true the Minister of Communications and Works and I are real buddies, and I believe I can call on him to do me a little favour, but for the records, I know there is very little to do in St. James now apart from tenantry roads and this was not because of this member of Parliament, but because of the other joker that the other side wanted to be in here. I kept the Government on their toes knowing that the joker who was the Attorney General then wanted to be in here; but there are still a few things which I would ask the Minister of Communications and Works. I will ask him when he is drawing up his forty point plan to remember me in his kingdom and just give me a little play in his team.

I am pretty concerned about the Husbands area in particular. Recently there has been a number of problems in the Husbands-Oxnards area. I am told you have been having young ladies molested at night because of lack of lights in that area. A number of people find it difficult because of the bus service. There is also a problem there which I believe if I were in Government at that time I would have suggested that a development of that magnitude should have had some kind of mini mart and that kind of thing there.

As far as the playing field aspect is concerned, one need have no worry in that because it is in your humble servant's hands and I would like to warn my colleague. I heard the members on the Opposition bench asking for a road this place and the next place, but I want to warn my colleague to let home drums beat first. Fix me up and fix up my colleagues first and then you can go into Dunlow Lane because after they had fifteen years in here they should not be asking for anything at all like tenantry road; we should be talking about building over-heads, but you are asking about a road in Dunlow Lane.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order. I would like the hon. member to know that it would take approximately 100 years before you can repair all the tenantry roads in the Island of Barbados.
6.45 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am sure about that, and the hon. member sounds as if he is 100 years old, and he looks that way, Sir.

This is the point I want to make. I am asking my colleague that when he is drawing up his 40-point or 50-point programme for the financial year, just to remember me, carry me along with him and try to give me a bus going through the Husbands/Oxnards area so that my old time friends would be able to go through there and canvass well again for me. You have

the problem with people living in that area and there is no bus going through there, and I would suggest to my colleague when he is bringing down the 60 or 80 buses he is supposed to be bringing down – and the member for St. Lucy is not in here to talk about buses at this hour – to let me have one going through there at peak hours, early on mornings and from about 4.30 to 6 o'clock.

I am particularly concerned with the lighting effect in that area. I know for sure, and I would not like to disclose it at this time, that there are a number of problems in that area in particular with women going home at night. I have had a number of complaints and I would like my colleague to go into this in particular. I have not got to ask him for anything else, he will understand that I am his friend and he is my friend, so let the home drum beat first.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, just to answer the Minister of Labour on two matters he raised which I think really concern to some extent the Ministry of Housing, and in particular the National Housing Corporation. In so far as the Oxnards Development is concerned, there will be increased lighting in there. He will have seen that we have very nearly completed Phase II with the exception of four houses and we are going to be doing Phase III shortly and the lighting will be put in and that area will be a lot more illuminated than it is at the moment.

It is also planned, and we have it on the Development Plan for the area, to establish an area for a supermarket as well as a playing field area. I will draw it to his attention that on what we call West Terrace, down behind the houses, down at the bottom, a part of that I have advised the Board that we should set aside for some kind of park, because that is now highly residential without the necessary facilities for the people who live there and who have children, and there are plenty.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, some time ago I was talking to the Leader of the Opposition and he said that this Government had so set up its administration that he doubted whether the Democratic Labour Party would get back in power within the next 25 years. I am so satisfied that he is correct after I have heard the hon. member for St. Philip South say that it would take 100 years to repair all the tenantry roads in Barbados, so I now understand why they are convinced that they cannot see Government again for 25 years. They put it in their Manifesto that they will do tenantry roads and never did one, so if we have now come 15 years after.....

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order. It is regrettable, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member has attempted to mislead this House. The Minister of Communications and Works can check the reports for the past 15 years and he will see the large number of tenantry roads which have been repaired, but I am saying this, that in this island with 24 constituencies and the number of tenantry roads, subsidiary roads and other roads it will take 100 yards before you could get every road in this island repaired or built, and I can assure you that that statement is authentic.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Then, Mr. Chairman, I would not want to hear one word about tenantry roads out of the mouth of any member on that side as of now, because we have to add 100 plus 15, 115 years, and that is the time the Barbados Labour Party has in power to do the tenantry roads in this country.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Sir. Only a certain amount of money can be allocated annually to repair roads, and therefore if you are giving the public the impression that you can repair all the tenantry roads in Barbados overnight, I can assure you that you are attempting to mislead the community. There are roads in St. Philip alone where I am sure you have over three or four hundred of them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

Mr. WEEKES: From the amount which is allocated you have to repair a reasonable amount annually and you have to give certain roads what I would call top priority. It is as simple as that.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like the member for St. Philip South to come back, because I am told – he acted as Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Communications and Works – and I am told that his desk used to be so full of dust that officers up there used to write on his desk "would you please come into your office at some time?" What I am saying is this. The Leader of the Opposition said yesterday never mind what you put into your Manifesto that is only a promise which you cannot carry out, so I am saying that we have the right to be in power for 115 years, based on the statements made by the two members from the Opposition.

I do not like to praise fellow Ministers, because I believe when you are made a Minister you have a job to do for the country at large,

but I must praise the Minister of Communications and Works this evening on two grounds. One, when I was in Opposition I wrote the Minister of Communications and Works, who is now the Leader of the Opposition, who has with him the member for St. Philip South as his Parliamentary Secretary, and I complained about the bad bus service in St. Joseph. He said he had investigated and his investigations showed there was no need for additional transportation in St. Joseph. Now, the member for St. Andrew was made Minister in September. He found a situation left by two gentlemen, the Leader of the Opposition as Minister and the member for St. Philip South as Parliamentary Secretary, and within six months he has been able to send the Transport Board buses into the bus stand at night to carry home people at night which the regular concessionaires could not do. They did not see the need for it, but this Minister has seen the need for it. He has been able to run a through route from Speightstown to St. Joseph and that bus is full every Sunday for every trip it makes, and the people of St. Joseph are now satisfied that they are getting service like anybody else.
6.55 p.m.

When in six months time the Hon. Minister could achieve what the other said there was no need to do, I must congratulate him on doing a good job for one constituency that has been for the Barbados Labour Party for all these years. Mr. Chairman, I believe that those on the other side should never have said one word when it comes to Communications and Works. If you look at the whole front line that is there – that should be there – the Member for St. Lucy is now absent – the man who blows hot in the morning and cold at night. He comes in and makes noise about people in St. Lucy not getting any buses; but when the Minister comes in and says I am going to buy 40 new buses in order to give the people in St. Lucy buses, he says no you should not buy 40 new buses.

The member for St. Philip South who all the years was Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications and Works makes a statement that Government could never fix the tenantry roads under 100 years. Here comes the member for St. Lucy. Mr. Chairman, I believe, I honestly believe that they should not say one word when it comes to M.C.W.

In simple language, the Barbados Labour Party and the Prime Minister have discovered a genius in the hon. member for St. Andrew who has worked miracles in six months. In five years time when we come to this Chamber I am sure that there will not be one complaint about transportation in this country. With the plans that the Minister has been discussing, I am sure that the general public will be satisfied, bearing in mind the various net works of road in Barbados and what the people want. Thank you.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the sitting be suspended for 45 minutes.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair.

Resumption of Head 113 (1) Ministry of Communications and Works, was called.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of debate on this Head and I only want to mention one or two points of interests to my constituency. I believe that people in my constituency need roads for special purposes. I am not saying that we need them because we are people living in a particular area. I understand that there is a proposal to develop the Spring Garden Road; and I am going to suggest that there is a very real possibility to link up the Spring Garden Road with Highway No. 1 either by constructing a link road with the area of which the Member for St. Michael North Central spoke or in the Danesbury area.

Residents of that area have been asking for a road for about 15 years; and I am going to suggest that if there is a road running from the City of Bridgetown, down through Brightons and down to the proposed development area in Spring Garden, then there can be a road either from Highway 1 through Bats Rock or the Spring Garden area or through Danesbury connecting Highway 1 with the said Spring Garden Road.

Another area where a road is desperately needed is in the Grazettes area. There is an area called Piedmont Park, and the justification for having a road there is that it runs between two rows of National Corporation houses. So that this is a case where about 60 or 70 families are in desperate need of a proper road. There are a number of roads running off either side of the Long Gap road which are in desperate need of repair. The roads are so bad and cramped that I have been receiving continuous complaints about what the surface of the roads has been doing to the motor vehicles of the inhabitants and also to people who use that road.

It is surprising, Mr. Chairman, to discover that a road like Goddards Road in St. Stephen's Hill is in extremely bad condition. I say it surprises me because the former Minister of Communications and Works lives on the edge of that road; and only last week I know that a petition was sent from the residents of that area to the Minister. I am urging the Minister to look carefully at Goddards Road because it has about two or four major pot holes.

I find it difficult to understand why in the past it has not been looked after at all, because on the other side of the road there is the famous Enid shop which, I believe, my opponents used as the headquarters; and I believe that on the evening of the last elections several pots of rice and peas and so on which were cooked in anticipation were thrown away. I find it difficult to understand why these roads were not repaired because they were strongholds of the former Government.

As to the University Crescent area, if we say that this is not to be developed and the people are asked to pay this extra tax, I am saying that the people should be given some compensation for the infliction of this particular tax. I believe that the roads in that part should be properly surfaced so that the residents can be given some compensation for a tax that does not affect other constituencies. I also want to mention the question of the bus service. The Minister has been good enough to move the buses from off the main road and send them through the old area.

7.50 p.m.

I have already suggested that they could easily be diverted to go through the new Lodge Terrace and into the Eden Lodge area and on to the White Hall Road, back on to the Spooners Hill Road and back to Town. I understand that there are special difficulties relating to the maneuverability of the bigger buses in the Eden Lodge area, but I would like to see some provision for smaller buses moving in and out of the Eden Lodge area so that the new development of the National Housing Corporation could be serviced by some sort of bus service.

I want to sound a word of support for the Hon. Minister of Labour because the University Road is connected to Oxnards Road by Wanstead Road and the Wanstead Road happens to be in my constituency. That is also another Housing Corporation Development, and there is no bus service running from the University Road to Wanstead. I have experienced the difficulties which the constituents there have because on mornings when we are travelling down to the University literally hundreds of people are standing along the road waiting for buses and, in some cases, they get wet having walked the whole stretch of road from Oxnards to Wanstead. Perhaps some consideration might be given to taking the bus which comes up the University Crescent and turns around and to send it down through the Wanstead area. If you really wish to uplift the bus service in that area, you could take the bus right down through Oxnards, through Thorpes, on to the Husbands road, through St. Stephens and back on to the main road of Highway 1.

The last point which I wish to mention, Mr. Chairman, is the question of the water supply in areas like Free Hill, in areas like Hinds Hill where I live – I do, Mr. Chairman, live in my constituency, so I have a particularly personal knowledge of these problems. I have raised the question already with one of the former Ministers of Communications and Works because he lives in my constituency. I refer to the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, and he himself has experienced a problem of a very low and sometimes nonexistent supply of water at periods during the day.

We have the awful problem of losing water for 10 hours – 10 continuous hours last year, and two weeks after that we lost water for 6 hours. I have not been able to discover the true reason for the loss of water in that area. I now understand that there is to be some improvement in the supply because in the Free Hill area a reservoir is likely to be constructed. I am going

to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these are problems of an immediate pressing nature, and if there is one reason why the people in my constituency ought to have these immediate amenities it is because we of all the constituencies in the country suffer the infliction of the betterment levy. *(Interruption).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Mr. ALLEYNE: I am reminded that the betterment levy was enacted by the last Government. *(Asides.)* We are told it was a Democratic Labour Party Government, but the point is that if we are to suffer the continuous infliction of that betterment levy, then it must mean that we ought to get some extra benefit. This is why I have waited until the end because of all the constituencies that deserves a better break in terms of roads, bus service and water, St. Michael North West is that constituency. *(Asides.)*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition said that he has given me five minutes to wind up. It is really surprising, since members have spoken at such great length, and with the number of questions that they have posed on me, there is something which I would like to put the record very straight on. On Monday while we were here, the Hon. member for St. John, in the course of his speech, said that there were plans made for the road in the Spring Garden area, and he said that if we went on that road we would have been walking on a road which was already prepared.

Now I want to put the record very straight. The area that we walked on was not an area that any preparation was made on before. We walked on an area that was desolate, a wilderness, and hardly a track. We found it extremely difficult to get where we were going, but if on his admission there was some form of a plan for the construction of a road in that area, he stands condemned by all people in this community, since he allowed the Town Planning Office to release those lands that were frozen in that area.

On walking through that area, we were able to discover that a development was taking place, although we were of the opinion that no development would have taken place. When we got to the end of the point where we thought that it was possible for us to make a roundabout, that is in the area of Paradise, we discovered that an area there that we would need to have, by releasing that land the people were able to develop a property there which would cost now to purchase in the region of $½ million or thereabout. Therefore, if he had anything to do with the plan which would have led to the development of a road in that area, and he then allowed the land to be freed for development in the area, he should either have kept his mouth shut, or admitted that he did something that was wrong and improper. I want to put the record clear on that. I think it was a very bad thing to have done, and now we have seen the wisdom.

Mr. Chairman, all of this lead to the point made by the last speaker as well as the member for Christ Church North Central. I refer to the point relating to the road going on to Batch Rock. This is the area that we were thinking of in tying up with this road for this area. However, we are prepared to go through with that road.

The member for St. Michael South Central asked me about the road leading on to Heywoods – the road which they were thinking of for some time. That road is one that depends very much on external assistance, and I can assure him that we are actively pursuing the type of assistance that we hope to get. The IADB people, who will be financing that development, are actively negotiating with people who are going to carry out the Transport Study which the Prime Minister referred to on Monday last. That is the type of Transport Study that the Prime Minister was referring to. It has nothing to do with the King's Report, the Richardson's Report, or any Report to do with the transport buses. It is a comprehensive Transport Study to do with the roads, to do with the ingress and egress of Bridgetown and things like that. That is the type of transportation Study which the Prime Minister was talking about.

With respect to the road referred to by the hon. member for St. Michael South, I can assure him that the area of Dunlow Lane is actively considered for development, and it is hoped that a road will link Dunlow on to the Lower Collymore Rock area by way of going through Dunlow Lane, Henry's Lane area. In the fullness of time something will be done in that direction.

8.00 p.m.

Now with respect to the tenantry roads and the points raised by the hon. member for St. Philip North with respect to the areas in St. George North, I am happy to think that even though I am actively considering the areas that are under the control of Your Honour that there was another hon. member who thought like myself. With respect to those areas I can assure you, Sir, that the Ministry is actively looking at

St. George North as it is looking at all the areas throughout the length and breadth of this Island.

Now earlier on members discussed the question of lighting. The programme of street lighting is being pursued. I have recently given instructions in my Ministry to reconnect the lights leading from Grantley Adams Airport down to Speightstown in St. Peter, and I want to assure the hon. member for St. Lucy as well that quite recently while I was in St. Lucy the people asked me to bring lighting into the area, and I have also decided to do that.

With respect to tenantry roads, we are not leaving out the construction of such neither are we pulling back in any great measure from that area of development, but as I say, the main emphasis will be developmental at this point in time. The Government is committed to the development of tenantry roads, and I am working along with the Attorney General who is responsible for Town Planning to make sure that the necessary legislation is put in train in order to have development within the tenantry areas. You can feel assured that I have listened very carefully to all that you have said and it will not fall on deaf ears. The Minister of Labour, that responsible representative for St. James, has just reminded me about the points he raised about Husbands. With respect to the Husbands development, when that development was undertaken a bridge was built which was not of the best engineering construction, and it is felt that it would not be safe to put the Transport Board buses in that area because of the problems with the bridges. Funds were provided in the recent Supplementary Estimates for Ministry of Communications and Works, but the time factor did not permit the actual construction of the bridge in that area, but I can assure the hon. member as well as the people in that area that very shortly in the new financial year construction of the bridge at Husbands will be done and very soon the Transport Board buses will be moving into the area of Husbands.

I want to thank you very much for the contributions which you have made and I want to assure you once again that I shall bear very much in mind all the points you have made.

The question that the sum of $9,644,249 under Head 114(1) – Ministry of Communications and Works – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 114(2) – PORT MANAGEMENT

Head 114(2) – Port Management – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, there is a slight amendment. Under Item 2 of the notes, delete the note under Item 1, and insert "(i) Engineering and Supervision."

I beg to move that the sum of $16,386,420 under Head 114(2) – Port Management – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, under Head 114(2) I do wish to draw to the Minister's attention that with the establishment of bulk facilities in the new extension of the Harbour and with the setting up of warehousing, we will now have warehousing and bulk facilities very near to the population centre of the Lands End area, and I hope that steps will be taken to ensure that there is not a rat problem created as a result of the establishment of these wholesaling and bulk facilities.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: We will give consideration to that problem as well.

The question that the sum of $16,386,420 under Head 114(2) – Port Management – as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE (9) AUDIO VISUAL EDUCATION

Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (9) Audio Visual Education – was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the reason for calling these Heads is that looking at the time, we have to call the ones with amendments, because after 8.30 p.m. we will just call the Heads and put them; so we have to call the ones with amendments now.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Items 3 – 12 under Other Charges should be renumbered "4 – 12".

I beg to move that the sum of $181,502 under Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (9) Audio Visual Education – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 15 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE (10) INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS

Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (10) Industrial Schools – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, in the note to Item 7, delete the words "and replacement".

I beg to move that the sum of $144,803 under Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (10) Industrial Schools – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 115 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Head 115 – Ministry of Education and Culture – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, in the note to Item 5, delete the words "and is partly reimbursable by the I.A.D.B.".

I beg to move that the sum of $14,828,341 under Head 115 – Ministry of Education and Culture – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

8.10 p.m.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

HEAD 16(1) – GENERAL

Head 16(1) – Ministry of External Affairs – General – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I will ask for the following amendments to be made and the following notes to be inserted:

Page 79 – Item 20 –

Provides for increases in rents provided under escalator clauses in lease contracts, parking rates and rental of machines. Provision also included for the leasing of motor vehicles at Overseas Missions.

Item 22 –

Includes provision for newspapers and first aid supplies.

Item 23 –

Provides for repairs to Furniture, Fixtures and Fittings.

Item 26 –

Provides for cost of redecorating, cleaning and repairing of buildings and the upkeep of gardens at the Overseas Missions. Provision also included for wages of domestic staff at Mission.

Item 27 –

Provides for unforeseen expenditure. Expenditure may not be incurred without the approval of the Minister.

I beg to move that the sum of $3,807,397 under Head 16(1) – Ministry of External Affairs – General – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I just want to make a general observation, that the Opposition in Government promised the people in this country that they were going to streamline, cut down External Affairs, and I still see a net increase of $225,223. I am not saying that the Minister has not made an attempt to streamline and probably cut as far as he possibly can, but it certainly is not the promise when the impression was given that the Democratic Labour Party was spending too much money on overseas representation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member is probably very fortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the time limit in this debate would not give me the opportunity to expose completely the fallacy of his argument, and of his logic. If the hon. member looks at the Estimates he will see that of the $225,000 he speaks, $225,545 is an increase due to Statutory emoluments and therefore it shows a net decrease in Other Charges, and if the hon. member had read the Estimates he would have noticed also that under the other Heads there is a net decrease of $151,800, and he will note that the Capital vote has been reduced more than 50%, he will note that for the first time he has an external policy rather than *ad hoc* nonsense without rationalisation of the vote.

I will invite the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to put down a confidence motion on External Affairs and get himself painted on the policy of the Government.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I do not want any confidence motion, I am looking at

figures. The figures clearly show an increase in the External vote of $225,223. Wherever you have cut down you still have an increase.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member obviously does not understand, Sir. I will invite him to ask the Leader of the House to give him a whole day to debate External Affairs.

The question that the sum of $3,807,397 under Head 16(1) – Ministry of External Affairs – General – as amended stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

HEAD 16(2) – CONTRIBUTIONS

Head 16(2) – Ministry of External Affairs – Contributions – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,850,000 under Head 16(2) – Ministry of External Affairs – Contributions stand part of the Schedule. There has been a decrease of $151,800.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. What exactly is happening at the moment? I understand it that we were letting these Heads go in order to get the amendments in.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The wrong Head was called.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE – HEAD 116 – MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Capital Expenditure – Head 116 – Ministry of External Affairs – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, subject to the following amendments, that the sum of $325,248 under Capital Expenditure – Head 116 – Ministry of External Affairs – stand part of the Schedule:

Page 82(a) – Item 3

Delete the figure "5,000" under the Column Estimates 1977-78 and insert the figure "11,000".

– Total

Delete the figure "319,248" under the column Estimates 1977-78 and insert the figure "325,248".

– Explanatory Notes –

Amend the note by adding the following words "Also includes provision for completion of the repairs and renovations to residence at Donnington Road, United Kingdom".

– Analysis of Expenditure –

Delete the figure "134,350" against Construction and Improvement to Property and insert the figure "140,350".

Delete the figure "319,248" and insert the figure "325,248".

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

MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

HEAD 18(4) – PARKS AND BEACHES

Head 18(4) – Ministry of Housing and Lands – Parks and Beaches – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18(4) be amended as follows:

Page 97 – Item 1 –

Delete the figure "1,364,167" under Other Charges and insert the figure "1,659,167".

Delete the figure "489,167" under the column Increase and insert the figure "784,167".

– Summary –

Delete the figure "1,364,167" against the Total Expenditure, 1977-78 and insert the figure "1,659,167".

Delete the figure "489,167" against Net Increase and insert the figure "784,167".

– Explanatory Notes –

Delete the figure "1,200,000" against Personal Emoluments and insert "1,495,000".

Delete the figure "1,400,167" and insert the figure "1,695,167".

Delete the figure "1,364,167" against Total Grant and insert the figure "1,659,167".

I beg to move that the sum of $1,695,167 under Head 18(4) – Ministry of Housing and Lands – Parks and Beaches – as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

HEAD 18(5) NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION

Head 18(5) – Ministry of Housing and Lands – National Housing Corporation – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18(5) be amended as follows:

Page 98 –

Delete the figure "2,417,316" wherever it appears and insert the figure "1,917,316".

Amend the note to read as follows:

Personal Emoluments	– 1,452,609
Other Charges	– 1,902,308
Non-Recurrent	– 12,399
	3,367,316
Less Revenue	1,450,000
Total Grant	1,917,316

I beg to move that the sum of $1,917,316 under Head 18(5) – Ministry of Housing and Lands – National Housing Corporation – as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

HEAD 19(4) – SPORT

Head 19(4) – Ministry of Labour and Community Services – Sport – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendment to Head 19(4): On page 102, Item 10, for "Barbados Hockey Association" substitute "Barbados Men's Hockey Association".

I beg to move that the sum of $357,506 under Head 19(4) – Ministry of Labour and Community Services – Sport – as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

8.20 p.m.

Capital Expenditure, Head 119 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 119 on Page 104 be amended as follows: To amend the note to Item 1 to read "and includes provision for the completion of netball facilities, improvement to the enclosure of the stadium and for the erection of a swimming pool." Item 2 – "Provision is made for the construction of sports facilities, and the purchase of equipment for the levelling of playing fields." Under Item 6 to amend the note to read "A token provision is being made to enable plans for the development and construction of a senior citizens complex to be laid".

I beg to move that Head 119 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out from my good friend the Hon. Minister for Sport some information about something I read in today's Nation. I read where that in the parish of St. Philip we expect to have three playing fields.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt. Anyhow, go ahead.

Mr. WEEKES: In addition to that there is another point. I would like the Hon. Minister to listen attentively.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the hon. member would just give way. We can come back to that after. I just want to get through the amendments.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We have two more amendments. One will allow the Housing Authority to go ahead.

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

Ministry of Finance and Planning – Head 20 (Pensions) was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the following amendment on Page 2 of Head 20 (Pensions) – Note 1 – "Undrawn Christmas advances on bonuses in December, 1974 and 1975."

I beg to move that the Head as amended stand part.

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

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

Head 22 – Loans and Advances was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendment to Item 2. This should read: "Includes provision for the Students Loan Revolving Fund"; and to Item 3 which should read: "Special provision for loans and advances to statutory bodies subject to the approval of Cabinet. Increase due to provision for loans to the National Housing Corporation."

I beg to move that the Head as amended stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. Is CBC included in this?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, CBC is included in this; but far from there being any provision for a loan for CBC, CBC has under the new administration undertaken to start repaying loans which the Government made to it some years ago. *(Cheers).*

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand the Prime Minister. I asked one simple question and he has to get on as if.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The question that Head 22 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Annexed Estimates – Port Department – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendments on Page 110; delete the figure $5,424,057 and insert the figure $5,224,057. Delete Maintenance of Static Facilities, $200,000. Under Total Expenditure delete the figure $4,849,372 and insert the figure $4,649,392. The final figure under the section Current Estimates should read $5,244,057 and not $5,424,057. On Page 115 amend Item 18 and the note to include "and (2) air conditioning units."

I beg to move that the Head as amended stand part.

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

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

Head 15(2) – Schools (Secondary) was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendment – the insertion under Item 14 on Page 7: "Provides for the purchase of cots, lawn Mowers, typewriters, chairs, legs, desks, cabinets, microscopes, waffle irons, head phones for tape recorders, theodolite, telescope lenses, record players, sewing machines, electric steam irons, cupboards, iron boards, beds, incinerators, hand weaving looms, film projectors, electric wheels, tape recorders, stools, guillotine."

I beg to move that the Head as amended stand part.

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

Head 15 (13) – Cultural Affairs was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move an amendment under Head 15(13) – the insertion of Note 8 which provides for the purchase of a tape recorder, electric kettle, desk, chairs, shelving.

I beg to move that Head 15(13) as amended stand part.

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

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

RECOMMITTAL OF HEAD 119

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, there was Head 119 on which the Hon. member for St. Philip South had a question. I therefore beg to move that the Head be recommitted.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, what Rule are we going by? Stumps ready to draw. It is 8.30 p.m. Let me read the Rule 66(9): "On the last day of the allotted days, the Chairman shall, one hour before the scheduled end of the day's sitting, put every question necessary to dispose of question with respect to each Head of the Estimates that the total amount of the votes outstanding in that Head be granted for the purposes set out under that Head. No debate or amendment shall be allowed."

I am asking if we have another five minutes before the end of the allotted time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said is quite correct; but I was only hoping that since the hon. member accommodated us, we would have accommodated him to talk for about three minutes.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, in today's "Nation" we have read that the hon. member for St. Philip North is speaking in no uncertain terms that we are going to have three playing fields in the parish. Now, I want to draw to the attention of the Minister that these three playing fields which have been mentioned are all in St. Philip North. In addition I am going to say that the King George The V Memorial Park which the Democratic Labour Party Government has spent so much money on is also in St. Philip North.
8.30 p.m.

Now, in St. Philip South we do not have one playing field. Imagine you have one already which cost the former Government over $1 million to put in order, and that is King George V Park, and you are now having the representative for St. Philip North telling the people of St. Philip and this Island that he is going to give them three also in the North. I have no grouse with him for giving himself publicity. I have no grouse against him because he and I get along as well as father and son. I am still saying that it will give the people of St. Philip the wrong impression because only a few weeks ago I asked a question in this House about a playing field at St. Martin, and the Minister has not yet given me a reply.

I know that you are willing to do your utmost for the people in this Island and, therefore, I was flabbergasted when I read this statement which did not even come before this House. I am asking you to look into the matter, and I expect you to do everything possible not only for St. Philip North, but also for St. Philip South which your humble servant has the honour to represent in this ancient and Honourable House of Assembly.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
HEAD 15(1) –DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 15(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation – stand part.

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

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

HEAD 15(2) SCHOOLS – (i) PRE-PRIMARY, PRIMARY AND SPECIAL

Head 15(2) – Schools – (i) Pre-Primary, Primary and Special – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(2) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 15(3) – ERDISTON COLLEGE

Head 15(3) – Erdiston College – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(3) stand part.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 15(4) – TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL

Head 15(4) – Technical and Vocational – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(4) stand part.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 15(5) – COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Head 15(5) – Colleges and Universities – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(5) stand part.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 15(6) – HOUSECRAFT CENTRE

Head 15(6) – Housecraft Centre – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(6) stand part.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 15(7) – HOTEL SCHOOL

Head 15(7) – Hotel School – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(7) stand part.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that..

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division

HEAD 15(8) – SCHOOL MEALS DEPARTMENT

Head 15(8) – School Meals Department – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(8) stand part.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 15(11) – LIBRARIES

Head 15(11) – Libraries – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(11) – stand part.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 15(12) – ARCHIVES

Head 15(12) – Archives – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(12) stand part.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 15(13) – CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Head 15(13) – Cultural Affairs – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(13) stand part.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

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

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS – HEAD 16(2) – CONTRIBUTIONS

Head 16(2) – Contributions – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 16(2) stand part.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE – HEAD 17(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 17(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(1) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 17(2) – COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

Head 17(2) – Community Health Services – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(2) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 17(3) – ENVIRONMENTAL SANITATION

Head 17(3) – Environmental Sanitation – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(3) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 17(4) – NUTRITION

Head 17(4) – Nutrition – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(4) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 17(5) – AMBULANCE SERVICE

Head 17(5) – Ambulance Service – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(6) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 17(6) – ST. MICHAEL'S DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Head 17(6) – St. Michael's District Hospital – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(6) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 17(7) – OTHER HOSPITALS

Head 17(7) – Other Hospitals – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(7) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 17(8) – LAZARETTO

Head 17(8) – Lazaretto – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(8) – Lazaretto – stand part.

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

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

HEAD 17(9) – MENTAL HOSPITAL

Head 17(9) – Mental Hospital – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(9) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 17(10) – QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Head 17(10) – Queen Elizabeth Hospital – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(10) stand part.

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

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I can rise on a point of order. The Clerk says that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are out of order. Please be seated.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE – HEAD 117 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE

Capital Expenditure – Head 117 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance – was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 117 stand part.

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

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

8.40 p.m.

HEAD 18 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS (1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATIONS

Head 18 – Ministry of Housing and Lands (1) Direction and Policy Formulations – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $181,653 under Head 18 – Ministry of Housing and Lands (1) Direction and Policy Formulations – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 18 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS (2) CAVES AUTHORITY

Head 18 – Ministry of Housing and Lands (2) Caves Authority – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $40,512 under Head 18 – Ministry of Housing and Lands (2) Caves Authority – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 18 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS (3) LANDS AND SURVEYS DEPARTMENT

Head 18 – Ministry of Housing and Lands (3) Lands and Surveys Department – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $2,417, 316 under Head 18 – Ministry of Housing and Lands (3) Lands and Surveys Department – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 118 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Head 118 – Ministry of Housing and Lands – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $6,537,908 under Head 118 – Ministry of Housing and Lands – stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $656,417 under Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (2) LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services (2) Labour Department – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $76,732 under Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services – (2) Labour Department – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (3) WELFARE

Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services (3) Welfare – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $19,227,960 under Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services (3) Welfare – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (5) YOUTH AFFAIRS

Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services (5) Youth Affairs – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $60,966 under Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services (5) Youth Affairs – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (6) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services (6) Community Development – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $157,846 under Head 19 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services (6) Community Development – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 1 – ANNEXED ESTIMATES – POST OFFICE

Head 1 – Annexed Estimates – Post Office – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $2,388,817 under Head 1 – Annexed Estimates – Post Office, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

SCHEDULE

The Schedule was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule as amended stand part.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the marginal note to Clause 2 be amended to read "Grant of $272,759,568".

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

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

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

Clauses 3 and 4 were called and passed.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Appropriation Bill in Committee of Supply, with amendments, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ESTIMATES OF THE PORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of a Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, Cap. 286, the Estimates of the Port Department for the year ending 31st March, 1978.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I want to move the following amendments. They are really only verbal amendments or corrections to the Resolution itself. The Resolution states the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, where its proper citation is now Cap. 286 and it refers to the year as the year 1975–76 where it should be 1977–78.

I beg to move those two amendments to the Resolution.

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

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

8.50 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Resolution to approve the Annual Estimates for the Port Department for the year 1977–78 do now pass.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken until 9.15 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not agreeing with that. The point is that we tried to accommodate the Government. We sort of could have spoiled them.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the Leader of the Opposition risen?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am speaking on the motion before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no motion before the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am sorry, Sir.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second the Prime Minister's motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is now a motion before the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: They can lay the replies. The Leader of the House never consulted me that they were going to do this, he asked permission to deal with any Civil Establishment Orders with which we agreed, but he did not tell me that he was going to come in with Question Time at this hour of the night. I agree with him that we will try to finish any consequential Civil Establishment Orders to go on the Easter recess, but he never mentioned anything about Question Time at nearly five minutes to nine.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am sorry that the hon. member did not appreciate the full purport of what I said. I said we wanted to clear the Order Paper, and there were two Questions to which we had given notice earlier that replies were ready, but we will lay them.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. The normal closing time in the House is 9.30; it is now five to nine, the answers to the questions are ready, if the hon. members do not wish to have the answers all they have to do is not to be in their places when the Questions are called and the replies can be laid, but we want to clear the Order Paper and finish with that.

These Questions have been on the Order Paper, one since October and one since November and I want them moved, I do not want any of the old DLP strategies in here of waiting six months to answer a question;

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I just wanted him, Mr. Speaker, to intimate, I am not objecting to it. The first time I am hearing that Question Time is coming up is now, so we do not have to go in for all this palaver.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

QUESTION RE METHOD OF HEALING KNOWN AS ACUPUNCTURE

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 10 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 10 reads as follows:

To ask of the appropriate Minister: (a) Is the Minister aware of the ancient Chinese method of healing known as acupuncture? (b) And is the Minister aware that this method has been successfully practised in many countries around the world? (c) Will the Minister state the Government's policy on acupuncture?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 10 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is as follows:

"Yes, Sir.

No, Sir.

The Government's policy is that acupuncture should be practised only by a registered medical practitioner, or by someone working in collaboration with and under the supervision of a registered medical practitioner."

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether or not any individual has made an application to practise acupuncture in Barbados?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: It is not within my knowledge that an individual has actually made an application during my term of office, but I have reason to believe that an application may well be made. I can say that an application was made as far back as 1973.

Mr. TAITT: Can the Minister state whether any study has been undertaken in the Ministry, or is in the process of being undertaken, to see whether the Government's position on acupuncture is susceptible of change?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The position is that there is no study currently being undertaken in the Ministry. The position is, Mr. Speaker, that the Ministry constantly monitors what goes on in the medical world, and acupuncture is under our eye. We are versed and well aware of whatever is new that might be coming forth from acupuncture, the Ministry's policy is not liable to change in the very immediate future, because in fact we do allow the practice by a registered medical practitioner.

QUESTION RE RATE OF CONVERSION OF U.S. DOLLAR INTO BARBADOS DOLLAR

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 20 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South West.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:

To ask the Minister of Finance and Planning: Will the Minister state why the rate of conversion of the United States dollar into the Barbados dollar has been fixed in the Central Bank (Rates of Exchange) (Foreign Currencies) Notice, 1977 (S.I. No. 6 of 1977) at US$1 to BDS $1.98 in relation to certain dealings in foreign currencies in the course of business by business establishments described in the Business Establishments (Purchase of Foreign Currencies) Notice, 1976 (S.I. No. 2 of 1977)?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before I give the reply I would just like to apologise to the House. I mistakenly thought that it was the answer to Question No. 5 which was ready when I made an earlier reference.

The answer to Parliamentary Question No. 20 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West on the 22nd February, 1977 is as follows:

"The rate of conversion of the U.S. dollar into the Barbados dollar has been fixed at U.S. $1.98 under the provisions of the order referred to by the Honourable Member so as to enable visitors to the island to obtain a fair rate when the business establishments prescribed in the Business Establishments (Purchase of Foreign Currencies) Notice, 1976 (S.I. No. 2 of 1977), purchase U.S. dollars from them in the course of their business operations. These establishments include hotels, restaurants and duty-free shops and the rate is comparable to BDS$1.98 which visitors can obtain from commercial banks on U.S. dollar notes and BDS$1.99 on U.S. $ drafts and Travellers' cheques.

Prior to the determination of the above rate by the Central Bank, many of the business establishments, particularly the hotels, had been purchasing U.S. dollars from visitors to the island at a rate as low as BDS$1.95. This rate had been in use by these establishments since the days when the Barbados dollar was floating against the US dollar. While the risks of a

floating exchange rate may provide justification for a large discount in the rate offered, such justification no longer exists after the Barbados dollar became fixed to the U.S. Dollar on July, 5, 1975. Moreover a rate that is highly adverse to the visitor could in the long run damage the tourist trade. For these reasons the Central Bank intervened to fix the rate which business establishments should pay for the U.S. dollar".

Mr. TAITT: Does the Minister agree that after July 5 those establishments which exchanged the US dollar for $1.95 were doing so while breaking the law? Let me put it another way. Does the Minister agree that by charging $1.95 such establishments were in fact in breach of the law?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The attention of the hon. member is referred to Standing Order 14(2)(i).
9.00 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Supplementary – will the Minister state what steps have been taken to police the new order of the Central Bank?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Steps are being taken for the Central Bank to police this order. In the ordinary way of thinking, the hon. member would not want me to reveal the very means by which the Central Bank is monitoring the situation. This might be exposed to the very establishment the means by which your law breaking is going to be detected.

Mr. TAITT: I accept the reply; but, again, supplementary – does the Minister agree that the rates set by the Central Bank constitute a devaluation?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Sir. I do not agree. It constitutes the making of hotels and duty free places give the legal rate for the dollar. It does not in any way devalue the Barbados dollar.

Mr. TAITT: Supplementary – will the Minister state whether any steps have been taken to have at the airport provisions for tourists and visitors coming into Barbados to have their funds in foreign currency exchanged for Barbados dollars?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am very happy to be able to give an answer to that question, which is that the services of one commercial bank remain available at the airport during normal banking hours for the purpose of foreign exchange as well as other banking activities; but later in this year it is expected that the Barbados Government Savings Bank will open a branch at the airport and among the particular functions will be the offer of a *bureau de change* service to change foreign currency both inside and outside the normal banking hours. *(Cheers).*

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Question Time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has given me the numbering of the various Civil Establishment and associated orders of which notice were given on Monday. There are Orders Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7. All hon. members should have received copies of the orders; but they may not know which Order in which when I ask that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day. I am now asking that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day. This is an order which seeks to amend the Leave Passages Order, 1976.

I beg to move that that be the next order of Government Business.

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

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

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, these notices were given during the suspension. No new Order Papers were actually issued. How can you get a number? I am not opposing it; but it was not in before. No new Order Paper had been given because we were in continued session from Monday until this evening. So, how can you get a number when no new Order Paper has been printed or ordered by during the session?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, it does have a number, but not on the Order Paper. The number relates to the sequence in which they have been given to the Clerk.

A Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1977 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot put my hands

on the relevant file, but I remember what the matter was about. The fact is that leave passages are still conditions of service for many public officers. As a result of the salary increases, it is necessary to make certain changes upwards in all cases of the salary levels at which officers may qualify for leave passages as a result of the coming into force of the new salaries from the 1st April this year, that is next week. The Order has been circulated and should by now be thoroughly familiar to hon. members.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, now that the Prime Minister has been able to poach the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers, I assume that this Resolution has the approval of the former General Secretary, and the Prime Minister is now introducing it. I assume that it has been given the approval of the General Secretary of the NUPW who of course haunted the last Government on salary increases and leave passages.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is a bit late or I would be quite prepared to set out the Government's policy on leave passages generally. It was indeed approved by the present Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister when he was still General Secretary of the NUPW and it forms a part of the package for salary increase which were agreed to by the former Government.

As I have said, it is as a result of the salary increases coming into force from the 1st April, 1977; and the Estimates that we have just passed allow for a general round of increases.

If hon. members care to take note of this, we are reviewing the entire leave passages situation, and I have already discussed it with one or two persons concerned whether leave passages may not be an anachronism and whether in fact at the time of the next salary revision we may not open the entire question of leave passages and see whether they will be continued, whether they will be abolished, or whether an option should be given to some persons to take a higher salary instead of leave passages. All of these options are in the mind of the Government and in due course will be subjected to the due process of collective bargaining by which I am sure I can say that the Government will be bound in this instance.

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

9.10 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT TEACHERS (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1977

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties which has been outlined by the Teachers' Representative Body and, indeed, bodies which represented all varieties of the Public Service is that morale in the Public Service can only be maintained if there is some positive security of service. The best way to achieve this security of service is to reduce the number of temporary jobs and, as far as possible, make them permanent.

For some time there have been outcries in the Teaching Service for establishment of some of the permanent posts. I see two former Ministers of Education paying keen attention to what is being said. I do not know if they lack the initiative, or merely the persuasive powers, in dealing with the then Minister of Establishment in taking this step, but when I came to deal with the situation that, as a result of the intended raising of the school-leaving age to 16, it would be necessary to create a number of new teaching posts, I decided that it was also time to put an end to the system which was iniquitous in some respects that teachers would be acting or temporary for a very long time. The Civil Establishments Order which I have made and which this Resolution seeks to bring into force provides for an increase in the Teaching Establishment by a total amount of 293 teaching posts.

As the Addendum points out, these will include posts at the School for the Deaf, Nursery School Teachers – these are new establishments which were not previously in the Established Service at all – and also for new teachers at the Primary and Secondary Schools to take account of the new policy of the Ministry of Education, which is to revise the teacher/pupil ratio. This was an essential before you could establish the new jobs. The present teacher/pupil ratio is one teacher for 40 pupils in the Primary

Schools. This new Order reduced this to one teacher for 30 pupils in the Primary Schools.

The present teacher/pupil ratio in which they based their recommendation in the newer Secondary Schools has been one teacher to 35 pupils. This Order will reduce that to one teacher for 25 pupils. I am sure that the Minister of Education is available to answer any questions that hon. members may care to raise over this, but I am equally sure that the reduction, or the alteration in the teacher/pupil ratio and the establishment of almost 300 teaching posts in the Teaching Service is not something with which any hon. member of this House is likely to quarrel about.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to attempt to deal with the question of the ratios because coming as it does at this point in time, I am not in a position to judge whether what the Prime Minister has said is accurate or not. It is not that I am doubting him, although, as I have said, I usually check everything he says very carefully. What I will say is that, irrespective of the ratio which might be allocated for the Primary School and, bearing in mind that this Resolution is consequential upon the passing of the Estimates which occurred not so very long ago, I noticed in those Estimates that the amount allocated for the repair of Primary Schools was cut by almost half. Whereas the Approved Estimates for 1976–77 had been in the vicinity of $1.88 million, the Estimates for 1977–78 only provides for $500,000.

Now, Sir, I do not know of all the Primary Schools across Barbados, but I can speak of some of the Primary Schools where the need for repairs is high, and where it is doubtful whether this sum of money will be able to take care of the repairs for Primary Schools and provide the kind of environment which the Prime Minister, in introducing this Resolution, sought to suggest was being engendered in the schools.

While I am on this question, I would ask the Minister of Education to tell us what provision has been made for the work of the National Curriculum Development Council. I do not seem to find in the Estimates any clear indication as to what provision has been made. For example, areas such as seminars, workshops and so on. Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly, this is an area which you yourself were interested in in the days when you so valiantly shadowed the Minister of Education from this very side. *(Asides.)*

I have another question to ask. I would like to know what is the Government's policy regarding the employment of expatriates, especially in the older Secondary Schools and schools like Harrison College. If the Prime Minister is telling us that he is going in the direction of having a ratio of one teacher to 25 pupils in the Primary Schools, we wish to know what is happening to a number of graduates whom I am told are having some difficulty getting work in some of the Secondary Schools while there are expatriates employed. I am sure the Minister has some good reason for permitting expatriates to work while Barbadian Graduates are unemployed. There is a very high proportion of foreigners and expatriates teaching in the older Secondary Schools. It is true that you may require a few to teach French, but I am told that there are a large number of Englishmen who are functioning as teachers at Harrison College, and I would like the Minister to give this Honourable House some indication as to what is the Government's policy on this matter.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very welcome to hear that the ratio of the teaching staff in the Primary Schools will officially be moved to one teacher for 40 pupils to one teacher to 30 pupils. This is welcome news. I am wondering if the Minister of Education would be in a position – I am certain that he has the statistics – to tell us what is the position in terms of the actual employment of teachers. At the moment you have a number of acting teachers and temporary teachers at the Primary Schools.

9.20 p.m.

While I am at it, I realise our time is running out and I am not speaking expansively on education at this stage, but it has been drawn to my attention that some of these teachers who would be acting teachers have been receiving notices from the Ministry of Education to the effect that their employment would be terminated on various dates; some are given dates for July and some for August this year, as I understand it. No doubt these are the usual letters which have gone out, but some persons who have the requisite qualifications for appointment to the service have been receiving these for the first time. They have never received them before and they are concerned. I am pretty certain that there is no intention of changing the

position as far as these teachers are concerned and that they will continue to draw their emoluments for the vacation and be taken on again in September, but quite naturally receiving these letters for the first time, Mr. Speaker, has caused some concern as to exactly what this means.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, if I may deal with the hon. member for St. Michael South West first with respect to the question he raised at the end, ex-patriate teachers in old secondary schools, the policy has not changed since the other side has governed this country, and my colleague the hon. member for St. Michael South could have told them that there are a number of subject areas where there is a shortage of trained teachers in Barbados. For instance in the areas of Mathematics and Physics and so on, therefore it is necessary for the time being and until such time as we can provide the people to handle these areas to get them from somewhere, and that is the criteria. We do not bring people in from overseas to teach in the schools if there are Barbadians equipped, able and willing to take the teaching positions.

In respect of the prominence of the cut in spending in primary schools, I would like the hon. member to realise that it has been universally primary education in Barbados for many years but not so with secondary education, and one has got to balance the amount of money available in education to suit clear priorities. Every child of primary school age in Barbados has a place in a primary school, not so in secondary schools, therefore if in this year when we are spending almost $6 million more in capital expenditure in education we tilt the balance in favour of secondary education, I think the hon. member for St. Michael South West should really take that into consideration and see that in view of the readmission of 14 year olds in the schools and the plans of making the school leaving age sixteen, that we have at this stage to tilt the balance in favour of secondary education for the time being.

Now there is one other point that the hon. member for St. Michael South raised, and that is with respect to the number of teachers. The total number of teachers in primary schools is 1,469. I do not know if that is what he wanted. (Mr. SANDIFORD: I asked the ratio.) The total number of children in primary schools is 35,829 which gives a ratio of 1:35.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1977

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, again this is a very straight forward matter. As a result of the reallocation of the Ministries and reassessment of the needs of staff in certain areas, there are a number of posts which will be required to be moved from one department to another and a number of shifts to be made. Again the principle of establishing temporary posts wherever there is a permanent need for such has been followed, and nearly all of these posts are the establishment of temporary posts, the most notable exception being the Mental Hospital. It will be observed that the administrative staff structure at the Mental Hospital is being reorganised, a temporary post of Hospital Director and various abolitions and establishments. If the order is examined and compared with the old order, it will be observed that there are a certain amount of abolitions because the new Civil Establishment Order will show what the Public Service is. This is really a matter of reorganisation.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, so that I would not appear to be in breach, there was an understanding from the Leader of the House that if there were any residual questions which we were not able to get in, we could raise them under these items, and I wish to raise a question as it relates to health. This Civil Establishment Order does relate to health and I merely wish to raise a simple question on the Ministry of Health. The Minister and hon. members in this Chamber would have seen in the newspapers a few days ago a photograph of a pile of rubbish at the corner of Peterkin Road. I am not raising this in a contentious way; I am the representative for the constituency, but this is a matter which has been going on for a very long time. It seems not to be able to get any solution, but it seems in recent weeks that the matter is intensifying.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there is a de-bush drive on and the trouble is that people, including the hon. member for St. Michael West – and I wish that other M.P.s would take his example because he has been seen in St. Leonard's Church yard hoeing and forking up bush – are so enthusiastic about the de-bushing drive that they are pulling up vines, cutting down bush and putting the dried stuff at the side of the road. So in truth and in fact in

order to accommodate one Ministry of Health drive, they are sometimes in their enthusiasm creating another health hazard. We in sanitation and in health are trying to coordinate the two programmes so that when the Public health people move into a particular district with the de-bushing drive, the sanitation people will be alerted and will move in almost immediately and clean up behind them as they go on. That is the reason why the mess that we saw in the newspaper appeared to you to be even worse in the last few weeks.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would permit me to ask the Minister a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly not; Question Time has long passed.

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

9.30 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1977

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, this Order makes provision for the abolition of two posts at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital – Boo Spencer is one and Bourne is the other – and it is a very short and simple Order. If hon. members want to talk about it, I am sure that the Minister of Health will give them a run for their money.

You, Sir, from the dignity of the Chair will be remote from this particular operation, but I am sure that the recollection of what is involved in this particular Order will not be remote from your memory, but more to the point, Sir, the Chief Executive Officer's post is being abolished and the post of Chef is being abolished.

The post of Chef never worked, Sir. It fell to the father of the present Hon. Minister of Health to appoint a Chef, and it has fallen to the Hon. Minister of Health to abolish his post in the fulness of time. As the Addendum points out, his duties will be incorporated in the duties of other food service personnel. I would just point out also that nobody has been fired from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There is a difference between abolition of a post and dismissal. The gentleman concerned has reached the age where if his post was abolished he was in fact going to receive a pension, and indeed we have arranged it in such a way as to make it possible for him.

Your Honour will take note that this Order comes into force at such date as I appoint. This is why it is still in the Order we have just passed. We have had to go out of our way to make a special effort in the House of Assembly to help Boo Spencer, to call a name, because if I had just put it into the Order we have just passed he would have lost his job and he would not have been pensioned on the basis of the emoluments which he would get if he was in the Service on 1st April, so we are going to let these officers get their new emoluments, and then I will bring the Order into force. This is why hon. members may wonder why on the same day I bring a Resolution for an Order embodying a post and then bring another Resolution taking the post out of the previous one. It has to be done this way so as to let Boo Spencer get his pension, and I hope that Boo Spencer will sit down in the Sugar Shack Restaurant at Ellerton, St. George, where he sells the 7-pound tins of Nescafé institution size and so on, I hope that he will reflect that the Barbados Labour Party Government did not show him any unkindness or spite or malice, and I hope he will be able to kneel down in St. George's Church and say "Lord, I have never shown spite or malice towards any member of the Barbados Labour Party in turn."

The two officers concerned are being allowed to leave the Service, despite all that has been said over the years which if true would put them in a much less favourable position than they are being now afforded, with every honour. They are marching out with the honours of war, drums playing, flags flying and pensions abundant in their pockets. Good luck to Boo Spencer, Sir, and the Sugar Shack at Ellerton, St. George.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that. I am quite sure that you, Mr. Speaker, will feel very happy this evening to put the question.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know Boo Spencer, and indeed have never gone to the Sugar Shack, wherever that is, but I find it somewhat surprising that the Prime Minister in putting this Resolution before this Hon. House did not find it necessary or desirable to mention that the National Union of Public Workers did have a series of statements in the newspaper. I would like to believe that the National Union of Public Workers is a responsible Union and therefore if the National Union of Public Workers claims to have a case that at least there is something approximating a case which would lead reasonable people in the National Union of Public Workers to believe that they had a case.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member for St. Michael South West discussing a Trade Union matter or something of the sort?

Mr. TAITT: No, Sir, the Prime Minister in introducing the Resolution referred to a Boo Spencer, and that Boo Spencer brought to my mind that I had seen in the national Press a case about the Chef at the hospital who apparently was one and the same Boo Spencer the Prime Minister mentioned.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the point. Are you now suggesting that we should no longer have a free Press?

Mr. TAITT: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that. I am suggesting on the other hand that we still have free speech in the country, and especially in this Chamber, Sir, and that is why I thought I could speak about my recollection of the matter connected with the Chef at the hospital. As I stated, Your Honour, so that I would not appear to be beating a trumpet for anyone, I stated (a) that I do not know Boo Spencer, and (b) I have never heard or seen the Sugar Shack, but I remember that there was in the newspaper something from the National Union of Public Workers which suggested that a worker at the hospital who was a Chef, and who apparently was the same Boo Spencer, might in some manner have been unfaired. If the Prime Minister is saying that he is issuing forth largesse by not having included Boo Spencer in the previous Order, I am suggesting that that might not necessarily be so, it might very well be that the case put forward by the National Union of Public Workers might have brought the Prime Minister to consider the action which he so gratuitously tells us he is taking tonight.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I suppose I should reply, Sir. As far as I know, the case which I considered was the case put forward by the Establishments Division. I believe that the National Union of Public Workers had to go through the motions for Boo Spencer because he is one of their officers, a Shop Steward or something like that, and I admire them for the way that they put their case in the Nation without ever actually troubling the Prime Minister with any of the details which they were seeking to put forward.
9.40 p.m.

I suppose that the morale of an organisation goes down if you do not support your officers when they run into trouble; but my private opinion is that the National Union of Public Workers has been waiting for the axe to fall on Keith Spencer for years – years and years that Keith Spencer is a person who has become famous on all sides of society in both political parties. I believe that if inquiries are made from Mr. Cameron Tudor he will tell you what a good hand Keith Spencer has for baking bread. Ask Mr. Cameron Tudor who baked the bread that Old Year's night, and he will find out something about him.

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

BILL TO AMEND THE CAVES AUTHORITY ACT

Order No. 1 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Caves Authority Act, 1975.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains a very short amendment. The object of the amendment is to transfer authority for caves in Barbados from the Ministry of Tourism into the hands of the Ministry of Housing and Lands. The other consequential amendment is to delete the provision in the Schedule whereby the nomination of members of the Caves Authority is removed from the Director of Finance and Planning and the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Housing and Lands inserted.

I beg to move that the Bill be read a 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 the 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. ODLE in the Chair.

On separate motions of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you 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, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that brings us to the end of Government Business; and before moving the adjournment, I would like on behalf of members to thank the staff and all those concerned in this period for making the situation in the House relatively comfortable for us. I would also like to express appreciation of the services of the Chairman of Committees who had to bear the brunt. I am sure that this experience will enrich him and the next time that he presides over the Estimates his hand will be a little firmer.

I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 12th April, 1977, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express my thanks to the Chairman of Committees for the five days of arduous sittings we have had. I think that the House would have to look at the possibility of getting someone to relieve the Chairman. Five days of nine to ten hours for anyone person is too much.

My only disappointment is that the hon. member for St. Michael North West who seconded the Appropriation Bill and reserved his right to speak is still on the reserve list as far as the Schedule is concerned. Be that as it may, I am happy to see that the Government's first Appropriation Bill has gone through in the allotted time in circumstances in which, not with heated debate; and that tonight after five days we have voted for the money for the payment of the country's services.

I think that tonight we will all leave in friendship. In a spirit in which we feel that we have had our moments of levity. We have had our moments of statemanlike debate; and I think that the Government can be satisfied, in spite of whatever has happened, even though certain Heads were not debated, that we have shouldered our responsibilities and carried out the duties which the people have entrusted to us.
9.50 p.m.

As I say, it is my first position as Leader of the Opposition in opposition for a long time. I must say I enjoyed it tremendously. I am sorry I cannot be as grateful as Bruce Spencer to the Prime Minister as Bruce must be tonight, since Bruce Spencer is certainly going to get his pension whereas I have not been that lucky to get anything. I think, all in all, we have had a very good fight in the Debate on the Estimates. I think that the Government can feel satisfied that they have discharged their first responsibilities in the best traditions.

I am looking forward, of course, to the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, which is another kettle of fish, and other developments from time to time. I can assure them that the Opposition will play its part in the best traditions of Parliamentary democracy.

ADJOURNMENT

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 12th April, 1977, at twelve noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
9.52 p.m.