

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th May, 1977.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour, and Community Services); 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. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

Mr. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of the 10th May, 1977.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 10th May, 1977 be now confirm.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received a communication from His Excellency the Governor-General which reads as follows:

12th May, 1977.

CONFIDENTIAL

Your Honour,

I have the honour to inform you that a simultaneous announcement will be made from Buckingham Palace and Government House, Barbados, today, Thursday, 12th May, 1977, at 1700 hours GMT (1200 hours Barbados time) in connection with the forthcoming visit of The Queen and The Duke of Edinburgh to the Caribbean in the autumn. A copy of the announcement is attached.

2. As there is no sitting of the House of Assembly scheduled to take place before the announcement is made, it has not been possible for me to address formal Messages to Parliament. I am therefore communicating the announcement to the House of Assembly through Your Honour.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your Honour's obedient servant,

D. H. L. WARD
Governor-General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Parks and Beaches Commission for the year 1974-75.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1977.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Financial Statements and Chairman's Report of the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation for the year ended 30th June, 1974.

Also I am commanded to lay the Report of the Barbados National Standards Institution for the period November 1975 to October 1976, and Financial Statement as at 31st March, 1976.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Omnibus and Carriages Act, Cap. 294.

I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act, Cap. 295.

I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Waterworks Department Act, Cap. 36.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act, Cap. 355A.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating to weights and measures and to provide for the introduction in Barbados of the International System of Units (S.I.) and for related matters.
12.25 p.m.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question:

"To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance —

1. What is the total number of income tax payers in Barbados?
2. What is the number of persons with taxable incomes in each of the following brackets:

- (i) \$1,000 or less
- (ii) \$1,000 to \$1,999
- (iii) \$2,000 to \$2,999
- (iv) \$3,000 to \$3,999
- (v) \$4,000 to \$5,999

- (vi) \$6,000 to \$7,999
- (vii) \$8,000 to \$9,999
- (viii) \$10,000 to \$11,999
- (ix) \$12,000 to \$15,999
- (x) \$16,000 to \$29,999
- (xi) \$30,000 or above?

3. What is the quantum of tax collected in each of those brackets?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, may I draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order No. 14 (2)(1) which states that information set forth in accessible documents or ordinary works of reference may not be asked.

The information which the hon. member is requesting is set forth in the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue which is published from time to time, and in so far as it is not set forth in that report, it forms a part of what is known as the unpublished records of Government, and I respectfully submit that it is in contravention of the Standing Order. With great deference and with great nobility, because I do not think this point has been drawn to Your Honour's attention so far, I submit that he is asking for information which appears in the published records of Government and under Standing Order No. 14(2)(1) should not be asked. We have no objection to giving the information, but he should go to the Public Library and get it.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I see that the Clerk has ruled by going on to the next Item.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk cannot rule in this Honourable House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, you will reserve your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will take notice thereof.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, a Bill to amend the Omnibus and Carriages Act, Cap. 294 was read a first time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in respect of that Act, this seeks to change the figures, one of 24 cents and the other of 48 cents which relate to the tax that has to be paid by taxi drivers to get a police inspection to \$1.00. It is such a short measure that if the

Opposition would indicate that they would let it be done in all its stages today, we would be prepared to go ahead. Of course, if the question of principle does arise, naturally it would take its usual form. It may very well be thought to be unlike the Waterworks and the other matters. The 24 cents was there since 1902.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I should like to assure the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance that the Opposition has no objection if as he says it is that sort of amendment.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is very accommodating. I will send a copy of the Bill for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to look at.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, a Bill to amend the Waterworks Department Act was read a first time.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, a Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE a Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating to weights and measures and to provide for the introduction in Barbados of the International Systems of Units (S.I.) and for related matters was read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 19 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is ready.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 28 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West is ready.

Mr. Speaker, the Order Paper does not reveal that an oral reply was asked for in this matter, and therefore I should, I suppose, give notice that the answer is ready to be tabled. I do not know if the hon. member in fact did not want an oral reply or if there was some oversight, the fact that it was misprinted in the Order Paper or what. It relates to Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. I would not like to deprive the hon.

member of his opportunity of asking the question and have him deal with supplementaries and so on.

12.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is highly improper to impute improper motives to any hon. member. I must really ask what is the Prime Minister inviting in this instance.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Evidently.....
(Inaudible)

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders, 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43, and 44.

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir I notice that the Chairman of Committees is not in his seat today, and since we have to go into Committee at some time, I beg to move that the hon. member for St. Philip South be Chairman of Committees for today's Sitting. (ASIDES)

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, taking into consideration that my colleagues are not in favour of my deputizing or being appointed Chairman for the day, I beg to decline.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this thought of asking the hon. member for St. Philip South to be Chairman of today's Sitting is simply because of his many long years here and I am confident that he would be *au fait* with the Rules of this august Assembly, and knowing him to be a person of integrity, fairplay and justice he would have brought to this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, a degree of that stability which we on this side are trying to set both in the Chair and in the Chairmanship of Committees. Furthermore, Sir, I think it would have been unique in that, having an hon. member from the Opposition bench, no one would have been able to say we were trying to muzzle the Opposition. I therefore thought it a bounden duty to have such an honour bestowed on the member for St. Philip South, Sir. I wonder if the hon. member will reconsider his decision.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind remarks made by the Hon. Minister and am willing Sir to accept the position for today. (Cheers)

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems it is the general feeling of both sides of this House that the hon. member for St. Philip South be elected Chairman of Committees of this day's Sitting. I can only now extend my heartiest congratulations to him on an occasion such as this and we look forward to his discharging his functions today in a manner which he has not been able to do so for almost a quarter of a century in this Honourable Chamber as a member. We have confidence, however that he will live up to the obligation thrust upon him on an occasion such as this. The hon. member for St Philip South is duly elected Chairman of Committees for the remainder of this day's Sitting.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L.S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken, Sir.

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

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

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

Hon. L.S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker Sir, there is a Bill to amend the Omnibus and Carriage Act which is the Order we are bringing at this moment. The Order stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister and I think that the Prime Minister is now ready to deal with this Bill, Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have given my undertaking that we will deal with the Bill, it has only just been circulated, and unless the Government is dealing with this matter alone, and then adjourning, it can come at the end. However, in view of the fact that the Hon. Minister of Finance will be dealing with it today, the Opposition will not object, even though we got this rather short notice.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is really a very short matter, Sir. There is an old Act from the year 1900 which originally provided for the licencing and use of omnibuses and hackney carriages. In those days it all had to do with horses, and you had to pay \$2.40 for a carriage with two horses, \$1.20 for one horse, and 48 cents for an inspection to get the carriage licence initially, and 24 cents every time you went to renew it. Taxis are caught under this Act, Sir, because it used to have a slightly different title; although they say hackney carriages drawn by horses, it does in fact cover

hackney carriages drawn by horse power as well; and every so often, I think it is every quarter, the taxi drivers have to go to Central Station and have an inspection of the taxi, and they pay 24 cents for it, 48 cents when it is first passed and 24 cents after that. This was a shilling back in 1900. This is one of the fees which escaped notice over the years, Sir, and today it is actually a nuisance for anybody to pay 24 cents, because you give 25 cents and you have to search for the odd cent to make change; and the taxi drivers don't even wait for the odd cent. They pay in the 25 cents and go on about their business whether they get the cent change or not.

12.45 p.m.

This is one of the fees that escaped notice over the years, Sir, and today it is actually a nuisance for anybody to pay 24 cents, because you give 25 and you have to search for the odd cent to make change, and the taxi drivers do not even wait for the odd cent, they pay in the 25 cents and go along about their business whether they get the cent change or not. The purpose of this Act is to raise it to the very, very modest rate of \$1.00, Sir. A shilling in 1900, \$1 in 1977, we do not believe that that is an unreasonable fee, bearing in mind expansion in the service provided by Government since that day.

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

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is certainly supporting this measure, but I would just like to ask the Government in view of the fact that public transport and the general method of transport and the general bus service and other services pertaining to transport have come a long way since, even 1937, when the Road Traffic Act was drafted, that the Government should look into the whole question of modernising the law relating to transport in Barbados generally. While this is only a sort of amendment changing figures, I think the whole question of omnibuses, minibuses and all forms of transport need a very good look at to update the legislation pertaining thereto.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member who has just sat down that his views are well taken, that my Ministry – and Government generally – is looking into the entire system of transport in this island. As a matter of fact, we are formulating policy with respect to this, and very shortly comprehensive legislation will be sought in order to deal with

the whole question of public transport and all questions of transportation, and he is speaking to the converted when he raises the points which he just raised.

The Opposition can have no fear, and especially the Leader, that the Government is very actively considering the question of transport in the island.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, has raised the question of the renewals, or that we should take a complete look at these matters, and there has been an assurance given by the Minister, and we have every reason to accept that assurance, that these matters will be attended to.

Of course, it relates to transport in the island, and I am really wondering whether the Minister can tell us at this stage whether the takeover of the buses, the complete takeover by the Government of the transport system which was promised earlier in this Session, this year, to take place in June, whether that takeover will take place at the date indicated, and whether there is any other information on these or related matters he would care to give to this Hon. Chamber. I remember when I spoke on this matter I did indicate that the June date seemed somewhat improbable, but of course my statements can be proved incorrect in as much as, according to my colleague and friend, the member for Christ Church West, I am not prophetic, so maybe the Minister can tell us whether the takeover is coming in June or what are the circumstances related to that.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. WEEKES in the Chair.

The Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.
12.55 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the instant order of the day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 is the instant order of the day.

BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION ACT

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is really a very short Bill. We have undertaken an extensive review in the Ministry of Defence and Security which is now responsible for Immigration in Barbados, all categories of persons who attempt to come to Barbados and to apply for work permits, residence and matters of that sort. It has been a longer process than we thought it would be; but we have come to the very firm conclusion that it is necessary to have more flexibility than present legislation allows.

I stated in my Budget Speech that there would be a review of certain fees, and all those fees are already in force. For a work permit issued to Bank Managers they have to pay \$5,000 if they are not CARICOM or Barbadian citizens. Hotel Managers, \$2,500 and so on. This is already being enforced; but we are looking at the whole category of potential employees and self employed persons; and for this purpose we are having to go through the entire I.L.O. categorisation list, and we are also examining the legislation in the Bahamas and other places, for which I am indebted to the Attorney General for his industry in getting these things together so quickly; and indeed he is playing an integral part in the entire matter.

We are having to go through all this entire legislation to see where the pressure comes and where we should apply a high rate and where we should apply a low rate. In all the circumstances, and bearing in mind that conditions may change from time to time, we think that it is better to give the Minister power to classify the level of fees in relation to different categories of employment and different categories of persons rather than embodying it

in the Act. In a short time Regulations will be published; but we are not able at present to go any further than the Budget Speech itself went.

What I would say is that we are very anxiously inviting comments. It has not been done formerly, but we are hearing comments and we are paying attention to them. We are inviting comments from persons who have some idea of the supply and demand of various categories and sections of skill in Barbados. Many people have got in the habit of writing to the Immigration Department to make what really are petty complaints. It would be of much more use to us, if as in the case of one professional association — I do not even know if it is an association — but all the firms engaged in one particular aspect of construction work have written to make a complaint.

Well, arising out of their complaint — because it was a very full document which they all signed eventually — we are able to assess that there exists in Barbados the skill necessary to do X; and that there are a number of local firms employing so many hundred people and doing a particular function. We can therefore say that if in fact there is another firm from outside which is seeking to do the same function, and there may be short term reasons for not closing them down, because there will be some dislocation of labour, you can impose such fees and work permits for such a short time — that is one of the keys — that it will become an economic necessity for the firm to employ a Barbadian and in the top jobs.

That is the sort of exercise that we are undertaking, and we think that we need the flexibility which this Bill will give us in order to undertake it completely. Many persons have pointed out that the categories in the Budget Speech are by no means exhaustive. We well know that. If we hear suggestions today I will very gratefully take them into account and they may be published in the Regulations in due course.

I am sure that no hon. member — well I very much hope that no hon. member will disagree with the principle of the Bill, and I move that it be now read a second time.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not quarrelling with what the Prime Minister said; but I have an instance in my professional capacity of a Guyanese who came into the country and was granted permission to stay till

the end of May. The police arrested him on a charge which was never brought against him, and I took out a writ of *habeas corpus* which was on the Easter week end. On the Thursday it was filed at five to four. On Saturday the Prime Minister revoked his right as Minister for Immigration to stay in Barbados. His name was on the note. I wonder. The Prime Minister, J. M. G. M. Adams signed this note as Minister for Immigration revoking this man's right to stay in the country although the matter was to come before a Supreme Court Judge on the Tuesday, the day after the bank holiday.

I thought it was very peculiar because it did not have Ministry of Defence. It seemed to me as if somebody passed it through the car window and you signed it. It was not from any Ministry; but on the Tuesday when the matter was to be heard before Mr. Justice Worrell the body had already left the island; because the man himself had two choices. When I saw him on the Saturday morning after Good Friday, the man had two choices. Having had his permission to remain in Barbados revoked, he either had to be deported, in which he would not have a chance to come back in, so he went out voluntarily the Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock. On the Tuesday when the writ of *habeas corpus* was being heard by Mr. Justice Worrell there was no *corpus*.

Now, I think that this is wrong. I do not think that the Minister responsible should use this type of power or this method to interfere with the course of justice. The Police had arrested him Wednesday afternoon. When I was retained on Thursday morning.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am going to give an answer to all this; but he really cannot say that the Minister should not use his powers to interfere with the course of justice. Apart from being untrue, it is a very serious accusation to make; and I submit that it should be withdrawn.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am giving the facts in that the writ of *habeas corpus* was served on the Commissioner of Police, the Minister for Defence, the Attorney General, by 4 o'clock on the Thursday afternoon, the day before Good Friday. They were aware of it before, on Saturday morning this man's right to remain in Barbados was revoked and he was deemed an illegal immigrant. I have the letter which I can produce, signed by J. M. G. Adams, Minister for Immigration. The man is in Guyana now because he had a choice either of being deported as an illegal immigrant since the

Minister had withdrawn his right to stay until the end of May; and he voluntarily went out in the hope that he could come back in one day if he so desired.

I am only giving one example to the Minister. When we were in Government we came in for a lot of criticism; and I cannot see — the whole intention in my view was to relieve the Police of a possible High Court action for false imprisonment. They had nothing against the man. Up to the Saturday afternoon when he was deported, or rather voluntarily left Barbados, not one charge had been brought against him by the Police for anything at all. He was walking down the wharf Wednesday. He was in company with somebody the Police probably did not like. They carried him over to the station and he was there until Saturday afternoon.

1.05 p.m.

When they got the writ, they moved him from the cell and put him to sleep where the Corporal sleeps at the station. On the Saturday morning in the upstairs building where the Corporal's beds and couches were when I interviewed him, again, he was there. I am just giving you one instance of a case where, when you are administering immigration laws, those who are responsible for it have to act with greater respect for the law. I am almost positive that, at the time when they presented to the Minister responsible for Immigration this letter to sign revoking this man's rights to remain in Barbados, they had already received the writ of *habeas corpus* to produce the body on the Tuesday morning before the Judge in the Supreme Court.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the Leader of the Opposition is not now suggesting that the Minister, when he signed the document, did so without having due respect for the law!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not suggesting that. I am saying that the law was taking its course by the writ of *habeas corpus* having been filed on Thursday and served on the Commissioner of Police and, therefore, when the Commissioner presented the document to him on the Saturday the Commissioner should have informed him that the writ of *habeas corpus* had been served on him on Thursday. I am not in a position to say whether the Minister knew about that or not. I am not suggesting that he deliberately did that, but the Police may very well have kept silent because they knew that they did not have any grounds for keeping the man from Wednesday to Saturday, and they had

used this ruse to bring in the Minister quite innocently in order to escape a possible action for false imprisonment in the Supreme Court.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, there are just two points on this amendment that I would like to raise. First, I would like to indicate that my understanding of the Bill, when it was originally introduced in Parliament, was primarily to exert some kind of regulation and control over the category of professionals and other technical people who would be allowed to come to Barbados to work in specialised areas where there might be a shortage of particular skills and, obviously, to give some kind of guarantee that, whilst they are here in Barbados and working in a particular occupation, a Barbadian would be trained alongside them to take over at some point in time. What we see here today and what seems to me to be the whole object of this exercise is an effort by the Prime Minister to find an additional avenue for raising money, and this seems to me to be a way to defeat the real purpose of the original Bill.

I want to say, and I think I should make this point very clear, that I am not objecting and I am sure the Democratic Labour Party does not object to ensuring that proper fees are paid for the categories which have been identified and other areas which have been specified. It appears to me that it is being used as one of the many devices of the Prime Minister to raise revenue in this country. I would hope that, as the Prime Minister has indicated, a very careful look and note be taken of this particular matter because I am sure you are aware that there have been a lot of abuses which can take place and which have taken place in this particular area particularly from the point of view of people who have come into the country with one kind of arrangement, and particularly from the point of view of ensuring or having a guarantee that a Barbadian national will be trained in the particular area.

We know that situations have developed where difficulties have been placed in the way of the Barbadian who has been earmarked to be trained and the entire objects of the particular permit were not fulfilled, but this is an area which has to be watched very, very carefully. Of course, Mr. Speaker, you will recognise, and this is a matter which has been pointed out on many occasions, that there are a number of firms which, from time to time, advertise for certain categories of staff and the kind of qualifications for which they ask are of such as to put the particular job beyond the reach of a number of Barbadian nationals. I would hope

that the Prime Minister, in the review which he has indicated, will take very careful notice of this and ensure that this kind of exploitation or this kind of advantage of the system does not take place. You will recognise that it is an area which can be manipulated by some of the "Smart Alexs" we have operating in the business sector of this community.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to make the first point that the Prime Minister should consider compiling a document of all of the categories of workers or of professional people who have been given work permits and, indeed, even their names, which would be available for public scrutiny, from time to time, so that people would have some idea of who are working in Barbados with a work permit. This would be a way of ensuring a public policing of this kind of measure. We think that this would be of benefit to the community and we would not have situations where sometimes people come to Barbados ostensibly on vacations; they enter the Island on holiday visas and end up working as Directors and Managers in some of the concerns of this country. As I have said, it is an area which is ripe for exploitation and we should ensure, in the interest of Barbadians and in the interest of our community, that we close as many loopholes as possible.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, this measure is one which would bring a lot of satisfaction to many people and, maybe, only a few people would be critical of it or opposed to it and, chiefly, those who would have to pay the new fees. I would like to say that it is my personal view that this increase in fees is long overdue. In fact, I recall in my time as Minister of Home Affairs when an attempt was made to get substantial increases in these fees but without any measure of success. However, while this may be so, there is still some concern being expressed in public about the way these immigrations matters are being handled. My colleague on my right has aired one case, but there are a number of cases aired all over the Island about things going on. We hear of a case of a lady dancer coming to Barbados and, having slept with three politicians in one night, winds up with a work permit the next day. It would be interesting to know which storm ran into her.

Now these are matters which bring concern to the public, and for a very long time now we have been taking immigration in Barbados very slightly, but there is great economic importance and also security importance which should be attached to immigration, I refer to economic

importance because we have to protect the employment opportunities of Barbadians. I know from experience that it will be very easy for certain people to come to Barbados and get jobs whereas the local Barbadians have found it very difficult to get jobs.

1.15 p.m.

I was embarrassed as a Minister for Home Affairs receiving letters where people told me that if we give a work permit they would provide a job, whereas Barbadians were going around unemployed and nobody was concerned about offering them a job; and the Minister responsible for immigration is well aware of the problems of unemployment in Barbados and I think he will agree primarily that an immigration policy has to take into consideration the protection of the employment opportunities for Barbadians. More recently we have had problems arising out of security in this country, and therefore any immigration policy must also reflect on that and ensure that people coming into this country do not necessarily pose a threat to the security of this country.

In addition to protecting the employment opportunities of Barbadians, there are other considerations which must weigh heavily on any immigration policy. We must look carefully at what effect people coming into Barbados would have on the health services, the educational facilities and the housing facilities of this country, and we cannot allow people to come in in too large numbers which would put a strain on the health services, education facilities and the facilities already available which are not as good as they should be in housing in this country.

When we talk about health it is a bit regrettable that people take health in Barbados very easily; but there are a number of diseases which, if they are permitted to be brought into this country by a lackadaisical approach to the Immigration Act, would bring untold harm or disaster to Barbados, and already a large amount of money has been spent in Barbados on updating the health services of this country and every year the taxpayers are being asked to pay a little more to maintain or to improve those health services, and therefore it is definitely necessary that any immigration policy looks carefully at what likely effect the importation or permission for certain people to come into this country may place on the health services of Barbados. To give an example of something that has occurred in Barbados not very long ago, we had a foreigner turning up in Barbados and taking up residence here, and when he was

subjected to an examination, in the course of that examination we discovered that he had malaria. There is no malaria in Barbados and one of the reasons why there is no malaria in Barbados is because there is no vector, no mosquito that transmits the organism; but suppose we had a vector and this person was going around in Barbados for a very long time with malaria in his blood before he was discovered, we could very well imagine the type of problems which could come out in Barbados through this lackadaisical approach to health matters pertaining to immigration, and in this regard I would like to point out that it has disturbed me very much to observe that people who previously had been required to submit themselves to a proper examination, the details of which were explicit in a medical form for immigration purposes, now find it very easy to go to a doctor and just get a letter saying that they are in good health and return to the Immigration Department. I do not think that this is good enough because every country which is concerned about the health matters of its people has medical forms which specify what the doctor should look for and comment on, and one such form was devised and put into operation in Barbados, and it is a bit sad to know that this year people can just walk in here and go to a doctor and get a note saying that they are in good health without any proper scrutiny being made to ensure that certain diseases are not being brought into this country, and then present this document to the immigration authorities. I must go back and insist that these forms are circulated and when people apply for work permits or residence these forms should be given to them and they should be properly examined to ensure that they are not reservoirs of certain diseases which would reek havoc in this country.

I can go a step further. I often wonder what has become of the demand specification forms and the job description forms which were at one time in practice in the Ministry of Home Affairs, because these forms sought to establish or obtain certain specific information which was lacking. Very often people just wrote a simple letter saying that they required a work permit, and when you set about to process this you met with all types of difficulties to get the type of information which would enable you to arrive at a decision of whether or not the permit should be granted. These forms were devised for the specific purpose of ferreting out this type of information. You found in the past dependent on how people were able to argue that they may or may not get a work permit,

and I do not think that is a very good basis on which to make a decision to grant a work permit. There are forms which can be devised, maybe better forms than you had in the past, which would ferret out the type of information necessary to determine whether or not the person being brought into Barbados is necessary or whether or not there are Barbadians available who could do the jobs; and I would like to impress upon the Minister responsible for immigration that these types of forms need to be put into operation.

Now, Sir, when you look at the question of housing in Barbados, that is also a problem and it would be interesting to conduct a survey among the many Government housing estates in this country to find out how many non-Barbadians were able to obtain housing easily. We have to realise that there is a big demand for housing in this country, and for a very long time in the future we will not be able to meet it due to financial and other reasons, and therefore you cannot have the type of immigration policy which is pursued so lackadaisically that people just drift in and the next thing you know is that they are competing with Barbadians not only for educational places, not only for health facilities, but also for housing.

In passing I would like to state here that I agree with the Government in increasing the fees at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for non-Barbadians and for people who drift in here purposely to take advantage of the health facilities of this country. This is an area that has been left unplugged for a very long time, and it has led to abuse by some people. In increasing the fees in that particular area for non-Barbadians you are not doing anything which many other countries far better financed, better developed and who are in a position to be far more generous are doing, and I think in this area I would have to agree it is something that should have been done long ago, and now that it is done I think it can be construed as an attempt to protect the interest of the Barbadian citizen.

Sir, I repeat that the approach to immigration has been lackadaisical for too long and we have to have a policy which people of all political convictions or no political conviction can appreciate and recognise that this policy is seeking to protect the employment opportunities of Barbadians, that it is seeking to permit people, if they must come into Barbados, at a rate at which this society and

economy can absorb without putting any undue strain on anybody or any section of the public. It is interesting to observe that certain members of the Asian community in Barbados have been complaining about the recent increase in the number of Asians who come into Barbados, and it is refreshing to observe that they are concerned because they consider that it not only puts strain on them but also there is the likelihood that if you have too many of these people in Barbados, you will find that they are less likely to employ the local Barbadian and they would have to find employment for these people. These are matters that we have to look at very carefully, and as long as there is a high level of unemployment in Barbados which the Hon. Prime Minister not so very long ago placed as high as 28% to 30%, we would have to do everything whether other people like it or not to protect the employment opportunities of Barbadians, and I think for a very long time in this country we have been taking this matter of immigration, work permits as they are generally termed, a bit too lightly. There are other countries who have tightened up; Canada, the United States, Great Britain; all of these have tightened up on their immigration policies or laws for different reasons. I am not saying that we have to copy them to the hilt; their conditions or circumstances in those countries may be entirely different from the circumstances and conditions in Barbados, but I am just stressing the point that the lackadaisical approach which has gone on needs to be replaced by a well defined policy, an approach which all Barbadians can recognise to be in the best interest of Barbados and would be willing to support because they would know what it is all about.

1.25 p.m.

I am just stressing the point that the approach which has gone on should be replaced by a well defined policy and approach which all Barbadians can recognize to be in the best interest of Barbados; and we will be willing to support this because we will know what it is all about and we will also be able to know who is permitted to come in and what benefits are likely to accrue from such an immigration policy. I personally do not consider this as an act to raise taxes because it is doubtful how much you can really raise by this measure, unless you are going to have an open door policy and have every Tom, Dick and Harry come into the country and so collect money that way; and we really cannot afford that.

There is one criticism that I would like to make. In the Budget Speech the Prime Minister said fees would be reduced for a re-application

for a work permit. I really do not see the need for that, because if you are going to do that, it is quite likely that the amount of money you expect to gather will be reduced, for many of the people who will be affected by this measure are already here. And if they are going to reapply for a work permit and you are going to give them a reduction, then you are reducing the amount of money you could very well obtain from the measure. I hope we may reconsider this matter and consider work permits as work permits. If you want to be here then be prepared to pay the full fee. I do not see any reason to be apologetic about asking somebody who has been here already and reapplying for a work permit to pay the full fee; there is nothing to apologise about. I do not see any need for a reduction in fees for anyone making a second application for a work permit.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am very much obliged to all hon. members for the speeches they have made especially the Leader of the Opposition for giving me the opportunity to set out the true facts regarding the Guyanese gentleman to whom he referred.

Dealing with his speech first: it appears that a young man from Guyana was seen in Barbados in the company of known criminals. The Royal Barbados Police Force elicited the information that this Guyanese was a well known choke and robber from Guyana and that it was the opinion of the Guyana Police that he had come to Barbados to practise his larcenous and brutal profession. It was considered by the Royal Barbados Police that he was conspiring with certain Barbadian thieves of less sophisticated habits to bring to Barbados some of the choke and rob techniques that have disfigured that country for some years. The Leader of the Opposition should be congratulated for his speedy, legal work in the melange of unfortunate events that followed. He has told you what happened after the writ of *habeas corpus* was applied for, but he did not tell you how the writ came to be applied for.

It appears that a sergeant of the Royal Barbados Police Force, forgetful of the provisions of the Royal Barbados Police Act of 1975, purported to revoke this man's permission to be in Barbados and had him arrested. The Leader of the Opposition must know this. If he does not mind my saying so, he may be confusing himself, because that revocation was clearly illegal. I concede that the man was improperly arrested and in my opinion he has a case.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: At no time did I know that; the first revocation I knew was the one you made. I was not instructed, informed or told that there was a purported revocation before yours. As there is a God in Heaven, that is the truth.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member must be mistaken, Sir, because my revocation was lawful. You could not apply for a *habeas corpus* arising out of your revocation. The *habeas corpus* was applied for. (*Aside*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the Opposition please contain himself.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The *habeas corpus* was applied for — I myself am getting too vehement, Sir — arising out of the revocation by the Police Act — without the knowledge, consent or advice of the responsible Minister — of this man's visitors permit be in Barbados; and his arrest was in my opinion unlawful; and in my opinion the *habeas corpus* must have succeeded. If you wish my opinion; it may not be worth very much in these days now I am no longer practising and they have different rules down there; but, I believe, uniquely in the House, I have appeared in a *habeas corpus* matter, namely the case of Carmen Bayley against the Queen. The *habeas corpus* was excellent, and in great alarm certain persons approached me — and the Leader of the Opposition is extremely well informed when he said that it was a Saturday morning, as I was in my car. He is extremely well informed; I am impressed by all the circumstances. However, he should also know that the Attorney General and senior police officers had spoken to me before hand; he would not know that, I think. But I was approached and the facts were set out. I said a very wrong thing had been done; the police cannot revoke permission to be in Barbados.

I was then informed — and it turned out correctly — that the man was anxious to leave Barbados. In the circumstances I revoked his permission to stay and I understand that he left Barbados voluntarily, and this has been confirmed by the Leader of the Opposition. But I would underline this — there is a big difference between revoking permission to stay and deportation. No order for the man's removal from Barbados was ever made and the man was at liberty to apply to the Minister responsible for immigration to be allowed to remain in Barbados while the case was pending. We have given such permission to other persons, and we have given permission to persons who

have been made to leave Barbados to return to conduct a law suit.

The record of the previous Government was a little spotty in this direction. Miss Carmen Bayley had an expulsion order served on her, and it was only the fact of the aeroplane in which she was sitting happened to be searched in respect of a bomb threat, that it was possible for her to stay in Barbados and have her case fully ventilated through the court. On the other hand, Mr. Leopold Tepper, the proprietor of Tropicana Hotel, was excluded from the Island and indeed dragged across the tarmac into an aeroplane, and physically and forcibly removed from the Island; upon representation being made — I think it was to Mr. Philip Greaves — he was allowed to return to the Island for the purpose of conducting his law suit against the Government, and I am happy to say that I believe it was in the end settled to the satisfaction of all the parties (I see the premises against which the law suit arose appear to have been tidied up in a way that seemed to satisfy everybody).

I would just like to say this; we have no intention of having that sort of spotty record. If somebody has a law suit, they will be allowed to stay in Barbados to pursue it. In my very humble opinion, the young man went to Guyana and did not stay to obtain the benefit of the *habeas corpus* application, or the possibility of false arrest, if you want my opinion, but he did so voluntarily. He was never ordered to leave Barbados. I would not have made a deportation order, and indeed I was not asked to make a deportation order.
1.35 p.m.

He did so voluntarily, he was never ordered to leave Barbados. I would not have made a deportation order, and indeed I was not even asked to make a deportation order by any of the Authorities, not while his case was pending, especially when I saw it was going to be conducted by a legal luminary of the quality of the Leader of the Opposition. I would have been very glad to see him having an opportunity of conducting a successful *habeas corpus* application in respect of a matter such as this, especially since mine was only partially successful, and such success as I might have achieved in the Carmen Bailey case, indeed she also frustrated me by voluntarily leaving the island. I lay some emphasis on the verb "frustrate" in this particular matter, because I believe that the young lady is the person referred to by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central when he indicates the services

which she rendered to three politicians one evening. Certainly he may be absolutely assured that it is not within my knowledge that any politician on this side of the House, in or out of Parliament on this side of the House, was alleged to have benefited from these services, but the hon. member's stricture is mistaken. As far as I know, hers was not a case where the services rendered to politicians enabled her to stay in the island, I thought hers was a case where the services allegedly rendered — well, I heard they were two, two and a half — politicians were responsible for her being removed from the island. I was not aware that it helped her with the immigration authorities. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Three politicians, but two and a half men).

Indeed, it is undoubtedly of some significance that when the subpoenas to give evidence were served on two Cabinet Ministers, to give evidence in her case, that within 12 hours of those subpoenas being served she was under arrest and being taken to District "C" Police Station for concealment from her lawyers so that she could be smuggled out of the island without anybody being aware. But the other complaints made by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central are very well taken, and I would like to thank him for ventilating some of these matters. In many ways it is easier sometimes if a member of the Opposition raises these matters for them to be dealt with frankly and openly, because at least we know that they are matters of general concern and that you, the Minister, are not travelling down a track that nobody else has considered worth investigating or exploring.

On the question of the medical certificate, the hon. member is on good ground when he says that some doctors just give a certificate "I find this applicant to be in good health." He is not on good ground in assuming that those certificates are conclusive. Many such certificates do come up, but I would like to give the hon. member an assurance that the full medical form is still in use and is closely perused by all concerned. It is a very delicate subject, but I do not think it is one which should be kept under cover, and it is the subject of Venereal Disease and Venereal Diseases in a transmissible form, particularly syphilis. I am very concerned over the number of applications for residence in this country that come from persons who have a positive response to the V.D.R.L. tests. I am very concerned to find that women who have become pregnant in this country and are applying, and part of their medical history is that they are now pregnant, also have a medical

history that they are very heavily contaminated with syphilis and other venereal diseases. This is something which is occupying the attention of the Immigration Department.

For example, I was particularly concerned to find — and I must say with great regret but honesty — but all these cases are of CARICOM nationals, it was great distress that I found in the case of one that she was an employee at a restaurant with a positive V.D.R.L. I was very concerned about that, and that particular case has now been sent to the Ministry of Health with a direction to enquire how she got the health certificate to work in a restaurant in the first place, and I hope there will be some tightening up as a result, but I am even more concerned to find that persons who have these handwritten certificates from some medical practitioners, when upon being asked for more specific details we observe that their form has a positive V.D.R.L. on it. In one such case indeed I hadn't taken note that the certificate from the practitioner was not dated, and he did write back to indicate that she had been examined, found to have a positive V.D.R.L., was treated, and he then gave the certificate that she was in good health. I suppose this is all right. I will have to be medically advised as to whether you can give somebody an immigration examination, find they have a positive V.D.R.L., give them a few shots of penicillin, and then the next week say that they are all right.

Dr. CADDLE: If you want an answer now, I could give you. If a person has a positive V.D.R.L., or a V.D.R.L. which is reactive, and you treat them, then you should have repeated checks on the V.D.R.L. until they become negative and it takes time. In some cases rather than become negative you find it tends to go back up, so you have to re-treat them.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am very obliged to the hon. member. This is exactly the point which has occupied the Immigration Department, that in fact these people with very reactive — I mean a factor of 4 or 5 — reactivity at that level I believe...(*Asides*). Well, the doctors will have to advise me on that, but I do not think that it has ever been the policy of any Government to accommodate persons who can transmit — because I am speaking unfortunately mostly of young women, occasionally young men, but mostly young women.

Mr. SPEAKER: Young men and women who come from abroad.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Who come from abroad. I do not think it is the policy of the Government to leave in circulation in Barbados young men and young women with venereal diseases in a transmissible form, and we are very conscious of this. The other diseases for which a lookout is made in the Department, Tuberculosis and so on, they never seem to appear at all. (A VOICE: What about leprosy)? I have not seen any leprosy yet either, but these are looked out for in the Department. I suppose the V.D.R.L. covers syphilis, leprosy, yaws, perhaps other diseases, but all of these are investigated, and the hon. member may rest assured that the present immigration policy has in no way changed from the past.

As far as housing is concerned, this also is a factor which is taken into account, but I will ask the hon. member to consider this. Applications for residence as such generally come from people who already have somewhere to live. In other words, their contribution to exacerbating the housing problem has already taken place. At CARICOM level, these are people who already live in a country village, many of them indeed own their own houses, there seems to be great thrift among the young women particularly I see come from St. Vincent and St. Lucia, they seem to be very quick to save up and get a house and get somewhere to live, especially if they have children, and we are speaking of persons who not only have somewhere to live but who probably own the place where they live. At the other end of the scale, the place where we are keeping a very careful watch, is permission given to persons allowed to reside in Barbados by reason of wealth, people who have the means to maintain themselves in Barbados, who are not allowed to work, but who are allowed to live here in retirement, and hon. members may care to note that although the only test laid down in the Act is a test of wealth, the Immigration Department does in its discretion not encourage rich people who are in their thirties, for example, to live here, because we do not believe that rich young men or young women will come here and be content to sit down and do nothing.

1.45 p.m.

So really I am thinking of retired persons, and from time to time we do make enquiries whether there appears to be any increase in the rent of the typical three-bedroom bungalow in a good area that you would expect these retired people to live in, or the typical semi-holiday villa on the West Coast which, in all probability, would have been built with outside money

anyhow, and may always have been in the ownership of persons from outside.

We keep a careful watch on this and we expect that when the provisions in the Landlord and Tenant (Amendment) Act become law, requiring that all properties rented out be registered with the Collector of Taxes, we expect that information will then be available to Government of the amount and the demand for rented accommodation at the higher income level which will enable us to judge whether you let in this retired English couple or retired Canadian couple. We may be stopping some Permanent Secretary or Member of Parliament from getting a house to rent or to buy as the case may be.

We are trying to look at the entire spectrum of Housing, and the impact that immigration has on Housing. At the moment I am inclined to think that the more expensive house for the better off immigrant makes a positive contribution to Housing because I think that houses are being built to accommodate that type of demand. I think that the cost of houses in Barbados has increased because there are people from outside who want houses; and it is not only one house being built. People will build a little group of houses in the hope of renting them out to the banks and so on; but it is within the experience of all of us that they do not get the amount of foreign tenants that they think they will, and one or two become available for rent to Barbadians. So we do not think that at the top there is too much housing pressure.

The Asians — I was not sure if the hon. member was speaking only of persons from the Indian sub-continent or whether he was also including persons from Arab countries when he categorised the situation with Asians. There does not appear to me to be so much pressure from persons of Indian origin to come to Barbados at the present time. Speaking off hand, all the persons that I can remember, who appear to be of Indian origin and wish to reside, work or settle in Barbados, with the exception of those from Trinidad or Guyana, from what I can recall all have come here to get married to a Barbadian. They are not many. These are recent applications. In other words, I am talking of a handful. There are a certain number of persons of Indian origin who want to come from Trinidad and especially Guyana; but I do not think that the hon. member is categorising them as Asians. They present a particular problem in that there seems to be some pressure to escape from Guyana, and Barbados is a very desirable

haven. Long may it remain a desirable haven for people to come and live. (Cheers).

We do, however, get a certain amount of pressure from people of Lebanese and Syrian origin who come here to engage in commercial activities. This is a matter which is sensitive at the moment, and certain directives are going to be imposed. It may become necessary indeed to have a separate and specialised check kept on the movement of all persons with passports into Barbados. We are not necessarily trying to visit any police state activities on anybody; but as a result of certain investigations made, it is revealed that Syrians and Lebanese come here to act as itinerant salesmen and pedlars without meeting their tax responsibility, without applying for the Itinerant Traders Licence or paying it, without fulfilling any of the normal requirements for a work permit.

I will give a few examples, Mr. Speaker. One man who has been here five years is really going to be given permission, once he can settle with the tax authorities, to remain here. He is now a national of Guyana, and he comes under our general attitude towards CARICOM citizens, once he brings himself within the law. The first year he came here he paid the \$500 itinerant traders tax. He has never paid it since. On one form he is said to have been resident here five years; but the Commissioner of Inland Revenue has a tax return for only the year 1975 and says that his information does not indicate that he had any income in Barbados in any other year.

Obviously there is something wrong. The man paid \$500 to be a pedlar; so it is impossible to my mind to think with ordinary commonsense that he did not acquire an income to cover that \$500 and a good deal more. The man has a car, \$50,000 in a fixed deposit account in the U.S.A., \$20,000 in a fixed account in the Bank of Nova Scotia and some funds in St. Vincent.

Now, to my mind it is desirable to keep him in Barbados and get some money from him — to get him to spend some of his money here. Apart from other considerations, if he has made it here we could at least encourage him to buy a house and put a bit of the money into circulation: but that is the type of case you get.

I will also say this, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members who have had responsibilities in the area may draw their own conclusions — none of this group of Syrians that we investigated

appeared to have a file at the Immigration Department at all. Their dealings are with the Immigration Officers. We get another man who would come in. He is clearly a salesman. He has a car registered. He drives about the country. We realise that this is a very bad case; and we order him to leave the country. A list comes from him — four foolscap sheets showing how many people owed him — and this from a man who is being ordered to leave the island. As far as I am concerned, I very much hope that the good people do not pay him.

In any case there will be legislation to ensure that people cannot collect money under these circumstances. In the case of the Lebanese we know that some of these are being exploited. They are encouraged to come here and work for paltry wages. We have had examples of many cases, and we have had to give one or two compassionate treatments. Two Syrians came here — and we are having these matters checked out in Lebanon — one man was a Christian living in a village which was put to the sword by Muslims.

1.55 p.m.

He is a genuine refugee, and he has come here to be employed. We have evidence that persons, who are in this position, receive very low wages indeed. The Barbados Workers' Union should look into some of the wages paid to these Syrians and Lebanese compared to the wages paid to Barbadians in many areas. We have two applications, one of which was mentioned in the Cabinet, from a young girl from a CARICOM Island. She has been in Barbados for many years and she now wants residential status here. In the course of our investigations we observed that her application was signed by her employer, and we discovered that she is working full-time with a Syrian gentleman for \$13.00 a week. We wrote and asked him to confirm that \$13.00 a week was the salary he was paying her and he confirmed it. These are some of the things that arise in the course of dealing with immigration matters.

Now, I am outlining this matter at greater length than it has been outlined to the House because former Immigration Ministers did not last very long. I would like to pay tribute to Senator O'Brien Trotman who looks after immigration matters, who reads the files, investigates the matters and works closely in all these matters with the Department and myself, for the great vision he has brought to bear on the work which he has done in respect of immigration. It is not necessary for me to deal with every file, and I have delegated certain routine matters to be dealt with by the Parliamentary Secretary.

Now, the Parliamentary Secretary will deal with applications for Work Permits, or applications from people who want to come to Barbados to undergo certain courses of training, and those applications will no longer come to my desk. Those things are delegated to be dealt with on an overall signature. A lot of work is involved in an immigration matter because it is not a straightforward problem. It is a problem of bringing immigrants into our society and so on. This is certainly a nonpartisan matter, and everybody in the House of Assembly should be interested in making sure that there are proper guidelines for importing certain skills and that immigrants should be given justice in their labour and social problems in this country.

Our Party has set down September, 1975 as the date on which persons who arrived here from CARICOM countries will be treated with the greatest generosity. Those who arrived after that date will be faced with much stricter conditions and a much more careful watch will be kept on them. There will be social justice to those who came here before September 1975 and stricter conditions or regulations for those who came in since that date or who now seek to come here. I do not know if there are any other points that I can possibly deal with, but I am sure they will be mentioned in Committee. I would not like to delay the House. If there are any points raised, I will endeavour to deal with them.

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

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask Your Honour to suspend the sitting to enable hon. members to have lunch. I regret that I omitted to give notice of a Bill. I am giving notice now that the Leader of the House is going to ask for leave to give notice of the Bill.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it is now two minutes after two o'clock and, accordingly I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

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.

2.05 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

QUESTION RE TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 19 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:—

To ask the Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport: Will the Minister state the number of persons whose employment in the Public Service or by Statutory Boards or Statutory Corporations has been terminated since 2nd September, 1976?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 19 is as follows:

"I have no responsibility for termination of employment of persons in the Public Service or Statutory Boards or Statutory Corporations generally.

However, in the case of the 4 Statutory Boards for which I am responsible, only the National Stadium Corporation and the Child Care Board were involved in termination of employment of members of their staffs. The employment of 38 persons was terminated — 2 having attained the age of 65 years, and the other 36 because the job of weeding and painting for which they were specifically employed by the Stadium Corporation was completed."

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would tell us whether or not the Department of Labour keeps statistics on the employment situation in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a supplementary you are asking?

Mr. GREAVES: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Would the Minister agree that whether or not he is responsible for all the Statutory Boards or otherwise, as Minister of Labour he should be in a position to answer the question as to dismissals of persons employed on Statutory Boards and the Public Service?

Mr. SPEAKER: You are asking about dismissals.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As Minister of Labour.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if I were to answer the Leader of the Opposition, in the Ministries for which I am responsible, there were 38 persons at the National Corporation employed to get the Stadium ready for the Carifta Games. The Corporation during that time employed 38 persons for the purpose of speeding up production and they were engaged for a very short time. When that job was completed their services were terminated. The services of two of the 38 persons were terminated because they had attained the age of 65.

With respect to the question about being Minister of Labour and responsible for dismissals, I do not hire neither do I dismiss, therefore I am not in a position to say who has been dismissed from who has not. I can tell you that the 258 workers fired from the Parks and Beaches is well known not only to this Assembly but to the entire public.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister state as Minister of Labour whether or not he is in possession of information relative to the number of persons whose employment has been terminated from Statutory Boards and Statutory Corporations?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the answer to this is going to be fairly long, and I do not know if the hon. member would bear with me. I will give you the whole run down since you want to know how many were dismissed. There were one police, one security guard, one watchman, one key punch operator, one porter and one nursing assistant. All the appointments referred to above were terminated as a result of disciplinary procedure; the others were terminated on medical grounds. That is the Police Department.

In the Ministry of External Affairs there were Mr. Maurice King, former Ambassador, Mr. E. D. Mottley, former Consul General and Mrs. Cyralene Gale, former High Commissioner. A Mr. Darwin Clarke submitted a letter of resignation on 27th July, 1976, and it took effect from 1st November, 1976.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Is the Minister of Labour suggesting that there are only two Statutory Boards in the whole of Barbados from which he has given the long answer?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I take it that the hon. member might have been bored if I were to take up the time of this Honourable Chamber with the amount of Statutory Boards, because there is the Attorney General's Office, the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education, and I did not want to bore the hon. member for St. Lucy with those figures, because I know he would hate to hear about the 22 cleaners at the Transport Board who were taken on in the month of August, and the 258 persons taken on at Parks and Beaches is only soup being warmed up.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Would the Minister agree that his answer is totally inadequate and not an answer to the question of the hon. member for St. Lucy since he gave snatches as he went along?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, my answer may be totally inadequate as far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, but that is only an opinion expressed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the Minister agree that the answer which he has given that he is....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, how can the Prime Minister who is responsible for Cabinet and partly responsible for the answering of questions ask the Minister of Labour a question constitutionally. What he could do is that if the Minister is in difficulty, he can help him to answer. In the whole of my life in England it is unheard of that the Prime Minister can get up and ask one of his Ministers, a question in Parliament. It is improper, unparliamentary and not done in the British Parliament, and he knows it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Suppose I am going to ask about one of my constituents.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister is a member of this Honourable Chamber.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The Speaker is a member. Can he ask a question from his Chair?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Speaker is the Speaker. Will the Minister agree that his answer that he has no ministerial responsibility for hiring or firing anybody is a complete answer to this nonsensical question?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I support the views of the Prime Minister. However, I would like to treat the other members on the other side with the contempt which I think they should be treated with.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister did indicate there were some members on the Child Care Board who were dismissed and he did mention that the dismissals were due to old age or disciplinary grounds. I wonder if he would say how many from the Child Care Board were dismissed and what were the reasons for dismissals.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, there were two persons whose services were terminated at the Child Care Board because they had attained the age of 65 years. They were two watchmen.

Mr. SPEAKER: That brings us to the end of Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of items under Private Members' Business and the Government is quite willing to allow for such if the members of the Opposition so desire.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Private Members' Business time.
3.00 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, under Private Members' Business, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the first Order of Private Members' Business.

The question that Order No. 2 be the first Order of Private Members' Business was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that bringing a Resolution of this nature to this Honourable Chamber is like trying to indicate to people who are already convinced of the

need for ideas expressed in the Resolution, and I do not consider that I have to advance any lengthy argument to impress upon this Honourable Chamber the importance of the Resolution. Let me say, however, that it has been recognized for some years now that in the context of our development in Barbados, urban, rural and suburban, that parks play an important part in having a well-developed and co-ordinated programme of recreational facilities which are available to the people of this country. You are aware that some years ago, the former Government took a decision and implemented the development of Farley Hill as a national park. This Resolution seeks a development, further north of Farley Hill, to be more specific, at Archers Bay in St. Lucy. I am sure that hon. members have from time to time visited this area and recognized the beauty which exists there and the potential for development of this area. I think it can be said that a large number of people have indicated that it is an area which could be developed not only for the use of the residents of the parish of St. Lucy but also for the residents of the adjoining parishes of St. Andrew and beyond. One knows, for example, that people from all over Barbados visit this particular area, and I am sure that greater enjoyment and appreciation for the area would be had if the area were developed into a national park, and this Resolution seeks to impress upon the Government the need for developing this particular area. Needless to say, I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that there have been a number of areas earmarked by the last Government for development, and this area is one of them, and I do not think that the present Government would not want to develop this area simply because it was an area earmarked for development by the last administration. We know that the present Government is famous for going back on things which have been more substantially agreed on than this particular one, but this is in the interest of the country from the point of view of the whole development; and this would quite naturally, Mr. Speaker, fit into the general plan and policy which I am pretty sure does not rate a high priority as far as the present Government is concerned, but certainly is part and parcel of the whole concept of rural development; and when we talk in terms of rural development we are thinking in terms of a situation where we try to develop facilities in the rural areas which would bring additional enjoyment and recreation to the people in these particular areas. And as I said before, Archers Bay in St. Lucy would provide this kind of recreation if the facilities are properly developed. I am sure you would be

aware, Sir, that the Sunday Advocate-News from time to time carries articles by a person who is considered as a leading conservationist in this country and who has had something to say about the development of certain areas of land — Captain Hutt — and this is an area which has been identified by him as suitable for development. So I am of the view that this would serve a number of purposes. In the first instance, it would satisfy the people of the North, especially St. Lucy, and I am sure the present Government, if I may use the words of the present Attorney General somewhat earlier in this session, would not leave the people of St. Lucy behind, and that they would be looking after that constituency. So I hope he will be in a position to influence his colleagues to do something about this particular matter. Secondly, it would be in keeping with the general national concept of developing parks around the Island, and provide additional facilities for the people who are residents in Barbados and also visitors to the country. In the development, if the concept is accepted, there are a number of things which will have to be done. For example, there will be a need for the widening and proper alignment of the road leading into the area, and other developmental plans to be put into operation. But in the final analysis a well developed park in this area would be, I am sure, to the benefit and enjoyment of all Barbadians. So without further ado, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Honourable Chamber adopt this Resolution.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this Resolution I would like to congratulate my colleague for bringing this Resolution to this Honourable House.
3.10 p.m.

At first blush it might appear that because he represents the constituency of St. Lucy that the Resolution is primarily a parochial Resolution, but a slight and indeed not too deep reflection would soon indicate that the Resolution is one of national importance.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of repeating the obvious, we in Barbados live on a very small piece of land, of only — it continues to be said — 166 square miles. I am told it is going to be increased by a few square feet when the Deep Water Harbour is completed, but by and large, Mr. Speaker, I think we all are agreed that our country is not a large country, and for those reasons it is even more important that the present and future generations of Barbados should have the opportunity of existing in an environment which is not only conducive to the

earning of a living, but an environment that is conducive to the promotion of good health. I believe enough persons, many eminent persons, have written on the requirement for recreation for the human being if that human being is to develop and perform to his maximum potentialities. In this context, I am particularly gratified when I go around Barbados in seeing the work that has been done by the Parks and Beaches Commission. Immediately down the road from us, we have Trevor's Way, and in the immediate vicinity where Pelican Park is located, and I think that all Barbadians who have to journey along that road, and who remember what it used to look like, must feel happy that a certain degree of pleasure comes easily to mind as one passes what is now, I believe, the Princess Alice Highway.

That is only one indication of the kinds of joy which can come to people merely from observing the natural beauty which is Barbados. I remember some time in Minneapolis, I think it was, when the temperature was somewhere in the twenties, and a lady walked up to me and asked, "How can you people who live in such beautiful climates be in a place like this at a time like this?" Having explained to her, Mr. Speaker, that I was only doing my work, and having indicated that I would prefer to be in the climate of my birth, it occurred to me that we have a tendency to assume that the beauties of Barbados are here to be preserved, and indeed reserved, only for those visitors who come to our shores and who come in the guise of tourists. But I believe of much more importance to us as a community is the necessity, the absolute necessity, and I dare say on a non-partisan basis, for us in this Hon. House of Assembly, and indeed all Barbadians to seek wherever possible to preserve those areas that by themselves bring sheer joy to the human soul.

As my colleague has said, there is hardly anyone in Barbados who has not enjoyed the privilege of being in Archer's Bay, whether it was night or day. There is hardly anyone who has indeed travelled from the northernmost tip of Barbados around the east until one gets to the southernmost tip of Barbados who could fail to be impressed by the natural beauty not only of the shoreline, but of the greenery which seems to be constantly in evidence in Barbados all year round. Mr. Speaker, it might come as a surprise to many people that there are many young children living in the suburban part of Barbados who have not yet had the opportunity to go out into the country and visit places such as Archer's Bay, and I do not believe a long

speech is necessary and desirable to impress the point that it is vital that all our people have the opportunity to do so. Not so long ago, I think the last Bank Holiday, I had the privilege of being part of an excursion from the constituency which I have the honour to represent. We had 17 buses that went out to Archer's Bay, and when we got there we found that there were a number of other excursions and private people who had gone out to this location, and the attitude of those thousands of Barbadians who had gathered there was, I would suggest, in stark contrast to the kind of hustle and bustle and the resultant tensions which are sometimes apparent in the environs of Bridgetown, not to say the environs of the Public Buildings from time to time.

I believe it is necessary from time to time for you, Mr. Speaker, and for members of the House of Assembly to move away from the trials and tribulations which are part and parcel of our daily lives, and I think we must have places such as Archer's Bay to which we can repair. I can think, for example, of no better way for a family to spend a quite afternoon than going to one of the national parks which so far have been created in Barbados, and I think added to Farley Hill where, I must say, that a fantastic job has been done by those persons who are responsible in the Parks and Beaches Commission, if we add to Farley Hill this area of Archer's Bay, I believe that the present generations and generations many, many years to come will pay homage to the Government for having taken the initiative so, I think fortuitously provided by my colleague to make this yet another of those beauty spots of which Barbados can be proud.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not believe it needs experts from the Caribbean Conservation Association, or the Barbados National Trust, or indeed large speeches to make what is indeed an obvious point. I am happy, and I hope that the Government will find it possible to agree to be happy to support this Resolution.

I beg to second this Resolution.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, tourism has made some rather serious inroads on the recreational facilities of Barbados over the long years during which it has been promoted vehemently in Barbados. Sometimes we get an idea, or impression, that Barbadians are being reduced to the standard of second-class citizens before the onslaught of the tourists. When you look around Barbados you will see that a number of areas where Barbadians used to

congregate on holidays have now been developed as areas for the tourists, very much to the exclusion of local Barbadians, although this might not have been the original intention. One only has to look at the Needham's Point area, Shot Hall where the Aquatic Club used to be, Graves End, Sandy Lane and many other areas in Barbados which due to the development for the tourists have now become out of reach to the local Barbadians.

In addition to this, you find that erosion along the coast of Barbados is making inroads also into the recreational areas of this country. Go to River Bay and you will see the effects of erosion, go to Cove Bay in St. Lucy again and you will see the effects of erosion, and these were two areas where Barbadians used to visit on Bank Holidays and other occasions. The point which I want to stress here, unless we take a serious view of what remains of the existing recreational facilities for Barbadians and make an effort to reserve them for Barbadians, it will not be very long when Barbadians will find it difficult to gain access to beaches and to other places adjoining the beaches. They also might find it very difficult to have the type of recreation or leisure which they now enjoy, and in the future they might find it very costly to find or to obtain leisure.

3.20 p.m.

It is against the background of the statement in the Press that the Government intends to resist the diversion of the road at Heywoods which to me is a welcome one because this is an area which is being used by Barbadians displaced from other areas due to the development of the Tourist Industry; and it would be a shame if again the development of the Tourist Industry forces Barbadians out of this area where they now seek leisure or seek to enjoy themselves.

When we are thinking in terms of resources of recreational facilities for Barbadians out of what now remains, it is obvious that Archers Bay is one of these areas. It must be maintained. There is another part of St. John, Bath, and there may be a few others about the island which would have to be maintained for the benefit of Barbadians.

I think that now is the time to indicate to all and sundry that it is Government's intention to reserve these areas before some entrepreneur, some enterprising businessman, sees these areas and acquires them and then they are lost to the Barbadian public, and the Barbados Government

has to look for large sums of money to compensate the owners.

When one looks at the general problems concerning Barbados nowadays, one may have to accept that this may not necessarily be a priority at this time; but you will have at the same time, Mr. Chairman, to think also that it is worthwhile in the interest of all to have a clearly define policy of which people will be aware, and which will prevent people from moving into areas and doing things to the embarrassment of the Government or to the detriment of the Barbadian people as a whole.

I would believe that it is not beyond the capacity or ability of the present Government to initiate such a policy which would bring about the development of Archers Bay for the benefit, not only for the people of St. Lucy, but of Barbadians as a whole in the development of recreational facilities in this country. The development of a country is a very serious matter; and sometimes one has to query what is the overall plan for development.

In some of the areas, where you find Barbadians kept out or very often inconvenienced, it is natural that the Barbadian would feel irritated or annoyed to see that the type of development that is taking place has excluded him; and therefore he may view this type of development with grim dissatisfaction or dismissing it as no development at all.

We do not want this type of thing to continue for any length of time, and we have to ensure that all development that takes place in Barbados embraces the Barbadian to its fullest. There is no point developing an area in any part of Barbados to the exclusion of Barbadians and only for the satisfaction of the tourists. We have to ensure that whatever is made available in this country. Barbadians are free to participate to the fullest at all times and enjoy the facilities of this development.

Sir, I hope that the Government will give some clear indication as to what are its intentions towards retaining the remaining facilities for Barbadians, bearing in mind the encroachments which the Tourist Industry has already made and continues to make on these facilities. I would like to repeat that it is not beyond the ability of the present Government to indicate in clear unambiguous terms what is the policy particularly embracing the site at Archers Bay.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Archers Bay in St. Lucy is an area just east of Salmon

area. It is about a mile away from the Crab Hill Police Station. I suppose that that is the area to which the hon. member for St. Lucy is referring. His Resolution calling on the Government to take steps to develop this area is not a bad Resolution; but what I cannot understand is the motive behind this Resolution.

The member for St. Lucy was in this Hon. Chamber since 1971. He did not make a speech or move a Resolution or any such thing. It seems to me that the constituency of St. Lucy did not exist during 1971-76. All of a sudden we are hearing about sports facilities for St. Lucy, schools for St. Lucy, roads for St. Lucy and parks for St. Lucy. The hon. member wants everything for St. Lucy; but, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to planning on a national basis, we have got to sit down and decide. We have got to have complete plans and ideas. The Government must have priorities, and they must have available the necessary finance to carry out any such projects.

Therefore, we in this Government are not looking at any particular area, at any one area. We are generally concerned with Barbados, the entire 166 square miles. We are aware that there are rural developments which have to be made; but we, as a responsible Government cannot take one particular area and think in terms of developing it. We have to have an in depth study of playing fields, of recreational facilities, of where we are going to place schools and of where we are going to build roads. We cannot just build roads or put up schools or playing fields before we carry out proper studies.

This was one of the failures of the former Government because they did not sit down and do their homework. They could find money to spend on things like Bath. They could throw away the taxpayers money. We are not prepared to do this. We are aware that there are areas in St. Andrew, in St. George, in St. Michael, in St. Peter and other areas in Barbados that need developing. The member for St. Lucy should be aware that some time last year when his Government was in power they carried out a survey into the whole Archers Bay area. If he was not informed, as the member for St. Lucy, it is no fault of ours. I see two former Ministers of Sport, and whose responsibilities included the development of parks and playing fields over there. He was a member of the party, and if it did not suit them to disclose to him what plans they had for St. Lucy, that it his hard luck.

3.30 p.m.

The plans were on the drawing card, but it may be news to him. He did not ask, as I said, during the last five years or when his Government was in power, about Archer's Bay. The position is that Archer's Bay is part of an area to the north of Barbados which my Government is looking into. There have been reports which reveal that it would be ideally suited for a National Park, but we cannot go ahead and develop a National Park just like that because most of the money which we would have liked to use is not available because it was thrown away by the former administration. Why did they take the Parks and Beaches workers, just before the election campaign, down to St. Lucy and start clearing Archer's Bay for recreational facilities? Why did not the member for St. Lucy ask the Minister responsible, his namesake, to develop the Archer's Bay area? Everything he wants down there.

What I would say, Mr. Speaker, is we are looking at all the areas. We are conscious that there is need for proper recreational facilities and, in due course, when the financial and the economic position of the economy improves we will not only take Archer's Bay and the north or the south, but we will carry out a feasibility study to see how many areas we can develop for the children of this country. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the position of this Government quite clear. We are aware of the needs not only of the people in St. Lucy, but of all the eleven parishes and the 24 constituencies, and we will undertake such plans and schemes after we have carefully carried out a survey and have planned properly so that we can put down proper monuments for the generations to enjoy long after we have been removed from office.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether any other hon. members want to speak, but if there is no other hon. member who wants to speak on the matter, I would like to wind up the debate.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution by the member for St. Lucy my colleague says....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Lucy.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member for St. Lucy, Sir. My colleague said it is a good Resolution. Well, it is a good Resolution in the light that it has been referred to in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. You will observe on page 10:

"Establish parks along the undeveloped coastlines of St. Philip, St. John, St. Joseph, the Pico Teneriffe area in St. Peter and St. Lucy."

We would not vote against this Resolution and that is clearly understood. We are not going to vote against it, but let me also warn that if the member believes for one single moment that he is going to scramble up a piece of paper, look in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, copy what is in it and then come in here to ask this Government to do something immediately for his personal aggrandisement, he has another thought coming.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is proper to suggest that...

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: For his political well being, Sir. I withdraw that, Sir. It is not for his own personal aggrandisement, but for his political relief or to put his heart at ease politically. I know he cannot go to Rome, but I hope he goes to Geneva; therefore, when he is going I would like his mind to be at ease. It is the policy of this Government not only to look at Archer's Bay, but we went further. His colleague on the other side or those who represent St. Peter would have the right to come in here and bring a Resolution of this nature if we did not set out our own guidelines as to what we proposed to do for the people of Barbados. We are not now concerned with the people who live in St. Lucy, St. John or St. Peter. We went in St. John to develop the coastline because this is in the interest of all Barbadians. I am not concerned with the tourists at this particular point. Of course, they will assist us with some kind of foreign exchange, but I am concerned with the actual development of Barbados whereby the Barbadians themselves can enjoy a part of the scenic beauty of this country.

Now, when the hon. member for St. Lucy comes in here with a dogeared Resolution copied out of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party and trying to convey that he is beating the gun and is so interested in St. Lucy, when for five years I sat in here and did not hear — I can count the number of times he even got up on a point of order and has never asked for anything for the parish of St. Lucy. I cannot recall anything about that. What I can recall, Sir, was that there was a Resolution regarding the Throne Speech for five years. You were on the Opposition bench at the time, and when we called on the member to get up and address the Chamber on it he would not move.

All of a sudden he knows what is to be done in St. Lucy from what should not be done. This Government is prepared to do everything possible for all of the constituencies in this country within its financial limitations.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that, with the wastage of money over the past five years, I believe that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance will have to be a political, financial wizard to be able to carry out a lot of his plans and pay off all of the outstanding debts and commitments which the former administration have left behind them, I believe that with the help of God we are going to succeed. We are not afraid of detractors. Let those who wish to abuse the Dean of Barbados, the Business Houses and the newspapers, when they are put in the scales, remember they are going to be found wanting again.

I can assure you, Sir, that we on this side are going to support this Resolution. It does not affect the planning of this Party or the Government because this is within the scope of the Government's planning and it was specifically set out in our Manifesto for development in the parish of St. Lucy. He does not have to run in here with a Resolution to have Archer's Bay improved. This is what we have planned to do, and this is what we are going to do. When we are going to do it in St. Lucy I cannot commit the Government to that. I cannot promise him when the Government is going to do that, but I am quite sure that it is the plan of the Barbados Labour Party to do whatever they can within their financial limitations to make sure that the scenic beauty of Barbados will be there for all Barbadians and visitors to this country to enjoy.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to intervene and I would rather keep quiet, but I just want to put the records straight on one or two matters. I will support this matter and I do not even want to say Resolution. I support it as a measure of the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto, and the idea is that the Opposition has seen the necessity to prod the Government to implement aspects of their Manifesto. It is upon that basis that I am supporting this Resolution. The hon. member for St. Lucy made a statement when he was introducing this Resolution that the former Government had selected Archer's Bay as one of the areas for development.

3.40 p.m.

I would certainly like to learn from him where I can find on what file that Archer's Bay

was selected. I know for sure that I have seen a number of properties which were selected to be purchased, but I have never seen Archer's Bay recorded on that list, and I would like to know where the hon. member for St. Lucy got his information from that Archer's Bay was selected by the last Government for development.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member would give way....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister is aware of a site visit in which I as Minister participated to Archer's Bay including other Ministers of the Government, officials of the Government and the Town Planner and a decision was made to have the Crown Solicitor proceed to acquire Archer's Bay for the purposes of making it into a national park.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, that is a point of stupidity. This decision is not recorded anywhere in the files. We have seen where Foster Funland was put up as one of the properties for purchase; we have seen a number of areas but we have never seen Archer's Bay, and therefore I make it abundantly clear to this Honourable House that Archer's Bay was never included anywhere by way of negotiations, or by way of its being put up for development, and I want to make the hon. member at ease on this particular point. He adverts quite often to the question of St. Lucy and the present Government's attitude to St. Lucy. Let me put this very clear to him. This Government considers St. Lucy as an area that is ripe for plucking. When the hon. member considers that he fortunately won his seat by 104 votes, he should have no comfort, and we can assure him that the Barbados Labour Party will give St. Lucy the representation which it is entitled to and which we feel it is our duty to give to that constituency, and that there can be no question of our failing to do for Barbados as a whole what we consider to be our bounden duty to this country.

It is all well and good for parties to indulge in partial legislation and stifle programmes of action, but these programmes of action never work for long. The last Government was certainly a Government capable of these types of actions and they were not just for a short time. I will never be party to and as long as I am Minister I never will be responsible for any action that will savour of the partial approach towards representation of any area in

this country. We all are Barbadians and we must work for the over-all development of our country, and when we go into an election in a partisan manner, as soon as the elections are over and a Government is returned, the Government must govern as the Government of all the people and not as a Government of only the people in the constituencies that returned them to power. That attitude will characterise the whole administration of the Barbados Labour Party as long as it remains in office.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of getting involved in a debate which I consider to be useless in view of the fact that the party has set out its plans for developing parks around the country. When I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South West make the statement that the Government agreed to develop Archer's Bay and then he proceeded to say that a site visit was made and the Crown Solicitor was to do certain work, I think it is about time that somebody clears the air as to how the previous Government operated. As far as I know Cabinet Government means that any decision which affects the country on a national scale should be decided at Cabinet and there should be a record of that decision because posterity must tell us whether or not the Government of the day acted within certain guidelines or not. When we hear that the last Government had agreed to do certain things, when my fellow Ministers and I peruse the files we find that is nothing of this nature or a record of what the previous Government had intended to do, and one of the examples that come to mind, Mr. Speaker, is the St. Philip Industrial site. Now as you well know this was a talking point in the by-election in St. Philip in February last year. Do not wave your hand because the public must know that when the hon. member got on television and said that the Government had intended putting an industrial site in St. Philip, the file came to me as Minister in December last year for approval of change of use from agriculture at Six Roads to an industrial site, and the application was not put in until August last year. It is time that past Ministers or members of the Opposition Democratic Labour Party learn to tell the truth, or if they are telling the truth.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the hon. member did say that he is referring to the hon. member for St. Michael South West. The facts are there and if he cannot read them, that is his business. The fact is that the St. Philip Industrial Park has been on files of the Ministry and the files of I.D.C. and he gets up and talks about coming to him for a change of use, and

talks about telling the truth. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that where the Government is going to engage in a project, change of use or the Town and Country Planning having to give specific approval has never been the practice, and he knows that; or maybe he does not know.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I would not know illegality because the Town and Country Planning Act covers all lands in Barbados whether owned by Government, by private individuals or Caymans Islands companies. What I am saying is that the file came to me for approval for change of use in December when the building was already up. What I am saying is that when you hear members on that side getting up and saying that the last Government had agreed to do something, these things are nowhere on the files.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, again if he would look on the files diligently he would see the St. Philip development plan, and I am sure the Minister responsible for Town and Country Planning would probably assist him. There was a comprehensive development plan for St. Philip which was passed long before the hon. member sat on the Ministerial benches and it included the Six Roads area as an industrial area.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand stupidity or ignorance. In other words, because there was a development plan for Broad Street, you can go and knock down the buildings and erect buildings in the middle of Broad Street and you do not have to get town planning approval. If there is a development plan in which you are going to build a road through somebody's land, nobody can go and start building without Town and Country Planning approval. Mr. Speaker, it goes further than that. When I was on that side and asked a question about the channel at Tent Bay in St. Joseph, the answer from this side came that there was no channel. Now I have got the file it shows there is a channel. George Fergusson who sat in here as an expert on marine affairs and said there was no need for a channel being blasted, minuted on the file that one would have to blast a channel at Tent Bay. It is on record. It is the same thing as attempting to dynamite a channel.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to Archer's Bay.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: All the members on the other side tell you about things that were put down and when I say they are not telling

the truth, they do not remember what they did because they did it in such a "slip-shodded" manner that they did not know what was Cabinet decision or party decision.
3.50 p.m.

If they would only stop and think; one of the major Acts of this Government was to take the proceeds of the IADB and apply them to the east coast and northern areas of Barbados, pointing out the erosion and what we were going to do for the country as a whole, and for a comprehensive plan not only for the development of Archers Bay but the whole East Coast.
(ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: Please let us not have any cross talk in here.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN:.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Each hon. member must address the Chair.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: If he starts talking about money....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please get on with the Archers Bay development.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, Archers Bay is only one of the recreational parks in this country. Government has got to look not only at Archers Bay — he says he comes from St. Lucy, but not all hon. members are from St. Lucy — but he takes things from our Manifesto and comes and ask questions. Let him look at his party's Manifesto and see if they have a policy. The Government intends to look at every aspect of policy in this country that will bring major benefits to the country. We are not going to concentrate only on Archers Bay, or St. Joseph or St. Michael. The Government is going to look at everything, not only Archers Bay but it will not develop the area simply because the hon. member from St. Lucy comes and ask these questions. When we wrote our Manifesto we did not leave out St. Lucy or St. George; we looked at the entire country. We are obliged to satisfy all Barbadians that we are trying to develop the country as a whole.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I was away from this Chamber for two weeks and it was two of the happiest week spent, as I did not have to listen to the hon. member for St. Joseph or St. Andrew.

The hon. member for St. Lucy represents St. Lucy. When the Minister was an ordinary member or the House representing St. Joseph he asked questions for St. Joseph. Mr. Speaker, you did the same thing for St. Peter. Every member does this. If I asked the Minister of Communications to build a road, will he say that I was the former Minister of Communications and this should have been done? Everyone is agreed that development of Archers Bay would be a good development as a national park. Whether it is in your Manifesto or not, it would be a good idea for development. If the DLP had done everything in fifteen years there would be no need for you, but human life is not like that. You hope to improve the economic status, people's aspirations increase, people's hopes and desires expand, so that as the society expands any Government has to adjust itself to meet the expanding hopes and needs. This is how a society improves. There is always room for parties and Government, because people's aspirations will continue to develop and expand. So there is nothing wrong with the member coming into this Chamber and asking the Government to meet the particular needs of an area. Are you saying that because we were in power for fifteen years we are not to ask any questions about any development pertaining to a constituency? If this argument obtains, the Opposition may as well come in here and not ask for anything on the assumption that you were in power for fifteen years and did not do it. However, you will find that many of your members will get things done without asking, because, as happened when we were in power, at your annual conferences and meetings you can get things introduced and thus avoid Parliamentary Questions. You can get things done without asking for it. A branch constituency would just send on a request and if possible Government would meet this request.
4.00 p.m.

I was the Minister of Communications and Works. I will soon be asking a question about the removal of the people from Constitution Road who have now got notices to quit by June, but because I was in Government for 15 years, am I forbidden by law, by custom, by convention.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Did I hear the Leader of the Opposition right, that he will soon be asking a question about the removal of people from Constitution Road who got notices to leave by June? I would not believe I heard right, because he was the Attorney General who appeared in the case against these very people, so I do not think he is in his right mind today. You were

Attorney General and I saw you in court, so do not come and ask foolish questions now.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I appeared for them as *amicus curia*, you know that too. (*Aside*). I did not, you are not telling the truth. It is not true, and you can ask the Attorney General if it is not so. He knows about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am sorry, Sir, but when he interrupts and misleads the Hon. House.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition cannot stand on his feet and say the hon. member.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am sorry, Sir, I withdraw, but when he interrupts and gives the House and his colleague on his left can tell him he is wrong, I did not appear for the Crown at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right. Let us now please get on with the development of Archer's Bay. We will return to Martindales Road at a later date.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All I am saying is, and with due respect to you, Mr. Speaker, if a member gets up and misleads, or gives the impression that I did something which I have never done, I am claiming my privilege to correct it and move on, but I am not going to let him misrepresent me in this Hon. Chamber.

Be that as it may, what I was pointing out, Mr. Speaker, is that the Resolution before you is not in conflict with anything they have in their manifesto, and the Opposition is by right entitled as representatives of the people to ask questions on any aspect of the total, political, economic or other life of the community, and especially questions pertaining to any inconvenience, hardship, need or hope of the persons whom they have the honour to represent. So do not let us get into this quagmire of saying that either you have been in power for all these years and you should not ask questions and let us try and get away from trying at all points, even on a simple Resolution like this which should have been passed already, get away from the question of whose Manifesto has it in and whose did not have it in.

This Resolution boils itself down to a simple question, that the hon. member for St.

Lucy represents an area and a constituency in which Archer's Bay falls and he is entitled to ask the Government who has the power to give consideration priority to this area. The Government, as the Government that has the power, is in a position to say we will look at the entire island, we agree that Archer's Bay is a nice place which could be developed, but we are not giving you an undertaking that Archer's Bay will rate priority, but we share with you your anxiety that it is a piece of land which should be preserved for Barbadians primarily. The answer is simple, but all this question of whose Manifesto it is and whose Manifesto it is not is just wasting the time of this House since, as said by the Government, they approve the Opposition's Resolution.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very good thing that the Government is agreeing with this Resolution, because I wonder what would have happened if they were disagreeing with the Resolution, and sometimes I wonder when you listen to these debates and some of the contributions, I am certain you shake your head sometimes in wonderment.

Mr. SPEAKER: When they are going to do something in St. Peter.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, I know you want to know when they are going to get around there as well, because we have heard today that you are Mr. Speaker and you cannot ask any questions; the Prime Minister can ask questions but not you. But it is a pity, I think, and I believe you will agree with me that the example that is set by the member for St. Andrew is not followed more often by certain other members on the Government benches, because when the member for St. Andrew speaks, whether you agree with him or not, at least he speaks with a clarity and a respect for the English Language which could be followed by others who have had the benefit of higher levels of education, and I am very serious about this. Some of his colleagues, both on the front bench and on the back bench, would do well to note his style and the way in which he expresses himself in this Hon. Chamber, both in terms of respect for the English Language and in terms of the type of logic — I am not referring to the Minister of Education, so he need not shake his head, he has a duty in here to preserve the English Language and we would not want any "slipshoded" anything in here. If he wants to correct me on "slipshoded" he can.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: If the hon. member will give way, the word is "slipshod." You are misusing the English Language.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am very grateful, Mr. Speaker, for the correction from the Minister of Education. He forgets that I was also Minister of Education, and I set him up like that because that is precisely a word the member for St. Joseph used. He comes in here and abuses the English Language, and he did it today when he spoke about "slipshoded" and I am certain you heard it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the development of Archer's Bay we might also develop the use of English, so let us get on with Archer's Bay.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I do hope the Minister of Education will have some words with members on his side as well, but to get to the point. The spokesmen for the Government benches have said that they agree with the Resolution, and to go all around the bush now to beat around the bush, to talk about that this was in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, as though the principle of developing rural parks and recreation facilities was not also in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party, and I am certain my colleague in his reply will deal with that particular point. I need not quote our Manifesto on the development of recreational facilities, it is set out quite clearly here in our Manifesto.

Not only that, we have to look at the practices which the Democratic Labour Party developed while it was a Government. We were interested in developing recreational areas and rural parks. I need not identify all of them, these are well known to the country, whether it was at Dover, whether it was at Bath, whether it was at Folkestone in St. James, whether it was at Farley Hill National Park, whether it was at Barclays Park, I am trying to remember the name of a place in St. Peter, Mr. Speaker, but I find it difficult to recall the particular park — Oh, Farley Hill — we did not quite get around to Nicholas Abbey.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shouldn't say you forgot St. Peter sometimes.

Mr. SANDIFORD: The record is there and we need not go all over the bush on this, and then to try to prove that the member for St. Lucy did not ask a question about Archer's Bay, I think that is not even worthy of developing in this Chamber, because next to yourself, Mr. Speaker, I believe the member for St. Lucy was one of the most persistent persons asking, he asked more persistently about matters relating to St. Lucy, but not only to St. Lucy but to the country generally, and I think it is a

distortion of the record to try to give the impression that the member for St. Lucy did not ask about his constituency, because all of us who would do just a little research on the Order Papers and the questions asked in this Hon. Chamber would realise that the member for St. Lucy asked a lot of questions about St. Lucy as well as about other parts of the country.

As has been said, this is not a parochial Resolution as such. The people of St. Lucy stand to benefit if this particular development takes place, but people from throughout the country as a whole stand to benefit also, because Archer's Bay is a very popular recreational spot.

4.10 p.m.

To develop it to the same standards and along whatever lines the Parks and Beaches Commission may decide on or whatever Government agency would be responsible for the development would be a development to be welcomed by people throughout this country. So the Government had no need to fear on this particular matter we cannot suspend rural development or any type of recreational facilities in the air. They have to be, as Shakespeare said: "Given a local habitation and a name." I think it is from *Midsummer Night's Dream*:—

"The poet's eye with a fine frenzy rolling,
Doth glance from earth to heaven, from
heaven to earth;
And as imagination bodies forth the shapes
of things unknown,
The Poet's pen turns them to shapes, and
gives to them a local habitation and a
name."

I do not think that the Minister of Education has graduated to that level yet. He is still with Cicero and Livy and so on. I think that we have to put parks down and just as we have asked about other things along these lines, I am sure that the Barbados Labour Party will get along with the development of Archers Bay.

I remember how very much you yourself, Mr. Speaker, wanted the development of a national park, if my memory serves me right. I am sure that someone over there will ask that question for you and you will not have to wait until the Democratic Labour Party is returned to power in 1981 to ask us to do that for you.

I do not want to speak any longer on this particular matter. This is a simple Resolution.

The Government has the responsibility for developing rural parks. That was also the policy of the Democratic Labour Party when they were in Government. Both manifestoes speak of this development which is to improve the environment and to provide recreational facilities for the people of this country. There is agreement on both sides of the House. We do not have to get up and attack a Resolution on Archers Bay via a channel at Tents or any such thing.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to wind up on behalf of the Government, all that I can say is that I am instructed that those who have listened to the words of wisdom that have fallen from the lips of hon. members during this debate have indicated that this is an unacceptable Resolution rather than such Government policy *im petto* the breath of the Democratic Labour Party during its regime; and those whose education extends no further back than Shakespeare, to them I may mention that *im petto* is a semi-liturgical expression I believe, in the Italian and the Roman Church, indicating that this is your policy which you keep to yourself while you are in power.

Archers Bay is part of the general sea scape and part of that area of Barbados which is rugged, interesting, relatively under populated and relatively unspoilt, as the expression goes. Archers Bay is the seat of the original inhabitants of Barbados, and there are more Arawak and Carib artifacts found in Archers Bay, I believe, than anywhere else, except at Chancery Lane. (*Aside*). I hear the hon. member for St. Lucy referring to me as a know all. I do not claim any original knowledge of the Caribs at Archers Bay; but there is a book called "Indian Artifacts in Barbados" which was written by a gentleman called Guy Barton who was a Colonial Secretary here.

I believe that as early as Page 11 or 12 he refers to the Indian remains at Archers Bay. I prefer to err with Mr. Barton's knowledge from personal excavation and observation and studies than to shine with the hon. member's belief. This will not be the first time that he has been mistaken. This will not be the first time that he has been wrong and strong. Nonetheless, his occasional incompetence in debate, in consideration and in daily activity should not cause us to believe that automatically if we bring this Resolution before the House, it is a bad Resolution.

The Government is already taking appropriate steps to convert and develop the

entire area where the public feels to be suitable from Bath up the coast line to St. John, St. Joseph, St. Andrew, St. Peter and right around to Archers Bay. This is one of the anchor points from which to convert the area with proper national parks.

We are seeking to get assistance from Canadians who have already visited Barbados in connection with the National Truss. We are in active collaboration with the National Truss in developing these areas. We are inviting people to tell us where a road is appropriate, where a presentation order is appropriate. Archers Bay, and the western part of St. Lucy are vital areas which are being considered at present in the environmental studies relating to the cement plant which will be taken a step further when the Minister of Housing, Senator Mapp, and I visit various cement plants in the region to see how they have managed to handle the problems of precipitation of dust and the preservation of the environment in the area of the cement plants.

For the benefit of the hon. member for St. Michael South who spoke so eloquently — he was so eloquent that I would not even pay him the disfavoured of saying that Shakespeare sounded better in his own honeyed words — in his inimitable delivery all sounded the same. He spoke about it being the policy of the former Government and this Government. The difference between having a policy *im petto* and having a policy *in actuo* is that we are doing something about it. We are seeking technical assistance, and we are addressing our minds in terms of other development projects and the preservation of such areas as Archers Bay.

I know that the hon. member for St. Lucy has not put forward this Resolution as a means of gaining votes. There is virtually nobody living at Archers Bay. Nonetheless, we appreciate that it is in his constituency. We appreciate his interest. We share his interest, and we sincerely hope for a culmination of his efforts.

However, Sir, I am not going to be over optimistic and come in with fancy figures. I would say something like three years. Other plans will be worked out. Guidelines will be published and facilities will begin at Archers Bay, in the Boscobelle area and the seascaping of Boscobelle and between St. Andrew, St. Peter, the Pico Teneriffe area and areas a little further inland, Prospect Woods in St. Peter and that general reach that runs from Bleak House to Farley Hill. All of these areas on the fringe of development areas are going to be taken care

of and preserved according to the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party which said specifically that we are going to establish parks around the coastline in places including the Pico Teneriffe area, in St. Peter and in St. Lucy. 4.20 p.m.

I am glad the hon. member has reminded me of Turner's Hall. He was always a good planner. Let him be assured that there is still room for him in the ranks of the Permanent Secretaries in a Government of Barbados. The hon. member for St. Michael South is always thoughtful. (*Asides*) I agree with the hon. member for St. James. The hon. member for St. Michael South is always thoughtful and is always giving assistance to the Government. I would like, in passing, just to thank him very much for the very kind words he said on Sunday in democratic perspective about the Budget. Many persons have told me how much they appreciate what the hon. member for St. Michael South said. One or two have even said that they always knew, not only that he was a decent fellow, but he was a sensible one. Nonetheless, I do not want to pour too much praise on him. I would not take the risk of pouring this praise on him if the hon. member for St. Michael South West were in the House. I would not wish to embarrass him, but he has indicated that he knows the Government is sincere about this, and I think all hon. members can support this Resolution.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I would let this debate wind up without replying to some of the comments which, misguided though they might have been, were made in the course of this debate. I was, indeed, surprised to see that a simple Resolution like this, which seeks to improve or increase the recreational facilities existing in Barbados, would have incurred the wrath and aroused the anger of members of the Government in the way it did. Be that as it may, I suppose that I should say I am glad they have indicated that they will accept the contents of the Resolution and will do something about ensuring that Archer's Bay is developed as a Recreational Park in the same way that the Democratic Labour Party indicated that it would be doing when it was in the Government.

I just want to lay to rest, Mr. Speaker, some of the misconceptions and misrepresentations which have been made by some hon. members. If I were to take the speeches or the points which were made by hon. members in the way in which they were made this would, I believe, give me an opportunity to deal with them one by one. If one were to, for example, examine what has been

said by the hon member for St. Michael South East, when I listened to him, Mr. Speaker, there is one particular thought which went through my mind. It is simply that I think it is fortunate that he is as old as he is, because I am sure that if he, even at this age, were called upon to sit the 11-plus common entrance examination he would fail because he has, consistently, demonstrated a type of ignorance that is unbelievable for a person of his age and standing, a person who is supposed to be a headmaster. Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I heard the member for St. Michael South East, from time to time, refer to what he considers to be a fact but which in truth and in fact is nothing but a lie. I know that in parliamentary terms one cannot accuse hon. members of telling lies or of being liars; so that I would not accuse the hon. member for St. Joseph or the hon. member for St. James of being liars. I would use, Mr. Speaker, a phrase which, I think it was Disraeli used in trying to describe hon. members who have the kind of qualities which these two hon. members display from time to time. I will say that they are often guilty of verbal inexactitudes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Listen to me. Would the hon. member for St. Lucy please withdraw that without delay! Please do not waste time.

Mr. GREAVES: I beg to withdraw it. I am sure that the hon. member for St. James and the hon. member for St. Joseph, when they were making their presentations in, probably, what can be described as in a loud manner, indicated that, during the time that I represented St. Lucy, from 1971-76 in the first 5-year period, nowhere have they seen me ask anything about St. Lucy or Archer's Bay. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you know the records will indicate this very clearly. If hon. members would be honest, or those who do not know would just take two minutes to check the records of the last 5-year period 1971-76, they would indicate very clearly my position as far as St. Lucy is concerned. I am not here to blow my own trumpet or, indeed, to indicate the kind of questions which I have asked with some success during the past five years. Just let me say that, as far as this Resolution is concerned, I know that it has value in it. It is not a question of the Democratic Labour Party not having this in view because our Manifesto states very clearly under the section dealing with recreation and leisure as follows:

"The Democratic Labour Party is firmly committed to the preservation of the heritage of the people of Barbados and to enhancing the natural beauty of the country for the peaceful enjoyment of its citizens. In

this connection the dynamic efforts of the Parks and Beaches Commission have been universally acclaimed. The good work of the Commission will be continued and additionally we will work towards (1) The development of rural Parks throughout the country."

Now, if you were to pause here a moment, Mr. Speaker, you would see very clearly that inasmuch as Archer's Bay is situated in St. Lucy and inasmuch as St. Lucy is recognised as a rural area, it is fairly obvious for the most simple mind in this House or in Barbados that this is an indication that the then Government and the Democratic Labour Party had the intention to develop Archer's Bay. There is a background to this because during the last 5-year period on more than one occasion, contrary to what the hon. member for St. Joseph has said, contrary to what the hon. member for St. James has said, and contrary to what the hon. member for St. Michael South East has been misled in saying, I did on more than one occasion draw to the attention of the then Government the need to develop Archer's Bay as a Park. I also drew to the attention of the then Government, not in a Resolution but in the course of a debate — I am sure that you will recognise this — I spear-headed the whole idea of rural development in this Parliament which you, subsequently, picked up and the two of us were, probably, the most consistent members on this whole question of rural development. I did indicate during that period that this was an area which should be earmarked for development in a manner which I have outlined here today. I will go further, Mr. Speaker, to say that during the election campaign — (*Asides.*)

4.30 p.m.

I am sure that you would have received a copy of the letter which was sent to the constituents and in it you would have seen that Archer's Bay was one of the areas that I would have liked developed; so I do not understand the kind of nonsensical arguments which have been advanced by some of the members on this particular record.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that one should spend any time or indeed pay very much attention to what the hon. member for St. Michael South East has to say because he talks and he talks and he talks but mere words come out and hardly anything of substance, so that I do not think we should worry too much about the contribution which he makes on any particular matter. I believe you will recall the most famous contribution which he made

in this Chamber some months ago when he advocated public flogging of people, but I am sure he will remember that to his dying day.

As far as the contribution of the hon. member for St James is concerned, it was not of any particular worth and I would not even worry to refer to it as a dog-eared contribution. He referred to my Resolution as a dog-eared Resolution, but nevertheless, whether it is dog-eared or not, it has some value and the Government has recognised the value and has indicated that something will be done about it.

The hon. member for St. Andrew indicated that this Resolution is an aspect of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. I wonder if the hon. member for St. Andrew would admit that the old concept and idea of development of parks and beaches in the manner that they are being developed today is a concept which was put into operation by the Democratic Labour Party, and if he would admit this, I am sure he does so in his saner moments, he would recognise therefore that the idea of providing parks throughout the country and more specifically as indicated in our manifesto in the rural areas.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry that you have risen, but the hon. member for St. Lucy would like to be a clever debater, and I sit and often laugh at him because I would not like to ask him to withdraw from this House. He just made reference to the hon. member for St. Andrew recognising in his saner moments or words to that effect. I sit and smile because the only person that I must call on is the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you should withdraw it in the exact tone in which you made the reference.

Mr. GREAVES: I have withdrawn the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: It should not be in any under-arm tone. That is what we are concerned about.

Mr. GREAVES: If I withdraw the word "saner" I cannot repeat the tone now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Withdraw and go ahead.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That was only one of the points on which I was rising. I think the hon. member is misleading himself. The question of parks in this country is a matter within the purview of Local Government, as you very well know, and despite that, efforts at the development of national parks took place in this country well before the question of Local Government came about. You see we are forgetting history too easily in Barbados, and everybody is making his own history as he goes along.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, it would be good sometimes if you would give some direction to the hon. member for Christ Church West because I was very specific since I knew that he would have jumped up of all people. I was very specific in stating parks and beaches developed in the manner in which they are developed today. That is what I said and the records will indicate that.

If I may continue after the interruptions which the hon. member for Christ Church West is so famous of, let me indicate very clearly that the Democratic Labour Party as part of its manifesto had stated very clearly its position on the development of parks in the rural areas, and as I said before, this is something which I consider we must understand very clearly. I have heard a lot of talk about the Barbados Labour Party manifesto referring the development of parks in St. Lucy. Now let us admit that this is so. Now are you going to tell me that you are referring to Archer's Bay or to the whole of St. Lucy, but because I indicate Archer's Bay, then that is what you mean? That is neither here nor there. As far as I am concerned, we have got to recognise this and I just want to let the hon. member for St. Andrew know that we obviously could not allow him to get away with saying that this was an aspect of the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. This is a very clear indication of the Democratic Labour Party and something that had been decided in the minds of the D.L.P. for some time.

As far as the hon. member for St. Joseph is concerned, so often this hon. member demonstrates an inability to argue cogently that one does not really listen to him. One only has to listen to him once and one realises this. Of course the hon. member for St. Michael South has indicated the murder he commits as far as the English language is concerned, but we would not worry to go into that. Quite often while talking about major benefits he refers to manger benefits.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought you were trying to wind up the debate.

Mr. GREAVES: I am winding up, Mr. Speaker, on the speech of the hon. member for St. Joseph because we were talking about Archer's Bay and he sought in this debate to wander as far afield as St. Philip and Tent Bay in St. Joseph, and you had to bring him back because he did not understand what the debate was about. Let me say that I am grateful that there is an indication that this development will take place.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the next Order of Private Members' Business — I did something that is out of order — it would impose a charge on the revenue.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time to make your submission will arise as soon as the Item becomes the Order of the day.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: I thought it was the next Order Sir, I will wait.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item 3 under Private Members' Business be the next order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item 3 under Private Members' Business is the instant order of the day.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is a simple amendment to the Holidays with Pay Act.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: On a point of order, I submit, Sir, that this is in breach of the Standing Orders. I think it is accepted on all sides that only a Minister can move any measure in Parliament which may impose a charge on the revenue. I hope I will not have to argue it out at any great length. It is a fact of the very system of Ministerial Government. It is the reason why, for example, even though you may have a Parliamentary Secretary for the Ministry of Housing in this Chamber, or the Parliamentary Secretary in the Prime Minister's Office in the other Chamber, yet in here the Leader of the House has to move Resolutions for the Ministry of Housing, and in the other House the Leader of the Senate has to move Resolutions for the Ministry of Finance, because only a Minister can move expenditure.

Under Standing Order No. 63 it says: 1. Except on the recommendation of the Cabinet, signified by a Minister, the House of Assembly shall not —

- (a) receive any bill or proceed upon any motion for leave to introduce a bill or proceed upon any bill (including any amendment to a bill) which, in the opinion of the person presiding, makes provision for imposing or increasing any tax, for imposing any charge on the Consolidated Fund or any other public fund or altering any such charge otherwise than by reducing it or for compounding or remitting any debt due to Barbados; or
- (b) proceed upon any bill (including any amendment to a bill) which, in the opinion of the person presiding, makes provision for the alleviation of taxation or for the repeal or reduction of any existing tax — and so on.

Now there are certain imperatives here. The Cabinet has not agreed with the hon. member for St. Lucy introducing this Bill, and as Minister of Finance I now signify this. No Minister has signified that this Bill may proceed. Secondly, Sir, in substance the Bill seeks to extend the portion of paid holidays for all workers in Barbados. This applies to Statutory Corporations which depend for their existence on the public fund. The Parks and Beaches Commission is one of the most obvious, that has no revenue of its own and if it did the revenue balance would be of the nature of a public fund; and it has a large number of employees who I am told do not have specific arrangements for vacations other than the general law. And I select only one; there are a number of Statutory Corporations in this position; the Transport Board Sir, at \$5 million a year. The public has to pay to the Transport Board — that comes out of the Consolidated Fund — and I respectfully submit that when you increase the period of paid vacation — if you are to maintain the level of the services — you must increase the amount of staff. This is a matter of commonsense. If you increase the number of paid vacation days for the Transport Board, a service which has to go on day and night, you have to have more staff. Apart from employing more staff we give persons statutory right under Statute 348 to increased average pay upon dismissal; this means an increased potential charge upon the revenue of public fund.

And I will also say this Sir, it seems to be believed that the Holidays with Pay Act is

superseded by a specific agreement between the Government in respect of casual employees and the Workers Union. This is not so, Sir; the Holidays with Pay Act still applies. For example, it is not open to the Government or the Union to agree that the casual worker can get only one week's vacation. The Holidays with Pay Act applies, and the Chief Labour Officer has specific right, for example, to withhold his approval to agreement other than those which in his opinion conform with the Holidays with Pay Act (Section 3) (6) of the relevant Act. And I submit that in all the circumstances, however desirable it is, and in spite the fact that it forms part of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, things must be done in a proper way. The hon. member for St. Lucy is entitled to copy out all the ideas from our Manifesto if he so cares; but until he is a Minister, unfortunately, he will not be able to put them into force; and while there may be some hon. members on the other side whose services might be thought desirable if circumstances were different, I have not so far included the Hon. member for St. Lucy as being of Ministerial ability. I therefore, Sir, respectfully resubmit that this entire Bill is out of order under Standing Order No. 63.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On many occasions in this House the Prime Minister has expressed his sympathy with those clients who would hire me. Today for a short time he elevated me to a legal luminary but I agree entirely with his contention. I have just intimated my colleague from St. Lucy that this Bill, interpretational and otherwise, would in fact increase holidays with pay and therefore obviously would impose a charge upon the Treasury and I agree with the Prime Minister on the interpretation of that particular section of the Standing Orders which would make this Bill more appropriately brought by the Government. And since the Prime Minister himself has agreed that it is a Bill which would meet with the Government's approval, I can only hope Government would see it fit to bring it down as soon as possible.

Dr. CADDLE: I now seek the approval of the House to withdraw this Item from further consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill does not stand in your name.

Mr. GREAVES: I beg to withdraw the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have to address your remarks to the Chair, hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to withdraw the Resolution.

4.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it it is the feeling of the House generally to agree that the hon. member for St. Lucy should be allowed to withdraw this Bill. It is undoubtedly, on the face of it, unobjectionable, however, it is clear from the reasons set out by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister when he rose on a point of order, that it appears that under Standing Order 63(1)(a) this Bill infringes by the implications of the Bill, and it will be on this basis of this rule that I have to rule the Bill out of order.

Under these circumstances, I would indeed appreciate the general feeling of the House that the hon. member be allowed to withdraw it at this stage. There being no objection, the hon. member is allowed to withdraw this Bill.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Private Members' Business for the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business for the day.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that we revert to Government Business, and that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and this House go into Committee, Sir, on the Immigration (Amendment) Bill.

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Immigration (Amendment) Bill, Mr. WEEKES in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

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

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I just rise in order to have the honour and privilege of

addressing you as Chairman. I do not think in my history in this House we have shown such co-operation in the last five years, in that the Opposition is prepared to allow one of its members to preside over the deliberations of this Chamber. All I wanted was to have the privilege of saying "Mr. Chairman" and I do it with great pleasure and in the knowledge that you will maintain the high standard set by the Opposition in this Chamber.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like personally to congratulate you on the honour to which the Government has invited you to serve. As I have mentioned on previous occasions when I had the privilege of travelling under your leadership, Sir, I do not think it is often appreciated, the sort of abilities and qualities which you possess, and you know that I have expressed in Opposition for the benefit of the then Government that they should have given you much more consideration than was shown to you at the time, and indeed what I would like to say on this occasion is that the Opposition has now seen where it is possible for members of the Opposition to be what they rightfully are, members of the Government in the wider sense of the term, rather than members of a party, one of whose duties is to oppose constructively and not destructively, Sir, and I want to underscore this point, particularly as the Leader of the Opposition has spoken and to invite him still to get his party to reconsider the position where some of his members can serve on Statutory Boards, and we hope with some distinction, in order to improve the system of Government in this country.

I think that your sitting there will not in one whit diminish your impartiality and integrity when you are in that Chair, despite the fact that you happen to be a member of a political party which does not constitute the Government in *stricto sensu* in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to express my sincere thanks to the two hon. members who have congratulated me, and I promise to co-operate and to do my utmost at all times in the interest of the community of this country.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the 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.

5.00 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 4 is the instant Order of the Day.

**BILL TO INCORPORATE THE ROMAN
CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF BRIDGETOWN
AND KINGSTOWN**

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, some time in 1970 the Roman Catholic Church decided to establish a new diocese comprising the churches in Barbados, St. Vincent and the Grenadines; and the then Prime Minister was informed of this intention. A little later the Church sought to introduce by a private Bill, a Bill to carry out this object. I believe that it is correct to say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as the then Attorney General of Barbados and like myself, he quite rightly felt that having regard to the fact that a Bill dealing with various aspects of the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church was already on the Statute Book, and having regard to the fact that the Church in this island had been an institution of great repute which has made contributions to the country as a whole, not only in religious, but also in educational, social and other matters, that it should have been fit to incorporate the new diocese by way of an Act of Parliament, an Act which would receive the sponsorship of the Government of the day.

I regret to say that he was not able to persuade his Cabinet colleagues. Whether he did persuade any of them or not I will not know because dissent is very seldom reflected in the deliberations of the minutes of Cabinet; but dissent there can be at times even although future historians may find it difficult to say whether or not this was so.

As a result, Sir, when I was in Opposition I did lend my support to a Private Members' Bill, and at the request of the Government this Bill was referred to Select Committee. Parliament was

dissolved last year, and that Bill died with the dissolution of Parliament. On becoming Attorney General I thought it proper that the Bill should be revived, and also I took the opportunity of the presence of skilled legal draftsmen to improve the draft which had been done by a private firm of attorneys-at-law. It is this draft which I am commending to this House for passing this afternoon; and the Bill seeks to do exactly what is set out in its objects.

Hon. members will be satisfied that the person for the time being, in this case the Rt. Rev. Anthony Dixon, and his successors in office will be established as a corporation. I think the term used is an eleemosynary corporation. Therefore it has perpetual succession. It will be able to hold land and it will be able to carry out the things that a corporation is normally in law entitled to do.

Section 3(2) of the Act makes specific provisions for this. In addition, the Bill will provide for the existing property belonging to the Church to be transferred to the new corporation. It will also provide for the corporation to have a fixed address for the service of documents on it, and for the corporation to register its address at the Registration Office.

This is a bit of an improvement on some similar Bills which have come before the House on previous occasions. I think that in future when we do a reform of the Interpretation Act and other laws we will try to make this a generally obligatory provision. I sincerely commend this Bill to the House.

I would say that I myself am not a Roman Catholic, although I do have very close connections in my immediate household with the Roman Catholic Church but it is not these close connections which influence me in saying that this Church has made a great contribution to this country. One only has to advert to the existence of the Ursuline Convent and the role which it is playing in contributing to education at the primary level and the secondary level. One may also advert to the St. Patrick School, a school catering to the primary level. One may also advert to the contribution of the Carmelite Nuns in supporting, along with the Rotarians, the Challenor School for handicapped children which is today acknowledged as one of the leading institutions of this sort in the Caribbean, and catering for a neglected sector of our community.

In the religious field the work of the Church is well known. In the charitable field one can advert to the contribution made via the St.

Vincent de Paul Society and in particular the work which this society and the Church have done among the under-privileged and poor persons in this community. I myself, as Minister in charge of the Prisons, have a first hand knowledge of the Roman Catholic Church's contribution in the rehabilitation, after care, and visiting of prisoners.

I think that hon. members will agree that this Church is one of those institutions which has contributed to the furtherance of progress in Barbados. I am not going to introduce any more comment into this except to say that you may well be satisfied that any constructive criticism by the Church will not be pushed under the carpet of this House or elsewhere; and that if the Church is criticised at any time, it will be on proper grounds, in respectful tones and without insulting words. Any views which the Church gives to the Government will be appreciated because we accept their *bona fides* on these matters.

So, as Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs and also as Attorney General, it gives me very much pleasure to move the second reading of this Bill, and to ask members to agree to it unanimously, as I am sure that it will have the support of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, he having adopted the stance which he did in 1970. I would only say this to him: Had he a Prime Minister similar in views to the Prime Minister we have here, his measure would have been adopted at that time without much ado. I think that although there is no record in writing that I have seen, from the attitude taken by the then Prime Minister there was a great reluctance on his part to allow this type of measure to come down as Government measures.

5.10 p.m.

I may say that passing this measure poses no problem in so far as the future publication of the Consolidated Laws of Barbados is concerned because the Law Revision Commissioners do have the power with this type of Act to exclude it from the main volume so as to keep down the cost of publication, but it will be kept in a separate annual volume and will be easily accessible both to the public through that means, the annual publication, as well as a copy will be on file with the file which must be lodged at the Registry so that the public will not be denied easy access to finding this Bill.

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

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to matters pertaining to the Church they have my wholehearted support. I am not ashamed to say that I am an ardent, faithful, and conscientious Church goer, and I am also a dedicated member of the Anglican Church. We cannot get away from the fact that religion plays a very important role in this country and, therefore, we as members of this House should, at all times, give the impression to the public that we appreciate the service which the Church renders to the community.

While we may not, at all times, agree with political sermons which are being preached on some occasions, we must admit that the Church plays a major part in the morals of the community. When you have the Roman Catholic Church which, as far as I am aware, has played some part in assisting in moulding the characters of certain members of the community, I think that anything which they ask us to do to assist them in carrying on the duties of the Church in a more efficient manner should be supported by us.

The Church has assisted with the education of the community of this Island. I would say that even now, although the Anglican Churches have been disendowed and disestablished, we still have the benefit of using the schools for the benefit of the children of this country. I hope, Sir, that you will bear with me when I say that, in giving this Bill my wholehearted support, I can only implore the Minister responsible to do everything he possibly can to assist the people of St. Philip in rebuilding that Church. I have heard your ruling here today, Sir, and therefore I realise that it would not be in order for me to bring a Resolution to this House asking for assistance to rebuild St. Philip Church, but I have confidence in the appropriate Minister and I have no doubt that he will take into consideration the amount of money it takes to rebuild that Church and the Government in assisting should not be cheese-sparing. The Government should go all out to assist the people because we realise that it will take approximately \$½ million to rebuild the Church. While all of us are contributing we are asking all of you to do everything possible to assist us.

I take this opportunity to give this Bill my blessing, and I hope that you have listened attentively to me on this occasion and that you will do all you possibly can to help us to have our Church, again, in St. Philip and prevent us from carrying on with the inconveniences which we have to endure at the moment.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long. I just want to say that, officially, the Opposition supports it. I am grateful that the Attorney General, from a perusal of the file, shows that my opinion has always been that a Bill should be introduced to give to this Church of long standing, with one of the largest denominations in the world, a proper status as given to other denominations. I do not have to profess my christian faith. That is a matter between me and my maker; nor do I have to judge. I think everything that I have done has made hollow the claim that I am either ungodly or blasphemous. Even with this very Church you will find, Mr. Speaker, that it was in my regime that the Ministry of Education gave hot meals to St. Patrick's Roman Catholic School because it was the first outside school that received hot meals. I drove to the Ministry every day and saw these children at primary school level and that, certainly, was a christian act. I was also responsible for the increase in the subvention to the Challenor School.

5.20 p.m.

That too was a christian act again out of my concern for those unfortunate children that the Roman Catholic Church was contributing to education. I am talking about christain acts and concern for human frailties and misfortune, and as I said, I have had occasions to discuss with the Roman Catholic Bishop himself as well as the Headmaster of Presentation College certain matters in which it might have been possible had I continued to be Minister of Education to assist the Church in the work which it was doing. I want it to be clearly understood that this Bill has the wholehearted support of this House. My particular salvation and what happens to me as a matter between me and my Creator, and it does not depend either on the Roman Catholic Bishop or the Bishop of Barbados, because I have got to answer to God for my faults and my sins on the great day of judgment, and they cannot do anything except perhaps intercede at some point for me, but it is my responsibility. Apart from that this Bill deserves to be on the Statute Book and has the support of the Opposition.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of repeating much of what the Attorney General has said, I feel that I should make a contribution to this Bill for two reasons. Firstly because the Bill will make more efficient the way in which the Roman Catholic Church can carry out its work in Barbados; but secondly and more importantly to me is because of the significant contribution which the Roman Catholic Church has made to education development in this country. It springs to mind that last October

when I was anxious as Minister of Education to find places for school children to return after they were superannuated, the Roman Catholic Church through Presentation College St. John and the Ursuline Convent came immediately unsolicited to my assistance, and I have had on a number of occasions to have discussions with the Roman Catholic Bishop of Barbados-Kingstown and the Principal of the Catholic School in Jemmotts Lane and indeed the Principal of Presentation College and Ursuline Convent and I have found that they have got a lot to contribute and have indeed made a great contribution already. So I shall not like the Leader of the Opposition to get up and talk about what I or we have given them, but rather what we have received from them. I know for instance that the Ursuline Convent which is one of the better private schools in Barbados is operating at the moment under very difficult circumstances because the cost of secondary education in Barbados has reached a pitch that the average parent cannot afford to pay school fees sufficient to keep the school going, and I know it is due to a large extent to the dedication of the Nuns at the Convent who work for little or nothing that this school has been continuing to give the kind of education it has been giving.

I want also to talk about the contribution the Catholic Church has made in other areas, not only in educational institutions, but I need not go to their contribution, charitable, public and religious. I recall reading of course a very interesting dialectical exercise taking place between Father Bessant and the late Sir Grantley Adams, or Grantley Adams as he then was, in the Thirties, and as I am given to the turn of the dialectical discussions, I think it would be a significant contribution to the level of scholarship in Barbados at the time when people were concerned about things other than scholarship.

Sir, the Roman Catholic Church has been around a long time and it has been making its contribution, and I quite often feel a little bit annoyed when a lot of unthinking, wanton and well-nigh paranoiac criticisms and attacks are made on the Church in Barbados, and whether the Leader of the Opposition thinks that his salvation, as he puts it, is something between himself and his Maker, I believe that if he takes the contribution of the hon. member for St. Philip South, he will appreciate not only as a citizen of this community but indeed as Leader of the Opposition and a politician that he has got a responsibility to the community while he is here, and I cannot help but feel ashamed that someone in his position would continue to make the loud, strident and as I said paranoiac attacks

on the Church, whether it is the Roman Catholic or the Anglican Church. Unlike him and unlike other hon. members who have spoken I am no professed Church man; I am not a Church goer, I am not a Christian; I am not all the things they say they are, but I believe that the Church has made a significant contribution to the wellbeing of this community, and I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition and other people who have been indulging in this foolish, priest baiting exercise will really come to their senses.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, he has got to withdraw that now. I am not baiting any priests; it is insulting and imputing improper motives to me. He has got to withdraw this foolish, priest baiting exercise. I am not standing for that sort of discussion from him. I let paranoiac pass, but even that is unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: Kindly withdraw.

Hon. L. R. TULL: If Your Honour rules that priest baiting is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it. I withdraw it. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, whatever epithet we may use for the type of behaviour that we have been witnessing over the past three years in respect of some members on that side in relation to the discourse with the Church, I hope they will reconsider it for the general good of this community. If we do not want to undermine the respect of people in Barbados for the Church, I wish that people on that side who have been making the loud strident noises they have been making in that regard over the last three years would reconsider their position and desist from it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I could not allow this occasion to pass without joining in the debate. This is not because the Cathedral of the Roman Catholic Church in this country happens to be physically in the constituency of St. Michael South which I have the honour to represent; that is the least of the reasons. I would like to take this opportunity also to indicate my support for this particular measure and to hope that this new structure or new legal entity that is being formed as a result of our action here today would lead to the further development and improvement of the Roman Catholic Church in this country.

I too am aware and appreciative of the contribution that that Church has made and is making to social development in this country, and indeed from a personal point of view my children have had and some of them are still having education in the schools being run by the Roman Catholic Church — I refer to St. Angela's

School and the Ursuline Convent as well as Presentation College. It is a Church which over the centuries — and we have to speak in terms of centuries even though in relation to Barbados the Church has not been here relatively speaking when we compare it with other denominations as long as these other denominations — has exercised a tremendous influence over the development of world affairs.

5.30 p.m.

Sometimes it has been positively good and at other times the contribution has been somewhat more doubtful. But we are certain that in Barbados, given the climate today, and given the fact that written into the constitution of Barbados is the guarantee of freedom of Religion, we are certain that the Democratic Labour Party, however much maligned and criticised it has been for certain aspects of its relationships with the Church, has always maintained that provision within the Constitution and honoured that guarantee fundamentally entrenched in the Constitution regarding freedom of religion. And we are certain that the present Government will continue to ensure that freedom of religion remains one of the bulwarks of freedom in this country and in a democratic Barbados. We have every reason to believe that they will follow the pattern that has been set in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the tone in which the Attorney General has introduced this Resolution. We note that the Church can take no comfort from the fact that they may be criticised by the Barbados Labour Party Government or that some of the actions taken by the church may not find the favour with the Government. Indeed, only last week, or a few weeks ago, we heard during the budgetary presentation the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance say that there is one argument relating to gambling in this country in which he does not necessarily share the view of the church. But the Attorney General said that when there are criticisms it will be done in reasonable terms. I do not remember his exact words, but this was the sense of it. And this is what we have come to expect, that we will not agree with everything or every position that the church takes on a matter; but when argument is joined, we would expect that it would be based at a certain level and that good sense will prevail. And that is for both sides. I think it is a pity that the contributions of certain members on this side have been distorted and their *bona fide* called into question. That is exactly what has happened (*Aside*) Mr. Speaker, will you protect from those asides?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have always done so, and will continue to do so.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. But I would like to make it clear and go on record as saying that when comments come from this side the intention is certainly not to attack the church in any destructive way but to keep the social and religious record straight; because on this side we have persons — my colleague, the member for St. Michael South Central — as he said, he does not have to preach it from the house tops — he is an accredited lay reader in the Methodist church and he is a man deeply religious and holds that his every contribution to matters springs from that upbringing which he has had in the church.

I will say this much, Sir, in conclusion, because I do not want to be too lengthy on this matter; there is agreement on both sides of this Chamber that the church has played an important role in this country and that it can continue to do so. And we certainly hope that it continues to do so. We believe that in the past the church has had to be criticised, not only in this country but in other countries as well, and those who are religious historians can point out ways in which deviations from the straight and narrow path have occurred. We only hope that the path for the social growth and development in this country will follow a true and hallowed way as set out in the Constitution of this country, whereby freedom of religion and freedom of speech, whether outside the church or inside, whether by favourites of this side or by those who are not favourites of this side — we believe that freedom is precious and that it must be maintained and we hope that by the means of this measure and other measures for the support and sustenance and continued improvement of the Church we will be able to live in a better Barbados and that our children and our children's children will be better and wiser for the ministrations of the Roman Catholic Church, indeed, for the churches general in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel that I must lend my voice to what has gone before, in words of welcome to the Roman Catholic Church — welcome in the sense that we are now extending Parliamentary incorporations etc., to give them legal and legitimate status which they have wanted for so long. I represent a minority religion, if you might say that; and I feel Sir, it is important for us from time to time — now I do not mean the Roman Catholic Church, I mean the

Seventh Day Adventist Church in this case — I represent a minority religion, and it is not a high church; and Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel it is necessary for us from time to time to get up and re-emphasize what is to all of us very obvious, that no country can long survive without the underpinnings of the church. Unfortunately, in a number of instances, through exuberance or lack of restraint, we have sometimes made utterances not always in the best interest of the church, and sometimes in our behaviour we have not reflected the real role the church has played throughout the centuries. The Roman Catholic Church is legendary in what it has been able to contribute from time to time through its economic, social and religious development. In Barbados it has run educational programmes which we have all referred to; throughout the world it has run clinics; it has made significant contributions through its development of the health of a number of African territories by sending missionaries into places where accredited medical practitioners would not go and where men, under the aegis of the church, have had to go and penetrate in order to bring some light to rather darkened areas; and it is with a great deal of pleasure, Sir, that I would say that we are grateful to the Roman Catholic Church for what it has done for the development of Barbados; and we are certain that it will continue to make an outstanding contribution to the development of our country.

Having said that, Sir, I would want to concur with my colleagues on this side, the hon. member for St. Michael South, who has voiced a word of caution to us that we must all stand up for religious liberty.

5.40 p.m.

I happen to have heard the former Prime Minister, the member for St. John, say some rather uncomplimentary things about the Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, a religious body which has as much legitimate right to the freedom of worship as any other Church. I heard him say in Pie Corner, for example, let them fly to town because they have no right riding on our buses, they do not vote, and matters like that, but when we enshrined in the Constitution of Barbados that clause regarding the freedom of religion, we meant the Roman Catholic Church, the Anglican Church, the Seventh Day Adventist Church, the Jehovah's Witnesses, the Tie Heads, the "Hold up Hands", everybody who practises any form of religious worship in this country, and I would like to caution the members on that side who like to attack the Church from time to time not to let

their own brand of partisan religious participation or worship blind them to the fact that God in His wisdom when he created us all never sought to enforce any form of worship on anybody. He gave them some guidelines and he left them to choose you this day whom you will serve in whatever manner you choose to serve, and that is what I would like to leave with this Assembly today, that every man regardless of his religious conviction, be free to practise that religion without molestation, and with these few words, Sir, I say welcome to the Roman Catholic Church, thanks very much for the contribution which they have made to Barbados and to the world indeed, and we hope that we can go along together towards the future development, social, economic and particularly religious, of our country.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am particularly glad that this measure has received the unanimity for which I asked when I began with my introduction of the measure. I think I need hardly do so, but yet for the purpose of the record I will.

The Government gives the Opposition, the country as a whole and the Churches its unequivocal assurance that at no stage during its tenure of office, be it till '81 or be it till '91, or 2001, will it interfere with the fundamental liberties of the people of this country, particularly freedom of religion. I notice that the hon. member for St. Michael South in a very clever and interesting speech wanted an assurance such as this, and as I listened to him with his analysis of this Bill, his analysis of the reasons for the Bill, his analysis of the political plums which his party may get from the Bill, I realise that he was beginning to set out on the exercise of salvaging the reputation of the former Leader of his party, and indeed that he was almost stealthily taking on the mantle of the present Leader of the Opposition, because he was at least standing up for him and pulling him back from the jaws of making a nonsense of some of his speeches. Indeed, Sir, it was cleverly done. The only criticism I would have of his speech is that it was not really factual to state that members have distorted the speeches of some of his members on this issue. What the hon. member should have done was to accept the fact that one and possibly and probably two of his members have from time to time strayed from the correct path of analysing the contribution of the Church and have allowed all the sins of which the Greeks spoke – arrogance, too brisk to take over – and have found their Nemesis now sitting on the Opposition benches.

The hon. member of course is probably inspired, and his speech was outstanding in this respect, by his hallucination that his party will win the next Government in 1981, and he has begun to convince himself that he has a special divination given to him by the powers that be. I watch him very carefully in his public relations exercise, but although there was that to it, Sir, he like other hon. members recognise quite rightly, and I think quite genuinely, the Church's contribution, and I welcome particularly the intervention of the hon. member for St. Philip South and the hon. member for St. Michael West, two of the people who are stalwarts of the Church, let me say this, and of their particular Churches indeed. When one thinks of the contribution of the Seventh Day Adventists in particular, one is very pleased to record that a religious sect which depends so little on State assistance has done so much for a community without asking anything in return, and I would wish to record this.

The hon. member for St. Philip South made reference, and perhaps you will permit me the indulgence to reply to that, to the position of the St. Philip's Parish Church. I should like to inform the House that at its meeting last Thursday the Cabinet approved of a Paper put up by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, the hon. member for St. Andrew, authorising the expenditure of funds from the Contingency Vote under the Head of Cabinet for the use of shoring up the walls of St. Philip's Church in order to preserve the existing structure, and to make sure that no further damage occurs, as well as to of course protect it for future reconstruction.

Very soon after the fire I invited the Reverend of the Church, the Archdeacon and the Lord Bishop to come and see me in order to discuss ways in which the Government may be able to assist the Church in its exercise of rebuilding this landmark. I am still awaiting some final suggestions, but the action taken by the hon. member for St. Andrew, the Hon. Minister, is an answer to one of the requests then made, and indeed I would like publicly – because Ministers very seldom find their trumpets being blown for them by anybody at all, no matter how much good they do – I would like publicly to acknowledge the ready response by the Minister of Communications and Works and his Ministry. If there is one thing I would say, Sir, he may have remained outside of Parliament for a long time, but those of us who work with him in the Cabinet have realised that he is extremely businesslike and

very considerate, and I think the country will recognise that it waited a long time to receive the best wine in St. Andrew.

So far as the question of helping the Church in other ways is concerned, I can assure the hon. members that the Anglican Church Act places an obligation on the Government to repair the Church schools. Once again I have had conversation with the Churches concerned and the relevant Ministries are now undertaking a survey of the schools which have been returned to the Churches and which are still in need of repair. In the current Estimates there is a token vote, we intend to come to Parliament as soon as a decision has been reached, and the Church and ourselves have come to terms on the particular sum needed, we intend to come to Parliament for a vote in order to carry out that Statutory responsibility.

5.50 p.m.

I am indeed grateful for the contribution made by all of our Churches — conformist, non-conformist, recently dis-established and long unestablished — the contribution which they have made; and if the hon. member for St. Michael South has taken my words as meaning that the Government is setting out on any course of action for looking for opportunities for disagreeing with the Church, I can assure the hon. member that that is not so at all.

We do not believe that in any society everything that is done by Government or the Opposition will meet with the approval of all sections of the community, be they religious or otherwise; and indeed in our system of open Government we welcome criticism, because one of the great things about criticisms, coming from the Church or from the Opposition, is that at some times it throws up very good ideas and a sagacious leader usually listens, considers and adopts those ideas if he wants to be a proper statesman in his country. One of the things we welcome, be it from the Church or from the Opposition is criticism.

Some of the criticisms may be unfounded, Sir. I am glad that hon. members have made reference to fundamental freedoms because I have heard on the tapes that I have been doing on the D.L.P. meetings the criticism that we have set out to abolish fundamental freedoms and that sort of thing. Nothing could be further from the truth. I know of no measure taken by the Government since I have been in the Government that has in any way affected any of the fundamental freedoms; and that applies to the Cane Fires Prevention Bill as well in

which two hon. Senators from the Other Place were mistaken enough to construe the legal implications of the Bill and queried whether or not they were affecting the Constitution.

In fact this Government, this Cabinet is anxious to preserve the fundamental freedoms of Barbados, and we intend, as we said in our party manifesto to set up a Constitutional Commission very broadly based with powers to show in what way Barbados can improve the quality of its Constitution, not to take further powers to politicians, but where possible to cement those fundamental freedoms, including freedom of Religion.

Since hon. members have heard enough of this Bill, I will with these words welcome the statements made and ask that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: 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. WEEKES in the Chair.

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE the Preamble to the Bill was postponed.

On separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE Clauses 1 to 8 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE the Preamble was called and agreed to.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: 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. deB. FORDE seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE the Bill was read a third time and passed.
6.00 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, has Your Honour put the final passage of this Bill yet? I believe the Clerk is looking at it. It may turn out to be a Hybrid Bill, Sir. It affects the corporate rights of persons. The Church is a sole corporation. In the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches the bishoprics are corporations sole. They are the original corporations. There was a great difficulty in Britain recently, Sir, with this business of a Bill being declared hybrid. It went to court, as Your Honour recalls. It was one of the shipbuilding Bills; there was a lot of difficulties, and the Bill was never passed. The Labour Party was unable to deal with that particular matter because of its hybridity. I think it is 57(3), Sir. I leave it at that, Sir, because I am sure the Clerk will advise Your Honour, before he presents it to Your Honour for signature, whether the correct procedure has been followed.

I am just asking if I can ask leave to give notice of the Bill which I referred to earlier. When I have given the notice, I will ask that it be read a first time. I am asking leave to give notice of a Bill to amend and consolidate certain enactments concerning the imposition of duties and fees in relation to betting and gaming. It is a fairly big Bill, and I want hon. members to have the longest possible opportunity of studying it, but at the same time I want to get it through quickly so that we can start dealing with the new gaming duties and the new provisions of the Gaming Laws. I want hon. members to get it early so that they can study it and be aware of

it. If the House gives leave, Sir, I will now give notice of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, leave is granted.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend and consolidate certain enactments concerning the imposition of duties and fees in relation to betting and gaming and also to provide for the use under licence of machines for the purposes of gaming and for related matters.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a first time.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, there being no other items on the Order Paper under Government Business that, therefore, concludes Government Business. I beg to move that the House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, 24th May, 1977, at twelve noon.

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

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