
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th January, 1978.

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. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Q.C. LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism and Leader of the House); Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, (Acting Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. L. L. SISNETT; and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER entered the Chamber and took her seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 10th January, 1978.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated, and subject to any observations by the other side or any member, I beg to move that they be confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, the Minutes stand confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to lay the Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1977.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$222,880 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1977–78, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977–78, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill entitled the Final Appropriation (1976–77) Bill, 1978.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did ask some questions some time ago, and I think you did rule or did indicate that two were deferred and some were out of order. I would like to know what has happened to those questions which have been deferred some two or three months ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue, Mr. Clerk.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like an answer to my question. It is only a civilised answer to a simple question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will immediately withdraw the remark.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am entitled to some courtesy from you. You cannot tell the Clerk to go on and treat me with such discourtesy; it is discourteous to treat me like that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Leader please take his seat? The Leader will immediately withdraw the remark that it is only civilised. It is an insult to the Chair and to this Hon. House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I withdraw the remark and I demand from you, Mr. Speaker, that you treat me as Leader of the Opposition with a certain degree of courtesy. I am entitled to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue, Mr. Clerk.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Final Appropriation (1976-77) Bill, 1978 was read a first time.

Mr. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken and that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to consider a number of Resolutions for the service of the Island.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.
12.25 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to consider certain Money Resolutions.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: 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 of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977-78 No. 23

A Resolution that the sum of \$7,520 be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal

of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1977-78 Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977-78 No. 23 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple matter. The Training Division during the last financial year was at premises at the Pine and it was necessary to have a ground floor to the new building. This was done, but unfortunately the bill was not received during the financial year; and to settle the bill it is necessary to supplement this year's Estimates. An amount of \$10,970 lapsed at the end of the last financial year and we are therefore only asking for \$7,520.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977-78

NO. 24

A Resolution that the sum of \$115,863 be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1977-78 Part I - as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977-78 No. 24 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 16(1) be postponed.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977-78 No. 25

A Resolution that the sum of \$163,274 be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1977-78 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1977-78 No. 25 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in pursuance of a promise made in two successive General Election campaigns, the Barbados Labour Party has decided that all Constitutions may well need what has been called "protection". Dealing specifically with the debates in 1974 when the Constitution was amended without reference to the Opposition, without any reference to the public at large, but merely by unilateral

Government action, we find that both public morality and the ordinary feelings of the man and woman in the street need to be given more expression in relation to the future of our Constitution questions of its improvements; questions of its amendment during the eleven years of independence.

As set out in the Queen's Speech, the Government has therefore decided to set up a Commission to review the Constitution, to examine how far the earlier amendments should be allowed to continue, to advise on what amendments may be suitable for the future and perhaps also to take procedural consultation with the Opposition and the public which will obviate the unfortunate circumstances of 1974.

The Opposition has been nothing, if not consistent in this matter. They have refused to consult us when we were in Opposition in 1974, and they now refuse to be consulted now that they are in Opposition in 1978. The House should know that the Leader of the Opposition was written and invited to serve on the Committee and to appoint a nominee to serve in his stead — if he did not think that there was any contribution which he could usefully make. His various replies have indicated that the Opposition does not like the form of the Commission. The Opposition feels that there should be more members on the Commission. I do not know if he wanted to be consulted before the letter inviting him was even sent out.

I think that it is my duty, because as I have said in another place, the business of the Government of the country must be carried on despite the Opposition. It is therefore with regret that I announce to the House that the Commission will consist of persons representing the governing party, persons of eminence in their different fields in the society at large, but no persons representing the Opposition. As I have said, we regret this; but we have done our best. You can lead a horse to the water but you cannot give it the commonsense to make it understand that if it does not drink, so much the worse for its constitution and its body politic — if you do not mind me spreading the metaphors a little bit thin.

The expenses of the Commission which has already begun work are modest enough for the remainder of this financial year. We are asking for \$15,000. The Commission's office is situated in Government Headquarters. The Secretary to the Commission is the Cabinet Secretary and the offices which are occupied by the Chairman, and other officers who will be full-time officers are adjacent to the Government Headquarters.

In due course, members of the public will be invited to make written submissions on constitutional

points which they think are of importance, and the Commission also intends to travel all over Barbados to hear oral evidence from simple people of this country who may not have the inclination or the wish to make formal written submissions.

12.35 p.m.

Its work is anticipated to occupy, at least, the whole of 1978. I say, at least, Sir. We are only budgeting for 1978, but these Commissions sometimes have a way of carrying on a little beyond the initial expectations.

The fact that the Opposition will not be represented in the Commission should not be taken by those sensible and right-thinking members of the Democratic Labour Party to mean that their submissions, orally or written, will not be accepted. They will be accepted, they will be welcomed, and they will be given the same consideration as submissions from any other source. We are extending the right of submissions to members of the Public Service, not merely in their capacity as servants of the Government, but in their capacity as servants of the Public Service as an institution, and in their capacity as persons experienced in the administration of Government and who, therefore, may have something to suggest to a Commission independently of political intervention.

I am very happy to say and I would wish to congratulate the Chief Establishments Officer and the Head of the Civil Service for already directing their minds to problems relating to the Constitution and already making, as I have said, on a personal basis, cogent, well-thought-out acceptable suggestions regarding certain areas of improvement of the Constitution. The point I wish to make here, Mr. Chairman, is that although I, on a personal level, would support the submissions on these points made by the Chief Establishments Officer, whose character I will not divulge at this time, even if I disapprove of them I would support their submissions to the Commission as matters which the Commissioner may discuss dispassionately for eventual consideration when they make their Report and submit it to the Government. The Opposition, the Public Service, the University, Mr. Chairman, and the public at large, will all have the opportunity to take part in this exercise of Constitutional review.

I have heard some of the less well-informed members of the Opposition suggest that since, they put it, the Constitution was their Constitution, it does not need changing and nothing could be wrong with it, and for them to associate themselves with the process of change would be a mistake. This, of course, shows a certain inconsistency with the attitude of 1974, but it does show a certain consistency to the attitude of the Duke of Wellington who, in making his speech in the

House of Lords against the Reform Bill late in 1831, indicated that he was against any reform for the Constitution of Great Britain was so perfect that any change could only be for the worst. If that is the attitude of the Opposition, then I am sorry for them. It is not the attitude of the Government, nor do I believe that it is the attitude of the public.

Speaking on the most mundane uncontroversial level, I would have thought, we have discovered since coming into office in the course of negotiations between the United Kingdom and the Government of Barbados relating to the pensions of certain former civil servants in the Colony of Barbados, who are nationals in the United Kingdom, that there are provisions in the Constitution which, though they may have been devised originally by the Colonial Office to protect their nationals, now have the effect of hampering more sensible and intelligent arrangements for the pensioning of these nationals. I do not think when our Constitution was devised that it was foreseen in British Government circles that the currency in Barbados would have comparatively remained like a rock of stability in the face of devaluations of sterling, but these considerations come up; it is suddenly realised that a former rigidity which seemed to be of advantage is now of disadvantage and, perhaps, the rigidity should now be relaxed.

The hon. member for Christ Church West, the Minister of External Affairs, has been negotiating, and we have found ourselves hampered in dealing with this very minor matter by reason of certain provisions in the Constitution. I mention this, Sir, because it is a small thing, but it indicates that there may yet be some room for improvement of the document which we now enjoy. I should also say that the Government is committed, as a matter of policy, to some revision of the Constitution over and above outside — perhaps not outside, but not necessarily inside the recommendations of the Commission. I refer, specifically, to the Government's proposals contained in its Manifesto and contained in the first Queen's Speech in the opening of Parliament to entrench the electoral laws in this country into the Constitution. We have seen situations in the last few years where the principle of a Speaker's Commission sitting on electoral boundaries has been breached by an administration and electoral boundary fixing reduced to the stage where it can be done by the Minister responsible for elections by Statutory Order. I think that the altering of electoral boundaries by Statutory Order was a very serious step down the slope that leads to unfree elections. Indeed, I would call it a corrupt step, when we remember that the first order made was the Order altering the boundaries of the Constituency of St. Andrew removing what was regarded as the Opposition stronghold of Springhead from the back of Dacosta Edwards who was a then Cabinet Minister in

the former Government. I would remind hon. members that the same power was used to adjust the electoral boundaries in Christ Church between Christ Church South Central and Christ Church East for purposes which were, transparently, those of removing the then Leader of the Opposition from his seat. (*Asides.*)

Sir, we intend to remove from ourselves the temptation, which I am confident this Government is quite strong enough to resist, of taking part in any such exercise, and more important to remove from those who have shown inability to resist the temptation of electoral corruption the possibility of indulging in it again in the future. (*Laughter.*) Let hon. members laugh when I indicate that the temptation is being removed by way of self-denying ordinance by the present Cabinet, but in their laughter let them reflect on their own personal contribution to the state of affairs from which I can exempt, fortunately, most of those now occupying the Opposition front bench. I think there may be only one sinner among them, Sir.

12.45 p.m.

The Government therefore intends to amend the Constitution to entrench the Electoral Boundaries Commission which was set up to look after elections in this country in future. This Commission will in due course have the right of appointment of electoral officers, registering officers, returning officers, etc., and will control the activities of the Chief Electoral Officers.

I have touched on some aspects of electoral corruption in respect of the boundaries. I do not think that I need to remind any hon. member who stood for elections on September 2, 1976, that we had to contend with the Government, with the supporters of the Democratic Labour Party, with the money of those who had done well under the Democratic Labour Party, money of the capitalists whom they so ungraciously abused as the election date drew nearer and they became more desperate but whose cash money they did not return when the crunch came. We had to contend with all that, and then when we went to the polls we had to contend with the people who had canvassed against the Barbados Labour Party week in, week out, year in, year out for the last ten years, sitting down and looking us in the face as presiding officers and returning officers, and so on. We intend, Mr. Chairman, never to see this situation again where, as I had to put up with in my own constituency on one occasion, the elector who seconded the nomination of my opponent was the presiding officer at one of the polling stations. I believe that the hon. member for Christ Church East not only had a seconder but also one of the subscribers to the nomination form as well. We had all sorts of incidents during the elections in the past. We have had Mr. Deighton Griffith, the Returning Officer in the constituency of the Minister of Home Affairs, being appointed a Senator immediately

after the elections over which he had presided. He is now, I believe, the presiding officer of the Democratic Academy of Politics. We had the situation where the uncle of the former Attorney General, a total political partisan whose dismissal was recommended as Chief Electoral Officer before the election, we had him as the returning officer for Christ Church East. He is said to have made complaints when the overall result of the election was already known, because he was threatened by one of the supporters of the hon. member for Christ Church East with being thrown through a window unless he gave a fair account of the votes. But returning officers who engage in partisan politics must expect to be threatened by the righteous wrath of those whose democratic rights they have attempted to suborn. And I wish the hon. member for Christ Church East was here, because he himself told me how he got so fed up in the end when he saw that he would get home by a margin of a few votes in double figures, he was so fed up that he did not bother to contest the other half dozen or so votes of which he had been deprived by the decision of the Returning Officer. All of this adds up to a situation in which the public has little confidence in the administration of the electoral system; and it adds up to a situation where only a Resolution of the majority of the electors was able to turn out of office those who were gradually drawing the electoral process into their own hands.

I make no apology for indicating that it is part of the policy of this Government that the Electoral Boundaries Commission be set up and protected constitutionally.

Mr. Chairman, it may be queried why the expenses of this Commission are relatively modest compared with that of the previous Commission which cost about ten times that amount. This Commission, although, headed by a full time Chairman, is not expected to have very large expenses. His Honour the Deputy Speaker has consented to serve as Deputy Chairman, and I would like to warn that such words of legal wisdom as may escape from him during the deliberations will not be rewarded by a brief fee but by a per diem allowance. We are also getting the assistance of personnel of the university in the legal field. Officers in the Public Service will be seconded to carry out much of the detailed work of the Commission, and so there may be some hidden expenses in replacing them during 1978. But we are not intending that this Commission should be a burden on the Treasury as far as can be possibly avoided.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the terms of reference of the Commission have been generally published, and I do not think under the circumstances that there is anything more I can usefully add to what I have already said.

I therefore beg to move that Head 5 stand part.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by paying tribute to the person who has been named as Chairman of the Commission. I do not believe that it is very often in Barbados that Mr. Cox is remembered as having been a formidable Minister of the previous Barbados Labour Party Government, but there are many civil servants and others in all walks of life who can attest to the fact that from their knowledge of the man he was foremost among the Ministers of the Barbados Labour Party Government, not excluding the Premier of that day. 12.55 p.m.

Therefore to me I think it is an honour in recognising the ability of the man in having him as Chairman of the Constitution Committee, although in my way of thinking when one looks at his position within the other Chamber one would have liked to see something better than that. The Democratic Labour Party, now in Opposition, has indicated that it has no intention of being a member of that Commission, because we are not happy with the way in which the Commission has been set up, and when one recalls all the talk about the various Commission looking into the so-called misdeeds of the former Democratic Labour Party Government, it is only reasonable for us to be suspicious of the reasons why this Commission has been set up as it is, and if we have any pride in ourselves, with the type of atmosphere which has been generated, and realising that we have not been asked to become members of the other Commissions, we would and we do question why we have been asked to become members of this Commission. But I would like to assure the Government that they must take no comfort whatsoever from the fact that we have not taken the invitation of the Government to become members of the Commission, because it is the intention of the members of the Democratic Labour Party to put forward their views as regards any proposed amendments to the Constitution.

We have to acknowledge that in the history of a colony, especially in the British Empire and Commonwealth, whenever the advent of independence draws near you have to accept the Westminster model Constitution if you are going to get independence, and therefore the fact that people do accept that is no clear indication of what the people themselves may feel about what they consider necessary for a country. There is no reason whatsoever to believe that a Constitution can remain constant and without change, because the society does change, and it is the responsibility of any party, whether they are in the Government or in the Opposition, to interpret the changes or the desire for change within the community and try to give effect to those changes.

Barbados having passed through a period of stability over the last 15 years, it is reasonable to believe that at this particular point in time people will be concerned

with effecting new changes, and these changes can point towards the need for changes in the Constitution. But just to indicate briefly, it is obvious to us on this side that in the thinking of the people when you are thinking of strict political change, that people in Barbados, especially the younger people, will be considering the desirability of moving a step further and having this country become a Republic. We have to accept these things, these are things you have to be able to interpret, so we on this side are not afraid of any proposed constitutional change, but I would like to stress again that it is the intention of members of this party to look carefully at any proposed amendments that may be put forward in regard to the present Constitution.

I do not know what the Prime Minister means when he refers to lesser members of the Democratic Labour Party talking about getting rid of the Constitution, because many changes have been made and people are aware of these things. There comes a time in the history of an individual when you have to part company with a previous concept or previous activities and adopt new ones. I would find it strange that anyone on this side wanted to believe that because we were responsible for the first Constitution of Barbados that we will say for all time it should not be changed, because if we do we will not be seeking to interpret the feelings of people in the society as to the desire or need for change. We are not as foolish as that. Sir, our views on the Constitution will come. I would like to point out that I myself have very strong views about the Constitution; I have always had. In the days when the Constitution of Barbados was first discussed, I submitted my proposal of what I thought could have been included in the Constitution, and I have held views right up to the present day, and even in 1974 when the amendments were being made, but one has to appreciate that in a Party one has to do things which will win majority support, and therefore if my views were not incorporated at that particular time I have no quarrel with that, and I believe that as we are looking at Barbados at the present time and there is need for change, the opportunity has again come when people who might be thinking like me will have the opportunity of presenting their views on whether or not the Constitution of this country should be changed.

We are concerned about expenditure, and I think it is a bit refreshing to learn from the Hon. Minister of Finance that the expenditure relative to the Constitutional Commission will be low, because when we look at the expenditure in relation to other Commissions we are a bit shocked at the high cost, bearing in mind all the talk of the difficulties which the Government now has in getting money to run the affairs of this country. I hope that the expenditure for this Constitutional Commission will be kept within reasonable limits or comparable limits as indicated by the sum being given here, and I hope that we are not going to be faced with a

full time Commission or Constitution Committee drawing salaries for as long as possible. We would like to know that this work will be brief, will be coming to an end in the very near future, and the public of Barbados will be relieved of this particular financial burden.

There were even views expressed that this may be a way of rewarding a particular individual. I do not share that view, but those are the views expressed by the public, and I am certain the public will be watching carefully the length of the duration in which this Constitutional Committee will be having its activities. Sir, whether or not we are members of the Constitutional Committee will not in any way detract from any contribution that we will make, and will not in any way ensure that the views expressed by the Constitutional Committee are not the views which we may have fed to it previously. In a neighbouring island in the Caribbean the Government in power set up a Constitutional Committee, and after that Committee presented its report and that report was bandied about in the country left, right and centre and got criticised, the Government then set about to set up another Committee to report on this report, and we would hate to know that this could happen in Barbados. We would like to believe that when this Committee submits its report, whether this year or next year, that report will be given a proper airing in this country and the Government will proceed to act on the basis of the recommendations of that Committee. We would not like to see that after this Commission has submitted its report the type of behaviour which occurred in another island in the Caribbean descends on us in this country and then the Government using that state of conditions and circumstances to set up another committee then to appoint someone to get what they have in view done.

As regards the Prime Minister's comment on the need for an electoral commission, I would like to ask him who is going to appoint this electoral commission, because these commissions and these committees are not guaranteed whatsoever that the things that we get up here and criticise and say should not happen are not going to happen again in the future. It takes a lot more than the mere appointment of committees and commissions to ensure within the lifestyle or behaviour in any community or country that the things we abhor do not occur. A lot depends on the integrity of the people involved, a lot depends on a a lot of other factors, some of which even the Prime Minister himself may not have any control over. I would just repeat that while he may be stressing the need for an election committee to prevent certain things which he considers to be bad, I would like to ask him who is going to appoint that election commission. It is worthwhile to consider this.

Sir, there are a number of things which relate to the Constitutional Committee, but I do not believe that this

is the place to air them, they could be better aired before the Commission when it starts its activity.

1.05 p.m.

We in the Democratic Labour Party, or at least some of us, are looking forward eagerly on the occasion to air our views on these matters; because we do not believe that the Constitution cannot be changed, nor do we believe that the Government should be allowed to go about and do what it wants the Constitution all alone. We accept our responsibilities. We recognise that a large number of the electorate of Barbados did vote for us, and expect us to champion their cause; and that is why we look forward to carefully analyse and to comment adequately and constructively on any amendments put up by the Constitutional Committee either at the stage when they are released or before that when the Commission sits; and furthermore when the Government takes action on these recommendations and brings them before this Hon. Chamber. I do not believe that a matter such as a Constitutional Committee is a matter which one should discuss, without rancour or one on which to make cheap comments about the activities of your opponents, and at this particular time I will try to restrain myself from responding to some of the comments made by the Hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, like the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, I am not surprised at the level to which the Hon. Prime Minister has drawn this debate. I am convinced in my own mind that he has no sense of fitness, as evidenced by the asinine and ungracious remarks that one gone, six to go. I am not surprised, Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will withdraw the word "asinine".

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will withdraw the word "asinine". I am not surprised that he takes New Year Day to give a rehash of what the Government has done. All that I am saying is that he has no sense of fitness when he talks about someone going into a booth at election time and who was who. A constitutional debate is to my mind too sacred a matter for that type of cheap politics; and when he can even make a remark to suggest that the first Attorney General of an independent Barbados, and President of the Bar Association would not have any contribution to make to constitutional revision, it shows that he either is being sarcastic or stupid.

I want the public for the first time to hear the correspondence that passed between me and the Prime Minister — not the Prime Minister, because he used to quarrel with the Democratic Labour Party about consultation by letter, but he still adopts it — not from him, but from the Cabinet Secretary. I used to hear a lot in here about what is consultation; but he has now come

around to the view that this is what the Constitution requires when the Prime Minister consults with the Leader of the Opposition. I am not going to quarrel with that. Soon from now he will not have to consult me at all. *(Laughter)*.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Let me read the letters.

On 17th August, 1977 I received a letter from Cabinet Office, Government Headquarters, Barbados, It read:

Dear Sir,

I am directed to inform you that the Government has decided to appoint a Constitution Review Commission, generally —

- (a) to review the existing Constitution and to make recommendations for such amendments thereto as it considered fit;
- (b) to consider the question of the institution of Barbados National Honours;
- (c) to consider a revision of the Table of Precedence;

The precise terms of reference are under preparation.

The Government has proposed that the following persons, including yourself, should comprise the Commission, and you are accordingly invited to inform me whether you are willing and able to serve:

Senator M. E. Cox — Chairman
Mr. Ezra Alleyne, M.P., — Vice Chairman
The Leader of the Opposition or his nominee
Dr. Elsie Payne
The Hon. F. A. Hoyos
Mr. C. A. Burton, O.B.E., — Secretary

Yours faithfully

(Sgd.) F. M. Blackman
Cabinet Secretary.

Now I live in Barbados, and I know the political affiliations or the learnings of this entire Committee. If Barbadians do not know, or pretend they do not know, or believe they do not know, that is their business. My reply was dated the 9th September and it read as follows:

"I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 17th August, 1977.

"I must confess that I am surprised and amazed at the composition of the Commission and the paucity of the representation given to the Opposition. (I am not a hypocrite. I know where people stand. Some of them have shown it.) It does appear that from the proposed composition of the Commission, the Government has a preponderance of representation. (The Government does not need to have them in the House. They have them in the community ready to serve them.)

"Secondly, the precise terms of reference are under preparation and I would prefer to wait until the terms of reference are settled.

"On the question of Barbados National Honours. The position of the Democratic Labour Party was clearly set out in the Throne Speech delivered by Her Majesty the Queen when she opened Parliament two years ago.

"On the question of the revision of the Table of Precedence, this is entirely a matter for the Government and the Opposition is not desirous of taking part in this exercise. (I do not care whether the Privy Council comes before the Opposition.)

"In short, I should like to draw to the attention of the Government, the criticisms made against the Democratic Labour Party when Constitutional Amendments were passed in 1974. I would therefore like to know from the Government what areas of the Constitution they now find in need of change, to enable the Opposition to study such proposals.

"Further the Opposition feels that constitutional changes do not rate priority at this time, in view of the state of the economy and the high incidence of unemployment and would suggest that the energies of the Government could better be spent in dealing with these two urgent problems rather than tamper with the constitution at this stage.

"On receipt of the terms of reference and on the assurance that the Opposition will be given greater representation on the Commission, my decision on participation will be communicated to you.

"Finally, let me express my surprise at the revelation on television on Saturday 3rd September, 1977 by the Prime Minister of my being asked to serve personally or by nominee since I had assumed that this matter was still confidential and I respect that confidentiality which was breached on that night."

On 29th September, I received a letter from the Cabinet Secretary reading:—

Dear Sir,

I am directed to refer to your letter of the 9th September, 1977 regarding the appointment of the Constitution Review Commission and to inform you that, having regard to the current representation in both Houses of Parliament of the existing political parties (29/9) the Government does not consider that it has a preponderance of representation (2/1) on the Commission.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I was awaiting to reply; but the hon. member is continuing to mislead the House. He knows only too well that only two members of the Constitutional Committee are members of the Barbados Labour Party — that is Senator Cox and His Honour the Deputy Speaker; and by going on and on and on, he is attempting, in my respectful submission, to impugn the impartiality of the Head of the Civil Service, and the Head Mistress of Queen's College.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am talking to Barbadians. I know that there are only two members in Parliament who are on this Committee; but I do not live in Timbuctoo or behind God's back; and I have been in politics too long not to know my way around. The letter goes on:—

"I am further to inform you that Mr. J. S. B. Dear, Q.C., has been invited to be an additional member of the Commission; and that Professor A. R. Carnegie of the Cave Hill Campus of the University of the West Indies has been invited to serve as a Consultant to the Commission.

"Enclosed is a copy of the precise Terms of Reference of the Commission.

"I should be grateful to be informed as early as possible whether you are willing to serve on the Commission or nominate someone to serve on your behalf."

Accompanying this letter was a communication headed up "Draft", Commission under the Commissions of Enquiry Act, Cap. 112." This reads: "Whereas by section 2 of the Commissions of Enquiry Act (Cap. 112), it is *inter alia* enacted that the Governor General may etc." It is clear from this that the Government intends to use the Commissions of Enquiry Act for this Commission. They did not use the Commissions of Enquiry Act when they wanted to enquire into the salaries of conditions of Parliament. They set up a Committee of two or three people who would be willing to serve in that capacity. 1.15 p.m.

I make no apologies for this. This is my reply to that:

"The Cabinet Secretary, etc.

Dear Sir:

I beg to refer to your letter of the 29th September, 1977 Reference No. 0075/32.

Rather than altering the obvious imbalance in representation as pointed out in my letter of the 9th September, 1977 I now find that an additional person is added to increase further Government's representation on this Body.

I am to let you know that the Opposition has no intention of taking part in this Commission Exercise since the correspondence submitted to me indicates that it is proposed to use the Commission of Enquiries Act, Chapter 112 for this Constitutional Revision.

The Opposition is not aware that the Constitution has been stolen or that Sections of it have been missing. In short the Opposition considers and has always considered the constitution to be a sacred document and does not intend to take part in any exercise which places the constitution Commission on the same level as the two Commissions set up by Government recently."

(The Housing Authority Enquiries and the Duffus Commission. We view the Constitution as a sacred document.)

"If the Government intends to provide a well paid job as a reward to one of its long standing supporters then the Government should give him the Job without bringing constitutional revision to the level of the Housing Authority Enquiries.

The Opposition contends that there must be in our society a body of intelligent Patriotic Educated persons who would be only too willing to give of their time and talents free and for nothing in dealing with a matter of such importance as Constitutional revisions, and the opposition is of the firm opinion that it was never the intention of the framers of the Commission of Enquiries Act Chapter 112 that a matter so noble as the Constitution should be a fit subject for its use. In fact, a proper reading of the Act and the power given thereunder would clearly show that this Act is being used for some other purpose not mentioned in the correspondence to me.

The Opposition regrets having to take this course but since it was the Democratic Labour

Party which led this Country into Independence we honestly cannot take part in any exercise which deregates from the high value and esteem we place on our Constitution."

Now, I would like the Prime Minister to give me details of what fees are being paid to members of this Commission. How much is the Chairman getting, and how much are members getting per meeting? I want to get the details. Do not say it is only \$15,000. It is taxpayers' money. If he has agreed on a figure for a brief, or per meeting, or whatever form, the Opposition would like him to state so here and now today. I am not criticising any member of the Commission, but I would like to know how the taxpayers' money is being distributed on this Commission. If civil servants are being appointed on their salaries, then the \$15,000 seems to be likely for meetings and for paying members of the Commission. I want to know how much the Chairman is getting, how much the Deputy Chairman and all the members of this Commission will be getting out of this \$15,000 which we are asked to vote here today.

I have read this correspondence to let the public understand that the Democratic Labour Party are not against Constitutional reform as my colleague said, but we feel when the Constitution was established in 1966 or 1965 we did not have any Commission of Enquiry to bring this country into Independence. I am satisfied that the same persons now in this Community will willingly serve on a Constitutional Committee without using an Act which the Government are using as they have done to enquire into the Housing Authority, North Point, Bath, Carib West, and so on.

Now, do not mind what the Prime Minister said, because he would know better than that to suggest that I could not make a contribution to it, because he would be the biggest idiot in Christendom, which he is not. He would know that I could make a contribution, because I was the Attorney-General interpreting the Constitution for five years, so he cannot talk that nonsense. He is trying to belittle me, but he cannot do that to me. I read this correspondence which I sent to the *Advocate* and the *Nation* about five weeks ago, and it has not yet appeared in the Press! The Opposition are being maligned all the time as if they are stepping out of their responsibility, and the public is not being made aware of the fact that our objection to serving is that we are not serving where the Government is using this particular measure. We would serve on a voluntary Commission where, as concerned citizens we feel we have a contribution to make.

Now, I shall not quarrel about the fact that there is no representative of the workers on the Commission. You see we are a middleclass society. Barbadians have not

changed; we are becoming very fast an off-white society. We have seen in this Commission — (*Asides.*) Since this Government got in they have turned off-white. We have here Mr. Cox, Mr. Alleyne — not one representative of the workers on this Committee. (*Asides.*) Of course, the workers can come and make their representations. The workers are entitled to make their representations, but the workers are not competent to sit on a Committee where you have Ph.Ds., M.As., B.As., LL.Ms., and all sorts of people. (*Asides.*) The workers are not fit to sit on this Commission. Someone says that Mr. Cox represents the workers. That is true if you say so, but there is no representation from the lower echelon of the Barbadian society in this Commission. This is another indication of the snobbishness of our society that the workers themselves are not even given an opportunity to sit — not carrying memoranda to be presented, but in this community in 1978 a Committee is set up to review the Constitution to affect the working man and not one working-class representative or anybody looking like a working-class representative from the Organisations is put on the Committee. (*Asides.*) If that is not true, then tell me who will represent the working-class Organisations, the Union, the people who are going to be affected most by any changes in the Constitution?

It will be interesting to see, when the Report comes out, whether the amendments made by the Democratic Labour Party in 1974 are going to be repealed by the Barbados Labour Party whenever the Constitutional amendments come. You made so much fuss the last time about it and gave the public the impression that there were the worst things ever put into the Constitution. I am certainly looking forward to seeing them completely replaced by what was there before the Democratic Labour Party amended them in 1974, leaving out all the background to it. You have a two-thirds majority now, so you cannot argue that you do not have the power to put back in the Constitution what the DLP wrongly moved out in 1974. You have 17. I am watching you like a hawk. I am still here. One has not gone yet. I know about six to go, but I know that one is here.

1.25 p.m.

And it is only talking like a parrot with this remark about one gone and six to go. I don't know about the six but I know this one is still here. That is all I have to say on that. But I just want the public to understand the position of the Opposition in this matter. As my learned friend said, we will shoulder our responsibility to the community. But if you look at that Committee with just one DLP member on it. When you consider that, it is better to issue a memorandum or submit a minority report even before you start.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to stop the Leader of the Opposition, but I

fear that if he repeats himself he will only drag down the level of the Opposition speeches, and I further fear that his fifteen minutes are up. I just want to draw that to your attention.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to one or two points made by hon. members in this debate. As I understand it, one of the reasons why the Opposition is not serving on the Committee, according to the correspondence read out, is because the Commission has been set up under the Commissions of Enquiry Act, and the hon. member further takes the position that since two other Commissions have been set up under this Act, it means that the Constitutional Commission will lose the status it deserves. I believe that this point of view represents a wrong appreciation of Commissions of Enquiry and the use to which Acts such as these are placed. It is a great tragedy that the hon. member with his several years' exposure as a lawyer and as the first Attorney General of an independent Barbados did not react by objective analysis and research of the uses to which such Acts are used, rather than an emotional, unresearched, un-erudite letter which was sent in reply. Research would have shown that Constitutional Commissions are indeed the highest status you can get, coming from the Head of State or from Parliament. In many instances they are set up by Parliamentary Resolution; in other instances under Commissions of Enquiry in order to give the Commissioners certain powers and accessibility to Government files and records. This Commission would want to see various files obviously involving matters of Cabinet, perhaps to see if certain functions are relevant in the 1970's and 1980's; and if the hon. member had taken the trouble to ask my Department to give him examples we would have been willing to give him the benefit of our research in this field. But that shows me that this is not the real reason. I believe the DLP was caught in various positions on this matter and we are under the impression that the purpose was to undo the 1974 amendments, and even now they are not sure as to whether they wish the 1974 amendments undone or wish to stick to the principles of the 1974 amendments; because, let us be serious, the hon. member in one breath makes the point that it should not have been set up under the Commissions of Enquiry Act, but yet he is sure that the people on the Commission would have served voluntarily and done a good job. Yet he ends his speech by saying that had he served he would have had to begin with a minority report. This is a contradiction in itself; either he believes in the integrity of the persons and that they are well suited for the task, or else he is criticising himself.

Let us look at the past history of the Independence Constitution for Barbados. The Barbados Constitution, the one put forward by the Democratic Labour Party, was drafted by their people. They never invited the

Opposition to sit on a Commission for the draft they put up; they never invited a workers' representative. In fact the Constitution was originally merely made available to the public for reference, and we had in London to put forward any representations which we had on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party and other organisations whom we had asked for their views. (I see the hon. member for St. Michael South writing rapidly after taking instructions from the hon. member for St. Lucy. He can have a look at the documents and files in my office and he will be able to see what is the real position and be able to be more accurate. Even now at this stage he has not done his research. Well, I am prepared to show him the files.)

But let me make the point that I welcome the speech which the hon. member for St. Michael North Central made, and regard it with respect. I am not trying to create problems in the ranks of the Opposition, but the speech conveys a different approach from that of the Acting Leader of the Opposition.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, am I the acting Leader of the Opposition? If the Attorney General does not know the position, what can you expect? But I don't mind him; he must know that I am still the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Is the hon. member having us believe that he continues to be a fiction rather than a reality? He issued a statement a few days ago that he would continue to act as Leader of the Opposition. If he wants to be a fictional personality I will accept that. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: But to get back to the point. He begins by saying in a letter which he wrote that "we see the Commission as giving a job for a long standing supporter." Now that is a very cheap gibe. 1.35 p.m.

Now that is a very cheap gibe. We are talking about the cheapness of politics, and now in this debate he wants to say that the Prime Minister by talking about things which were omitted from the last Constitution and how to establish it is indulging in cheap politics. Let us be serious. That is a cheap gibe because the hon. member next to him has said that Senator Cox is well suited to this job, has the ability to do it, and has always been an outstanding Minister. Is that party really serious, Sir? Are they really very serious about how they approach a matter such as this? I want to come to 1974, because we are now going to hear about the cheap politics and bring the constitutional amendments down into the gutter of cheap politics.

I sat in this House in 1974, and before the full glare of the television cameras we had an exercise in character assassination by the hon. member for St. John, and not one word came from the then Minister of Communications and Works rebuking him for the way in which he assailed the Church, assailed the Judiciary, attacked hon. members; not one word then about cheap politics, only because people had had the guts to disagree with the amendments which he was bringing before this body. The 1974 performance of the leader of his party and the leader of the Government was a disgrace to people in this country and was no doubt a strong contributory factor to the Democratic Labour Party being thrown out as the Government of the country.

We have tried to lift the constitutional issues in Barbados above the narrow political advantage of the day, because if one is going to get into the act of constitutional reform it must be meaningful and it must be serious, and it cannot be based on assailing people because you do not agree with their point of view. It cannot be based on the sort of cheap politics of which the hon. member was speaking which were displayed by his party at that time. What is beginning to happen is that the DLP believes that people's memories in this country are short and that within the period of 15 months no matter what is being said on the platform by them willy nilly now that people will not remember when they are properly reminded of the events of particularly the last few years of DLP Government where they had missed their way of reading correctly the tempo of Barbadian lifestyle and politics as they should in this particular instance, and therefore I believe we are justified in going for the maximum amount of consultation on constitutional reform in this country. We are justified in lifting it up to the stage of a Royal Commission, if you want to give it a title, or a Governor General's Commission, because it is tantamount to that, so that it would have an aura of respectability about it and people will take it not just as the whims and fancies of the particular political party which today constitute the Government of the country.

I believe that the political parties, even the one-man political parties we have in this country, should come and give their points of view. I believe they should put in memoranda, and I go further. I believe that members within political parties should express their individual points of view on any issues on which they may feel strongly, because it should not be a partisan exercise. This reform must be serious. There are areas, for instance, that I would have expected the hon. member wanted to quarrel with, such as the terms of reference which are so widely and firmly and sensibly drawn that anybody who loves Barbados and loves the system of parliamentary Government and maintaining democracy must see that they are matters of great substance and that they will be

looked at, and I want to see this even ahead of the constitutional review.

The Government intends to get on with some other matters of great significance, and which will to some extent be also commented on and reflected in the terms of the Commission. I want to tell the hon. member, he raised the question of integrity, I am very hopeful that the integrity legislation, the second draft of which is now before me, will be in this Parliament and in front of this Parliament, and debated by the Parliament, and I hope accepted by the Parliament ahead of the Constitution reform and review, but hon. members will still have an opportunity to look at this issue as well when the Constitutional Commission comes up.

I have heard it being said that we are not being serious about integrity legislation. I can assure hon. members that within about a month — I think it was six weeks — of being the Government of the country a first rough draft was done in my Department. We have since refined and reviewed this considerably and it is expected that it will come before the Legislature certainly within this calendar year, and I hope by mid-year at the latest. (*Laughter*). Hon. members need not laugh. If my views on it are accepted it will reach back right down into the membership of political parties, because it is a mistake to believe that corruption can only occur at the level of Ministers or members of Parliament, or indeed civil servants. The seeds of corruption can be in political parties, people who are paid to go about on platforms cursing other people, and they have to declare their assets. One wants to know how they live and also you want to know how people operate and what is their standard of public life, and I hope that if my Department's views are accepted other hon. members are going to be satisfied that if we are going to move corruption out of Barbados the fingers must not only point at Ministers or members of Parliament, let them point at those who occupy positions of public trust or who seek for public office in one form or another, and that is one of the reasons why we have taken the time, and accept in my Department the responsibility for the time taken, because we have now managed to get in from the Commonwealth Countries in particular all their existing legislation and reports, and we have gone further, we have even had on a basis of confidence some of the proposed legislation from other Commonwealth countries which they are still considering and which we have to treat with the greatest confidence, since it has not gone before their Legislatures.

I would hope that this same wider consultation will take place in relation to this Constitutional Commission, and I would hope that those of us who have had experience of ministerial office will not shirk from going and giving our views as to whether certain Conventions should be enshrined in the Constitution, whether the area

of consultation with the Leader of the Opposition should be wider, whether the participation of Parliament in the control of public funds should be greater, whether Parliament should be encouraged to participate more, to sit more regularly to debate public business, and dissect the issues that we bring before them. These are all issues, not only the issue of Republican status, those are important, and I am sure that the Constitutional Commission will report on the need to strengthen those provisions dealing with discrimination in our society, and indeed to give women a more advanced status than they have in the existing Constitution.

I will tell you why I will end on this point, Sir. The hon. member made a remark that I must take seriously. He says that the Commission was off white and we were becoming an off white society.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I said the society is becoming off white; I did not say anything about the complexion of the Commission. Do not misrepresent me, I said the Barbadian society is fast becoming an off white society again.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: With the speeches I have been hearing from the DLP platform I am not prepared to sit down and not reply to that sort of comment. That comment is saying that since this Government has come into power that off white people — and some of them are even more blunt — that white people are dominating this country, and there are nasty, savage attacks on the Prime Minister for his colour, nasty savage attacks being made day after day against members of the Barbados Labour Party on the basis of colour, and if the DLP persists in bringing this country to the stage where race and colour become issues between these two political parties, we are not going to have an easy time in the next five years.
1.45 p.m.

If the Democratic Labour Party persists in bringing this country to the stage where race and colour become an issue between these two political parties, we are not going to have an easy time for the next five years. The Democratic Labour Party in power had several white members, including a member of the Cabinet, a Minister who was a white Englishman. Mr. Bernstein is one of their leading white members. Members of the Democratic Labour Party today associate with white people. In fact, I believe that some of them are even courting and are married to white people. What are they talking about?

All of a sudden this nasty remark is being introduced into politics in this country to try to convince people that the Barbados Labour Party is a party which is in favour of white people. I do not believe that the Democratic Labour Party has any bigger commitment to the emancipation of the masses and the fact that people who are black should get a better deal in this country

than anybody else. Regardless of what they say, I have never found any trace of racial discrimination in the Prime Minister at any stage at all, and he takes all steps to stamp out all traces of racial discrimination in this country. His father has a history of which many of you would be proud in fighting for the down trodden masses, and it is debasing politics for a party such as the Democratic Labour Party, in its anxiety to get back into public office, to bring politics down to that level.

I suffer from it because in the 1971 campaign the same nasty remarks were consistently being made about me, and I stood up to it then; and any time that I see it raise its ugly head in Barbados I am going to deal with it. It is cheap. It is not based on any genuine survey of the Barbadian context or any genuine belief on the part of the Democratic Labour Party; and they believe that they are pandering to something in the society. More and more in speeches on the platform we get people moving to the degree of bringing racial connotations into politics and setting races against each other, rather than fighting for a genuine multi-racial society in which there is greater equality in this country. We cannot stand up against apartheid in South Africa if we want to create apartheid in our own country or not stamp out apartheid in our own country.

In this Government, each of its members knows that they are dedicating to a just and multi-racial society, and no amount of misrepresentation and slander, no amount of nasty remarks can prevent a reply being given; and I trust that the Constitutional Commission.....

Hon. F. G. Smith rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the member rise?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order. The Hon. Attorney General has been speaking for more than 15 minutes, and you know it. I want to draw to your attention a breach of the rules of the House. You know that he has been speaking for more than 15 minutes too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member be seated, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Let me end by saying that I trust that the hon. member in his old age as a politician will try, besides playing to the Gallery, to lift the standard of debate, and try and impress upon the members of his party the necessity for an area of understanding in this country where we do not create a society based on the type of racial clashes that we deprecate. I know that we can move on beyond that and remove all remaining signs of racial discrimination rather than putting races against one another.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, in the ten minutes left before the adjournment, I hope that I will be able to add

a little bit to this debate; but before I begin, I find it a little amazing that the Hon. Attorney General manages somehow, each time that he has to make a point, to feign righteous indignation; and talking about playing to the Gallery, he is able to convince the Gallery that he is hurt deeply by some statement that he is making.

What he is missing is what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said about off white is not what the Democratic Labour Party is saying. It is what the people in the street are saying, that ever since the Barbados Labour Party came into power people of this country who are not black seem to be in charge of what is going on. That is what the people in the streets are saying. That is not what anybody in the Democratic Labour Party is saying.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Is the Hon. member denying making that statement on their platform? That statement was made by a member of the Democratic Labour Party, including the hon. member. He made that statement.

Mr. TAITT: What statement? Is the hon. member suggesting that I am off white? If the hon. member is saying that I would stand up in Barbados any time and say that it is a travesty of justice in this country for white people to seem to be getting everything at the expense of the broad masses of black people, if he is accusing me of having said that anywhere it is true; and if he wants me to say it again he has only to listen where two or three are gathered together and he will hear it because I believe it. I believe that the broad masses of the black people in this country have a right to share in the benefits of this country; and the hon. member, the Prime Minister or anybody else who feels that to say that is a racist may feel free to say that I am a racist.

On this question of the Constitution, we have gone fairly wide in discussing a Head allowing \$15,000 to set up the Constitution Commission. Perhaps it is just as well that one should read far and wide, because the Constitution is the supreme law of the country, and according to it any law made contrary to that Constitution is null and void; and for that reason it is only natural that all the questions bearing on the Constitution tend to become somewhat emotional if people feel that something strange is going to happen with the Constitution.

Perhaps it is very unfortunate that people have come to feel that only lawyers, and a certain kind of lawyer, can make a useful input into the fundamental laws of the country. Mr. Chairman, as you very well know, the best known and perhaps the most widely read Constitution was written 200 years ago and has survived with very few amendments within that 200 years. I think that it is fair to say that when that Constitution was being put together there were no illustrious lawyers sitting

down. There was a wide representation of the varied and sundry interests of the country.

This particular commission has been given the responsibility to report by the end of the year. I think that some indication should be given as to the breakdown of the cost, and I wish that the Prime Minister would do that in his reply. I am not one of those persons who gets concerned about the fact that the Constitution may or may not be amended. I am very happy that the governing party now recognises that a Constitution may be amended from time to time and that a mere decision to amend the Constitution is not by itself any reason for panic. Frankly, I do not care who they put on the Commission. If they want to put members of their own party on it that is their business. I think that it is a matter of politics when we have one party in power and another party seeking to capture power.
1.55 p.m.

The point is though, Sir, that the mere setting up of a Constitution Commission ought not to be used to give people of the country the impression that something new and wonderful is happening. So far the Government has been in power for 18 months. (*Asides.*) It seems a long time, Sir, but so far they have not amended or repealed any of the amendments which were made in 1974 that they gave people to believe were going to be dangerously ominous to their existence in the community.

Mr. Chairman, they made some political hay of the amendments to the Constitution which we proposed, and I think the Hon. Attorney-General especially ought, when he is making his now famous phrases regarding the 1974 Amendment Debate, to distinguish between the style of a particular person in this House of Assembly making inputs during the Debate and the substance of the amendments themselves. What happened is that they have started to suggest that the amendments were wicked and they do this by inference to the style of the person who led the debate for the Government. Everybody in Barbados heard the debate, and everybody has formed his opinion on that debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now two o'clock.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now two o'clock. This sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

On resumption —

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. It is now Question Time, but I have been advised that there are no Questions on the Order Paper, so we automatically, go into Private Members' Business. Similarly, there being no item of business under Private Members' Business, we revert to Government Business.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

CONTINUATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977-78 No.25

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Michael South West may continue.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was saying, the Constitution should be, in my view, a living document. That does not mean that the language has to be changed to suit each new approach to language. What I mean by that, Mr. Chairman, is that the Constitution must allow of interpretation to solve modern-day problems which come up as a country progresses. Mr. Chairman, the degree to which the Barbados Constitution is a living document may well be a moot point. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, there are aspects of the Barbados Constitution which, in my view, do some violence to our sovereignty, but it may very well be that the vast majority of Barbados prefer it the way it is. The point I am making here, Mr. Chairman, is that some provision has to be made on a continuing basis for review of the Constitution, and I would like to make it clear that the members of the Democratic Labour Party, as a political party do not believe that any Constitution of Barbados is static and it must so remain forever. If that were so, I cannot imagine that proposals for amendment of the Constitution in 1974 could have been forthcoming.

I do hope that in discussion of the Barbados Constitution, now and in the future, we would tend to distinguish between the purely political statements which are made from time to time and the real substance of constitutional change that is desirable for this country to continue to live and grow as a country of which all of us can be proud. For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I am not particularly concerned about who are the individuals who make up the Constitution Committee. I do make the point, however, that if the

Government decides to establish a Commission, it is the right of the Opposition to feel that the manner in which the Government is being set up does not suit them. That does not negate the right of the Opposition to participate in whatever manner it sees fit in any review of the Constitution of Barbados. I hope that the word will not go abroad that what I consider the prerogative of the Opposition not to sit on a particular Commission is an abdication of its responsibility to participate in any changes which might occur in this House.

I would like in the few minutes left to me, Mr. Chairman, to deal with one aspect of the Hon. Attorney-General's intervention. I formed the impression that he was suggesting that what they are doing now is somehow different and better than what happened in 1966 and in 1974.
2.50 p.m.

I suggest that in 1966 circumstances were completely different, and I do not believe that the Attorney General would attempt to compare like with unlike. At that time the then Barbados Labour Party took a specific position on independence for Barbados versus independence within a Federation or what have you. Barbadians are not so naive as not to remember the circumstances surrounding the Under Forties, which circumstances were very helpful to the country. However, when he talks about representation of the workers it must not be forgotten that the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union was a member of the delegation that went to London to participate in the framing of the Constitution. It is also a fact that the Barbados Labour Party's position was clear. They stated that they would not participate in a particular way in the framing of the Constitution; they took a political decision and no one can quarrel with them for that. I would not think they can now want to argue that in 1966 the Democratic Labour Party did not allow them to participate. The year 1974 is perhaps a different stamp and they are free to argue what should have been as they see it. I might point out, however, that to suggest that since the then incumbent did not invite the people of Barbados to participate by way of the Commissions of Enquiry Act was somehow non-consultation might be a slight variation of the truth. In fact, the proposals for amendments of the Constitution were prepared in draft, as I remember it, in 1972, and the Attorney General's Chambers went through many drafts and changes, and what came to the House of Assembly in 1974 was a result of consultation with a number of groups and organizations, and final provision was made for a wider discussion of the Constitutional amendments. I do not think that the Attorney General is correct in suggesting that the manner and style of debate in 1974 was itself a major issue of the Constitutional amendments.

Finally, the Attorney General spoke of the Integrity Legislation, and I must say that I am very pleased to hear

that the Integrity Legislation is going to reach this House this session. I was somewhat concerned by his statement that they wish to know how certain people are living. We have to be very careful that under the guise of integrity legislation we do not through some kind of over enthusiasm or sheer "cussedness" entrench into the laws of Barbados legislation that can do violence to the human rights of any individual. The Hon. Attorney General is constantly talking about human rights. Persons who engage in public life are in a somewhat different category from those in private life and that should be accepted. For years in this country they have been a number of apparently respectable people whose manner of style of living has raised questions in the minds of people and it would seem that because some members of a Cabinet may be living in a way they cannot understand they would pass legislation to come and investigate. I must express my concern at this.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a little amazement to the last speaker in that the hon. member is totally at sea when it comes to an understanding as to how the existing Constitution of Barbados was framed. For his enlightenment I would like to remind him that from this very Chamber the now prospective Leader of the Opposition, then Premier, made the significant announcement that in the framing of a Constitution for independence for Barbados he would prefer to go to England with Dr. Verwoerd of South Africa than with the Opposition of Barbados. Had it not been for the strong support given to the then Opposition by the public of Barbados who subscribed money to the tune of over \$5,000, and had it not been for the persistence of the Barbados Labour Party and the representations made to Sir John Stow and the Colonial Office, the Constitution of Barbados would have been framed by Vaughan and Fergusson, because it was the two of them who produced the draft of the Constitution which was taken to London. The document was never circulated in Barbados; the first draft was never circulated in Barbados. And when we went to London the draft as produced by Vaughan and Fergusson was shown to us one day and the next day it was withdrawn because it was regarded as the worst constitutional document ever put forward by a Government. The Government then hired Professor Marshall and Sir Lionel Luckhoo. The hon. member at that time was enjoying himself in the USA working as a part-time lecturer and part-time employee of the Industrial Development Corporation.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think the hon. member knows that at no time was I a part-time employee of the IDC.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I apologise; full-time employee doing part-time work at his job.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is misleading the House. He knows full well my former

position in the USA with the IDC. I think the hon. Prime Minister knows as well. I do not know why the hon. Minister wants to score points by making cheap statements.

3.00 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member knows that moonlighting is a part of the mores of the New York community. The basic position is that the Constitution as originally proposed in 1966 was a matter purely out of the breast of the then Prime Minister. I do not even believe that the hon. members on that side know anything about the Constitution. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition *pro tem* was in Jamaica, the hon. members were not graced with the opportunity to make any comments, the Hon. Premier at that time was saying that this was a war in the community between themselves and the "lard oil lobby". He was in one of his vicious destructive moods, so what was produced then was a document, as I said, which subsequently was not the document debated. The document that was the proposal of the then Government was not the document debated in London; I was present. It was not the document in London, they had Professor Marshall and Mr. Patchett working overtime in London. It was the only Constitution conference which took place that when the delegates went to the Constitutional Conference — because the Labour Party only had one delegate, the Hon. F. E. Miller, the Hon. Prime Minister, myself, the Attorney General were the advisers — we had to pay for the Attorney General to go. A public collection had to pay for two out of the three to go, because the Prime Minister was saying he would have preferred association with Dr. Verwoerd and Mr. Ian Smith rather than members of the Opposition. That was the kind of deep seated hatred and the contempt that the hon. member had for the office of the Opposition.

I really do not believe that the hon. member loves Ian Smith or Dr. Verwoerd, but it only shows the depth of the hatred he had for the Opposition. On the other hand, we lived and we survived and we went to London, and at the constitutional conference in London there were a number of points that the Opposition put forward which were conceded by the British Government as being reasonable points. As a matter of fact, I well remember that conference. The issues were so closely debated on those points that they delineated the difference between the Government and the Opposition, and they were put out in a list. One was the control over the civil service. I remember that clearly. The second one was the question of an entrenchment of the electoral system, because at that time we had a double member constituency system. There were others, and they were set out in a list, and the constitutional conference nearly broke up upon that point because of the weakness of the British Government, because the British Government then said that Barbados had a long history of self-Government and they preferred

to defer to the ideas of the Government of the day than the reasonableness of the Opposition's position. That is a fact. That is the position, and we refused to sign the release unless they had put in the position taken by the Opposition.

A long time has passed since then. Since then the Government has even emasculated further what I regard as fundamental principles of democracy by the abolition of Local Government and things of that kind. We have always felt that there are certain areas of the structure of this Government which should be approached upon a bipartisan manner, and it is because of this feeling that there are certain areas where we accept, once you agree with the democratic system — and I know there are one or two on the other side who do not agree with it — and I honestly do not believe that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, if what he says is true, if he is serious about what he has said, only believes in the democratic system of Government. That is if what he says is true.

Mr. CADDLE: The hon. Leader of the House must not misrepresent what I said.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I heard the hon. member talk about changing the system and I understand he talked about a fundamental system, and as I understand it the hon. member said he is a Marxist.

Dr. CADDLE: I discussed the matter of the proposed Commission on the Constitution, but on no occasion, at no time was any reference made to substantiate his contention. What is the sense of drawing that into the debate at this stage?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I apologise to the hon. member if I say that the hon. member has always given me the impression, and I am very glad to see the hon. member has disavowed his belief in Marxism. At least we have something in common, we both believe in democracy. The basic position is that we really feel that after 12 years — from 1966 until now — that it is time to have a review of the constitutional arrangements in Barbados.

3.10 p.m.

We have tried to get a broad-based Commission. Our only regret is that hon. members on the other side persist in the same attitude that was adopted when they were in power in this idea that the Constitution is a matter for partisan approach. This side was very genuine in its approach to the other side to participate in the shaping of the Constitution that could truthfully be said that was arrived at after a great deal of consensus; but hon. members on the other side refused to participate in it. Of course that is beyond the conception of the Leader of the

Opposition, because pettiness is the manner of his approach. In spite of that,.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I want to warn the hon. Leader of the House. I am not afraid of him. When he talked about pettiness and that kind of thing, he should be asked to withdraw it.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I am saying, and I repeat, that for as long as the hon. member has held the office of the Leader of the Opposition, that has been his approach. I repeat it because when the hon. member goes out, it will be on the record that this Government approached the hon. Leader of the Opposition. What is more, I add crudity to that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, he should withdraw that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What do you want withdrawn?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The word "cruelty".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member used the word "crudity".

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am just as crude as he. I got it from him.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: The hon. member knows that I have never taken him as an example to follow. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: I have never taken you as an example either.) That is the position. The Democratic Labour Party was given an opportunity to participate in this great national exercise, and the Democratic Labour Party did not decide to participate. Our hands are clean. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Old plantation.....)

Call me what you like. I have never been ashamed of my birth or of anything connected with me. If he wants to abuse me, I am a pastmaster at abuse too. There is nothing that the hon. member can say to me that can hurt me.

This Government has given the other side an opportunity to participate in a noble exercise — a re-examination of the existing constitution of Barbados, having regard to its working over the last ten years. All the bitterness and division that took place when the Constitution was framed is behind us. We are looking to the future. We are looking to see whether the instrument created in 1966 has the flexibility that is desired now. Whatever constraints may exist, he should have realised that the Government is doing its duty in wanting to remove them. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in carrying out this exercise the Government is doing something which the people of Barbados will be proud of, and in which

they will fully participate despite the efforts of members on the other side.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, as regards this Resolution, obviously there is appreciation on both sides of the House as I have gleaned from the debate. By its very nature, any document which sets out the legal framework of Government and the rights of citizens, will call for amendments from time to time having regard to the traditions of the people, and in some cases, commonsense. So I cannot believe that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central has any reason to be suspicious, as he put it, as to the reasons for the establishment of the Constitutional Commission.

As the Prime Minister said in his introduction to this Resolution, the fact that we would establish a Constitutional Commission to review the workings of the Constitution was in our manifesto from 1971 and reiterated in 1976. I never heard during this campaign any suspicions voiced as to our reasons for setting up this Commission. It seems hollow now to echo the mouthings of suspicion with regards the setting up of this Constitutional Commission.

Of course, in the same breath the hon. member for St. Michael North Central said that he is not afraid of any constitutional changes. I do not understand the seeming contradiction in what he said. On the question of Constitutional amendments, I believe that it might also be remembered in 1974 when the constitutional amendments were introduced by the then Prime Minister, the present member for St. Michael North Central, when asked to comment said that he would like to see the Constitution changed from A to Z. When I asked what particular areas he wanted changed, to the readers of the *Nation*, there was nothing forthcoming.

Dr. CADDLE: If the hon. member would give way, I have always given my views as far back as 1965. I gave my views when the amendments were being proposed. They were broadcast by C.B.C. and they are there.

Mr. SIMMONS: If I have misquoted the hon. member, I apologise to him; but he gave no details of the amendments he would like to see.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, if I have misquoted the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, then I would apologise to him. I made reference to what I saw in the *Nation* newspaper, and I said that, in the *Nation* newspaper, he gave no indication to the country as to the specific areas and the details of the amendments that he himself would have liked to see. Whether he gave them on CBC in 1965, I am not in a position to say. If he says that he gave them, then I accept that.

Dr. CADDLE: The interview I am referring to was in 1974 when the amendments of the Constitution were proposed and I was interviewed then as Minister of Health about my views and they were given to CBC. How the *Nation* got them is an entirely different matter. I still carry those strong views which will come out at some time.

Mr. SIMMONS: Sir, I accept that. I said just now that I did not see anything on CBC, and I can only talk about the *Nation's* report. What I am saying is that today I heard him reiterate his views that he himself has very strong views about the changing of the Constitution, but he has not indicated today in what material particulars he would like to see it changed. Of course, he has indicated certain things to the House, and we look forward to seeing his views represented to the Commission. It is clear that the DLP are now saying that they will give their submissions to the Commission at a later stage when the sittings are more frequent.

I think one can only wonder that in the same way as the Opposition sought for reasons then advanced by themselves not to reply to the Budgetary Proposals, in the same way, for reasons known only to themselves, they refused the offer of this Government to have representation on Statutory Boards, in the same way for the third time they are now refusing to sit on the Constitutional Commission because of a variety of reasons advanced in various exchanges of letters by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Whether those reasons will hold water or not is another matter, and this is not the place for me. The Prime Minister can deal with that and go into the reasons advanced by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition today. All I say is that it seems to me that the Opposition have, calculatedly, decided that whenever an invitation comes from the Government for them to share, participate, or be part of the consultative process of Government they are going to abstain, abdicate their responsibility, and then shroud that abdication in reasons which may at first blush appear to be plausible. It is a matter for the country as a whole to look at and determine whether the Opposition are doing their functions as they ought to. That is my only comment on the matter.

Now, I do not want to get in the questions of off-white or white. I do not see how that has any relevance in this debate at all. As the member for St. Michael South West said, the people are now saying that this is a Party under which the off-white and whites have done nothing. I do not see the relevance in that statement. How can he justifiably say that and ignore the part played in the DLP Government by the Morgans, the Harold Kirtons, the David Coziers, the Johnsons from the DLP — not this one here, but the one that carried away the money — the Edwards, the Denis Atkinsons, the Chapmans?

With regard to the present member for St. John, I have a document in which it is alleged that he, when somebody went to him for a proposal to do certain development in Barbados, said there is no lawyer in Barbados who can do that, and gave this person the name of a lawyer in Miami. Who was the lawyer in Miami? The name of the lawyer was Chapman, a Barbadian. All of them did well under the DLP. The people were not saying then that that was a party of white people or off-white, and the people are not saying it now. If the people are saying it now, they are doing so because they are being prompted, goaded, cajoled by members of the Democratic Labour Party on their nightly platform meetings about this country. The members of the Democratic Labour Party are saying it, as they so often do. They take rumours and smears and give them to the people, and then come in here and say that the people themselves are saying these things of their own volition.

Now, it is clear that the Constitution of Barbados is ripe for the consideration of amendments. It is now 11 years old, I believe. I was close to the framing of the Constitution in 1966 in a journalistic capacity, and I know a lot of what went on in London at Marlborough House. I can only say that, in the proposal to establish a Commission to enquire into the workings of the Constitution and make recommendations, we are going further and trying to use the consultative processes in a different way from those used by the former Prime Minister. If you recall, I believe it led to a libel action in this country. But the former Prime Minister is alleged to have said that it took him two nights to write the White Paper for Independence, and I quote him precisely: "without much intellectual struggle." Somebody talked about a white lie and had to pay \$2,400 for that. It was the member for St. John's own document and, according to him, they went to London and they merely wanted the Opposition to be represented. Now I hear people talking here today about having all yard fowls on the Commission.

When the Constitution itself was framed, and for as long as members of the Opposition were members of the last Government, they never thought to do differently. They allowed a situation to continue in this country where the Opposition was given but two places in the Senate. Two places among 21 or whatever number it is up there, and now you are complaining that on a Commission of five or six one place was offered to you! When all the jobs were being handed out and when the work was being distributed in this country, did anybody from the Barbados Labour Party get a look in; We never complained. Do not complain now. If you are out of power take what goes. You are out of power. You should be proud that this party has not been guilty of the victimisation of which your party was guilty of. Look how many of your people have jobs under this Administration and have won contracts, and nobody has

interfered with them; they have got houses and all sorts of things. You have to be reminded of these facts.

Now, I say the time is opportune for looking at the Constitution and its revision, Sir. After 11 years we have seen how, as an Independent country, the Constitution has failed or has satisfied us. We have the experiences of Trinidad and Jamaica, who have entered Independence before us, as a guide. We have what is getting to be a mass now of reported cases, even in the Associated States, on the working of written Constitution in the Caribbean area. All of that material is there as precedents and a storehouse to which the Constitutional Commission could advert with a view to ensuring that some balance is given to our Constitution in areas where there is imbalance, and that some progressive thinking can be brought to bear in the light of historical experience throughout the countries which have written Constitutions so that ours may be improved.

I feel, Sir, very strongly that there should be some system, whether it is in the Constitution or not, where the Ministers themselves have a greater accessibility to the general public in terms of their day-to-day operations.
3.30 p.m.

I feel very strongly that just as you have a National Economic Council, there are certain sensitive Ministries, like the Ministry of Agriculture, that should have an advisory Council drawn from a broad spectrum of the society. Although Frank Walcott went to London, I do not think it was so much as the Workers representative but as a member of the Democratic Labour Party, and during his stay in London he spent most of the time practising to be an Ambassador to the United Nations; for I myself saw him playing games. He had gone to a lift and he said to the person with him "After you, Mr. Prime Minister." And the other person replied "After you, Mr. Ambassador." So he was only practising how to perform in Washington; he was there purely for making sport. But I am serious when I suggest there should be some framework where Ministries should have access to a broader basis from which to draw broader ideas. I have had a chance to see how this operates, and I have my own view on how a Government can be hamstrung and the way in which the masses can be kept out of decision-making, because there is not a sufficiently formalized council or meeting place at which the masses of the people can get together for discussion. Nobody today has spoken about the question of national audience. It is very important that as ex-colonials we take stock of ourselves now and determine once and for all to cut adrift from the Colonial Office. It makes no sense saying Sir Garfield Sobers is going to be the last person to be knighted and then we hear of Dr. Cato (*Asides*) The Leader of the Opposition is waiting for his? Well, get something local. We will honour him, but get something

local. It is important that children growing in the post colonial era must realize and feel themselves nationals of Barbados. At present they have nothing to relate to. Things with Britain have been cut off and it is important for us to fashion our own future.

I hope that the Constitution Commission will see itself as all embracing, e.g. to make representation for instance on the question of dress. Some of us wear jackets and ties because we have to wear them in the courts; you can't appear in court otherwise. But we come in here, some in shirt jacs, and some in ties. There is no uniformity. If the Constitution Commission is going to consider questions of national honours, let it also consider the question of national dress. And I was embarrassed by the invitations when Her Majesty the Queen was here recently. Some invitations indicated shirt jac or lounge suits; sometimes only lounge suit. There was no system, no set standard. Some of the women wore gloves, some not; some wore hats, others not. It is time that we stop embarrassing ourselves and settle on a certain system. If the shirt-jac is equivalent to the lounge suit let it be so known; but do not put lounge suit and give no choice. These are areas where the Constitutional Commission can get feed back from the masses and make proper representation to the Government for implementation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Standing Orders do say that three hours are to be allotted for a supplementary Resolution containing up to twelve items. I respectfully submit that more than three hours have passed since the supplementary was being discussed. I would like to see all members speak but a halt has to be called at some stage. Every one of the Opposition speakers so far has exceeded his fifteen minutes and I would like to draw the attention of the Clerk to Standing Order No. 70(2)(a) which reads: "Three hours shall be allotted for a debate on a Supplementary Estimate of Expenditure containing up to 12 items and an additional 15 minutes debate shall be allowed for every item over twelve items."

I therefore beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

The question that Head 5(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 9(1) stand part.

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

The question that Head 9 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES,
1977-78 No. 24

A Resolution for the sum of \$115,863 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution asks for various supplementary grants by this Committee for the current year in relation to the Ministry of External Affairs. Before I deal particularly with all the items I should like to make a few general comments on expenditure in the Ministry of External Affairs.
3.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, under Heads 16(1) and 16(2) the sum of \$6,414,212 was provided for the year 1977-78 in the Approved Estimates of Expenditure. The request for \$115,863 to supplement this Head will increase the total provided from \$6,414,212 to \$6,530,075. However, the Revised Estimates for 1977-78 indicate that the annual expenditure will be in the vicinity of \$6,371,138 — that is, some \$43,094 less than the Approved Estimates — and \$158,937 less than the Approved and Supplementary Provision. It should be noted that in 1977-78 the Other Charges, \$3,579,870 as against \$3,704,805 in 1976-77, is a decrease of \$124,935.

In relation to the total budget, the Approved Estimates for 1977-78 for the Ministry represents — and this is most important, Sir — 2.3% of the total budget as against 3.035% in 1976-77, 3.05% in 1975-76 and 3.19% in 1974-75. In short, from the year 1974-75 the percentage of money spent on External Affairs as a percentage of the budget expenditure has decreased from 3.19% to 2.32%. I should like to make this point that in relation to other recurrent charges there has been a decrease by 3.3%, and in relation to other personal emoluments there has been a decrease by 15% on the figures for 1976-77.

I cite these figures because I think they are important and also that it should be understood that at the end of the year, despite the grant of supplementaries, we would have saved on the overall budget which has provided a considerable amount of money and expended less than we have provided for in the Estimates. If I may give an example, Mr. Speaker, under Item 3 — Other Personal Allowances, Headquarters is this year effecting savings in the Estimates of \$20,032; High Commission in the United Kingdom \$17,000, Caracas \$2,500 and the Consulate General \$15,000. It means that we have set ourselves during the past year the task of reducing wherever possible expenditure on certain items of expenditure in the External Affairs budget without undermining the efficiency of the Department.

Further, there are areas in which it is impossible for us to effect any savings. This is particularly so in the area

of Statutory personal emoluments where there is an annual increase outside of civil service wages, with the wage bill, or now in some areas of other personal emoluments and allowances, because of course we have to grant increases in the amount being paid for the Unestablished Staff and also we have to grant increases in allowances which have been made to officers in the diplomatic field and to Non-established staff as well, but in Non-Recurrent Charges where we have some room for manoeuvre, and Contributions to International Organisations, we have effected as much savings as possible, and hence we are able to say that there is a decrease in the operating expenses as such in the External Affairs budget.

We do not want to anticipate the Estimates for 1978-79, but the Department has been told to effect further savings in the area of operating expenses — those areas that we can ourselves affect the economy without affecting our statutory liability — and it seems therefore reasonable to conclude that expenditure on External Affairs is growing at a slower rate and in fact is decreasing than it did from the year 1974-75 to the year 1976-77.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken some time to give these facts because I consider that expenditure on External Affairs is of importance, especially of Government accountability, for how the Government of this country is run, and that we cannot just have.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I rise on a point of order, this is a matter of privilege. Standing Order 76(5) states: "If during a sitting of the House, a matter suddenly arises, which appears to involve the privileges of the House and which calls for the immediate intervention of the House, the proceedings may be interrupted, save during the progress of a division, by a motion based on such a matter."

I wish to make a motion that the matter concerning the supplementary estimate No. 25 be recommitted on the following grounds, Mr. Chairman. The Standing Order quoted by the Prime Minister and member for St. Thomas, Rule 2(a) of Standing Order 70, states: "Three hours shall be allotted for a debate on a Supplementary Estimate of Expenditure containing up to 12 items and an additional 15 minutes debate shall be allowed for every item over twelve items."

I wanted to speak in that debate, Mr. Chairman, and there are other members on this side who wanted to speak during that debate on another item as well. I am contending that as a member of this House, I have been deprived of my privilege of speaking during that debate, because three hours had not elapsed on that debate. As I

understand it, the debate started at about 12.30 and therefore in spite of the mathematical wizardry of the Prime Minister I am submitting that three hours could not have elapsed as far as debating time is concerned, and I am drawing this matter to your attention and I move that the matter be recommitted if you so rule.

Mr. TAITT: I rise to second the motion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit?
3.50 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I rose to second the motion.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman...

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. You asked me to sit. I do not see how he can get up.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: If he gets up, he must get up and talk sense.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair's ruling on this matter raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South is not considered a matter of privilege, and cannot be raised in the middle of a debate. You are out of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I hope that the hon. member will watch the clock and do not be misled by the Leader of the Opposition, and do not wait until the coop is closed. I was making the point that there was a decrease in the expenditure on external affairs in certain areas. I will explain to you why these additional funds are required.

Under Item 1 — Other Personal Emoluments — three officers attached to headquarters have been granted study leave with full pay, and it is necessary to provide this money to pay officers who will substitute for them. This leave was approved subsequent to the actual Estimates and that is why it has become necessary to ask for this supplementary.

Under Item 4 — National Insurance Contributions — the contribution to National Insurance has been increased, and supplementary provision is needed to meet this increase. Under Items 6, 8 and 16 — Other Personal Emoluments — increases are necessary to meet the salaries of non-established staff of the Barbados Missions overseas. This is a result of an increase in salaries of non-established staff as from April, 1977.

Under Item 18 — Communications — the rental of telex machines in Canada has gone up Can. \$95 to \$112. Also the newsletter informing Barbadians about events at home has had a wider distribution and they have had to pay more for postage since postage has been increased in some countries.

Under Item 20 — Rent of property — the Barbados Mission in Caracas was housed in the Hilton Hotel. We have moved into new quarters where the rent is higher. Under Item 23 — Maintenance of Property — Service Contracts for maintenance of office equipment at the Missions have been increased, and under Item 25 — Maintenance of Vehicle and Plant — provision was made for replacements to motor cars in the United States and Caracas Missions. We had to wait longer than we anticipated for the arrival of the replacements from the United Kingdom.

Under Item 26 — Maintenance of Buildings and Lands — as regards some of the residences owned by the Government and people of Barbados, we have had to spend a bit more on these residences. We have managed to lease the house at New Rochelle which was bought by the Consul General since no economic sales price could be obtained. As regards the state of the house in Canada we had one significant offer; but after inspection by the engineers it was shown that the cost of shoring out the foundation would be too expensive and the offer was withdrawn. We are looking at the possibility of getting this house sold, otherwise we will have to come back and ask to get permission to lease. I give the House the assurance that this Government will not dispose of Government's property at a low economic rate unless the situation is very drastic.

In relation to Item 29 — Furniture, Fixtures and Fittings — Mr. Chairman, this Item of expenditure was totally unknown to me and unforeseen. I will tell you why. When the Embassy was set up in Caracas it was using furniture which I normally would assume belonged to the Government of Barbados. When the lease was obtained and we move into new quarters we discovered that it belonged to the hotel and was lent to the Government of Barbados. The Mission was not provided with furniture for secretaries, etc. These are matters which, I suppose, may have been obvious to the Government before. We have borrowed some furniture from various people, but we cannot go on having a Mission in Caracas existing on borrowed furniture. It is not ours, and we have to give it up. If we have a Mission there, obviously we have to provide it with furniture.

Those are details on the items in the Resolution. I wish to state quite emphatically that the cost of external representation has not skyrocketed. We have been faced with an increase in personal emoluments, by an increase in the Civil Service and an automatic increase for people in particular grades and salary increases for non-established staff. We have also had to pick up the increased charges to us for rental overseas for the existing space which we occupy. Wherever it is possible we have taken the opportunity to reduce expenditure, but there are some areas in which we have not been able to do so.

I hope, Sir, that at the end of the year to show an overall savings of \$43,094 I would like to say that despite the rigid control of expenditure in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the foreign Missions of Barbados are now

more oriented to productivity. Officers of the Missions and also headquarters are working long hours without asking for extra pay, and I would like to thank them for their show of interest in the affairs of the Government of this country.

That is an important aspect of our foreign relations. The Missions together with the Ministry of External Trade and the export agency are seeking out new markets for our products and cheaper sources of supply for our imports. Through the reports from our Missions we are able to identify markets. We are able to look at the increases in prices in Bridgetown in relation to our circumstances and identify these sources not only to the benefit of the public sector, but the private sector as well. 4.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, you will forgive me if I mention, specifically, the performance of our United Nations Mission during the last session of the General Assembly. I believe that the last General Assembly passed some 124 Resolutions moved by 150 countries. Of these, four Resolutions were Resolutions originated by Barbados and piloted by Barbados through the Assembly. Resolutions of great significance for the Third World countries, for employment of our citizens and other Third World persons, for the opportunities for women, for assistance to the Associated States, for reducing the expenditure on international travel by diplomats to mention only a few. In addition we co-sponsored other Resolutions with other members of the United Nations.

When we spoke of this contribution as measured against the size of Barbados, its very small population, the very small size of the Mission of the United Nations, I think hon. members should be satisfied that we are making a contribution far in excess of what our size and resources would lead us to expect. I am quite happy about the way in which the Foreign Service is now functioning. It does not mean that there is no scope for improvement. There is also scope for greater co-ordination with other Governmental bodies. We have functioning a Co-ordination Committee on Foreign Policy in which we feed to the other Departments of Government all of the information and intelligence which we have on Foreign Affairs and they, in turn, bring to us their participation in Foreign Affairs as well. I have gone into some detail to the figures, and I have gone into some idea of the functioning of the Mission. I have not, Mr. Chairman, however talked about the broad areas of substantive policy.

I would like to say one thing. It is difficult on a supplementary, having regard to the Rules of the House, to debate Foreign Affairs in any great detail. I regret that there has been no real substantial Foreign Policy debate in this Honourable House since the Independence Debate, although on a few occasions when I was in Opposition the present Prime Minister and myself particularly as well

as Mr. Elliott Mottley, when he was here, took an opportunity at times to debate policy as against the actual looking of small items and talking about how people are spending the money or going to Cocktail Parties. I feel that the time has come when Parliament must try to participate more substantially in the formulation of Foreign Policy. I believe that we should try to set aside at least two days of Parliament for a full substantive motion on the area of Foreign Policy and, subject to the time of the House and the constraints of Government, I trust that some time before the middle of the year the Government will move, if a back bencher or the Opposition does not want to move, a substantive motion on the overall Foreign Policy of this country in order to get the views of members of the House on both sides of the House. We are prepared, as far as the Ministry is concerned, to make at all times available, subject to the Official Secrets Act, to hon. members research papers, information, documents, pamphlets on anything on various aspects of International Affairs in the hope that Barbados will move as far as it can to a vibrant, bipartisan policy of foreign relations.

We may have our differences in some aspects of Foreign Policy. We are hoping that we can do this, and I should trust that when the House has time the House should seriously consider whether it is not in the interest of the country to have a Select Committee as a Standing Committee on Foreign Relations where aspect of any Government's change in Foreign Policy must be looked at from time to time in a wider concept. We suffer in this country from not having the sort of resources available in larger countries or, indeed, with smaller countries but with more resources such as New Zealand where outside of the body of Parliament, or the Political Party, there are groups who do studies on Foreign Relations and make their researches available to members and to the Government in order to increase the content of the benefit which will flow to the Government from Foreign Affairs.

Already, I believe, we have begun to see some benefits to this country in the Foreign Relations field. We are co-ordinating our technical assistance. We are not only now getting increased technical assistance, but we are in turn giving technical assistance to some of the Caricom countries. Indeed, as you would have read from the newspaper a couple of days ago, even the United Kingdom has identified an area in which we may be able to render technical assistance to the British Government as well. We have reviewed our association with quite a few of the international organisations, and we have managed to tighten up the areas in which we can get increased benefits from them.

Mr. Chairman, finally let me say I am not unhappy about the development of the Ministry and what it is doing, but I will never be totally satisfied because I

always believe that there is still room for improvement. As long as I have the honour to hold the Ministry, I will set out to get greater efficiency, greater benefits, greater productivity and a better approach and greater respect for this country in international councils. Today our relationship with the Caricom States is at a very high level particularly in the LDCs. Our relationship with the United States has improved somewhat. We have always had warm relationship with the United Kingdom. We have set out to increase these and there are great signs of a lot of promise. We are widening our relationship in Africa and the Far and Near East, and we expect that we will be able to maintain a very solid relationship with Canada which has characterised the Caribbean as a whole since the 1920s and onwards.

I beg to move that this Resolution stand part.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the Minister would have put the last part of his submission at the top, so that we could approach the whole question of Foreign Affairs in a manner which he asserted is the manner which he longs for. I shall not by anything I say cast any aspersions on the hard-working Barbadians who function in the Overseas Offices in one capacity or another. I think the fact that the distinguished Ambassador for Barbados, Dr. Blackman, is sitting in the Gallery might have influenced the Minister to pay a special tribute to him, and I hope that anything I may say would not suggest that we are derogating from the manner in which we on this side regard those Barbadians who function for us outside of Barbados.

4.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that at some time I had that opportunity, and I hope that what I say will not necessarily reflect on the interviews I held then but would be seen in a wider context. I do not believe that the Minister of External Affairs is doing himself or the country justice to come to this House and suggest that he is effecting savings and then use percentages. If we are talking about savings we must be more specific. I do not think it is a position which any Government in Barbados needs to take, but I can well appreciate the Minister's predicament; having initially in 1966 and thereafter used the concept of expenditure for partisan political opposition, they feel it is necessary to justify the present position in this way. I myself consider that words like "A considerable amount of money has been saved" really do no justice to the reality of the situation. As I have had occasion to say before, if you do not appoint persons to high paying positions for long periods, you are bound to effect savings because the salary paid to those who act in such positions is not the same as for the substantive post.

The carrying out of a policy for Barbados must necessarily incur money. What is important is not what we have saved; what is important is whether we can quantify or articulate the benefits received.

The Minister will be aware that I am not impressed with all of the statements he has made. I am impressed however with some of the statements and will deal with them.

I do not believe the Estimates which came to us, especially as they relate to overseas offices, can be as accurate as estimates on the internal running of the country because on the local scene we can query the cost more immediately than in the case of overseas expenditure, and some of the items touched on are items over which the Minister has little or no control. But he talked about other personal emoluments, and I would have preferred him to tell us how many officers have gone on leave, and where, etc. I would have preferred him to say if he had effected his savings by a policy which was a very strange situation, as for instance, over the past year when we had a visit by a Head of State and we did not see the customary arrangement of this country's ambassador accompanying the Head of State on the visit. I have never heard it explained by Government why the Barbados High Commissioner in the United Kingdom did not come to Barbados on that occasion. They may have a good reason, but it is standard practice to have the High Commissioner accompany the Head of State and I have never heard any explanation as to why a different situation obtained on that occasion.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman, the matter was raised and was well researched. When Her Majesty visited Barbados recently she visited as Queen of Barbados and not of the United Kingdom. The High Commissioner is accredited to her Court in her capacity as Queen of the United Kingdom and not Queen of Barbados. Constitutionally it was ruled that it would not be necessary for the High Commissioner to be present. If on the other hand President Carter of the United States visited here our ambassador to the United States would have accompanied him on the visit. We have researched this and checked with the Queen's advisor on protocol, and this was the proper procedure.

Mr. TAITT: I thank the Minister for his explanation, which I think is one that the people of Barbados are hearing for the first time.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister indicated that the House at New Rochelle has been leased. I wonder if he is in a position to tell us the extent of the lease, the amount to be received, and has the Consul General been removed. I saw a photograph recently which showed the Consul General as operating from a new residence. I would expect the Minister to tell us where is this

residence and if there have been any savings effected. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that one of the matters discussed was the residence of the Consul General. When the Minister talks about savings in the operation of overseas offices it would be useful to know such things as how many Barbadians were repatriated this year as against last year. When one is talking about foreign affairs one can talk about absolute figures, but what you have to do is examine the details of the exercise.

I am not going to contest the Minister's statement that the overseas missions are seeking out new markets, because that is in keeping with the policy which overseas missions have always had. The extent to which the policy is carried out will depend on the total funds at their disposal and disposition of the head of the Mission. Some heads are more interested in economic matters than others. Some heads spend a lot of time dealing with political matters while other heads find themselves more at home dealing with economic matters. But I would like to deal with the point that as far as the United Kingdom is concerned the Minister should not have to make any boast, because as far as I know the head of that Mission has not been changed, and the kind of information submitted will only change in detail; and the Minister must find on his files evidence of the Commissioner having instructions to proceed along certain lines for the benefit of Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, when you talk about two days for debate on foreign policy, if the Minister is serious it will afford us an opportunity to examine the foreign policy of Barbados. But I do not think that the foreign policy of Barbados has changed in any way during the last eighteen months to suggest that there is need for a debate of two days to discuss foreign policy. What we have seen is an intensification of policy which has been previously outlined. There are two areas which I expect members on the other side to say are different: the area of establishment of diplomatic relations with other countries, and the questions of China.

4.20 p.m.

My personal position on the question of China is hardly any different from the position which has come to Barbados in the last year. The difference between a two Chinas policy and a one China policy has been largely dictated by the change of attitude of the United States on this issue. The fact is that to argue that the nine million people of the Republic of China need to be recognised is not to argue that the eight hundred million people of the other China are not to be recognised, and as anyone who has been following this debate knows, this matter was hanging on a technicality. Finally Nixon went to China and it is instructive that it takes a Republican President to be able to forge those kinds of relationships with the Communist countries, as no doubt it takes a

conservative Government to be able to forge those kinds of ties with Barbados, but it is instructive that after Nixon went to China the American position changed substantially, and I think the present Government came in on the upswing when everybody had finally decided to banish the Republic of China. There are many persons of goodwill who would have preferred to see them banished a long time ago, banished in the sense of their being removed from the political arena on the international level.

On the increases in the amounts granted to Non-Established Staff in the Missions, I would have preferred to hear — and I hope the Minister is in a position to give us details of what are the wages and salaries which the persons in these various offices overseas now earn. I say this, Mr. Chairman, because when I remember that in the days not so long ago when the Government was in the Opposition they used to take the converted figures of the salaries and wages of the persons working in, say, New York, and use them as a yardstick to indicate a wastage of money. In truth and in fact I think the Minister will agree that no matter what are the figures, the persons who work in Missions and Consulates of Barbados in New York, and in the U.S. generally, are working for modest sums. Many of them work with Barbados primarily for the purpose of having their visa arrangements. The Established Staff who come from Barbados are not as badly off, but those persons who work as clerical officers in New York and various places work because they love their country, because they are provided an opportunity to stay in the United States until they can organise themselves along other lines, and I am not downgrading that, I am merely saying that it is a fact.

On the same theme, Mr. Chairman, this question of getting more employment for Barbadians in the international and regional agencies is a matter which I caution the Government to follow very carefully. I believe that the initial thrust by the Government was a proper one in that I believe that the people who function in the Missions in North America were saying that we have a number of persons existing in this environment, existing in this North America who are capable of finding employment at the professional level in the United Nations and other agencies. I think you have to be extremely careful that when you have 20, 30, 40 or 100 Barbadians living in North America capable and competent to assume positions in these institutions, that the institutions themselves have an aberration, if you will, of coming down to Barbados and recruiting here in Barbados persons of special technical ability.

The phrase "brain drain" has been thrown around and I think it has been misapplied a number of times. I am not getting involved in the discussion of the brain drain, I think it is a valid point that has been raised,

certainly in one newspaper in Barbados and by other well-meaning persons, that you have to be extremely careful that a policy which appears attractive on the fact of it might not turn out in the long term to be a policy deleterious in its nature to the country. Fortunately or unfortunately we are not likely, unless the United Nations hierarchy has changed considerably, we are not likely to see any great exodus of professional people from Barbados into the United Nations Secretariat, because it is not often recognised and understood that the bureaucracy in the United Nations Secretariat itself is hard pressed to discriminate against people from the developing countries, and I have no doubt that the experience of the Ambassador on the spot must have led him to participate in this Caribbean thrust for more Caribbeans on the United Nations professional staff.

I think the Minister should make it clear to the people of Barbados that to employ ten more typists in the United Nations or three more persons working in the basement putting together the publications is not to provide that great increase in the influence at the United Nations which I understand the thrust to be seeking. We have officers working at the United Nations who have been there for long periods of time, who have been trying to get their promotions and who find themselves constantly being placed in the "P" category when in truth and in fact by all the criteria used at the United Nations they by now should be in the "D" category or in the "Directorate" category.

I would like to congratulate the Ambassador for trying to get the United Nations to regularise its travel arrangements. Many people do not know that prior to the coming to independence of a number of the developing countries, the United Nations Directors and professional people all travel first class, and for the first time after 1955 when there was a large bunch of developing countries coming into the United Nations the policy started changing, but it changed in a very discriminatory way, a very interesting way, and I think that this new resolution will force the United Nations to be consistent in its application of a principle, but I want to warn that we must not appear to be making a statement which seems on the face of it to be a statement for greater economy but which by its very implementation interferes with the quality of product which emerges from it.

In Barbados itself it is a very popular thing to feel that certain people ought not to travel in certain ways, and the fallacy of that is so obvious as for me not to deal with. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Christ Church East will have some words to say on that in due course.

Mr, Chairman, if I may wind up, let me say that when the Minister of External Affairs says that he looks forward to a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs, the

Minister and his Government must lead on this. They must not seek to use foreign affairs to indicate as they have done on more than one occasion that the past Government was squandering money in foreign affairs. They must not use foreign affairs to state that the past Government had no interest in economic activity. As a matter of fact, one of the problems which I believe the present Government is facing now is that they have run into a problem in trying to organise their overseas office at New York in a particular way. They may very well be diluting the expertise, the very rare expertise which they currently have at New York.

4.30 p.m.

I will tell you what I mean. Take the man who works at New York and who has been responsible largely for directing the affairs of Barbados over the last five years in the field of industrial promotion. In their wisdom, or otherwise, the Government, as I understand it, has sought to bring into his ambit a new and different area, that is tourism promotion. Now, on paper, that appears to be an eminently desirable position because it will "save money"; but in truth and in fact I will state here, Sir, that I believe that it is impossible for a man who is an expert and who has vigorously carried out his responsibilities in the industrial promotion field to direct as well a vigorous prosecution in the tourism field. If they choose to do it that way, I have no quarrel with them. I merely issue to the Minister, and through him to his colleague in the Ministry of External Trade that they may by inference or by definition be diluting the expertise of Barbados. We have extremely small offices overseas. Our expertise is too garnered, and the expertise that we have managed to get should not be frittered away. I find that this arrangement is one which is going to do violence, not in the short term, but in the long term, to their approach to economic development.

Consequently, the role which has been carved out for the Consul General at New York has been reduced considerably. I shall not in this debate attempt to find out the reasons why. I do not know if the Minister would wish to give the reasons, but I issue a note of caution to the Minister that in his administration of the responsibility for Foreign Affairs he must not seek to appear to be partisan to one officer or another, because in the long term the country suffers. The Consul General at New York, it seems to me, is reduced to a welfare operation, collecting gifts from Barbadians is the principal job. (*Asides*). I do not know if it is true, but that is how it appears. I hope that the Government will take the opportunity to deal with this matter so that we will know what is the real role of the persons in the particular positions at New York so that the country, instead of being told that they have benefitted from savings will be told instead that as a result of the reorganisation, or as a result of the manner in which they are now conducting the affairs of the country, they will have clear benefits

being increased; and in those terms we will be able to judge whether in fact his foreign policy has changed any.

I do not believe that we can have a bi-partisan approach to foreign policy until those on the other side cease and desist from trying to make out the foreign policy that preceded them to be a foreign policy not of a Government that was interested in the welfare of the country, but a foreign policy of a Government that was made up apparently of non-caring persons who did not know what they were doing. I hope that the Minister will be able to respond to some of the comments I have made, and I look forward to a wider statement from him on this.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, let me say at first that if there is one area in which the new Government has at least made some departure, it is in Foreign Affairs; but up to now they have not done anything except to carry on what the Democratic Labour Party left behind — whether it is the airport, the harbour, the sewage scheme — they have not done anything for the good of Barbados yet. They are still planning; but at least you have to concede that under the Minister of External Affairs we have had more relationships established with countries throughout the world — with Korea, we have not heard anything about China yet — relationships with South Korea; and there are other areas in which I think that the Minister himself is showing some initiative.

This is something that is of interest to me. In spite of all the figures that he has quoted in a lot of these Missions, I gather, the accredited Ambassador has not yet presented his credentials in any of them. When this is done, keeping the bill within what he has said will not obtain unless he is not going to send somebody to Korea, or to these new places like Czechoslovakia etc., unless those persons are not going on national days to present their credentials.

A small country like Barbados needs friends; and one of the planks of the Barbados foreign policy under the Democratic Labour Party — I do not want the foul mouthed Leader of the House to get into this yet. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will take that back.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I knew that you would ask me to take it back; but when he says something and I ask you to ask him to take it back, you sit down and let him abuse me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will withdraw it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will withdraw it because I know it was coming. I want to give the Minister of External Affairs some credit for the initiative that he has shown in guiding the foreign policy of Barbados. Now, there are one or two comments that I would like him to answer me on. When we are talking in figures, will he tell me for how long Barbados did not have a Consul General at New York? What time elapsed between the appointment of a High Commissioner to Canada? When you are manoeuvring figures, all this will clearly show that in terms of money if he had had a full establishment throughout, all the savings that he is boasting about certainly would not be there; and he must tell the House how long Barbados was without a Consul General at New York and how long without a High Commissioner to Canada. He should tell us why it was so long that Barbados was without a Consul General in New York. I hope that the reason that he will give us is the one that the Opposition heard was the real reason.

I do not like pretending. If you are going to save all this money in Foreign Affairs, why have offices going unfilled for such a long time? Perhaps it is no fault of his. I want to say without fear of contradiction that Barbados abroad under the Democratic Labour Party had a high reputation. (*Aside: Nonsense.*) Nonsense what. I attended international conferences on several occasions all over the world, and my colleagues can tell you that every forum at which we appeared Barbados has always had a known reputation throughout the world. That is accepted. People come here from abroad and say this.

Diplomatic relations is one area in which there is always room for improvement, and very often on issues you have to stand up for your country's integrity and your country's position; and there is always the tendency for people to get the impression that you are pro America, pro Russia or pro anybody. I remember when I went to a conference in Tormelino. The Americans, the Dutch and Barbados were the only three at that time who refused to condemn Israel because some cables were blown up off Lebanon. We were the three who stood up together. Of course, after that, Barbados' name was mud; but on the evidence, even though one might suspect that it might have been Israeli divers doing the damage, they did not have concrete evidence to prove that these cables were blown up by the Jews. After that Barbados was to some extent a marked country.

I am only giving these instances to show that in these highly scientific fields where self interest and enlightened self interest plays a very vital part in the day to day relationships between nations, a country can very often, temporarily at any rate, be considered by the persons to whom you have to stand up not as "hail fellow well met". I think the Minister himself will have to accept that his task has been made so much easier because of the high reputation that we have had in the

U.K. and Canada and because of the groundwork which the Democratic Labour Party did during its term of office since Independence.

4.40 p.m.

What better relationship can we have than with Canada who has been financing so many schemes in Barbados like water, the Airport, etc? The United Kingdom's relationship has been good. I cannot think of any country even in the Caribbean, apart from the triumvirate of Manley, Burnham and Barrow who were LSE men together where the bond was originally forged — Oxford was not included in those days; it was purely the London School of Economics — you had a relationship in the Caribbean where, at least, the Caribbean Community could come into existence. If the Minister wants a bipartisan approach, he must not make the type of speeches that he made at the American Base at North Point. Last week when he made that big statement, I thought he had received \$90 million to talk about. He has said what is fair to be said. He is still in the process of negotiating, but when he makes a speech and accuses the last Government of not getting this and that from the Americans, then he cannot expect us to run to his arms when he is asking for a bipartisan approach to Foreign Policy. I am waiting to see what he is going to bring home, if and when he brings it home. He has to understand that new Governments coming into power in the flush of victory are entitled not only to reassess their Foreign Policy, but to reassess every aspect of the running of a Government. That is their right and their privilege, and he must avoid — not by Commissions of Enquiries either — giving to the Opposition and to the public the impression that the last Government were a bunch of people who were not concerned with Barbados' welfare, or Barbados' interest in the international field.

Sir, I agree with him that there are certain areas of a country's life where bipartisanship will work well, but it has to be on both sides. In a small community like Barbados it is extremely difficult where every time somebody opens his mouth political capital is being attempted to be made on any issue that comes before the public. I am yet to see in Barbados where you can get an approach on both sides. It is one of my disappointments with politics that you always find that your motives are suspected, and anything you do you will find most people putting ulterior motives to your sincerity and to your action.

Mr. Chairman, the Opposition supports this Resolution except for one or two things. Again, he talks about the Caracas Mission and said that we borrowed furniture for four years. Can he tell this House how much it cost the Barbados Government during that period? Let us have the figures? Did the Government pay any money? (*Asides.*) It was not a bad arrangement, and that is what I am trying to say. I am not against his buying furniture

for \$30,000. If you were getting the furniture free, then do not give the impression that we were just using furniture and you do not know how it happened. If somebody loaned me some chairs for my drawing room and for my dining table, I would use them until he called for them. (*Asides.*) What is wrong with that? It would save me some coppers. Do not give people the impression that this is something wrong in our using the furniture. We want our own, and I am glad to see that the country can now afford its own. Do not give us the impression that for four years the Mission in Caracas did not have this and that and you cannot understand why.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member will give way, he is really misrepresenting what I said. What I am saying is that the arrangement for the furniture — On a point of explanation, Sir, — was a personal relationship between Ambassador McConney and the then Manager of the Barbados Hilton. Ambassador McConney had asked for a vote for the furniture and it was never attended to. As a result today the cost of the furniture is more than it would have been had he been provided with furniture before.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not quarrelling with that. Looking at Head 25 — Maintenance of Vehicles and Plant — I remember when we were discussing something about a car for the Mission in New York, we had one of the biggest debates on the tendencies of the then Consul General and who sat in front and who sat behind, but we will not quarrel with that. If you have to repair a car you will have to do so. We really want a Library here to get the Debates and some of the comments made by the Government when they were in Opposition on the Coast Guard, the Foreign Service, and so on. Even the Prime Minister himself got in here and told the House that the Duffus Commission would cost less than the Commission for Housing. Today it is \$148,000. We had short-circuit time and we have not heard anything more about that. Those are political tactics. Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this. The Minister will avoid criticism in this House because of his approach. As a matter of fact, he has been thorough, he has given us details which I think were even unnecessary and other Government Ministers should follow his example. Why does he not run a seminar for them? He should tell them how to approach introducing Resolutions in this House. His introduction on this Resolution is one of the most thorough and one of the best introductions I have heard in this House in my 10 years. I will go back further than that because I came in here in 1956. Even going back that distance, for the first time ...

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member must not give the impression that he was in here from 1956 to now continuously. He ran after 1958.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Leader of the House. I ran after 1958 and walked back in here like I owned the place. People like him who did not run got kicked out, and people who did not run cannot get in. You must be a giant to do that. I ran away and walked up in here like I owned the place.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman. I am sure the hon. member will agree that nobody on this front bench has ever been thrown out by his colleagues.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House fully agrees with the Prime Minister?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: He is too ashamed. Mr. Chairman, this is how the House should be. We should make a little parry and so on without rancour and abuse. Be that as it may, I would like to compliment the Minister of Foreign Affairs on the very lucid, thorough and painstaking explanation which he has given. The Government has to run the Government. The Government is in charge, and the Government can do what it likes. If the Government would understand that we are a part of the machinery of Government in that in making legislation both sides have to take a meaningful part, and they would introduce Resolutions like the one that has just been introduced by the Hon. Minister of External Affairs, then this House could proceed without all of the problems which it faces sometimes. I would like personally to compliment him and hope that this standard he has set will be emulated by his colleagues and that he will continue to give that type of explanation, even if we do not agree with him.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would begin my short contribution with some well known words the Leader of the Opposition uses from time to time: "I shall not be long." And it is for the simple reason that the ground on our side has been covered very thoroughly by the preceding speakers. But there is one point on which I would like an explanation, particularly in view of what the Leader of the Opposition said about the thoroughness of the presentation which was made by the Hon. Attorney General in this matter.

You will recall that the Attorney-General in his presentation made reference to a substantial increase in emoluments which apparently were granted to the staff of the various Missions. Looking at the Resolution it would seem this was done sometime in April, 1977. In this particular matter, related to the nature of the increases, I would like to know for example what percentage increase

was granted, how long the increases have been in effect, and in truth and in fact did they come into effect from April 1, 1977. I do not suppose it is any secret that I have already been seeking this information. I hope the Minister would do this House the favour of giving the information which I am seeking on this particular matter relative to this Resolution.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, my point of intervention relates to statements made by the hon. member for St. Michael South West when he said that in the eighteen months since the Barbados Labour Party has been in office nothing has materially changed in the area of foreign affairs. To some extent the point I wanted to make has already been made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition who really contradicted himself in recognizing that the Hon. Attorney General and Minister for External Affairs has really brought considerable rationality and direction to the foreign policy of Barbados.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman, it is not correct to state that the Leader of the Opposition contradicted himself. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke about was the methodology of approach to foreign policy and he said, if I remember correctly, that there was no basic change in policy but he made reference to the increase in the number of countries with which diplomatic relations had been established.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: If the hon. member wants to restrict his contribution to methodology, I want to go beyond that. I repeat, Barbados in general had been mismanged during the last days of the Democratic Labour Party's administration. One area of Barbados' public affairs that was mismanged was that of foreign affairs. You had, to begin with, a cock-eyed view of the world, failing to recognize the 700 million people or more in China and recognizing Taiwan as the voice of China. That is the first and only bit of evidence I need to use to show that the Democratic Labour Party had a cock-eyed view of the world.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is misleading the House. On more than one occasion the then Government, the Democratic Labour Party, expounded on a two-China policy. If you have a two-China policy you cannot say that Taiwan could speak for 700 million people. There is a difference between a two-China policy and having Taiwan representing 700 million Chinese.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, how could there have been a two-China policy when they repeatedly said that Taiwan represented China? However, the former administration persisted in that approach and thereby clearly illustrated that they had a very cock-eyed view of the world. This was the first defect of Barbados' foreign policy under the Democratic Labour Party.

The second thing relates to the disarray of the foreign policy. No one could make explicit at any time what was the foreign policy or the main premises on which the policy was formulated. In fact, Barbados' voice in the United Nations was a voice of disrespect and a voice viewed with considerable contempt. The way for instance, in which Ambassador Waldo Ramsay was used by the Jewish lobby was something that caused considerable shame and embarrassment among the Barbadian community in the U.S.A. Indeed, several ambassadors of foreign countries have spoken to me about this, and it was a source of considerable disgust to see the way in which Ambassador Ramsay was used by the Jewish Lobby. I want to make this very clear, and I hope the hon. member would not want to rise on this. The policy of Barbados with regard to Cambodia and several other nations in the days of Ambassador Ramsay was a source of shame and embarrassment to Barbados, and the point I wish to make now is this: foreign policy under the Barbados Labour Party, and especially in the hands of the present Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs, has been a rational, progressive and sane voice in an area in which there was previously disarray. The hon. Attorney General has brought rationality, sanity and direction to Barbados foreign policy, and whatever else may be said about him, we must recognize that has been his contribution thus far in the area of foreign policy. The former administration used to boast, indeed it was the former Prime Minister's expression in a White Paper in 1966 on Barbados foreign policy, that Barbados would at all times try to make its position clear as a friend of all and a foe of none. But in truth and in fact the policy that Barbados enunciated — so far as it could be called a policy — was one in which a considerable portion of the world viewed us as foes rather than friends. The Barbados Labour Party has completely reversed this situation, and we are trying to develop contacts with more and more countries using the technique of multiple accreditation which has not brought any greatly increased costs to this country.

I would like to spell out what I regard as the premises on which Barbados foreign policy now seems to be based. First of all it seems to be a policy on the protection of our nationals abroad. The second premise is the maximization of benefits to Barbados from membership in international agencies, benefits not only in relation to the country but also in terms of the employment of Barbadian personnel. And I have been very disappointed to read of the former Prime Minister of this country commenting on our efforts in this direction as a begging policy.

5.00 p.m.

Indeed I have been very disappointed to read the former Prime Minister of this country commenting on our efforts in that direction as a kind of beggar's policy. I do not think that is fair to the facts or fair to what is going on at all.

The third premise on which it is based is the promotion of the interest, as I understand it, of small states, and in this regard I know our efforts to get benefits, economic and otherwise, to our smaller brethren in the Eastern Caribbean.

The fourth premise on which it is based is the pursuit of justice and morality in international affairs, and Barbados is in a particularly good position to do that, because our domestic record is such a good one that we can afford to project ourselves on the international stage as far as justice and morality are concerned. That is another important dimension which a Foreign Affairs Minister, and indeed the whole Barbados administration, has introduced to our policy.

The fifth premise on which foreign affairs is indeed structured is the promotion of trade through our foreign policy. I think there could be a lot of legitimate discussion as to how our overseas offices ought to be structured and whether it is wise that we should combine tourism, for instance, and industrial development promotion and so on, and in that respect I think there could be some ground for exchange between the hon. member for St. Michael South West and myself, indeed between that side and this side, but I wish to restate the point which I intended to make, indeed it is the aim of my brief contribution, and it is this. That there was considerable disarray in our Barbados' foreign policy, confusion, irrationality, lack of contribution in the past, and if indeed Barbados secured any respect abroad, and indeed the country was respected, it was because of its whole history, because of the contribution of our people in many walks of life overseas, because of the respect that one or two individuals who were rather well known overseas, but it cannot be said that many of our representatives overseas, Ambassadors or the former Minister of Foreign Affairs, George Moe, that he himself commanded any respect, or that a lot of people who worked with him commanded any respect.

It makes no sense continuing mythology in this country. At some point the record has got to be set straight. George Moe never understood anything about foreign policy, and that was reflected in the way in which our external environment was managed, particularly in the last five years. As far as I know, and I can say that I have many friends around the United Nations from many countries, Barbados' voice was the voice of disrespect. People viewed us with a certain amount of contempt and embarrassment, our position in relation to the whole Third World was one that needed straightening out. Our stand on the Israeli/Arab conflict was one of great ambivalence and confusion. All of these matters have now been set straight, and through the efforts of our Ambassador at the United Nations today, Barbados is regarded as a progressive and sane voice in world affairs, small though we are, in irreproachable moderation. I

think that this administration has got to be applauded for that, and all of those who are now working in the foreign affairs Ministry and working hard to project the image of Barbados, they too have got to be applauded.

The important point which I wished to make was that it should not go unchallenged the false statement in my view made by the hon. member for St. Michael South West when he said that in the last 18 months nothing has changed as far as Barbados' management of its foreign environment is concerned.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just a point of explanation. Again, for the record, I said that the policy has not changed, and if I recall correctly the Prime Minister when asked by someone why he had gone to the United Nations and made a statement essentially similar to the "satellites of none" statement, asked the person what is wrong with that. I do not know why the hon. member keeps bringing in the question of management, the policy has not changed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow you to make a speech on this at all.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps the first occasion — and I can see the Attorney General and member for Christ Church West smiling — it is perhaps the first occasion on which he has had some praise from his back benches, and I think this must certainly have gladdened his heart, because normally he is accustomed to criticism from his back benches, but on this occasion he has had some praise following some very sane policies, and I cannot remember the adjectives or epithets that were used in that regard. Indeed it is the thing of politics that as a Minister he has had more praise from this side of the Chamber than he has had from his back benches, and I think that is a very instructive thing.

I think from the tone of the speeches, certainly from this side so far, no one can seriously quarrel with the direction of foreign policy in this country, because to quarrel with that direction would be to quarrel with the antecedents of that particular foreign policy. Whatever may be said and however attempts may be made to twist the direction of affairs, particularly the external affairs of this country since 1966, it is really irrefutable that a very solid foundation has been laid for the practice of foreign policy in this country. There can be no doubt about it, and that the Democratic Labour Party Government during those years it held the reins of Government in this country not only established Barbados as an independent country, but went about in a very methodical way and a very sane way in establishing our relations with other members of the international comity of nations.

It is in the nature of politics for that side to try to degrade or disparage or downgrade what has been done by the previous administration, but the record speaks for itself, and what really bothers me at this stage now is that in spite of the promises that have been made, in spite of the labourings, we are today debating the activities of foreign policy under a Supplementary Estimate. I think it tells us something about how we organise our business in this House, that we could be debating the issues of foreign policy, the relations with other countries, with whom we should associate and with whom we should not have relations, that we should be doing this under a Supplementary.

5.10 p.m.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we need to get a committee system in which details of policy changes and of policies can be examined within a Committee of this House and these matters can be discussed in the presence of the particular officials concerned who can be questioned. I think that the sooner the Government gets around to this the better. I believe that there was some reference to it, although the reference did not go deep enough for the purpose that I am speaking of. I think that you have got to set up this type of system for matters of importance as our foreign policy.

Now, let me make this point clear. I have no quarrel with the way in which the foreign relations of this country have been conducted. If the Government believes that there should be a push further East, that we should establish closer relations with the CARICOM countries, that is a matter for the Government arriving out of its foreign policy; and then this is the same Government which gets up and talks about Marxism and tries to indicate that a member over here is a dyed in the wool Marxist, and has tried to push him to the point of expounding his political philosophy; but it is that Government that is establishing more relations with the Eastern European, Communist countries than the previous Government.

If the Government wants to do that, that is all right because it knows the premises from which it is operating. I have no quarrel with the way in which our foreign relations have been conducted. At the United Nations, I believe that over the years since 1966, we have had outstanding representatives in that position from 1966, from the very beginning, *ab initio*. Maybe the present Minister of External Affairs does not have as much influence in those particular areas as other Ministers. I am not talking about the Prime Minister. Anyhow I have no quarrel with that. I believe that the present Minister is a competent Minister, and I make no bones about it. While he is trying to get his officers to tumble over themselves to do things more quickly than the 8 or 10 or 12 hours a day may permit them, I believe that his heart is in the right place.

I would like the Minister to tell us, because I do not think that this Hon. Chamber has been told yet where the premises of the Consulate in Florida will be located. This may be my fault in probably not following the releases very closely. Is it in Miami? (*Aside: Orlando.*) It is Orlando. I used to hear that West Palm Beach was too far. It was not near Miami. I was not here and I want to know now if Orlando is more central to the whole scheme of things and the movement of Barbadians in the part of the United States than West Palm Beach; because the debates speak very clearly for themselves. What are the logistics for setting up that arrangement in Orlando? We cannot say that it is a station post on the way to Disney Land because I think that the Minister takes his foreign policy more seriously than that.

We also want to hear something about Ambassadors to CARICOM. It was one of the major planks on the platform of the Barbados Labour Party that instead of setting up Embassies and other diplomatic representation outside of the Caribbean region, that one of the first areas we would look at would be the CARICOM area. Now, as far as I can recall we have an ambassador, the distinguished Head of the public service of this country, appointed to the Bahamas. I believe that we have very close relationships to the Government of Grenada, and that accreditation has been given as far as the Government of Grenada and its leader, Sir Eric are concerned; but there is nothing that tells me if our foreign policy, as has been enunciated should be an expression of our economic interests and relationships. I think that this was intended to be our main thrust in our economic relations within the Caribbean. What about Guyana? What about Trinidad and Tobago? What about Jamaica?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of elucidation. Barbados has full accreditation with Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and Suriname — Ambassador Babb. The Bahamas and Grenada are represented. All of the independent states.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, apparently the majority of people of this country did not know this, including myself. I think that you must tell it to the nation. I can tell you now with the information that has been given that you could not have chosen a better Ambassador — but he had his training in the Democratic Labour Party.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member is less than generous. He must realise that the Ambassador was trained by me at Coleridge Parry; and I think so was the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the point I really wish to make in respect of Florida and in respect of Canada — may be you can correct me on this — I believe that some promises were made to Barbadians in Canada about establishing a physical presence where there is a

large concentration of Barbadians. Maybe the Minister can tell us what progress is being made in this regard; but in closing I would like again to say that as far as the present Government is concerned, it continues the external relations that this country established since 1966. I think that in this field of operations, if in no other, it is necessary for Barbados to speak with a single voice because in the world of international foreign politics it is absolutely necessary and vital that Barbadians should know what their true interests are; and when these are enunciated they should get as broad a measure of support as possible.

5.20 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, if no other member wishes to speak, I will try to be as brief as possible in view of the late hour of the day and to provide some of the information asked for by hon. members. First, let me say that I am very heartened by the level of the debate, and I am very much indebted to hon. members for the contribution made in this debate, and it fortifies my view that a full debate on Foreign Affairs is necessary. I will be asking the Leader of the House and the Cabinet to agree to provide us with such an opportunity and then, perhaps, we would be able to go into a closer analysis which we have been doing on the way Barbados conducted itself before and now with the factual background and not members just believing that a set of circumstances exists.

Let me say, too, that I am indebted to the hon. member for Christ Church East for putting so succinctly the premises on which our Foreign Policy is based. Surely, he would wish me to emphasise one which would at the same time permit me to reply to some matters raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South, and it is that the Barbados Labour Party believes strongly that a great plank of its Foreign Policy must be the strengthening and deepening of the Caricom relationship and the further strengthening of relationships with the Commonwealth countries in particular. In relation to Caricom, you will have seen that our concept of regionalism is so great that you will see to this day we are doing all we can in order to cement the existing relationship and to help smooth over any existing difficulties in Caricom States.

One of the first things we did was to have addressed ourselves to the appointment of a representative within the Caricom States. We look forward to moving beyond having an Ambassador in Caracas away from the physical geography to some extent of the main Caricom partners to actually having a physical presence in one or two of the Caricom States. At the moment, because of the financial constraints of the Government and because of the other competing matters that have some priority, we are not able to do this, but I trust that we will be able, certainly by 1980, to have redressed this balance and to

actually have Ambassadors stationed in one or two of our Caribbean partners. After all, there are some of our main trading partners, we have very close historical family, cultural, social and political contact with them. I have always believed, and the Barbados Labour Party has always believed, that we should have moved to this position before allowing events to overtake us. I could not withdraw an Ambassador from Caracas, for instance, and reassign him to Guyana or to Trinidad without causing some rupturing in our relationships, but had I been beginning *de nova*, or *ab initio*, to use my friend's language, I would, certainly, have stationed the Ambassador either in Trinidad or in Guyana in preference to Venezuela.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what point have you risen?

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister has given way. He was speaking about Caracas, and he said that he could not move the Ambassador from Caracas. I wonder if, in his reply, he would also say something about this Cultural Agreement and the removing of the Venezuelan Cultural Attache who left here recently.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I should say that we have been working on our relationship with Venezuela. We have done a reappraisal in the office where things have not gone exactly as warm and right as we would have wanted them to go, and it seems that, perhaps, prior to the Independent countries of the Caribbean our relationship with Venezuela has not been at the same high level as it has been in the case of Guyana or Jamaica. There are certain difficulties that I would not like to state with any more detail, and I would prefer to speak to the hon. member about this, but we are hopeful that we can develop these relationships. I have given some time myself to this period of formal but insubstantial contacts.

In relation to the Cultural Agreement, I do not want to sour the relationship with ourselves and Venezuela. The Cultural Agreement has been sent by the past Government some considerable time ago. I remained in the office until May last year. From September to May the Agreement did not come back from the Venezuelan Foreign Office, and it has been there for several months before that. When it came back to us in May, it was sent, I believe, in the month of June from Foreign Affairs to the Ministry of Education and it remained there until a few weeks ago when the Agreement came back to the Ministry of the Attorney-General. (*Asides.*) I would not say it is so much shame. The thing was translated and opinions were had from various people.

Now a head of the Agreement coming to us in Foreign Affairs Venezuela had sent one representative here without the Agreement having been signed or, indeed, without us having the Agreement. I am told that the representative has moved. He is not a particularly well man, and I believe there was some anxiety on their part to have him in the Caribbean beforehand. We have been pressing Venezuela on various areas — on the area of Air Services, for instance, without getting any reply. We have made various approaches to Venezuela, and indeed, it is only recently that my Ambassador has been able to enter into any substantial discussions with Venezuela. Perhaps some countries do not react as quickly as other countries. That is the most I am prepared to say at the moment. I give hon. members an undertaking that I will try to return the visit to Venezuela which the Ex-Foreign Minister of Venezuela paid to this country, and I trust that before May I would have visited Venezuela. It has been indicated to us that the present Foreign Minister of Venezuela, former Ambassador Gonsalves, will be visiting the Caribbean region including Barbados. We will try to develop that relationship. I better not go any further at this stage.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, having heard all that the Hon. Minister has said, I get the feeling that he is not satisfied that the relations between Barbados and Venezuela are at a high level. I really want to find out from him if he is satisfied with the nature of the relationship.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: All I can say that I am satisfied about, Mr. Chairman, is that there is considerable room for improvement in that relationship, and Ambassador Babb has had instructions to make all the representations he can on various areas. For instance, hon. members should know that about six years ago Agreements were signed in the area of Agriculture and Housing. Mr. DaCosta Edwards was then the Minister and he visited Venezuela. No development has taken place out of those matters.

5.30 p.m.

Obviously, if our relationship is to be developed, Venezuela must be able to talk to us and certainly at Ministerial level on the areas of our relationship. I understand, however, that Venezuela is interested in being one of the donors to the sub-group dealing with Barbados under the group for economic cooperation which is to be launched in May, and this offers a new opportunity for developing relationships with that country.

I was also asked about officers on leave and the resultant savings. Three officers were on study leave during the year. I don't know if I remember the names of them all, but one was Miss Welch, another was Miss Collins and I think the other was Miss Jackson. No savings were effected by their leave as they were on leave

with full pay and we had other persons carrying out their duties. Savings have come about because we tightened up in other areas, like in communication by telex and in travelling.

I was asked about the Consul General's residence at New Rochelle. We have leased the New Rochelle residence for US\$1,000 per month and have rented premises for the Consul General at \$600 a month in an area where Barbadians are, in a part of Queens. This area is more suitable in this respect than New Rochelle. We are therefore making a gross saving of US\$400 a month. This saving not only takes care of the upkeep of the house but pays some of the mortgage which we have to meet on the New Rochelle building. We have signed an option to sell the house at New Rochelle for I believe US\$135,000. The Consul General is now more accessible to Barbadian nationals.

Some play has been made about the position of the Consul General. Let me say that as far as I am concerned he has been performing his duties properly. I do not know what is all the play about how much time it took to appoint the Consul General. As a matter of fact the Mission was being manned during that period of time. I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South West has a different view of the role of a Consul General from the view that I have. I believe the people who are familiar with the conduct of foreign affairs know the duties which a Consul General performs, and in my view the Consul General in New York is performing his duties very adequately. I have no complaint about what is being done; but I made it clear from the beginning that any Consul General in our administration will be under an ambassador, because the Consul General is not the principle representative of a country. We were wrong in the way appointments had been made in the past and wrong in the attitude that was taken, and we created certain problems in New York which are now being sorted out. The Consul General works very hard among Barbadian nationals in New York. He has given them a greater belief that their home country is interested in them, and he has been trying to remove the political nuances existing in New York and is concentrating on giving a broader representation for Barbados than in the past. And this is the role I wish him to perform. And I have made it quite clear that if any member of the Opposition or the leaders of various sectors of the community such as the trade unions visit New York they must be given proper treatment regardless of political leanings. I have put this forward quite clearly. It will be recalled that some time ago when the Present Prime Minister visited New York — he was then Leader of the Opposition — the then Consul General was taken to task by a particular ambassador because he extended some courtesies to the Leader of the Opposition. That was wrong. I expect the Leader of the Opposition to be treated as well as a Minister if he visits New York,

because he too is a representative of the country regardless of whether he has been appointed on the advice of the Prime Minister or by some other means. I believe in professionalism in the foreign service. This does not mean there will not be political appointments, but these will be for political functions.

Reference was made to the good name we now have at the United Nations. This is due as much to our policies as to the personality of our ambassador at the United Nations. He is a forthright, outstanding man and people respect him and the image he projects for Barbados. Although this appointment was political the ambassador has been doing a first class job and we are now much more effective at the United Nations.

I was asked about changes in London. The Minister of External Trade has suggested that an economic council be appointed to London to look at and analyse economic data, and he will be leading an economic team to London. In New York Mr. Clarke is doing economic analysis and not being merely engaged in trade promotion.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. Minister could tell us more about the economic team for London.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Two members constitute the team, Mr. Brown who is an economist and Mr. Hinkson. They will be assisted by the High Commissioner and his staff. As I said before, in New York economic matters are now being looked after by Mr. Clarke.

I was asked to say something about our emphasis on the employment of Barbadians in international organizations. I do not accept that there is any counter productive effect in this policy. We have tried to get Barbadians employed in all the clerical and professional grades of these organizations. We believe there is room for Barbadians who want to move out of the Civil Service for a period of time for further experience and there are several well deserving officers in this category. I am not as constrained in my thinking about the Civil Service and the talent in it as is the hon. member for St. Michael South West. I can find, without thinking for more than a split second, at least four people, including a young lady, who in my view are ambassadorial material and would love to have the opportunity to show their competence. And it is a good thing when we can get people placed in international organisations. They can keep us informed of what is happening, and our interests can be better looked after; so we will continue to pursue that policy.

I think the hon. member for St. Lucy asked about the increase for non-established staff. Effective April 1, 1977, there was an overall increase in the region of 15%; there had been no increase I believe, for three years. We

have told them we will look at the position again in April, 1979, but that there was no certainty of an increase then; salaries will be reviewed in the whole context of the Government service and the country in which they are living. The only exception has been with the staff in the United Kingdom which will be increased by 7% in 1978 simply because of the high rate of inflation in the United Kingdom. We have figures to show that they have suffered more than any others of the foreign staff because of inflation, as far as salaries are concerned.

5.40 p.m.

I am not going to read into the record the annual present and revised salary increases prior to April 1, but if hon. members want that I will send it to them.

The position with Florida is that we had an Honorary Consul who was in a different area of Florida, and we have now appointed someone in Orlando. Let me say that Mr. Chapman before he ceased being Consul for Barbados and High Commissioner to the Bahamas had himself seen Orlando as an ideal area for the appointment of an Honorary Consul, and he himself thought very highly of Mr. Gerald Bourne, the present Honorary Consul.

For the benefit of hon. members, Honorary Consuls are not paid, they get approximately \$2,000 U.S. a year to cover their expenses, and we have therefore gone to Orlando where the need is both in terms of tourism and in terms of the possibility of trade. The statement about this, the recommendation about this, about the area was from Mr. Chapman himself. Indeed had he stayed on he would have pressed us into going to Orlando and probably establishing an office there for himself.

We are reviewing in the United States the areas in which we will have additional Honorary Consuls; I am awaiting on the Ministry of External Trade for their recommendations. Ambassador Jackman and Mr. Clarke of the IDC and from the Ministry of External Trade, and the Consul General during this year will be doing a tour of the United States to look at the areas and make recommendations. We will be probably guided by the presence of our nationals, the possibilities for the promotion of trade and tourist opportunities in particular in where we locate Honorary Consuls in the future.

Toronto. The other point asked was about Toronto. We were hoping that we could have established by now a Consulate in Toronto. We have not been able to do that because of financial constraints, but we have tried to make available a little bit more time from the young lady who performs duties to the Tourist Board, and she has been appointed Vice-Consul. We now have a Consul and two Vice Consuls in Toronto, who are Tourist Board personnel and External Trade personnel, but they report

on various matters concerning external trade direct to their Minister and Board, they report on consular matters direct to ourselves, and the No. 2 in the High Commission in Ottawa does monthly visits in order to supervise their work. In due course we hope that we will probably upgrade the level of political and Consular representation at Toronto, and also have some form of consulate services in Montreal. This is the way we are going about it at the moment.

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

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour the SPEAKER the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSALS IN THE WHITE PAPER ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BARBADOS DEFENCE FORCE

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If you please, Sir, it has been indicated to me by the Leader of the Opposition that the Opposition would like more time for the consideration of the White Paper. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that the White Paper although it was sent out by post has not been received by hon. members. It went out last week, and certainly there are some hon. members behind me on the Government benches who have indicated that they have not seen it.

I therefore beg to move that consideration of this Resolution be postponed for one week.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not properly before the House for discussion so there is no need to postpone it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have not entered into the matter. I beg Your Honour's pardon, I am obliged to Your Honour.
5.50 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Government for their consideration in this matter on my intimation.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND SITUATED AT JAMES STREET AND LUCAS STREET

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land situated at James Street and Lucas Street in the

City of Bridgetown for the provision of offices for the Barbados National Bank was called.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to utilise the process of compulsory acquisition under the ordinance of this Island of two parcels of land, one consisting of 11,790 square feet situated at James Street and Lucas Street well known to hon. members as the headquarters for some period of time of the Telephone Company and land on the opposite side which I believe was a property several years ago of the Methodist Church of Barbados and known as Alexandra House, consisting of 21,000 square feet of land.

The sole reason for bringing this Resolution before Parliament is that in the investigation of the title by the legal advisers of the Barbados Savings Bank who are the real purchasers from the Barbados Telephone Company questions have arisen as to the power of transfer by the Telephone Company of a good title, having regard to the fact that the Telephone Company bought it from the Methodist Church in Barbados.

I happen to be familiar with the titles of Methodist Church properties in Barbados and there has been grave doubt for a long period as to some of these titles, not because the Church did not legitimately buy them, but because the Church as such was not fully incorporated in Barbados. I believe that attempts have been made to rectify this position, and the Methodist Church has been fully incorporated in Antigua by a statute of Antigua; and the territories in all the Caribbean territories other than Antigua have been passing separate laws recognising the Methodist Church Corporation as trustees of the local bodies in Barbados.

I remember when I was in another place I was concerned about a draft Bill coming before the Legislature of Barbados. I know that Antigua has passed a Bill, Grenada has passed a Bill and that Trinidad and Tobago has passed a Bill; because it was as a result of the efforts of the late Sir Hugh Wooding when he tried to tidy up the whole question of the legal status of the Methodist Church right through the Caribbean.

It appears that when the Crown Solicitor and the legal adviser to the Savings Bank examined the matter, all thought that it would be unsafe to take a possessory title having regard to the fact that this property was formerly owned by the Methodist Church. There is no disagreement. The Government comes into it because a request has been made to the Ministry of Finance which is responsible for the financial institutions, to use the Land Acquisition Act. The money will be coming from the Savings Bank. The only alternative would be to pass the land through the courts which could have taken about three to six months; and the Government is not ashamed

of the decision of the Savings Bank to purchase the former Telephone building and the car park opposite.

As I understand it, there are plans afoot for the area between Alexandra House and the Water Works Department, excluding the Jewish Synagogue, to come within the control of Government so that we will be able to expand the Registry, realign the road to James Street which was suggested many years ago in a Development Plan. So, the use of the Land Acquisition Act is a means to ensure that a good title is obtained.

I can tell hon. members that it is contemplated that the Barbados Development, the Barbados Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and the Agricultural Credit Bank which will be merged as part of the financial institutions and a division of the commercial bank will all be housed in the complex. The Barbados Development Bank has to move from its present location within the compound of the Garrison, because that will be needed for other purposes; so that we feel that the acquisition of this property to facilitate the merger of the financial institutions is a very good thing.

The Mortgage Finance Division will also find accommodation on the left hand side of James Street in the old telephone building. The Mortgage Finance Division will at some time in the future take over the functions of the Mortgage Finance Corporation which is purely a money lending institution for people who deal with the Housing Authority, and those who are eligible like Civil Servants and others who are eligible for loans like members of the Barbados Workers' Union in connection with the development at St. Philip, and those who are eligible under the terms of the Barbados Mortgage Finance Act. I feel that it will be a very convenient location because most of the business is dealing with the transfer of land and financing of the transfer of land. What better place could it be situated at than near to where all the titles are?

There is nothing else in relation to that. There is a plot of land available if hon. members wish to scrutinise it; but basically it is the old telephone building on the left hand going down James Street, and the car park opposite has already been demolished; and the only reason for using this Act is because of the history of the title.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of being conducted on a tour of this building by Mr. Lewis, the Permanent Secretary, and I must say that this is a very good purchase, and I agree with it. From the outside one does not know that it is as big as when you

look at it on the inside; and I was more or less pleased with the renovations which I saw. There is one thing which I would like to say, and which I would like the Leader of the House to answer me on. The Government is buying this building. I do not know where the money is coming from. The title I assume, would exist in the Crown as a result of the purchase. Are you going to let it remain or lease it to somebody or resell it; Do not mind that the money is coming from the Savings Bank. The use of the Compulsory Acquisition Act makes the Government the owner. Will it be at a peppercorn lease, or what department will be responsible since the title is a result of this acquisition and must lie in the Crown in right of the Government of Barbados?

6.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you are addressing the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, one question before the Minister gets up. I wonder if he could add to that information whether the price of the property will still be \$600,000 as it was announced when it was said that the acquisition would be made. It would seem to me that if, in fact, the Crown is now acquiring the land that the price of the building would have changed considerably, unless it is the wish of the Government to acquire the land and then sell it to the Savings Bank, which would be incongruous. I wonder if the Minister would explain exactly how it is going to happen and what is going to happen.

While I am on my feet, I must say this acquisition does lend itself to debate of the concept of the amalgamation, but I do not believe that this is the time to raise the question, since we have not yet had any detailed outline of how the proposed merger will work. One does not know from the Government, so far, what are the administrative details, and I might be, somewhat, anticipating if I attempted at this point to raise questions which are in my mind about the whole concept of amalgamation. I think there are certain inherent administrative difficulties which are bound to come, but I will wait until we hear from the Government how they propose to deal with this matter in the future.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Perhaps the hon. member does not recall that we are in the House and he would not be able to speak a second time in this debate. If there are any specific questions that he wishes to ask, I have some papers here and I will do my best to answer them. I do not believe that I can speak and then be asked questions and speak again. Hon. members will have to ask the questions, and then wait on me to reply on the policy of the Bank, and on the Leader of the House to reply to the acquisition points that have been raised.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, one would have assumed in a matter such as this that very early in the

Government's presentation, in fact, we would have had some information set out in much greater details than has been set out so far about the usage to which this property would be put and the matter to which my colleague, the member for St. Michael South West, adverted and that is the concept of the amalgamation of the financial institutions of the Government but, apparently, this will come a little later at No. 5 or No. 4 where the Prime Minister will be batting on this occasion.

Be that as it may, I have said that whenever the Government comes with any proposal that is a new proposal, I will be the first one to get up and say this is a new proposal, and it is a departure from what was pertaining before. As far as this matter is concerned, on the basis of the information that has been disclosed so far, the housing or accommodation of a number of the financial institutions of the Government in these premises, the amalgamation of the financial institutions so called, constitutes a departure from previous policy.

Now, it will be for the people of this country to judge whether that is a sound policy, whether it is a good departure, or whether it can be termed the converse. I wish to say and to compliment the Government for courage in taking on this particular matter. It is true that when the matter started out the Central Bank was to be involved in this amalgamation but, apparently, wiser counsels have prevailed and it has now been recognised that you cannot involve a Central Bank in that type of amalgamation.

Sir, we are told that the Barbados Development Bank is to be included in this amalgamation. I understand that there is some reluctance on the part of the Barbados Development Bank to be part of this amalgamation. Maybe the Minister responsible and the Prime Minister can say whether this is so or not, but that, certainly, is the information that has been circulated that there has been a demur by the Barbados Development Bank in being part of this amalgamation. It maybe the force with which the heightened decibels the force with which the introducer of this Resolution said that the Barbados Development Bank must move. That might be an indication that they are not too happy about moving and the force of the words would make it plain to the Chairman and to the members of the Board, or whoever has been against this type of amalgamation, that the Government has spoken on this matter and that is that. They will just have to move.

It is true that sometimes the Government changes and relents, because sometimes the Government says that things or people must move, but then the Government says you can stay a little longer but no Christmas presents. Maybe, that may be another matter. The whole concept of the Commercial Bank, the amalgamation of

the institutions and the running of a Commercial Bank by Government, is a very interesting development. I said it is new, as far as Barbados is concerned. Of course, there are other precedents in the region and beyond for Government's participation in commercial banking. I am not one of those who are against this particular development. I think we have to find ways and means of making the people of this country actually involved in development in all aspects of commercial activity in this country and, so far, the mechanisms for doing this have not yet been developed. State ownership as opposed to private ownership does not necessarily mean that the people are involved in commercial activities at a meaningful level because, as has been pointed out, there is a separation of ownership and management, and to get a feeling of participation is going to be the challenge as far as the State intervention, not only in banking, but in the general economic life of the country, is concerned.

6.10 p.m.

If the Minister can turn his attention to this particular matter of devising a proper mechanism for this type of development and this type of participation, I think this would certainly be a step in the right direction. I would like, however, to say that I do not think that it makes for the best possible form of Government and for the best participation if relevant information in these areas is not made available at the outset of debate but only comes out at the end after members, especially on this side, have spoken. I do not think that would make for the most meaningful debate of these issues because the Opposition would be deprived of the basic information necessary for making sound judgments or coming to reasonable conclusions. We have necessarily got to speak in these terms because as the member for St. Michael South West indicated the details are not available to us and we have got to wait until that information has been made available.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, having heard what the ostensible Opposition spokesman on economic affairs has to say, and the real Opposition spokesman on economic affairs, I think it might be suitable for me to say a few words. The ostensible spokesman did not say very much but the real spokesman raised a few questions.

The situation with the proposed National Bank is in broad outline as follows: The Bank will eventually have a Commercial Division, an Agricultural Division, a Development Division, and will also handle and direct the affairs of the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation, in which the Government is now in the process of becoming the 100% owner, and also the Public Officers Housing Loan Scheme at present administered by the Barbados National Housing Corporation.

To deal with the particular question that has been raised: The Development Bank will probably be the last

of the institutions to come under the immediate umbrella of the National Bank. The Development Bank has, as hon. members may know, turned in a spectacular performance in the last twelve months, freed from the shackles of Bath Plantation and the \$3 million tied around its neck which was a worse albatross than just debt, it was smelly as well. The Bank has had a highly successful bond issue, and under the dynamic, disinterested and sincere Chairmanship of Mr. David Seale, a man who as far as I can see would certainly not regard himself as being there to carry out policies dictated from elsewhere — under the Chairmanship of Mr. Seale the Bank has succeeded in disbursing more funds in the last twelve months than in the whole previous eight years of its history, and is proceeding to break even this record and rapidly approaching the projected level of 2,500 jobs in construction and 300 to 500 permanent jobs which we expect it to achieve. The Bank is doing so well at present that it is not thought that it has an immediate need to be brought into James Street to carry on its business. But offices are being selected for it; it has selected office space which it expects to occupy — I believe there is some little discord in that regard because although we have a lot of space at James Street we may not have unlimited office space to satisfy everybody who wants space — but certainly by January, 1979, it is expected that the Barbados Development Bank will be transferred to the National Bank.

Now the Commercial Division: The Commercial Division should be in full operation by 1st March, 1978. The Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank has already, according to my instructions, moved into the building under discussion. I think only on Friday, or yesterday, I signed the necessary instrument effecting the transfer of the Agricultural Division to the Barbados Development Bank, because the Bank's main activity is going to be independent for a few more months, but the Agricultural Bank's activities are in the process this week of being transferred to the new National Bank. The Agricultural Credit Bank's function, including all loan applications in hand at February 1, 1978, will be handed over to the new Bank at that time. The Agricultural Credit Bank will continue in operation only for the purpose of winding up certain collections and other particular aspects of phasing out, which may perhaps mean a continuance for the rest of the year.

There has been some delay in completing the transfer of the non-Government shares in the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company Limited to the Government. Certain exorbitant demands were made by the Commonwealth Development Corporation in connection with these transactions. However, I am glad to say that after a meeting with Ministers of the British Government and with high officials of the Commonwealth Development Corporation, what appears to be a very reasonable contract of sale has been arrived at. However,

since that date, it appears that there are many defects in title in the outstanding work of the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation. I must say that I was shaken when I saw how few conveyances executed by that Body were regarded as satisfactory upon a review by the Attorney General's office. I understand that the lawyers concerned – persons who have worked for the Mortgage Finance Corporation – are claiming that the tests applied to the quality of these conveyances are too severe. But the faults range from conveyances not recorded, titles bad, releases not to be found, root of title insufficiently traced, along with the great delays to which former Solicitors' offices, and indeed new attorneys' offices, have been subject. Nevertheless, the lawyers say that some of these titles can be accepted.

6.20 p.m.

It did occasion the Commonwealth Development Corporation asking the Government for an indemnity clause to protect themselves from being sued for faulty conveyancing or faulty titles. The clause is now being discussed, I will just say that I am certainly not prepared to give the CDC any general indemnity for faulty management of the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation in its early days, although of course, Sir, it is probably best argued that the primary remedy is to sue the lawyers concerned if the conveyances are bad or if there has been tardiness in the work, but that is in the pipeline and the deadline being settled on is 31st January, 1978. We very much hope that this will be dealt with by that time.

I come, Sir, to the commercial division which will be the major division in terms of size. The commercial division should have three branches in operation in Bridgetown during this year, and a fourth full branch in operation at the airport in April 1979. The headquarters of the commercial division will be on Fairchild Street, that is where the designated Manager already has his office. The bank's principal office will be in James Street, the Board Room will be in James Street, the President and the Vice Presidents will operate from James Street, if we maintain the structure. I do not want to go into that too deeply, but we are planning to have the President and Vice Presidents who will be full time executive officers. They will all be in James Street, but the commercial branch will have its Manager sited in Fairchild Street. That branch is of course already open. A second branch we expect to open next month on Broad Street on the site of the old Bank of America operations.

Hon. members may wish to know the latest with the Bank of America negotiations. I am not in a position to reveal the secrets of what has gone on so far, and I am not indeed in a position to say how the negotiations have ended, because they have not ended yet, they are due to recommence tomorrow, Wednesday, 18th January. The system which is being used to arrive at a consideration for

the transfer of the business as a going concern is really a very simple one. We are identifying the assets one by one and putting a value on them; the bad debts presumably nil, medium debts discounted, and the good debts at face. We will then add in the properties, the real estate which the bank owns and which it has on lease, and we will then subtract the deposits. (*Asides*). I hear the hon. member for St. Michael South asking about goodwill. My brief does not include any suggestion that goodwill is involved in the negotiations, except that the parties are exercising great goodwill towards each other. It is a perfectly amicable negotiation.

I am instructed, Sir, that tomorrow a price may very well be arrived at, and hon. members can be assured that if the negotiations are completed this week, that a statement will be made to the House next Tuesday about the matter. The legal side is also being finalised – the legislation setting up the Barbados National Bank – I have seen the draft and it is now in the process of being prepared for Cabinet, but it will not be ready in time to allow the Bank of America to be taken over, so a commercial company is being formed called the Barbados National Bank Limited. It should be formed this week. I believe some action will take place today. The Directors of this company will be –

Mr. Harcourt Lewis

Mr. C. A. Burton, Head of the Civil Service

Mr. Oliver Browne, Solicitor General

Miss Christine Zephirin

Dr. George Reid, and

Mr. Collymore who is at present designated Chief Finance Officer of the National Bank.

That is to be set up to accept the transfer of the Bank of America. We expect that possession of the Bank of America's premises will be taken by the Government between 30th January and the 1st February.

The remaining matter is the other branches. By the middle of the year there should be a branch of the commercial division in operation at James Street, and in April 1979, a full branch of the bank will open in the new terminal building at Grantley Adams Airport. I would like to give notice from now to all concerned that it is not intended that any other bank, except the Barbados National Bank, will operate at the airport. We do intend to have a monopoly of this traffic. The present operation is marginal in terms of profitability, but we are gaining useful experience from it. In due course we do think that it is reasonable for us to say that our airport will have to be reserved for our bank.

There are one or two general points which I would make, Sir. First of all, this will be a bank like any other bank. The Board of Directors will be under the same

constraints of confidentiality that any bank directors are under. The Minister of Finance will not have access to anybody's bank account in the new bank. I do not want it, and the law will be such that anybody who has the nerve to try to give it to me will be committing an offence. I do not want to know anybody's business in a banking sense. I am told that in Trinidad it is very difficult to get Cabinet Ministers to bank in the national commercial bank — I would not say who, Sir — but it is suggested that there is a certain amount of mistrust in our sister island. I believe that mistrust is misplaced, and I am sure that in Barbados there need be no such mistrust, and I hope that my colleagues will take heed of what I say and follow my example and have their principal bank accounts in the Government's own national bank when it opens fully for commercial purposes. That is the first point I will make.

The second point I would make relates to the fact that a commercial bank has to be run on commercial principles, that it will be impossible — and I will not be taking phone calls, they have started already, not phone calls directly but approaches which do not understand what is going on — nobody connected to the Government will be listening to any word from people who have applied to the bank for a loan, or whose motor car has been repossessed and so on. I was told only Saturday, Sir, that somebody who is in fact in a position to pay had his motor car repossessed by the Bank of America, and he telephoned a person whom he thought to have my ear to say that things are a little tight, so when he saw the Government was taking over he did not pay the instalment, and he wants this person to ring Tom and ask him to tell the bank to give him back his car.

6.30 p.m.

I am glad this has happened at such an early stage. It is the kind of absurdity that will make nonsense of a commercial banking system in the Island. We want this bank not to be conducted by political favour. We want it to have less political favour than the commercial banks in Bridgetown. I have seen more than one of the commercial banks smile in the past under the regime of the hon. members opposite at Cabinet Ministers and involve them in liabilities and in Barbados to reach in the range of \$3 million. We wish to maintain higher standards than the commercial banks, and I am warning the general public that they need not expect anything in the way of political favour from the commercial operations of the Barbados National Bank when it comes into being. It is as well to put all of this completely out of your mind if that is the way that you are looking at things.

There is one further point that I will mention, Sir, in connection with the Bank of America, and that is I would wish all the depositors and all persons who have accounts with the Bank of America to understand that

confidentiality and sound commercial banking principles will be the watchword of the bank immediately it is taken over. Their accounts are absolutely safe. The Government has very little to fear from a run on the Bank of America. Indeed one might almost argue that a run is favourable to the Government because a run takes away liabilities; but the assets which are the loans remain there.

I just mention it in passing. I can also mention that a number of persons who hold substantial accounts at the Bank of America have been reassured by Mr. Lewis, the Project Manager of the entire financial institution exercise. I am happy to say that some of their largest customers, including customers from overseas, have expressed full confidence in the way that they expect the National Commercial Bank to run its operation in due course.

I hardly think, Sir, that there can be any great range of matters which I have omitted from what I have said. As far as the rules of the House permit, I will be happy to answer any questions on detail.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, to the extent that the Hon. Prime Minister has spoken at some considerable length in relation to proposals relating to the Barbados National Bank I thought that I would take this opportunity myself to make one or two cautionary comments in relation to this matter. There seems to be in some circles undiluted enthusiasm for this institution; but I think that without in any way taking away from the great hopes with which this is being born, some words of warning ought to be sounded because in another 20 years from now it may well be that the institution will not realise all the grand goals that we are now setting.

I wish to say myself that I am still to hear the case made for the advantages in terms of speed and efficiency which will result from bringing all of these institutions together. I think myself that a case can be made for an institution such as the Development Bank being kept outside of this framework; and I will make the point as to why I strongly believe that in a minute or two.

I am concerned myself that we are perhaps creating a bureaucratic monster which will perhaps haunt the Prime Minister, if I may mix my metaphors that way, in a few years. We are combining several critical institutions of this country, and we are putting all the power in the hands of the Civil Servants. We are combining developmental roles with commercial roles, and in many institutions where this has been attempted these institutions have failed. At least it has happened in the Barbados Marketing Corporation, certainly under the last administration, where they have attempted to combine developmental roles with commercial roles; and there are several examples of failure when you attempted to combine those two roles in other countries.

The big point is this. If perchance the commercial operation fails, then it is going to blame the capacity of the institution to raise money for developmental functions because overseas lenders are not going to compartmentalise the divisions. They will say the bank is failing in the commercial functions and therefore we are not going to be happy to lend money for the developmental role.

This is not the case of the second reading of the Act to create the institutions. On that occasion I will have a full speech to make with respect to my own position and my own observations; but for now, I think that we should temper this undiluted enthusiasm which is about at least on this side, and we should go on record as pointing out certain likely dangers which may befall us in the future.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to speak? (Pause).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker there are a number of questions that were raised. On the question of how will the land ultimately be vested in the national institution, that can be effected in a number of ways. When the Bill to implement the amalgamation of the financial institutions is brought before the House it is a simple matter to annex in the Schedule of the Bill the existing property assets and liabilities of the former institutions as well as its specific property. The mechanism is therefore available.

I will reiterate the reasons as set out in a note from the Crown Solicitor for the utilisation of this procedure. It is because of the fact that a fair title, in the opinion of the Crown Solicitor, could not be obtained from the deeds and documents exhibited to them. The Government is well aware of the point of view taken by the hon. member for Christ Church East. It is a point of view that some of the staff of one of the institutions was very vocal on; but I want the House to understand that there is really no magic in running a commercial bank. It may seem a great venture to people that a commercial bank is being run by the Government; but let us not forget that the Barbados Savings Bank and the other institutions which have been in existence for many years in Barbados were run under the supervision of successive Governments in Barbados.

Provided that the new Directors in the commercial division of the new financial institution recognise the point made by the Prime Minister that the true criteria for lending is the economic viability of the project or the commercial consideration and no other considerations, I do not see any reason why the bank should not be a successful undertaking; because the transfer in the commercial division from what the Savings Bank does now to other areas of commercial lending is not that great. The only distinction between the commercial bank

and the old Savings Bank is the ability to lend on overdraft. The existing Savings Bank changes foreign exchange. What is the distinction between the Savings Bank and the commercial bank other than the ability to lend on overdraft?

I do not see this fear. There seems to be some idea in this country that the running of a bank is the preserve of people in North America or in London. I do not believe in that, and the proof of the fact is that many of these banks are in fact run by Barbadians. As to the acquisition of the Bank of America, I have never had any fear about that. Because in my opinion — I have never seen the acquisition cost, and certainly I will be able to pronounce and give my views on the cost of the acquisition.

When you are buying over a bank like that, you will have the assets and if there are any bad debts I am confident that a proper evaluation will be placed upon them because if the bank during its existence could not collect them, only a fool would buy them at face value. 6.40 p.m.

What other assets do they have other than the furniture and the fixtures? I do not believe that anybody will pay anything for goodwill in something that is changing its name.

Now, I will concede that there is an attitude of mind about Civil Service attitudes and Civil Service Departments operating commercially, but I am pleased to see that the actual operators and decision makers of this Bank are persons who have been recruited from comparable commercial institutions. They have not come through the ranks of the Civil Service, and I would hope that the Directors of the Bank would be so appointed operators of the Bank where their commercial expertise would be allowed to function.

As far as the Development Bank and the other institutions are concerned, they themselves have a worst record in profit making than the existing Barbados Savings Bank. I will say that, and I have no fear of contradiction about that. They have a worst record of profitability than the Barbados Savings Bank. Do not talk about the developmental role, because it is precisely because of their developmental role that they have been able to attract funds at concessionary rates which the Savings Bank has not been able to attract at concessionary rates, so that their cost to on-lend has been lower than the Savings Bank cost. It is precisely because of that. The cost of money to the Development Bank and others has been, I believe, lower than the Barbados Development Bank. The truth of the matter is that, when you come to merge institutions like this, there will be many who do not like the change and who cannot contemplate of the change. (Asides.) The Development

Bank borrows money, and do not let anybody fool you. The Barbados Development Bank borrows money from the Inter-American Development Bank and from other institutions. (*Asides.*) Of course, the depositors.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please do not let us have any cross-talk.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Savings Bank borrows money, because when you borrow money you borrow money from the depositors. When you invite people to deposit money with you, you are borrowing. That is a fact. What you have to pay to develop is the cost that you borrow it. What you lend out is different. There is a difference between what you pay the depositors, and what you lend out at is your margin. There is no mystery in this matter. I know that there is a feeling that the developmental section of this institution is in danger. Let us not forget, Sir, and I want hon. members to remember that the reason we have Development Banks in this country is that the Commercial Banks in Barbados fail to carry out a role which, in other countries, was carried out by comparable Banks in other places. They refuse to give medium and long-term finance, and that is why we have to have Development Banks in this country. The role of a Development Bank in this country is to give credit and fill a gap where the existing Commercial Banks have failed in the past to provide. It is not to give people loans who have no hope of ever repaying those loans, and that is the confusion in the minds of people in this country. People feel that the role of the Development Bank in this country is to give or lend people money that will not be paid back. The people will use the money, not for the purpose for which it was loaned, but to build big houses, drive big motor cars, and have a lot of women. That is not the role of a Development Bank. The role of a Development Bank is to lend and supplement credit.

I will analyse the portfolio of all of the failures in the Barbados Development Bank, and I can point to a style of living, a standard of living and a fashion of living which shows that, in my opinion, the money was not used for the purpose for which it was lent. Let us get this clear about the role of a Development Bank in this country. If the Commercial Banks had lent money on medium terms and on long terms in this country there would have been no need for this so-called concept of development banking. In other countries they have Merchant Banks who perform the role in the historical development in the United Kingdom precisely in the way our Development Banks have been doing. It is also done in the United States of America. When you are getting down to an analysis of this so-called Development Bank, I am willing to carry a debate with anybody on that.

Sir, I feel that this is nothing to be afraid of in our thrust to really ensure that banking, insurance and other areas of the economy genuinely are under the purview of

the people of Barbados, the Government of Barbados and the profits therefrom. We will go forward despite the fact that there are some people who feel that the fact that we have gone forward means that we will fail. I say that corporations and the concept of corporate law on corporations as an institution was created after the South Sea bubble. The fact that they had the South Sea bubble did not prevent the great corporations from rising in the world. If this is the stage we are going through now, I do not see why we should be afraid of it.

I beg to move that this

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If I could be heard under Order 28, Rule 16, very briefly on the point raised by the hon. member for Christ Church East —

"A Member who has spoken to a question may again be heard to offer explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood; but shall not introduce new matter."

Sir, I think it good that the question of the Development Bank was raised, but I really do think that the arguments are misconceived.
6.50 p.m.

I think it good that the question of the Development Bank was raised, but I really do think that the arguments are misconceived. I would have dealt with it at greater length if I had known that an hon. member was going to mention it.

The profitability of Development Banks has seldom been a criterion for getting international aid, otherwise the Barbados Development Bank would not have got any in the last year and a half, because it had a vile record and is still losing money. The write-offs that we had to do last year meant that even last year the Development Bank was still in a losing position, but this has not prevented us from getting money.

Secondly, I evidently did not make it sufficiently clear when I spoke that the accounts of the Bank will be compartmentalized — the Commercial Division will be kept separate in accounting terms from the agricultural and separate from the developmental.

Thirdly, those who speak about concessional funds fail to grasp the simple fact, that is, that the commercial banks get money at rates of interest much lower than the Development Bank. The Commercial Banks in Barbados for the last couple of years have been getting money at 2½%, 3%, 3½%, perhaps a maximum of 4%. Perhaps some have been able to get money at even 1½%; and there is a system which commercial banks use for calculating their average operating rate — add up all the funds they have

and see what their interest liabilities are and portion them out, and it will be found in general that these funds are more concessional than what is thought of in the development banks as concessional funds. We have had to borrow money for the Development Bank from the Inter-American Development Bank at 8% and have had to fight to get agreement to lend it at less than 11½%. The commercial banking system will facilitate the Development Bank in that regard.

Fourthly, I am surprised to hear the argument coming from the hon. member for Christ Church East who is on the Board of what I believe is one of the most successful commercial cum Development Banks in the Caribbean, and for all I know in the world — the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank which has a particular role of carrying the overdraft of the sugar industry until the sugar money comes in and at the same time lending money for implements of development. He sits on that Board, so he must be completely aware how easy it is to combine a commercial and developmental role. And more than that, that bank makes profit without any difficulty, despite the dichotomy of the commercial role and development role of providing concessional loans for purchase of machinery. If the new institution has any difficulty, I believe that the IADB will be able to assist it in how to ride two horses at the same time.

Finally, if the hon. member wants to look abroad he must look at the example of the Federal Republic of Germany, one of the most successful countries in post war times; a country that started after the devastation in 1945 — a country with an area I believe of a little less than Great Britain and a population substantially more — a country that started with virtually no natural resources. Most of its coal fields now lie in Eastern Germany. It has no oil, no hydro-electric power, certainly far less in natural resources than Great Britain has got. But in a matter of thirty years it has reached a standard of living double that of Great Britain, its most immediate competitor, a country of similar size, similar stock, etc. One of the elements of Germany's success in my opinion, has been the easy access of developmental funds provided by State enterprise — and by State enterprise I don't mean the Federal Government but rather local, municipal and provincial State enterprise which maintains a number of development banks in all the principal areas, savings cum developmental, which have created what is described in Germany as 6,000 small businesses; and Germany is a country, contrary to popular belief, where small businesses are very important — 6,000 in Germany as against 28,000 small industrial enterprises in Britain. And in Germany these municipally-run, State-run banks have operated a developmental function and commercial function hand in hand. I sincerely hope that the Barbados National Bank with the access which it will have to deposit funds at relatively low rates of interest will be able to become a portfolio for commercial loans in its

commercial division and development division, which will adequately maintain the thrust we have been giving in development, and at the same time make a profit for the Government in the commercial field. And though I appreciate the argument of the member for Christ Church East, I sincerely believe his fears are misplaced.

I am obliged to the House for hearing me again under that Standing Order. I hope I have not set a precedent which will dog the House too much in years to come.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 7 o'clock p.m. This Sitting is suspended until 8 o'clock p.m. this evening. 7.00 p.m.

On Resumption :—

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

THE MARINE BOUNDARIES AND JURISDICTION ACT, 1978

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I think it has been agreed just out of courtesy to the other side that this is a matter that one should allow a little bit more time to pass, especially in view of the fact that there is a conference in Barbados on the 19th, and I just wanted it announced so that we could give our explanations to why we would not be in a position to proceed with it today.

We are in a position to proceed with Order No. 5.

THE HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1978

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill would amend the Health Services Act, Cap. 44. There are four major amendments.

We are seeking first to amend section 9 which deals with the bringing and the institution of court proceedings. We are moving that the persons of the Chief Public Health Officer, a Chief Health Inspector, the Manager, Sanitation Service Authority or any person authorised in writing by the Minister may institute proceedings in a court.

Section 10, we are moving to amend that by way of the increasing of penalties up to a maximum of \$5,000

and to impose a continuing fine in the sum of \$200 per day for continuing offences after conviction.

Section 11A deals with the matter of closure of business or other undertakings who operate without the prescribed licence under the regulations, and this is an additional power which is being sought. If I may take the opportunity to point out that this is a power which is intended to be used in the most extreme of circumstances where it is felt that the public's health is threatened, we feel that we need the power of closure.

The new section 18 which is being proposed is intending that the Crown shall be bound by the Health Services Act. The Health Services Act has annexed to it diverse regulations, regulations dealing with sanitation, management, collection and disposal of garbage, it has regulations dealing with the condition of certain trading and commercial houses; it has regulations dealing with the conditions, maintenance and upkeep of swimming pools, lodging houses; there are regulations dealing with all manner of matters which impinge upon the public health of our country. I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to list them all. Maybe for the information of hon. members a few more, regulations dealing with prevention of overcrowding of premises; regulations dealing with maintenance of the proper sanitary condition of premises; measures for ensuring the purity of the water supply with respect to sewers and sewage disposal works, the providing of licences of persons, places and institutions in the carrying on of prescribed businesses, etc. etc.; regulations for the keeping of domestic animals, providing for the disposal of dead animals, and so on and so forth.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that in these past months — certainly in these past years, it is more accurate to say — that the whole matter of the public's health has become the subject of much public debate, and we have found that the Health Services Act and the regulations thereunder were seriously out of date and out of touch with modern times, the demands of modern living, the demands of a society which is becoming more and more sophisticated, new types of businesses, new types of pollution, new and more sophisticated demands are being made by the public for the care of their health, and it is felt that the penalties under the Act have no persuasion at all upon the public of Barbados. The penalties are regarded as slight, it is not unusual for business houses and for the ordinary householder to find that it pays them rather to pay a petty fine, to go before the courts maybe two or three times a year if it was necessary rather than to take major steps to put what the Chief Public Health Inspectors consider to be out of order into proper order, and so it is hoped that, having updated the penalties, prosecutions will now be more meaningful, that prosecutions will in fact ensue, because in truth and in fact we have not in the Ministry of Health been

prosecuting under the old regulations because it has served little purpose.

It is felt in some quarters, Mr. Speaker, that a maximum of \$5,000 is excessive. May I say that the matter of the health service regulations does not only touch the man or woman who stands up outside the Baymart or the Cheapside market and throws perhaps a sno-cone container into the street, it touches the mighty corporations who run hotels in this country, corporations who allow raw sewage to be discharged into the waters where Barbadians and tourists alike are expected to disport themselves every day. It touches upon the matter of the upkeep of swimming pools at or near the premises of some of these luxurious hotels.

Apart from the protection of our own health, Mr. Speaker, we also have a responsibility to protect the health of those who visit our shores; our economy depends upon these people. I do not make out a case for locals as distinct from the case for the protection of visitors. I submit that there could be no taking of sides in this matter. I believe that in the matter of the public's health we are all on the same side.
8.10 p.m.

The maximum fine of \$5,000 is like any other fine in our legislative set up. It is the maximum fine. Magistrates and judges in this country exercise their discretion every day in the law courts. They look at the offence, they look at the evidence concerning the offence and they look at the person alleged to have committed the offence, and they exercise their discretion when they fine people. I would not like to think that if a person stood up outside the Baymart and threw a snow cone unto the street that any magistrate would fine that person \$5,000. At the same time I would not like to think that if any one of the more luxurious hotels in Barbados persisted in the non-maintenance of a swimming pool, and was brought before the court that the magistrate would see fit to fine that hotel \$50.

As far as the continuing daily fine is concerned, I feel it to be very important, Mr. Speaker, because in many respects offences and breaches of the regulations under the Health Services Act have a tendency to affect in a disastrous manner not only the public health, or the health of those persons immediately concerned in that household or business or that trading station. It has a tendency to spread further and touch perhaps innocent members of the public. It is important that when the offender is punished by the magistrate or fined by the magistrate for a serious breach of the Public Health Regulations that this should not be an end of the matter. In this kind of circumstance, more often than not the matter must be put right, and the rationale behind it, behind the continuing fine is that even after a conviction, and even after the offender has paid his fine and has

satisfied the court he may not have satisfied the Ministry of Health that he has put his business or his house in order; and the continuing fine after conviction is designed, we hope, to be an active encouragement for people to put their households and their business places in proper sanitary conditions.

Now, the matter of closure is a serious problem which we are thinking to introduce. As I said before, it is going to give power which will be used in the most extreme circumstance. The Act makes it clear that the burden of proof is a heavy one. It will have to be shown that the impairment of the public health is imminent.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that even after the maximum fine of \$5,000 and the continuing daily fine of \$200, the public health may well be seriously threatened. The Ministry of Health is requesting the power to go in and close until the matter is put right. Hon. members will see that there is the right of appeal from this seeking to order a closure.

To touch back on the amendment to section 9, the business of the institution of proceedings, it is important that the prosecution be speedy and well brought. It is felt that the Chief Public Health Officer, the Ministry concerned with the Sanitations Services Authority or the Chief Public Health Inspector are the persons who should properly be authorised in writing by the Minister to institute proceedings under the various regulations of the Health Services Act. In cases where the advice of the Crown Law Officer or the Ministry of the Attorney General is required, it will be sought; but it is very important, Mr. Speaker, and I urge upon hon. members again that this is a matter in which there is no room to be partisan. We have got to be all on the same side. Disease and ill health are no respectors of persons or political parties to my knowledge.

I think that recent public discussions have made all of us aware of the conditions in which we live; and the picture that it reflects is indeed one which shows that we need measures which we hope will assist in bringing to an end a particular sad situation obtaining in many eating houses and butcher shops and restaurants and the like which I have had described to me by an officer of the Ministry of Health in these words; some of these butcher shops, some of these market shops where raw meat and vegetables are exposed for sale — I have heard a Public Health Inspector described one institution as a place where wall to wall flies were a part of the furniture. To my knowledge one Public Health Inspector, having visited a poultry processing plant found it impossible to eat chicken for over a year following that visit.

It is not the easiest thing to try to bring home to hon. members the urgency and the need for this legislation. One would not want to scare the community.

One would not want to be accused of terrifying the public; but the whole truth, Mr. Speaker, is that around the streets of Bridgetown, around the streets of Barbados, a great deal of filth is eaten every day. The more and more our community gets away from fresh food, and from most households having their little kitchen garden, the more and more we go in for eating in restaurants where bulk cooking and bulk preparation is the order of the day.

The Ministry of Health now has 91 Public Health Inspectors and they have to do a difficult task. The airport and the seaport have got to be manned which has added a heavier duty on these Public Health Inspectors. 8.20 p.m.

More and more hotels, more and more restaurants, more and more hairdressing salons, more and more butcher shops open up everyday. People who engage in the kind of business I have just described know that they ought not to be operating without the Certificate or Licence of the Chief Public Health Officer, but it is not possible for us to monitor every single one in the way that we think we ought to do. Very often businesses open doors and it does not get to our notice until, perhaps, months have passed by before we can go and do our inspections.

I have instructed the Chief Public Health Officer in the Ministry of Health that I will not be satisfied with a yearly report from him. Since the beginning of last year, on my instructions, he has been providing me with a Quarterly Report on the performance of the Public Health Inspectorate. They do a massive job. They do, in the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, in my view, a magnificent job, but the public does not always make it as easy for the Public Health Inspector as the public could. I feel that this legislation before us tonight might go a long distance in "persuading" — I use that word in inverted commas, Mr. Speaker — the members of the public that they must observe their responsibilities especially where they carry on businesses and are exposing goods or services to the Barbadian public.

I have said that the Public Health Inspectors, under the circumstances, do a magnificent job. That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that there are not instances which occur which displease us. We hear of the business houses, who know when the Public Health Inspector is coming to do his inspection and who do a quick cleaning up for his benefit, who may offer him a drink and may sometimes offer him more than a drink, Mr. Speaker, to secure themselves a licence. I should not like the hon. members of this House to feel that I am unaware that that kind of incident happens from time to time but, generally speaking, I would really like to take the opportunity to publicly praise the work of the Public Health Inspectors. I think we have reached the stage in Barbados where we no longer see the Public Health Inspector as the man with

the ladle. He is a much more modern and sophisticated agent of the Government; he is not, perhaps, as respected by the ordinary householder in 1978 as, perhaps, he was when I was a child.

This is another reason, Mr. Speaker, why the Public Health Inspectorate today needs more power in its elbow in the form of this legislation. It is most frustrating, Mr. Speaker, when Public Health Inspectors have to go back to premises, both public and private, time and time again. Because they fear for the health of the public, they are forced to go back to premises on several occasions and sometimes in the end they are not satisfied. The Reports show me that they are not satisfied, but there is little more that they can do. This is the more, Mr. Speaker, that the Public Health Inspectorate and the Sanitation Authority require to make their presence felt in our community and make the importance of the job they do a little more clear to the people in our community.

It is not a case in public health, Sir, where we can shrug our shoulders and say that people will not learn, people will not be told certain things, and that the education process of people takes a long time. We cannot do that. In the meanwhile we have to get the garbage off the street; we have to make sure that the butcher shops are clean, that open sewers do not run under the very table where meat is being chopped up and so on and so forth. We have to be getting on with the job in the meanwhile, and we need the strength of this kind of amendment to give added impetus to the job which lies before us.

I beg to move that this amendment to the Health Services Act, Cap. 44, be now read a second time.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak at a later stage.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, the call for this legislation goes back a far time in the Ministry of Health, and it is reasonable to assume that now it is before the House the staff of the Ministry of Health will be very much pleased with its passage. They have always considered the absence of this legislation to be a serious handicap in the performance of their duties. I do recall, when I was Minister of Health, an attempt was made to get this type of legislation before the House of Assembly for passage, but, due to circumstances beyond the control of the Ministry at that particular time, nothing much came out of it.

One has to point out that there have been instances in the past in Barbados which have prompted the call for this type of legislation. As far as my memory serves me, there were a number of hotels on the South Coast where the problem of the pollution of the sea waters due to the inadequate disposal of the sewage was causing concern

and frustration among the Public Health Inspectorate and, in spite of repeated calls and pleas, efforts to get the people who own the hotels to do something about the sewage, very little was done. I have given that as an instance to show why there has been a call for some time from the staff of the Ministry of Health for this type of amendment to the Health Services Act. Not only hotels, but there have been business places in Barbados that have made the work of the Public Health Inspector more unpleasant and more difficult and, therefore, we find that in spite of pleas, in spite of goodwill coming from the Ministry, very little has been done by these places to improve the sanitary conditions of the place.

Now, when one looks at the question of the disposal of garbage in this country, it has been a problem for some time, but one has reason to believe that in recent times it is of a greater problem. I feel that the absence of teeth in the legislation, under which the collection and disposal of garbage in this country is pursued, has contributed greatly to the way in which garbage and other refuse have been piling up in this country.

8.30 p.m.

However, it will be found out that amendments to the Health Services Act are not going to be sufficient to bring about the improvement to which we look forward. A lot will depend upon the survey of those places by the public health inspectorate and one is going to depend on the co-operation of the public if we are to see better standards obtaining in this country. I agree with the Minister that education is a slow process, and while educating you have got to motivate, and sometimes education can be seen as a form of motivation. Where I disagree is that it is going to be a bit difficult because I am convinced that there are occasions in Barbados where some business places should have been closed down, and I want to point out that if you have to go to court it is going to be a bit tedious, and with all the legal luminaries we have in Barbados we will see a ding-dong battle going on. I think we should follow the approach of other countries whereby on the basis of criteria made by the Ministry the place would be closed down and the onus put on the owner to go to court. As I said, litigation can be tedious and time consuming, and some of the public health people may not be versed in the art of arguing a case, and when they come up against these legal luminaries they may find it difficult to argue the case as the facts would indicate.

I share the view that a lot has been done to get the people to maintain proper standards of health, but there is no point in having legislation which permits people to do things which they should not do. So it is not only amendments to the principal act that I question, but I think it will be necessary to draft new legislation to suit present conditions.

The task of amending these regulations started when I was Minister of Health, and I would like to see many more of these amendments to suit conditions existing now. I just have to mention eating places, for instance. The laws are made to protect the public, but I think it is not very well appreciated by the people of this country the amount of disease that can be spread by the handling of food and drink; and in this regard I would also like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister that a new look must be taken at the question of issuing health certificates to people employed in many of these restaurants, cafeterias, etc. I think that at the time when the present approach was adopted there might have been good reasons, but in the light of changing circumstances a new look must be taken to the matter. I think that when a person takes ill while working at one of these restaurants, they should undergo a re-examination and they should be certified as being in good health before they return to work again; because what you find obtaining at present in Barbados is that in December and January of the following year people go to doctors, get examined, and certificates are issued saying that they are free from any disease that can be transmitted by the handling of food. But during January and December of that year some of them do get sick and they just present a medical certificate to cover them for the period that they were ill and then they return to work. I think in the best interest of the health of this country one would need to know whether or not these people are carriers of organisms which can be transmitted by the handling of food. The present legislation does not make provision for that, and that is why I am throwing it out to the Minister of Health that she should take a new look at the system of issuing health certificates to employees of restaurants, cafeterias etc.

She may also have to take a look at some of the hair dressing salons in this country, because here again there are a number of diseases that can be transmitted by the handling of hair. I think it is time that we got a better approach to some of these activities in the country: and I think it is not sufficient just to have a doctor issue a certificate. This is something which I have been against for a long time. It is time that the Ministry spells out what type of examination a person should undergo; because unless we do this it is likely that in a large number of cases you may get certificates being issued which if really challenged are not going to reflect the fact that the people have been examined for the particular type of diseases which can be transmitted in that particular field of work. For example, we feel that when you are talking about health certificates people should have their stool examined for signs of disease; they should have their blood examined, and so on, rather than leaving it entirely in the hands of a physician to look at a person and say "in my opinion you are in good health and don't have any diseases transmittable by food." Again, in hair dressing, there are diseases of the skin and hair for

which proper examination should be made to ensure that the people involved are complying with certain requirements.

All in all, my chief purpose for rising is that having been a Minister, I understand the problem which confronts the staff of the public health inspectorate and the staff of the Ministry in general; and I agree with the necessity to make people aware that standards of health and proper environmental sanitation must be achieved at all costs, otherwise not only will we be permitting the development of diseases in this country but at the same time while these diseases are developing we will be undermining a very important sector of our economy, that is the tourist industry which contributes greatly to the economy of this country.

And when you talk about the spread of disease, I would like to point out something that has shocked me in recent years — the large amount of scabies occurring in Barbados at this time, and the large amount of insect bite reaction. There are reasons to believe that all of this has something to do with the large amount of garbage which is seen all over the country, and which in many cases has been there for weeks without anything being done about it. I know from my experience as a doctor in this country that it was rare in the past to see cases of scabies in Barbados. The last time I saw a case before the present period was when I visited the Nightengale Home as Minister of Health. Since then you find many cases occurring; you find many people being tormented by insect bites, and sometimes as a result of constant attacks by sand flies they end up with what Barbadians refer to as poxy legs. I think also we now find more mosquitoes around the place than before and we have to look carefully at the reasons for this. It is not enough to say we are leaving it to the Minister or the Ministry of Health to do this or do that. Responsible citizens of Barbados have a role to play in assisting and ensuring that these types of problems are removed from the health of the country.

8.40 p.m.

If they are not removed we can be faced with disastrous consequences.

Sir, there is a point here on which I would like to get the reaction of the Minister, and the point is one of binding the Crown. Again, the staff of the Ministry of Health in previous years have found it rather difficult to get certain Departments of Government and certain Boards complying with regulations coming under the Health Services Act. I can recall one example in Reed Street which gave the Minister a lot of problems when I was there, and when this matter was taken up with other Departments a lot of reasons or excuses were given. One valid reason given was that there was a scarcity of money to do these things, and I would like to raise this because

this can be a real problem. You can have Departments of Government or Boards who are in default and not complying with the regulations, and then they will tell you they are unable to do so due to the unavailability of funds, and I want to throw this out because I wonder what then would be the position of the Ministry of Health in such a situation, and furthermore, this is a matter for the legal luminaries in this Chamber.

In what ways are you going to serve the Crown where you get some infringement of the Health Services regulations? I am aware of this because these are matters which I have raised in the past. If some Departments of Government are infringing the health regulations and a notice is going to be served, on whom do you serve this notice to go into court? Are you going to serve it on the Attorney General? Are you going to serve it on the civil servants responsible for that Department, and things of that nature? All of these arguments have come up in the past and I do not think that these arguments have subsided. Maybe some answer has been given, but I would like to be satisfied that the answer that has been given is a correct one, one that would not lead us into a situation later on where we will find that in reality we have just passed a Bill and in relation to Government Departments and Statutory Boards the teeth will not bite, and this would be a sort of iniquitous situation to find ourselves in.

Sir, we on this side are going to support this Bill. We can have some reservations about some things, but at the same time we are realistic. We do not expect everything to be done at one time, but we are hoping that a lot of improvement will come in the very near future, especially in the area of the collection and disposal of refuse, and this is a problem which I think many people in this country are concerned about, debating daily and have become irritated daily about, this question of the presence of large masses of garbage, refuse all over the place, and then the large collection of flies, rats, dogs and so on which prey on this refuse, and we are looking forward, the people of this country are looking forward to a speedy improvement in this, and we are hoping that with the provision of this amendment we are going to see a better surveillance and more cases coming before the courts than we have had in the past.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly on this matter, and I want to speak as a citizen of this country as well as a representative of a constituency, the constituency of St. Michael South. I wish to say from the start that in these two capacities I must express very very deep concern about the state of collection and disposal of refuse.

There is no point at all in anyone, least of all the Minister, fooling herself or himself that the situation is satisfactory. It is bad and it is growing worse, and I say

this with a full sense of responsibility, and it behoves the Government to try to find the solution to this particular problem. I know that there are many problems involved, but with responsibility for this particular area it behoves you to come up with some type of solution to this problem if Barbados is not to experience some type of epidemic. Let us not believe that because the sun shines or because we have not had any serious outbreaks in the past that these things cannot happen, and this is causing much concern to the people of this country at all levels in the society.

This Bill speaks about the impairment of public health and about the protection of public health. When the Minister herself, I believe some months ago, can complain about the collection and disposal of refuse in her constituency, what does she leave the rest of us out here and out there, because it is a general problem, to say, or to whom must we complain? I say this to underline and to underscore the point that it is a national problem and solutions have got to be found. They are not going to be found simply in making the penalties more punitive by increasing the fines, I think it is going to take all the tact necessary or all the tact that the Minister and the Government can command to ensure that all the agencies responsible, or which have a responsibility in these areas, that they combine in order to achieve a healthier and a cleaner Barbados.

I myself have seen human beings in this country collecting meat which has been disposed of by undertakings, they have been collecting this meat, and I have reason to believe that they may be using this meat for human consumption. This tell us something about the way in which meat declared unfit for human consumption or which may be considered unfit for human consumption is disposed of. If it is simply put outside of the establishment there are going to be persons who are going to come and scavenge that same meat and take some of it hopefully believing that no harm will come to them. These are some of the problems involved.

When in my own constituency I see piles of refuse for weeks on end not being collected....(Aside).... Are you saying it is not true? There is no need to overstate this particular problem, it is a real problem, and when I say this it is not to make the situation sound worse than it is, the public knows that this is a fact, and more than that, when I see these collections near day nurseries we have got to ask ourselves the question whether we should not redouble our efforts in order to try to find a solution to this problem.

8.50 p.m.

Now, what I say, I am not saying from any point of view of hostility towards the Minister. I say it in the interest of an important service in this regard, and I am expressing the view that I think that the Minister did

herself and this country a disservice when she tackled the sanitation workers in the way in which she tackled them. I believe, too that to reduce the working days of these workers at the time that she did, coming on to Christmas, when in fact there should not be a reduction but an increase, I think that the timing on that particular occasion was wrong; and I believe that this only served to exacerbate the attitude of these workers; and I do hope that the damage can be repaired, and that steps can be taken to ensure that we get greater efficiency in that regard. I genuinely believe so.

I would not like the Minister to fool herself into believing that between her threat not to pay out money to those workers at Christmas time and her change of heart to pay it out that there was really any improvement in the collection and disposal of refuse in this country. I believe that the Minister has to be firm, and I make no bones about that; and I would compliment her for taking what might be unpopular decisions; but I think that the fitness of things and the timing of things are also important, and I do hope that when she tackles these problems she will take all considerations into account.

In my constituency we have been particularly plagued by this problem, not only as far as the piles of refuse may be concerned, but also in terms of broken storage lines and the discharge of effluent into the sea which affects popular bathing areas; and from this side we are particularly interested in that clause which indicates that the Act shall bind the Crown. Like my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who has spoken about it, and I believe that the Leader of the Opposition will also advert to this particular matter — what happens in a case where the Crown or one of its agencies, one of the Statutory Boards, carries on an undertaking and that undertaking is in very grave breach of the Act? What happens indeed?

We notice that the Manager of the Sanitation Services Authority is one of those persons who can institute proceedings in court; but when the Sanitation Services Authority itself may be one of the biggest offenders in so far as the possibility of impairing the public health is concerned, what steps are to be taken there? *Quis custodiet custodes?* What are we to do in those circumstances? Those are questions that we have to ask ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I said that I would not be very long on this particular matter. I merely wish to register my deep concern of these areas. I know that the Minister is concerned about them. She has taken certain initiatives, and this measure which is before us is yet another initiative in this particular area; but I am afraid that the Government will have to think and think again. They will have to put their heads together and come up with additional types of solutions to this problem because it is

a national problem. It is a major problem, and none of us in here can be satisfied with the particular state of affairs that relates to these matters about which I have spoken.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that in seeking into section 18, this Act binding the Crown means nothing to me for the simple reason that this statute creates both penalties. It is a penal statute in some cases and the amendment may be considered as civil as far as the new section 11A is concerned. The proceedings under 11A will be civil, and therefore, to that extent, this question of the Crown being bound can operate; but if you are going to put the Crown on an equal basis with the companies and corporations this section means nothing because you cannot serve the Attorney General if the Hotel School is in default or if the Police Canteen is in default because this is a penal statute. In so far as the civil aspect is concerned, under the Crown Proceedings Act, you can of course revert to the proceedings where the Attorney General is sued. If it is the Government's intention that the criminal section of this particular Bill should apply, then they have to draft something more to make it clear on whom and against whom action should be brought in particular cases; because the only way you can serve the Attorney General is by using the Crown Proceedings Act, and this is a Civil Act. Therefore I agree that the civil sections of this Bill will operate as the Attorney General is the proper person to be served. In the criminal sections you cannot go up to Marine House and serve the Attorney General if the Police Canteen or the Hotel School are in default. The Crown cannot be bound criminally, and you will find that that section is often inserted mainly in Acts which affect civil liabilities and not criminal liabilities. That is my view that you should say something more, whether it is the Permanent Secretary or whoever is to be sued in the case of a particular department. Therefore you cannot leave a blank like that because it cannot operate, and no conviction would ever be obtained if you go and serve the Attorney General for something done by a particular department.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the Bill is not controversial. In that case please proceed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short contribution. I will speak with reference to the point made by the hon. member for St. Michael South, and that is in connection with garbage collection with which we all in Barbados are worried about. There is no doubt in my mind that the points raised by the hon. member — we on this side are as conscious of such a problem as the entire nation. There is no doubt in my mind also that the Minister — and I do not rise in defence of the Minister but to lend my own personal views about this matter.

I believe that the whole of the problem of garbage collection started from the time when Local Government

was abolished. The garbage collection became worse, and I have no doubt that it started in that era. I happened to be a member of the Sanitation Authority Board on three occasions, and I had to resign from that Board on all three occasions because I never understood what was going on at the Sanitation Authority Board.
9.00 p.m.

There are problems with the workers. I am not a person who sets about to attack workers. I always try to do my best to encourage them in better work habits, but this sort of thing sprung from cheap politics, when a Mr. Weekes, who was Chairman of a Committee that was supposed to have talks with the Barbados Workers' Union, took it upon himself to write a letter committing the Sanitation Authority to a 40-hour per week, Monday to Friday. The Union, of course, grabbed the letter with both hands, and I do not blame them. From that time until now the habits of the Sanitation Workers left much to be desired. There is no maybe about that. There are all the tricks in the books that you can think about at the Sanitation Department well, I do not know about now, but during my tenure of office there, from the Managers back down — and I think the former Minister of Health knows this — to the sweepers were involved in tricks and problems. The Fix-It-Right garage was involved in it as well. It was a matter that, I believe, would have taken the brains of a tall Adams and a Einstein to solve.

This is what I, personally, believe and this is the view which I will express. I have a collective responsibility in this matter. All of this garbage you see on the road is purely the wicked work habits of the workers of the Sanitation Authorities compounded by the Union. That is the position, and I know what I am talking about. You only have to decide that you will carry the truck on the dump, telephone the garage and say that the truck has broken down. Somebody from the garage will take five hours to get there, and the particular district would not be cleaned that day, as long as there is a problem inside of the Sanitation Authority with the Manager, the Under Manager, or the Transport Foreman. It is a big problem, and I am really in sympathy with the Minister.

Now, this is what I would like to do, and I have expressed this view in the Cabinet. If you call out the Army or the Regiment, in one week they would demonstrate to this country in an 8-hour day — they do not work 8 hours — that all the streets in Barbados would be cleaned in one week. In that way, it would let the country see that it is not the efforts of the Minister or the Government, but it is the work attitude of the people at the Sanitation Authorities. The attitude of the people there is the whole problem.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Union must play a very responsible role in a society. In the meantime,

it appears to me that the Union only sees one role and that is an increase in wages. That is the role, I believe, the Union sees every two years. We all look forward to getting a better salary at some time in our lives. In the light of the views expressed by an hon. member on the other side, I hope that, when the Minister comes to Parliament asking to amend the Dogs Act, I will not hear members on the Opposition benches saying that we want to take up the poor people's little dogs. It will be said that even the little dogs we want to take away from the poor people. The dogs are their little pets and so on. Very soon the Minister will be introducing an amendment for the purpose of taking up stray dogs off the road. Nobody can tell me, Sir, that the public as a whole is not making an effort to assist. You can look around and see plastic bags on the walls or on the road. I go out jogging on mornings very early and I see plastic bags on the wall and on the road, I also see piles of refuse on the road. The Minister has expressed that view about her own constituency, but some people are trying to do something about the garbage. You will find that the refuse is put in plastic bags and put on the road or on the wall, the dogs come along and destroy the bags, and the garbage is all over the road again.

Now the Minister has taken a line in doing everything to encourage the public to reach out to this National problem, but I believe that we have to take a firm hand and face up to the challenge. We are not thinking about 1981, 1991 or 1996. In the interest of our own health we must make a National effort and let the Sanitation workers understand in no uncertain terms that it is in their backyards that they have this problem. The Sanitation Workers do not live in Elizabeth Park. You can go into South Ridge, Elizabeth Park, Sunset Crest, or any of these highly developed areas and you will not see any garbage. You will not see any garbage in Dover where I am living, but you will see it in Nelson Street, New Orleans, Powder Road and wherever the Sanitation Workers are living, and you will find the garbage building up. They must be told in no uncertain terms that it is in their interest to do a good job.

Sir, I believe that it is time we take a firm stand in this matter. I believe that the Barbados Youth Council and the Youth Groups that fall under my portfolio would demonstrate to this country that it is the sanitation workers who are holding the people — not the Government — of Barbados to a health ransom. That is my personal view, and they must be told this in no uncertain terms. If they believe that taking up garbage is something so difficult to do, then they have another thought coming. I would dismiss all of them. I will tell the Minister of Health now that any time I have to act down there, whenever she returns to Barbados she will hear there is a confrontation with the Ministry of Labour, the Sanitation Workers, Youth, the Prime Minister, the

Army and everybody in the interest of our health in this country, because it is a problem as far as I am concerned.

I hear the former Minister of Health talking about people going to the dump and taking up meat. That is nothing new. The *Nation* used to publicise that all the time. Even Byer's meat was bad, and it used to be served to the children in the schools. Byer used to take bad meat out of the dump and send it to the schools to be served to the children.

Mr. SPEAKER: Who is this Byer?
9.10 p.m.

It is only fair that if you had any intention of mentioning anything about Mr. Byer or any other supplier, you should have sought the permission of the Chair before you did so; Mr. Byer is not here to defend himself.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that Byer was a supplier.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, but you said he sent meat to the schools.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, he sent some of the bad meat he picked up out of the garbage.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did he send it as a gift?

Hon. L.S. CRAIG: I do not know, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us leave out Mr. Byer; we understand.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, you have asked me to leave out Mr. Byer, but even when you were on the Opposition bench you would sometimes call a name or two; so you must forgive me if I am following part of your old time method and mentioning a name now and then.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you are learning the game, you must learn it right and play it right.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. To continue Sir, this is a problem which we all have to face up to. I admit it may be very strong language. Maybe the press tomorrow morning will mention that I suggested to bring out the Army, but I would say the same publicly anywhere at all, for it is in our own interest to make sure that the streets are clean. I believe that the Pathfinders of the Seventh Day Adventists, the Barbados Youth Council, the Guides and the Scouts would assist in a national effort to keep the streets clean and to demonstrate in no uncertain manner that the fault is not with the Ministry, not even in the last regime. The problem is with the workers; they

work three or four hours a day and go home and that is the end of it. And it is in their own backyard that you find garbage accumulating. And that is where I am concerned, because as I mentioned earlier you do not find it in the built-up areas — in the parks and terraces and heights. So a very strong arm must be used.

Now I realise the Minister's approach. The Minister is going along quietly using the media, using legislation, putting out her appeals day after day, seeking every way before she attempts to use brute force. But there are times when you have to call a spade a spade. I cannot understand how a country 21 miles by 14, with a good network of roads, good education, everything to teach proper work habits, and just this one set of people giving trouble. These people seem to think they are stronger than Parliament — not Government, but Parliament as a whole, because this is a national effort and in the interest of the nationals of this country I am submitting that when we get on public platforms or in here we must make it very clear what are our problems and how best to solve them when it comes to something of this nature. I hope that in the interest of all concerned that when the Minister can do no more and when the strikes come down — because you know a strike is a very easy thing to call — I hope that we all come together in a national effort to make sure that we get the streets cleaned in our own interest. I can speak from my own experience of the Sanitation Authority. It is a difficult board. I remember the last Minister of Health, the member for St. Michael North Central, I think at one time he actually abandoned the Board. When Mr. Owen T. Allder was the last Chairman it actually went on a spree; he decided to let it run as it liked. They decided to bring a pulverizer, a sewage plant, new trucks, all sorts of things. But we must make the workers understand in no uncertain terms that it is around them most of all where the garbage is piling up and that it is in their own interest to protect their own health and the health of their families.

That is my contribution, Sir, and I can only assure the Minister that she has my full support.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to answer several points which have been raised, and the queries put to me. The member for St. Michael North Central prefaced his remarks with a statement that because of circumstances beyond his control he could not do then what he is proposing should be done now. I do not understand how as a Minister.....

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I did not say circumstances beyond my control. I want to make that quite clear. I did point out that the Ministry had difficulties in getting certain things done; I never said beyond my control.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: I am still marvelling at how he could have circumstances beyond his control when he had charge of the Ministry.

Mr. SPEAKER: The 40-hour week would have been beyond his control.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: If I may say so, Sir, I have not had that difficulty.

The first point I want to answer is about the instigation of court proceedings in a matter of closure. A reading of the legislation will show that the Medical Officer of Health would have the power to apply to the High Court for a closure order. Orders of all sorts are dealt with on virtually a daily basis in the courts and I do not foresee that there would be any time lag. There may be a time lag in the actual hearing but not in securing an order for closure.

I take the hon. member's point on the issue of health certificate to employees and about the requirement of the medical examination which ought to be specified and clearly spelt out by the Ministry.

The hon. member for St. Michael South spoke a great deal about the current garbage situation. I want to make this point clear: garbage does not fall like manna from heaven, nor does it appear on the ground like dew. Every bit of garbage we see in Barbados has been put there by some human hand. Stray dogs and pedigree dogs may help to scatter it, but it is first put there by human hands.

The hon. member for St. Michael South queried the wisdom of certain actions taken by me last month. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the public of Barbados and members of this hon. Chamber will see, I hope in the short run, whether the timing was wrong or right. Part of the strategy employed last month was an effort to get the union to the talking table quickly. The union is due to sit down with the Ministry in March or April this year for regular negotiations, but it was imperative to get the union to sit down before then. I offered the union to sit down the second week in January, and I am privileged to say the union sat down with me last week and talked. The Minutes of that meeting are on their way to Cabinet. I have no intention at this time of disclosing the results of the outcome of that meeting, but I would like to say this: A great deal has been said about non-collection of garbage in the Bay Land and elsewhere. But I want to know if every member of Parliament is doing his duty to get his constituents to observe sanitary regulations.

9.20 p.m.

I want to know if the complaints I am hearing in here have been made to the Sanitation Authority. It is no

sense belly-aching to me and to each other, we have an Authority and complaints must be properly made there.

We had a situation — we heard the hon. member for St. James outline it in the past, Mr. Speaker — where the last administration gave them new compactor trucks, bought a pulverisation plant, made an agreement for the construction of a sewage disposal plant. Mr. Speaker, this is the situation that I found. In 1970, 1971 and 1972, before we had these compactor trucks when we had the old conventional open side trucks, the Sanitation Service Authority workers were collecting 181, in 1973 as high as 272, tons of garbage per day. The compactor trucks came in in 1973; a greater carrying capacity. Infact, the fleet that we have today in the Sanitation Service Authority has a daily collection capacity of 350 tons of garbage, but from the day those compactor trucks were put into the hands of sanitation workers we saw a graph downward in the daily tonnage collected. It fell from 272 before those compactor trucks came into operation. Towards the end of the last financial year 1976–77 it had plummeted back down to 183 tons of garbage collected per day, and in 1970 they were collecting 181 tons of garbage with open side trucks.

I spelt out those figures to the Union and I told them that is my whole case about productivity; answer that. The only answer to that is that the workers simply are not taking the garbage up off the street. Talks flowed from that point onwards, and as I say, the result of those talks should be evident in the coming weeks, and whether the timing was right or wrong is left to be seen.

The member for St. Michael South also made mention of broken sewage lines and so on in his constituency. There was a sewage line fractured as a result of the October 13 floods last year. It was put right in record time. Parts were flown in by air freight from Canada, Mr. Speaker, and further to putting the situation right we are in fact improving the situation by lengthening the line from the St. Michael Geriatric Hospital, as it is now known.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central made mention of this business of binding of the Crown. The majority of these proceedings, Mr. Speaker, are expected to be civil proceedings. Hon. Members of this House must not feel that I am afraid to move against agencies of the Crown or Departments of the Crown itself. When I went into the Ministry of Health and tenders for the supply of foodstuff to my institutions came before me, the first question I asked was this. Do these business houses and suppliers of goods and food and so on have public health certificates? I made it clear to the officers in the Ministry that when they advertise these tenders they should make it quite clear in the newspaper advertisement that if you do not have the Ministry of

Health's certificate do not even bother to apply. I have exhorted the Ministry of Education which has the business of school meals under its portfolio to adopt the same attitude. In fact, I exhort all Ministries to adopt that attitude. That is the kind of stand which I am going to take. If I have to close down a school meals centre I will do it in the interest of the health of the children of this community, and I have started in my own backyard. That is also for your information.

The last point I wish to make in answer to the point made by the hon. member for St. James about this business of the problem starting when Local Government was abolished, is that I do not subscribe to that view. I was alive in the Vestry days and I lived in a place called Brighton in St. Michael. In our household we burned our garbage every weekend in a trench at the back of our house. There was a big heap at the corner of Brighton Road. I grew up with that all my life, so all this fancy talk about how wonderful it was in the Vestry days, I am afraid, it is lost on me. I do not know what happened in the Southern District. You had Mr. "Fred" on the Southern District Council and people like that, and maybe sanitation workers worked better up there, but I can only speak for St. Michael where I lived, and I do not know about any magic. The problem has to do with a sophisticated society, a growing society, it has something to do with throw away habits of a modern society.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that time is against me, and I beg to move that this 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.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now go into Committee on this Bill.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Leader of the House should be aware as to time, and unless there is agreement on both sides of the House for an extension of maybe ten minutes we just could not do this. If it is the view of the House that we complete it in ten minutes' time, we can do it, but it must be with the consensus of the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: We agree.

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

The clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, 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.
9.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committees has reported to me the passing of one Bill in Committee.

On separate motions of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 24th January, 1978 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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