THE

# House of Assembly Debates

## (OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 31st 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. StC. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour, and Community Services); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A.; Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M. (Deputy Speaker).

*Prayers were read.*

*Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. SANDIFORD and Mr. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took their seats.*

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of the 24th January, 1978.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the 24th January, 1978, be taken as read and confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I would just like to .....

Mr. SANDIFORD: I wanted to speak on the confirmation of the Minutes, Mr. Speaker. Looking at page 4, COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY RESUMED, I note that the confirmation of the Minutes has been moved by the hon. member for St. James and beside his name I notice the word or words "Post prandially." I see here "Hon. L. S. Craig continued, (Post-prandially)." With those words there, I am really wondering what is the significance of the continuation Post-prandially. Does this mean that he was continuing in a good mood; after lunch he was in a quieter mood; in a joyful mood, or what? We already had that the sitting was adjourned to 2.45 p.m. I was wondering if things had cooled down by that time, or what is the significance of the post-prandially.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: While Your Honour is considering that, Your Honour might also consider the following line: "(Drew attention to the absence of a quorum in the House)." There is no further comment on that. I do not believe that Minutes can be complete to say that an hon. member drew attention to the absence of a quorum without any record of whether count was taken, or whether the Chair declared that, in fact, a quorum was present or what. On the face of it, it would appear that there was no quorum, but no action was taken and the House resumed.

*Mr. SIMMONS entered the Chamber and took his seat.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any further observations?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There is a general point of order which I would make, Sir. It has long worried me in here. There is no provision in our Standing Orders or, necessarily, in the practice of Parliament for the confirmation of Minutes. I have always submitted that the correct motion is that the Minutes be taken as read and entered on the records of the House, because the

responsibility for the Minutes is the Clerk's and, indeed, the Minutes are the Minutes, I believe, whether they are confirmed or not. I was only wondering, Sir, since you are raising levels of procedure and practice in here to higher levels, or to higher standards, than have been enjoyed in the past if, perhaps, in the fulness of time, we could have Your Honour's guidance on what form of motion to move, and what form or point should be taken if the Clerk's record is questioned.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will make s single observation. At page 1, under the heading "ANNOUNCEMENTS", you will see:

"Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received the following:–" That line would have to be deleted because that was one of the occasions on which Mr. Speaker did not make any announcements. I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South is by now satisfied that the reference to the item, line 4 from the bottom of page 4, is a mere reference to what I believe when he is making his usual after-dinner speeches.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no further alterations, the Minutes stand confirmed. As regards the mention about a quorum, my understanding of the matter is that the hon. member drew attention that there was no quorum, but before the necessity arose for a count to be taken there was a quorum. There could possibly have been an announcement that a quorum was assembled or words to that effect.

## PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Customs Tariff (Amendment) Order, 1978.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Report and Statement of Accounts of the Severance Fund for the period January to December, 1976.

## GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of three Resolutions: Resolution to grant the sum of $112,521 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. 28, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also a Resolution to grant the sum of $891,295 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1977–78, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977–78, No. 29, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister responsible for Finance of the re-payment by the Barbados Development Bank to the Inter American Development Bank of a principal sum equivalent to US $3,000,000 and of interest thereon.

## STATEMENT BY MINISTERS

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to report to this Honourable House on certain developments relating to our CARICOM sister state, Belize, which as Honourable Members are aware has been seeking to move to independence with its territorial integrity intact, its boundaries secure and a credible guarantee against external aggression from its neighbour Guatemala.

Barbados has over the years been consistent and persistent in championing the cause of Belize in its fight for independence and together with the other independent Commonwealth Caribbean countries, has been in the forefront of those speaking out on its behalf both at the United Nations and at Commonwealth Heads of Government Conferences. At the last two such Conferences successive Prime Ministers of Barbados have made major policy statements expressing the support of the Caribbean for the principle of independence for Belize with territorial integrity. On both occasions the position of the Caribbean Prime Ministers was firmly stated: namely, that it is incumbent on the United Kingdom as the administering power to take whatever steps were necessary to ensure that Belize should proceed to early independence with the appropriate guarantees for its security and its existing territory.

At the Commonwealth Conference in London last year, a Ministerial Committee on Belize was established of which I have the honour to be Chairman, and which was mandated to seek support for a negotiated settlement both within and outside the Commonwealth. Meetings of this Committee were held in New York during the 32nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly and the Committee heard statements from the British Foreign

Secretary and Premier Price. Discussions have also been held by me with Representatives of the United States State Department – that is both with their Permanent Representative to the United Nations and the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter–American Affairs.

At these meetings the Barbados view that there should be no cession of land leading to settlement of the dispute between Guatemala and Britain over Belize has been put to the Government of the United States of America and that Government has been urged to use its influence in the region in favour of Belizean independence without the truncation of its territory. I regret to report that the United States does not appear to share our view of the matter and to be lending its weight to those who advocate a settlement at the cost of some cession of Belize territory, euphemistically referred to as "border adjustments."

During the last session of the United Nations General Assembly the Caribbean States co–sponsored a Resolution which reiterated the feelings of the majority of United Nations members that Belize must proceed to independence with its territory intact. Our deplomatic initiatives resulted in positive votes from some countries which had previously abstained on similar resolutions and abstentions from countries which had previously voted against them. As a result of the initiatives undertaken since June 1977 the vast majority of Latin American countries now either support independence for Belize with full territorial integrity or else have taken a neutral stand on the issue.

In December of last year at the invitation of the Jamaican Foreign Minister a Meeting of those Latin American countries which had participated in the Bogota Summit as well as those States which are members of the Commonwealth Committee was called to discuss the question of Belize. A strong declaration in support of Belize was issued at the conclusion of this meeting.

Earlier this month Mr. Ted Rowlands, the British Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, visited Barbados and held discussions with the Prime Minister and myself in which he reported on the negotiations between the United Kingdom and Guatemala.

Subsequent to these discussions the Minister of State visited Jamaica where he held discussions with the Jamaican Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and Premier of Belize. Resulting from these discussions the Premier of Belize was invited to London for discussions with the Foreign Secretary.

In our discussions with the British Minister of State both the Prime Minister and myself have again reiterated Barbados' firm stand in the matter. It is that:

(i) Belize is well qualified by all accepted standards to become a fully self–governing and independent country;

(ii) the United Kingdom is under a duty consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter to take all appropriate and urgent steps to secure early independence for Belize;

(iii) Guatemala has neither a valid legal nor moral claim to even one square inch of Belizean territory; and

(iv) the Government of Barbados will not lend its weight, authority or support to any cession of Belizean territory which may be negotiated as a way of buying off the Guatemalan claim;

(v) the United Kingdom in consultation with other interested parties should continue to explore a suitable guarantee for the security of Belize after independence. Until such an international guarantee is forthcoming, Britian should seriously consider an effective British military presence remaining in an independent Belize with the consent of the Belizeans, at least to enable Belize to build up its own armed capabilities and to canvass effective support for an internationally credible guarantee;

(vi) in any event, the Government and people of Belize must freely and without pressure be allowed to accept or reject the suggested terms of any settlement.

12.35 p.m.

In statements in the House of Commons both the British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary admitted that discussions have taken place with Guatemala and Belize which involved cession of land; but such cession would not be undertaken without the support of the people of Belize. This view that an early settlement of the dispute cannot be achieved without some cession of land (even from the Moho River) is totally unacceptable. For there is a fundamental principle at stake which must be preserved at all costs; the principle being that the people of Belize must exercise the right of self-determination and must proceed to independence with territorial integrity and secure borders.

The Government of Barbados remains firmly committed to this principle.

We fully support the resolutions passed at successive meetings of the United Nations in which the right of the

people of Belize to self-determination, independence and territorial integrity have been overwhelmingly approved.

The Barbados Government will continue to assist in efforts to have this matter resolved speedily in the best interests of the Government and people of Belize.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that Honourable Members of both sides of this House will give clear and unequivocal support to any measures in accordance with the principles of territorial integrity and safe and secure boundaries which will pave the way for another CARICOM member state to gain full independence.

I may add, Mr. Speaker, that throughout these long and arduous negotiations we have been heartened by the fact that the Premier and Government of Belize have conducted themselves in a manner which shows them fit to assume the mantle of independence. I wish I was in a position to say the same for Guatemala.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour will permit me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member making a ministerial statement?

Mr. JOHNSON: No, I am seeking the leave of the House to move a motion, if Your Honour will permit me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is seeking the leave of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON: It relates to the statement just moved by the Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that this House take note of the statement of the Minister responsible for External Affairs on Belize, approves of the Government's policy with respect to the question of Belize, and strongly supports the rights and aspirations of the people of Belize for early independence with full territorial integrity within secure boundaries.

## GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Government Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and that this House go into Committee of Supply to discuss one money Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is not the correct procedure, he has to move what is the order of the day. He says it is Government Business, but what are we doing? He has to do it properly.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Item 1. I would have expected the Clerk to call it. I must apologise.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item 1 is the instant Order of the Day.

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

*On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply to discuss one money Resolution, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.*

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977–78 NO. 27

*A Resolution for the sum of $18,204 was called.*

*Ministry of Finance and Planning – Head 9(6) Inland Revenue.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is quite a small item when one considers the importance to the revenue of the work being done by the Department. The work of Inland Revenue has expanded considerably in the last few years, collections of income tax have been increasing, and the ambit of the tax although it has got no wider is yet reaching out into new areas due to the pressure for increased efficiency in the Department.

In 1976, for example, there were approximately 59,000 taxpayers, and in 1976 income year also an exceptional number of returns to these taxpayers had to be dealt with because of the innovation of a tax credit which was granted in the last budget, as well as a dividend credit which was granted in respect of individual shareholders in corporations to give them some relief from the corporation tax.

For the interest of the Committee, Sir, I may mention that out of the 59,000 taxpayers no less than 51,728 had to get a tax refund of some sort, and 51,000 taxpayers – I am sure some of us on the Committee are among them, although whether all of us are among the fortunate ones to receive the refunds, I do not know – I certainly have not got one I was looking forward to as yet, Sir – but these taxpayers were refunded a total tax of over $9.3 million.

12.45 p.m.

These taxpayers were refunded a total tax of over 9.3 million dollars. The tax credit itself returned to the pockets of those taxpayers earning less than $500 month. They were given back the tax they had paid in the amount of $1.8 million, if I may say so, a quite substantial concession to the lowest income earners in the community. Now all of this, Sir, was done not without much hard work in the department; and I would like to

pay credit to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue and his Deputy for the devotion to duty and the efficiency which they brought to the discharge of their duties during the time that I have been able to observe them, Sir, an efficiency which was well known before, but which was all the more pleasing to see at first hand.

None the less, Sir, you cannot build bricks without straw; and to carry out these duties it was necessary to employ temporary staff to assist in the processing of the refunds and the assessments. Although we are not at this stage contemplating the establishment of the temporary staff, it will be necessary not only to keep them in service, but perhaps to increase their number next year to deal with, not so much this time refunds, Sir, but extending the reach of the tax man.

It is a prerequisite of being able to reduce direct taxation that everybody must pay his fair share. There are 90,000 people employed in Barbados or working in Barbados and earning money of some sort, Mr. Chairman, at the present time; and there are another perhaps 15,000 to 20,000 people who flow in and out of the work force, either unemployed voluntarily, idle or whatever, but employable. So one would expect that there should be more than the 60,000 or perhaps the 62,000 or 63,000 income tax payers who now exist in Barbados.

There are certain areas where we recognise that wages are so near the margin that it would be oppressive to have Inland Revenue poking its nose into people's earnings. Particulary one might instance the case of domestic servants of whom there are still more than 6,000 at wage rates which might marginally attract income tax. Certainly they may attract returns since everybody is intended to make an income tax return. None the less, it is not really at this stage intended by the department to be running around behind people who may earn $50 a week, $60 a week and who in the ordinary way, with their allowances may not pay tax. It is not the department's intention to harrass such people; but there are yet many people in Barbados who are self employed or semi-self employed who are not bearing their fair share of direct taxation.

It falls very hard on public servants especially and on persons who derive income from the Government that right down to the very last penny, their incomes are known to the Inland Revenue and their tax correspondingly deducted, while other persons, perhaps in the commercial sphere, fight sometimes a successful battle to have not so high an income, but to have a more generous scale of expenses, and despite the strenuous efforts of Mr. Campbell and Mr. Waithe and the officers in the Inland Revenue, I think that in the business sector many expenses still escape the hot breath of the tax man, Sir, and go either in kind or in cash into the pockets of those who should be paying taxes on them; and there are other areas – small retail traders and persons who work in construction, mechanics and so on. I could mention some of the self employed professions – hair dressers and others, persons who work in the taxi business – all of these persons who may well pay income tax, but who do not have the same tight observation of their earnings as persons on salaries, and especially persons on Government salaries.

We are not here, Sir, to try and run down or crucify anybody who is making a small living in the country; but it must be understood that if everybody bore his fair share of the tax, it might be possible for the burden to be reduced a little bit from the levels which we have now achieved. To this end the Inland Revenue Department is carrying out a special project at the present time on the newly registered landlords under the Landlords and Tenants Registration Bill.

Just over 11,000 persons at last count had registered as landlords in this country. It may not be 11,000 persons, Sir. I should say just over 11,000 premises have been registered as rented premises in the country. The Inland Revenue is starting with those persons at the top. All those who are reporting rent of over $600 a month will have their tax returns for the necessary period – for the last five years – examined to see whether their returns from rented property have been declared; and I give a warning to all those persons, if you have been renting out your property and not declaring it to the Insland Revenue, you had better start from now and find some way of preparing a sufficient quantity of tax to meet your liability for the last five years when you have not been declaring the rented property.

We are starting at the top, Sir. These are the properties of $600 a month and over. I do not have the figures of how many of these properties exist, but speaking as the landlord of one of these properties, Sir, I am very proud to say that not only have I declared it for the last five years, paid the tax, and fortunately in most cases received a little tax relief, Sir, because my rents are very negligible compared with the repair costs of the house; but I am seeing to it that the 8 per cent which is due on the rents received over $600 will be in the hands of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue this week for the rents that I have earned during January.

It is necessary if you are a politician to set an example, Sir, and I am sure that my experiences will be matched by those of other members of the House who have very faithfully over the last five years without fail returned every penny of rental income on their income tax returns. None the less, Sir, I am sure that it will be found that there are some less scrupulous citizens around and about – and we expect some increase in the collection of tax from some of these persons.

It also goes without question that we will be going down the line; we are starting above $600, but in the fullness of time when the staff has finished with those of $600 and over, they will turn to the lesser amounts, and all those persons who have built houses – an apartment downstairs and a house upstairs – will find that this will also come under the ambit and review of the Commissioner.

We intend also, Sir, as a result of certain proposed reforms for registration of self employed persons, a slightly different identity system which will have the effect of being able to correlate National Insurance returns and Income Tax returns, something which can be done only with immense labour at the present. We hope that by the end of the forthcoming financial year we will have added many more thousand income tax payers to the roll to give me the opportunity in due course of being able to examine the tax system from a wider base than present analysis would afford.

12. 55 p.m.

Sir, the amount asked for is really very small. It is only $14,504, and it is needed to supplement the salaries of the temporary personnel. I do not know exactly how many temporary personnel there are in the entire Department, Sir, but I can find this out in a moment or two if any hon. member wishes the exact number. Of course, it ebbs and flows according to need.

I beg to move that Head 9(6) stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak at a later stage.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Opposition is not opposing this, but I do not like how the Prime Minister seems to crow because he gave back taxpayers in this country $60.00. He thinks that is a big thing, but I, certainly, do not think it is anything to be proud of. I am going to show him that although he gave back $60.00, look what he took back? He increased the water rates from $6.00 to $10.00 among the lowest classes, which is $16.00 a quarter. Postage stamps went up where the poor man had to post letters abroad to Auntie in America and in England. They went up considerably, and in some cases more than 100%. Bus fares for the travelling public, the man who has to get to work, went up from 25¢ to 35¢ and that is 50¢ a week, which is nearly $25.00 a week he increased on them. Car licences for those under $600.00, most of whom in Barbados, thanks to the change in society, have a car; he increased the road licences and highway tax. Gasolene went up from $2.00 to $2.20. He increased the hotel and restaurant tax, where the working-class girl has to go into a restaurant, from 5% to 8%. He also placed 10% on overseas calls, but that is not bad. However, he raised the tax where the working-class has to go into Antoine's and the Coal Pot to eat.

Furthermore, the Hospital charges went up. All of the registration fees, Character Certificates for the poor girls, who want a job in the Industrial Estates, went up from $1.00 to $5.00; Birth Certificates went up; Marriage Certificates went up, and everything went up apart from increasing the lodging of fees and the probate fees as well as divorce fees in the Courts. T.V. licences went up, so do not let him come here and think that because he gave back $60.00 it is any feather in his cap. He took away from the working-class people in this country more than the $60.00 he gave them under $600. T.V. fees went from $12.00 to $20.00, and, if you have a colour T.V., to $30.00. Registration fees, passports, Character Certificates, Hospital charges went up from $20.00 to $40.00 and $50.00; Hotels Sales Tax; bus fares, gasolene, highway tax, postage stamps and water went up, and he is going to get in this House and crow that he gave somebody $60.00 a year! If they are happy with that, then that is their business. Do not try to fool the people that you have given them something. You have taken back much more from the working-class man by the imposition of taxes you imposed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, the Budget reply of the Leader of the Opposition, while somewhat delayed at least has the benefit of brevity, simplicity, and moderate delivery when we consider the normal mode of the hon. member. I am reminded, however, when I speak of simplicity, of Lord Mansfield once complimenting Counsel on his very simple arguments and saying to Counsel: "Your arguments were short, simple and wrong." Taxation has to be imposed in this country, and, at the time when the taxation had to be imposed last year, the refund of income tax was not by any means the only tax which was ameliorated. The Retail Sales Tax, which used to bear hardest on the working class and whose amount exceeded all the amounts which have been enumerated by the hon. member – it was $6 million a year, and, as he was enumerating, I was running through in my mind quickly what all those impositions added up to, and I believe they would hardly reach more than $4 or $5 million. The Retail Sales Tax was also abolished. Peculiarly, if the hon. member really gives his mind to it, he will appreciate that a $60.00 tax credit and the repeal of the Retail Sales Tax are means of assisting the poorest classes in the community. Regressive taxes, such as the Retail Sales Tax, bear hardest on persons who have the smallest incomes.

The hon. members for St. Michael North and South Central, who are smiling as I say this, should perhaps look at the sage countenance of the hon. member who sits between them, the hon. member for St. Michael South, who could give both of them a lesson out of his right

hand in economics and still have enough to teach Dr. Gonsalves at the University. (Asides.) The point is this: Is the Leader of the Opposition criticising me for giving back the $60.00? If they did not get the $60.00 they would still be $60.00 poorer. They would still have the other taxes to pay and still be $60.00 poorer. It is because they had the other increases to pay that the Government at that time thought it appropriate to give a $60.00 tax credit. It is as simple as that. It is because it was necessary to increase these things.

I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he examines more carefully this list of things that he has read out now on political platforms, perhaps, even on television and in the House many times. He should examine the list more carefully. He speaks of the highway tax and how people under $600 a month would have their car licences increased. He has not examined the fact that only half of all car licences were increased last year, because the minimum licence was not increased. There are over 12,000 persons who own motor cars and pay the minimum. More than half of our cars in Barbados are of the minimum weight, and there was no increase on the smallest motor cars last year. Where does the working class come in? It was the Jaguars. It was increased for the hon. member, but it was not increased for the smallest size of motor car. Whether that state of affairs will continue is a different matter, but, if the hon. member is making criticisms of the highway tax, I would have thought that the Government should have been praised at allowing more than half of our motor car owners one more year at a totally unrealistic rate – one that was set in 1972. We should have been praised for it. Five years, and to have a motor car for $50.00 a year, Sir?

With regard to postage stamps, the hon. member, as former Minister for Communications and Works, should know that the Universal Postal Union Agreement dictated the necessity of an increase in Overseas Airmail Postage Rates. The Hon. Member himself signed the protocol.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If I signed it, I did not impose it. I can sign anything. You imposed it.
1.05 p.m.

I heard one of the members of my own Cabinet recently chiding someone and saying "I am only the Minister; when you are dealing with this particular matter it is the Minister of Finance. I did not set the rates or give out the money." I accept what the former Minister of Communications said. It is nice to have him shuffle off so completely the thought that he might ever have had the responsibility for the finances of this Island. But, nonetheless, there is another point that perhaps has not been taken into account with the $60 tax credit. The $60 tax credit was all the tax that most of these people paid, and you cannot give a man more than $60 in tax credit if he is only paying $42 in tax. And it covered no less than 35,000 people, more than one third of the work force, and I do not think that we have anything to be ashamed of in giving a third of the work force – 60% of the taxpayers – a tax credit up to or near the limit at which they were actually paying tax. I do not think there is anything to criticise in that Sir, and I regard it as a tribute to the way the Government has been running the Department of Inland Revenue if the only criticism we can find is one well nigh a year out of date. The hon. member should be practising for the next Budget reply, not practising one that should have been delivered nine months ago.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chariman, I would like to raise a different question. As the Leader of the Opposition indicated, the Opposition is not voting against this measure. Anything that leads to increased efficiency within the Department of Inland Revenue or in any other Government department will find support from the Opposition. However, there are two matters I wish to raise. One relates to a Parliamentary Question I asked some time ago and on which on more than one occasion the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance indicated that when the information comes to hand it will certainly be passed on to me. That related to the number of taxpayers broken down by category in terms of the amount of tax paid etc.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have to apologise to the hon. member. This pledge was made, and although the report of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue for the year in question is not ready, figures do exist not for 1974 and 1975 – I can't make myself responsible for those – but they are available for 1976 and I have said to officers at Inland Revenue that the hon. member should be sent copies of them. But matters of revenue secrecy were being discussed and were on the report and I omitted to show exactly what of the material should be sent to the hon. member. But it is a matter into which I will look this afternoon if possible and get the information for the hon. member showing the breakdown of taxpayers last year. There are so many different things that come out of the computer that he might get an idea of what is in his mind if I just sent him the raw figures. He will have to be sent the straightforward table of existing tax rate principles for 1976.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Prime Minister for that assurance and I certainly look forward to the information which he will send. The other point I wish to raise relates to the number of income taxpayers who have not yet received their refund from the department of Inland Revenue. We have seen statements from time to time that persons have in fact received their refunds, but I know for certain that around Christmas time there was a number of taxpayers who were claiming that there was money owing to them by the Inland Revenue and they were anxious to receive this money before Christmas and they were experiencing a

measure of frustration. I hope that the situation has in fact been cleared up. Perhaps the Minister of Finance can tell us whether in fact there are substantial numbers of persons who submitted their returns around the time that they should have been submitted but who so far have not received their refunds. It might be good if the Minister of Finance could respond to this question because I suspect that there are a number of persons who are still expecting to receive refunds. I am not talking about the Minister of Finance who said he did not get back as much as he was expecting – I am sorry, he says he hasn't got back any at all. So I have a case right here in this Chamber of a member who submitted his return and has not received a refund. But then again I am not sure he is to receive a refund. I do not know how he manages with all the large receipts, etc., that he gets, but maybe he can tell us approximately how many people are still owed refunds by the department of Inland Revenue and what steps are being taken to speed up these refunds. It is well known that if anyone owes the Department of Inland Revenue, there is an interest charged, per month on the amount for the period that the amount is outstanding. I think the monthly interest charged is 1%, and I well remember the hon. member for Christ Church West, my friend and colleague the Minister of External Affairs was very vocal when in Opposition that the Government should pay interest to those taxpayers to whom it owed money. He was very strong on that particular point. I see he is now talking with the Minister of Finance and maybe they are consulting on that particular point, and maybe he will let us know whether he is as vocal now about those persons who are owed refunds by the Government.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member may rest assured I am not like anyone on the Opposition, for if I have a principle I stick to it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: The hon. member must now tell us whether this is a principle which he is enunciating or not. But maybe I do not need to go on. I think I have made the point and the Minister of Finance has said he is looking into the matter of those persons who have not yet got their refunds and maybe he will throw more light on the situation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: There are only approximately 200 persons who have not got back their refunds, and in every case it is because there is some problem with the return. I really cannot say what the problems may be with any given return, and the provisions of secrecy would prevent me from making any comment, but these are returns with which some problem is involved.

1.15 p.m.

These are returns in which something is involved. Maybe some people have not claimed enough back, maybe, some people have forgotten something or calculated a depreciation allowance wrong, but I do not think that 200 problem returns is bad after nine months, people argue about their returns for years and years. I think this is only an ordinary level of difficulty that might be expected. It is a very small percentage out of 60,000, the only trouble is that these 200 people are apt to be vocal people that have the ears of politicians, if they are not politicians themselves.

*The question that Head 9(6) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

HEAD 9(7) – RATES AND TAXES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Head 9(7), Sir – Rates and Taxes – Item 3, is Travel and Subsistence. Tax Officers have to travel, they have to get about, they had at that time of course, Sir, the trade tax to deal with, and during the last financial year there had been a request to supplement the Item of Travel and Subsistence, because a number of officers had travelled and had not been paid for it. Agreement to effect the supplement came too late to be included in last year's Estimates. It came too late to be supplemented in the appropriate financial year, and it also failed to be included in last year's Estimates, so we have had to pay the officers that amount out of this year's Estimates and we now have to supplement this year's Estimates in the sum of $2,400.

The Leader of the Opposition will be excited by Item 4, because he will take note that due to the increase in postage rates it is necessary to supplement the sum by $300. I might point out that a great deal is talked about the increase of postage rates, but I think that it is observed that of all land owners in Barbados – and there must be 30,000 hereditaments or more – but there are a large number of hereditaments in Barbados taxable under the Land Tax Act – but to supplement postage for tax bills on all those hereditaments and including some new ones, it is only costing $300. I hope the Leader of the Opposition will not now suggest that the increased postage rates are going to form a significant item in increased working class expenditure in the light of this.

Item 5, Sir, will also excite the attention of the hon. member. This is a sum of $1,000 to pay the increase in the water rate. This is for all the tax offices, including the headquarters, the whole Rates and Taxes Division. Indeed, Sir, I believe that this is even partly a carry on from the year before, because the Waterworks no more as yet under the present administration than under the administration of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central find themselves very hard pressed to send out bills on time, and Government Departments have to pay water rates just like anybody else, but they seem to be among the last to get bills, and so we are asking for $1,000 extra for all the Rates and Taxes premises to pay the water bills.

I beg to move that Head 9(7) stand part.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not excited, much to the Prime Minister's surprise, but there are two things I would like to assure the Prime Minister about. One is that the Opposition is only too happy to vote these supplementaries, because from what I have been hearing in Government these days every Department, almost without exception, is being told you have to cut back, there is no money, you cannot do this, you cannot do that because there is no money, so I want to assure him that I am only too happy to vote sums where it is justified by the expenditure, and I can tell him some Departments where that obtains.

Secondly, if I remember correctly, the then Opposition used to quarrel with the then Government for spending money as is spent under Item 2 here. Their contention then was – I am not going into the legal aspects of it – that when money was voted by Parliament for specific purposes in one budget you should only spend that money on those purposes in that particular budget. If it is discovered that certain other commodities from a previous budget have not been paid for since the budget comes to an end on the 31st March, then the correct procedure should have been a supplementary, and I think on many occasions I have had to listen to the then Opposition chastising the then Government for spending money from one year from a current budget on paying bills that accrued, occurred or incurred in a previous year, because according to them on the 31st March all unspent money goes back into the Treasury, the House has voted money for a particular and specific purpose, and therefore it is technically wrong. I am not quarrelling with this, I am just saying that when the shoe was on the other foot you used to criticise us. If the money is owed it has got to be paid, but technicalities like these I used to hear coming from that side when they were over here, and I see them doing exactly what the last Government used to do. I am not chastising, I am drawing to your attention that we used to run into criticism for this very thing, as you say here, as a result of payments that were made from this year's provision. You used to tell us that that should not be done because it is a new budget where Parliament has voted for specific items, and that the correct procedure should have been a supplementary. I just want to draw it to your attention to show how things change, when you are on one side you say something, and the other time you say something else from the other side of your mouth.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Finance would throw some further light on Item 4 – Communications, in the sum of $300. I would like to know if Government affixes postage stamps or pays postage when they are sending out these rate bills. I do not know if Government does that, and I would like him to indicate beyond any doubt if what is stated here is correct, that as a result of the increased postage rates and additional tax bills to be posted you will now have to be seeking a supplementary of $300 to meet such expenditure.

There may be other reasons why this expenditure is being sought, and I would like to hear from the Minister of Finance what is the reason for this increase, because Government does not pay postage rates on bills or Government documents being circulated locally.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to deal with something perhaps not directly arising out of this Resolution, but in my submission connected to it. Ever since 1971 I have been saying on political platforms and elsewhere that the Rates and Taxes sub-offices in the rural districts should be put to greater use. In particular, I believe that rural dwellers as, for example, in my constituency and your constituency Mr. Chairman, St. Peter, St. Lucy, St. Andrew and so on are faced to some extent with a very onerous burden of travelling to Bridgetown to pay their water rates, for example, their telephone bills and their electric bills.
1.25 p.m.

It seems certain that we are concerned about relieving the hardships of rural dwellers and decentralising some of the functions of Government, and providing for greater ease, especially among the middle aged and the aged. If that is so, we should consider entering into negotiations with the Light and Power Company, the Barbados Telephone Company and the Waterworks Department – negotiations of a nature whereby they can establish, or seek to establish or contribute towards the establishment of offices of the Rates and Taxes Departments over the country where rural dwellers will be facilitated with the payment of their bills for water, electricity and what have you.

I believe that some of the banks in Barbados, in Bridgetown at least, accept telephone bills. I pay mine through the Bank of Nova Scotia; but it seems to me that this is a function which some of us who work on a daily basis in Bridgetown can afford. But to ask a man from the depths of St. Lucy or St. Philip to come to town just to pay that bill is perhaps not being certainly conscious of the burden which is cast on the rural dwellers.

First of all, I would like to counsel the Government, if my suggestion has any merit whatsoever, to enter into negotiations with those various public utilities and Government Departments with a view to seeing if something cannot be done at Six Roads in St. Philip where I know that the Rates and Taxes Division is located. The building there is operated on the first floor,

but it has two storeys, and I believe that with some redecoration and renovation greater use could be made of that building to help the people of St. Philip.

I am not only speaking for the members of my constituency. I am speaking also for those in outlying parishes as a a whole and who would also need some consideration. I would wish to hear the Minister responsible – I now see that the Minister of Communications and Works is in his seat. Perhaps it may involve his Ministry, but I feel that some use could be made of these buildings. In St. Philip there is a disused building which I believe was formerly owned by the Telephone Company at Six Roads. The Post Office at Six Roads where pensions are drawn is in need of a complete overhauling and enlargement especially if the Government has plans for developing Six Roads into a mini township. In that case some consideration will have to be given to the enlargement of the office to provide greater scope for the increased activity that we would expect to take place at Six Roads; but I believe that in other parishes there are people who suffer from the same hardships where paying their utility bills is concerned.

There is a question which I wish to ask the Minister of Finance, and that is a question about land tax. I believe that that was introduced in 1972, and my opponent in the last elections was the subject of much criticism because he was the then Commissioner of Valuations and played a very leading role in the setting up of the Land Tax Scheme under which we now operate. I wonder if the Hon. Prime Minister would have been seized of any information today as to how the Land Tax Scheme has been working after five years. In particular, for example, the arrears outstanding on land tax in Barbados.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, before the Prime Minister replies I wonder if he would tell us too whether he is satisfied with the level of efficiency at departments and sub-departments of the Rates and Taxes Division, and whether they carry out their duties as would be expected, or as he would expect, and whether he is having any problems with any of them located throughout the country, and generally speaking whether he is satisfied that the work that is being done by the personnel of these departments is satisfactory.

Rt. Hon. J.M.G.M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have taken note of what the hon. member for St. Philip North has suggested about decentralisation of the collection of land tax. I hope that when the Barbados National Bank is established that you will be able to pay your tax bills, and in due course as it branches out, this will be one area of collection possibilities. The hon. member for St. Philip North spoke about the collection of land tax.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Hon. Prime Minister has misunderstood me. I did not only ask about the collection of land tax. I am very concerned about the collection of water rates and electricity and telephone bills. What I was asking was whether people in the outlying parishes should not be able to pay their water rates bill etc. at the Rates and Taxes sub-divisions spread about the Island.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, all that I can say – I have heard it canvassed in here. I will say that the current advice that has been received by the Ministry of Finance in this regard is that some decentralisation would probably be appropriate. There might be some difficulties in this decentralisation of the collection of taxes. I do not want.....

Hon. F.G. SMITH: On a point of privilege. I treat the Minister of Health with respect; but members of the Press must not talk to members of the House when we are in session. It has got to stop. I am not quarelling with the Minister, but I am talking about the dignity of this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Prime Minister will continue.

Rt. Hon. J.M.G.M. ADAMS: Difficulties do exist in this area. I very much regret to say that the Royal Barbados Police Force is in fact investigating a very substantial loss at one of the Rates and Taxes Offices. I believe that perhaps $15,000 or $16,000 has been paid back; but a substantial sum is still missing. There are also sometimes difficulties about security at the outlying offices, that safes are not entirely secure.

I shall be shortly answering the question of the hon. member for St. Michael South because I do not know when he spoke if he was obliquely but politely inviting me to make a statement about this matter. If this is the matter to which he referred, he will understand that the matter is even not yet *sub judice*, but in the hands of the Police.

1.35 p.m.

Matters like this reflect on the overall efficiency of the Department. I will, indeed, give an example. The Government is very anxious to collect arrears of land tax. I have remitted all the arrears due up to 1972. I have wiped off all the old Local Government arrears. That was done in the last Budget. All moneys before 1972 a curtain was drawn over. This is one of the curtains that was of total benefit to the people of Barbados; therefore, you would hear nothing about it from the Opposition. But even since 1972 you get a lot of non-tax-payers in these land questions.

The Department, under some pressure, collected just over $1 million in arrears of land tax between the Budget

and the end of last month – April to December, 1977. Just over a $1 million is not unreasonable, Sir, because we always have been collecting less than the estimate of revenue, but we are hampered. For one thing, the procedure for selling land for taxes has not been exercised for a number of years and, therefore, there are very few sanctions against the non-payment of taxes. It is only when you get to a situation where you want to sell the land you then have to get a Tax Clearance Certificate.

Sir, there are matters that I cannot go into, but there are some which I will go into. For example, in St. Thomas there is some land controlled by a former member of this House on which the tax was not paid, we yet find that a Tax Clearance Certificate was issued for it. This is something I was dealing with in my office up to this morning. I received a minute from the Attorney General, and this was one of the pieces of information which was contained in it. I do not know if you will call that inefficiency, or if, when it is fully examined, it will amount to corruption, but hon. members can see the dilemma into which you can sometimes be placed by the turmoil of the past.

I, again, will say something. The Government had very seriously been considering this matter of the land tax arrears, and I had given instructions, so that nobody would say that I was being hard on people in other areas – I had actually given instructions that a start should be made in the parish of St. Thomas, and that all parcels of land in building developments in St. Thomas, which were not built on, whose taxes had not been paid should be sold out for the purpose of collecting the taxes. If I had said that this should be done in St. Michael South, or in St. John, or in St. Lucy, I imagine what would have been said, but it is necessary to make a start within a particular area. It is now discovered that there has been extensive misappropriation of funds, some of which may be the taxes in St. Thomas for which we are trying to sue the people, and we also have other difficulties.

There are some companies called Inland Investments Limited, St. Thomas Development Company, Western Investments Limited. They are all controlled by a gentleman who lives at Norwood, and yet when the tax bills are sent out they come back "Returned Unknown" as if these big parcels of land being sold in Western St. Thomas and St. James have no owner or the owner does not live anywhere. The fact that Mr. Happy Bryan is Secretary of one of the Companies, Inland Investments Limited and a Director of another, apparently, has not made itself known to the Post Office and the appropriate officials of the Rates and Taxes Department. This is what I mean by getting a carry over of the turmoil of the past. These are some of the situations that you are meeting. In the instant case, obviously, no matter who the people are, I do not believe those taxes have been paid myself. But no matter who the people are, I cannot proceed to allow the Collector of Rates and Taxes to put up somebody's land for sale because a servant of the Government has been dishonest, received the taxes and not paid it over to the Collector. You will see that all of these difficulties, which may appear to people like inefficiencies, are arising in this very, very difficult area.

I believe that there is no more difficult area where the revenue is concerned than the collection of land tax, but I would give a warning about the arrears of land tax. Steps are positively being taken to revive the procedure of selling out land for taxes. It used to be done in the Local Government days. The hon. member for St. Philip South will be well aware from the days of the Vestry that you could not go on forever not paying your taxes on land. In many cases, indeed, you get a situation where the taxes are not paid because nobody is really sure about the ownership of the land; it is the estate of a deceased person, etc., and in the old days they used to welcome the selling of the land by the Provost Marshal because they would get a good title. They would go and buy back the land from the Provost Marshal and get a good title. The Marshal would give them a title and then there would be no doubt after that as to whom the land belonged. This is still possible and, in due course, certainly during this year, we can expect to see some land sales for unpaid taxes.

I have tried to describe some of the problems in answering the questions of hon. members, both those from St. Philip North and St. Michael South. They will understand that, until you are sure of the efficiency, the security and the control over these outlying Rates and Taxes Departments, it is impossible to make any generalisation about what they can do in the future. In arriving at the efficiency of the Department you have to examine the margin between inefficiency and dishonesty. I observe that 1800 Demand Notices have already been returned as undeliverable. These are the notices that went out in November 1977–78. Hon. members can understand what that means. It means that there is a parcel of land lying down in Barbados somewhere; it owes tax and you cannot find the owner. These are the difficulties which we encounter. I would also say that there still appears to be some difficulty at the interface between the Data Processing Department and the Rates and Taxes Department. It does not seem that the Rates and Taxes is entirely satisfied that all the information which is fed into Data Processing is being processed with a maximum of certainty. I will put it that way. You have two sets of uncertainties: uncertainty at the collection end, and uncertainty at the processing end.

In the light of all of this, Sir, I can only say that we are trying our best. We have cleared off the old difficulties; the staff who relate to the old difficulties have been turned on to the matter of the current arrears, immediate arrears, or arrears within the last three years. I

would like to deal with the point finally, Sir, of the Leader of the Opposition in connection with expenditure carrying over from one year to another. A careful analysis of Part IV of the Financial Rules is necessary before the conclusion that he seeks to draw and, in fact, to make on this subject.
1.45 p.m.

The financial rules make it clear that in such things as non-recurring items, if an item set out by description in the Estimates is not purchased within the year to which its appropriation relates, it cannot be paid for from funds of the succeeding year, but Rule 19 makes it clear that a continuing service such as travel, substantive allowances etc., go on from year to year. For example, in April you obviously pay travel claims for the preceeding March, even though it was the previous financial year's expense. This is obviously allowed under the rules. I don't think anyone will seriously question that such a condition is necessary. If the hon. member read rule 19(d) he can see that the authority for payment is implicit in the nature of the item. It is different if a specific warrant or requisition has to be made to get that particular item discharged, but travel is a standing vote that goes on all the time. Obviously, there are other items to which this applies. The rule says that payments shall not be made before they are accrued. It also says that expense properly chargeable to the account of a given year should so far as is possible be met within that year. So travel expenditure properly charged to 1976–77 should as far as possible be met within 1976–77, but if it cannot be met for lack of funds or some other reason then it must be met later. And this particular item was the case where it was not possible to meet the expense in the previous year. I hope hon. members will accept the proviso under Rule 19 of the Financial Rules and I beg to move that the Head stand part.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words to substantiate a point made by the Prime Minister. I would like this Honourable House to know that in trying to solve one problem you sometimes create another. The Prime Minister has mentioned that in levying on lands for taxes people would be glad in many cases to get the title to the land. The point I am making is that there are many people who will not pay their taxes because they want to get title for their land, and my point is that it is very difficult to put a man in court for taxes for his land if he has an ulterior motive in not paying the taxes, because he would be glad at any time if the officer puts him in court for the taxes so that he could get title for the land. I would just like this hon. House to be aware of this very important point.

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

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

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

## SUSPENSION

*On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Sitting was suspended until 3 p.m.*
1.55 p.m.

*On Resumption:*

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

## GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am seeking the leave of the House to give notice of a supplementary Resolution, if there is no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: You may proceed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to give notice of a Resolution to amend the Note to Item 14 of Head 7(2) and Item 2 of Head 107.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. As there are no questions on the Order Paper, we move into Private Members' Business. There again, there is no Private Members' Business on the Order Paper, so we go automatically to Government Business. It is now Government Business.

## THE MARINE BOUNDARIES AND JURISDICTION ACT, 1978

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be read a second time, and in so moving let me say that the Marine Boundaries and Jurisdiction Bill if passed will seek to establish for Barbados a marine resource zone of 200 miles contiguous to the territorial waters of Barbados, measured from the baselines of the territorial waters which surround the island. The zone will be known as the exclusive economic zone.

It will be recalled that last year Parliament passed the Barbados Territorial Waters Act which recognises the 12 mile limit as the area of the territorial waters of Barbados. The Act has not yet been proclaimed and I should explain to hon. members that the delay in proclaiming the Act is because we are awaiting technical

assistance in surveying our coastal waters to have new maps and charts ready. In this Bill the exclusive economic zone which will be established is separate and apart from the Territorial Waters Act, and I do not wish in either the mind of this Hon. House or indeed of the public that the two are confused in any way.

In relation to the Territorial Waters Act Barbados will have jurisdiction by its national law and international law a jurisdiction and sovereignty which is almost exclusive and subject only to the right of innocent passage by vessels of foreign States. The exclusive economic zone will comprise the sub-marine areas of the seabed and the superjacent waters and will give Barbados as a costal state a primary jurisdiction to exploit and explore the natural resources of the zone. Essentially it is a resource zone of the coastal state of Barbados, and in this zone Barbados will have sovereign rights over both the living and non-living resources, such as fish and other minerals.

Mr.Speaker, I am sure that hon. members are aware that the concept of the exclusive economic zone was not invented by Barbados, but it is certainly a concept first proclaimed by developing countries of Africa and Latin America under the names of the exclusive economic zone as well as the patrimonial sea, and this took place particularly in the early part of the 1970's when the United Nations Seabed Committee meetings were being held in Geneva in preparation for the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference, a session of which was held in Caracas in 1974 and which is still continuing. The next full session of that conference should be held in Geneva between the middle of March, I think, and May, and an intercessional meeting of the main delegations will be taking place in New York during the early part of February.

Although the Law of the Sea Conference has not as yet achieved its primary aim of establishing a new law of the sea in the form of binding an International Convention, I think that hon. members could be well satisfied that some of the principles which have been evolving from the discussions seem to point quite clearly to the establishment of a 200 mile resource zone, whether that will be called an exclusive economic zone or a fisheries zone, I believe that the concept is now being accepted by a large majority of countries in the world, and indeed many of them hav adopted in their national legislation some of these provisions.

In the developed world – I cite the United States of America, Russia, members of the EEC (European Economic Community) including the United Kingdom, as countries who have adopted at least a fishery limit of some 200 miles. In the Caribbean, Mr. Speaker, and in adjoining areas of the Atlantic some of those territories too have passed legislation extending their limits over the marine areas to 200 miles, or as least have given notification of their intention to do so. If I may cite some of the countries for the benefit of hon. members, these include the Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayenne (better known as French Guyana), Columbia, Cuba, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Suriname and Venezuela. Barbados' policy to promulgate a 200 mile marine zone has been taken after a very careful analysis of our social, economic and political interests, and after an analysis also of the prevailing international law developments at the Law of the Sea Conference, and is consistent with the thrust of developing countries for the establishment of a new international economic order.

We are a small developing country surrounded by a large expanse of sea and I think that there are certain policy considerations which must guide any Government in our position in its approach to this matter. If I may briefly outline these for the benefit of hon. members, firstly we have to avail ourselves of the natural resources of the sea surrounding our coast and of the seabed and sea subsoil in order to feed our people and to assist with the development of our economy. Secondly, we have to seek to promote the ordinary management and conservation of our fishery resources in the waters surrounding the island. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I have from time to time expressed the Government's concern that the Caribbean Sea has become a fishing area for well developed, highly industrialised countries whose economies are more advanced and whose standards of living are higher than ours.
3.10 p.m.

With their advances in technology and resources far beyond our own, they have not allowed any opportunity to slip in exploiting the resources of this area. I have said outside of this House, and I will repeat it within this House that the Caribbean States cannot sit idly by and allow our sparse fishing resources to be indiscriminately depleted by foreign vessels in our waters without leave or licence. In this particular regard, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in particular the countries of Japan and South Korea; and I believe that the response to my statement has earned an invitation for me to visit Japan and discuss with that country our views on these matters.

It is too early for me to react either publicly or otherwise on that invitation. I will only say that the Government does not shirk having a discussion on any matter of vital concern to Barbados; but those discussions must not be interpreted in any way as a weakening attitude on matters of principle. The main policy is that we have a duty to protect and preserve the marine environment of Barbados, including our waters and beaches from the ravages of pollution from oil and other sea-borne sources. After all, Mr. Speaker, our sea and

beaches are part of the very limited natural resources that we have; and we stand at a very vulnerable site in the area between the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea.

Therefore, we have had to state as a definite part of our policy that we will be extending our territorial limits and our economic zone; and we will be seeking to negotiate with the neighbouring States in the Caribbean to reserve and preserve the limited resources of the area for exploitation, probably in joint ventures with other States. In carrying out this, there are various areas of this Bill which I think I owe a duty to this House to explain and also to explain to neighbouring countries and underscore certain principal aspects of our policy on this matter, since the Government is anxious not to have any misunderstanding between ourselves and our Caribbean neighbours about the areas of jurisdiction which we are seeking to establish in this Bill.

Firstly, I should like to say a brief word on the rights of other States within the exclusive economic zone. The rights and jurisdiction which we are seeking under the new Act are not exclusive in the sense that no other State shall have rights in the zone. I want to repeat for the benefit of the other States that we are not abrogating to ourselves exclusive rights so that another State will not have a right to that zone. We intend to give the right of freedom of foreign Governments to over fly and the right to lay submarine cables will be preserved in accordance with International Law, particularly because since as a member State, we recognise the necessity for commercial activities across the seas.

The other areas that I want to emphasise is the area of access to the living resources by other States. Barbados will certainly under the new law promote a policy of controlling fishing by licences and agreements; and the interests of our fishermen will of course be paramount; but we recognise the principle that the developing countries, especially those which are land locked such as ours or geographically disadvantaged such as ours are dependent on mutual cooperation with neighbouring States.

We will recognise too the need for special consideration to be given to access, if requested, by our Caribbean partners and developing countries. Already under the aegis of CARICOM we have co-sponsored a conference here with our other Caribbean partners to look at areas in which we can co-operate regionally to permit the exploiting of the living resources of the Caribbean Sea. Indeed, this recent conference was merely a follow up of other conferences that have been held from time to time in the Caribbean region.

We have exchanged with the independent states most intimately connected to us our position in this respect by way of diplomatic notes seeking to get the right to fish under licence in their waters, and also encouraging discussion on any applications that they may make to us. The third point which I would like to emphasise – and we have had some reaction in the Press, not a very deep and analytical reaction, but a reaction nonetheless – is what will constitute the boundaries of the 200 mile zone in circumstances where there is less than 200 miles between Barbados and a adjoining territory.

One of the principles of the 200 mile economic zone concept as accepted by us is that it recognises that in a semi-enclosed sea such as the Caribbean in which there are large numbers of island states and territory, you will obviously have a situation that the zone cannot extend a consistent distance of 200 miles. Barbados has always recognised this principle, and we have made a clear provision in this law to deal with the situation. There will be no question – and I repeat that there will no question of Barbados' exclusive economic zone infringing on the marine areas and territorial waters which may legitimately be claimed by other countries and states. In short, Mr. Speaker, we are not an imperialist power. We are not extending our jurisdiction over the territories of St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Tobago and even Trinidad itself. An hon. member has reminded me of Guadeloupe and Martinique. In a case where the coast of Barbados and another country such as Martinique, St. Vincent and Trinidad and Tobago is less than 400 miles, we will initiate steps to start negotiations for an agreement to fix the boundary line of the economic zone adjacent to that other country. In such negotiations we will recognise the use of the medium line principle, and in reaching an agreement we will further recognise that the outer limit of this economic zone does not extend beyond the meridian or equi-distant line.

I would again like to say that our Caribbean neighbours need have no fear that Barbados has any aspirations of either claiming their land territory or their sea territory; and we will not be making any inequitable claims which will affect their legitimate rights.
3.20 p.m.

In this regard we hope, in due course, to send displomatic notes to the United Kingdom which still has jurisdiction for the Foreign Affairs of St. Lucia and St. Vincent, to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago and to the Republic of France for talks in order to agree on the median line between our countries. I know that already there has been some reaction from certain sources believing that we are pretending to be a great power and claiming and taking jurisdiction over territories.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when Barbados, perhaps, had jurisdiction in the days several centuries ago over other countries, but those days are long since passed. There is no longer a Governor reigning from Barbados

over the Windward Islands, or having Tobago under his jurisdiction, and I would not like the public to go away with the belief that this Government is seeking to take in territory to which it has no claim whatsoever.

Perhaps, hon. members would wish me, therefore, to give a slight explanation of some of the main Clauses of this Bill. Clauses 1 and 2 are the Short Title and Interpretation, Mr. Speaker. Of special importance in Clause 2 is the definition of a "Barbadian vessel". The intention there is to give effect to the principle that Barbadian owned fishing boats will operate under the general licensing provisions of the present Fisheries legislation, but foreign owned vessels must have special permits, or be licensed under Government to Government Agreements.

Clause 3 describes the marine zone, which will be called the "Exclusive Economic Zone", and will be 200 miles measured from the baselines of the territorial waters of Barbados with provision for the Minister responsible for External Affairs to have the power by Order to extend or restrict the limit of the Zone. This Clause also makes provision for the fixing of the seaward limit of the Zone where the median line between Barbados and another State such as St. Vincent, for instance, is less than 200 miles.

Clause 4 sets out the procedure by which the seaward boundary line of the Zone is to be demarcated, and it also makes provision for maps and charts showing the boundaries of the Zone to be made available to the public.

Clause 5 declares the rights and jurisdiction which Barbados, as a sovereign State, will have within the Zone with respect to the economic resources including fisheries and for the purpose of protecting the marine environment and controlling and regulating marine scientific research.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Clause 6 vests an exclusive jurisdiction in the Government. That is Clauses 5 and 6, Sir. Clause 6 determines who shall explore and exploit the resources of the Zone, and imposes sanctions for contravention of the provisions of this Clause. Sub-Clause (ii) is intended to make it clear that existing fishing by Barbadian vessels will not be prohibited under the Act.

Clause 7 gives recognition to the concept in International Law, which is also recognised in the current informal Draft United Nations Convention that foreign vessels should be entitled to enjoy the traditional freedoms of navigation overflight, and laying of submarine cables and pipelines within the Zone.

Clause 8 gives His Excellency the Governor-General the power by Order to extend any enactment relating to the territory of Barbados and to the Zone, so that such an Act so extended will have the force of law within the Zone.

Clauses 9 and 10 are provisions for conferring jurisdiction on the Courts of the Island over activities taking place in the Zone, and it is recognised in Clause 10 the difficulty of residential proof that an act or offence has been committed, or has taken place within the Zone.

Clauses 11 to 13 make provision for the control of foreign fishing within the Zone. Such fishing can only be carried out under permit granted by the Cabinet, or pursuance to an agreement with the Government and the foreign State with which the vessel has nationality.

Clauses 14 and 15 make provision for the enforcement of the Act by Marine Conservation Officers, and for this purpose Fishery Officers, members of the Police Force, members of the Defence Force, Coast Guard officers, and other persons approved by the Cabinet or included within the definition of Marine Conservation Officers. Marine Conservation Officers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are given certain powers of boarding and inspecting boats both national and foreign and of arresting persons for offences committed or reasonably suspected of having been committed within the Zone and in the territorial waters of the Island. Provision is also made for the forfeiture of vessels and equipment in certain cases where offences have been committed against the Act or, indeed, the Regulations.

Clause 16 makes provision for the disposal of fish seized in order to prevent spoilage.

Clause 17 makes provision for exempting the Crown and Marine Conservation Officers from liability with respect to the performance of duties performed under the Act in good faith.

Clause 18 provides for offences and penalties in relation to Marine Conservation Officers and for breaches of the Act for which no penalties are provided in the Act.

Clause 19 makes provision for the return of property seized where charges before the Court are dismissed.

Clause 20 gives the Cabinet the power to make Regulations for carrying into effect the main provisions of the Act.

Clause 21 is a provision empowering the Minister responsible for External Affairs to give directions respecting the disposal of vessels and other property ordered to be forfeited by a Court under the Act or Regulations.

Clause 22 makes provisions for the amendments of certain Acts affected by the new Act.

Clause 23 makes provisions for bringing the Act into force by proclamation. Those are the main provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I may only say that this Bill is being passed in pursuance of Government's firm undertaking contained in its Manifesto and also repeated in the speech by Her Majesty at the recent opening of this Session of the Legislature. It is the fulfilment of one of the many undertakings we have set out as our policy for the period of time that this House is constitutionally supposed to meet. We hope to perform each one of those promises. I am sure that hon. members opposite will appreciate that these Bills have been done with some degree of speed and with some degree of care, and after a great deal of consideration with other Government Departments.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I have taken the opportunity of circulating for the benefit of hon. members a brief note on the present state of the Law of the Sea Discussions, as I believe that hon. members are entitled to this information. Should any hon. member wish to hear our position on any of the present outstanding areas which are at present before the Law of the Sea Conference, I would be all too happy to make a statement on the matter. We had hoped that the duties of the Department would have permitted us by this time to lay a formal Paper before the House on the Government's position on the Law of the Sea Discussions. I am still hopeful that this will be done, certainly, before June.

We will be represented in Geneva by the Solicitor-General and, possibly, two other officers. There will be no political representation, except I am satisfied that there is need for a politcal presence at that time. I am not as optimistic as some other people who believe that the next session of the Law of the Sea will be the final session. Indeed, I hope it would be, and if it is I would be only too happy to attend and make any contribution of which I am capable. If there are any tough political decisions no doubt, Mr. Speaker, I would have to be there, but our present reading of the situation is that negotiations will continue after the March/May meeting for some time and we may have to wait for a few years before all of the problems are settled.

3.30 p.m.

But our present reading of the situation is that negotiations will continue after the March-May meeting for some time and we may have to wait a few years before all of the problems are settled. I would like to say regarding another important issue, the mining of the resources of the deep sea bed, that the industrialized countries must show a greater degree of restraint in the attitudes which some of them have taken towards negotiations. I was surprised at the reaction of the United States Government after the last set of negotiations to threaten to withdraw from the discussion of the law of the sea, and recently with the Congress revising legislation to make provision for unilateral mining of these resources. I think that countries such as the United States of America, which are possessed of advanced technology and an abundance of natural resources and one of the highest standards of living that none of us in the developing countries can reach for perhaps fifty years, should show a bit more understanding of the points of view of the developing countries. We are hopeful that a compromise position will be reached on this point, and we will use our diplomatic efforts to bridge the gap between the extreme stand being taken by some of the industrialized countries and the stand being taken by most of the developing countries. But we believe that merely threatening not to be present at the discussions will not help an international convention evolve in any way whatsoever.

I must say finally that during the last couple of weeks the United States Government seem to have come around to the view that their place should be at the negotiating table and not be withdrawing from the negotiations. This changed attitude is to be welcomed.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this Bill to the House and invite from hon. members any constructive suggestions for improvement. I myself will be moving a small amendment to Clause 15(1) (b), notice of which has been circulated, but I will do that at the Committee stage of the Bill.

I move that this Bill be read a second time.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the Chamber will give this Bill our support. It will certainly get the support which was not forthcoming last week when the Prime Minister pleaded for the support of the Opposition on the question of the Defence Force, and I would like to commend the Minister for the able way in which he introduced this particular measure. Lacking from it was any bombast and any suggestion that these matters originated solely out of the breast of the Barbados Labour Party. We are grateful that the Minister circulated a paper, although a little late, giving the background to the progress made so far on the third United Nations Law of the Sea Conference and matters preceding that. I think that approach of taking the Opposition into their confidence, circulating relevant information, bodes good, and if other Ministers would follow that example I think it could go well for cooperation in those matters in which the national interest is involved.

There are a number of reasons why this measure is of particular importance to this country. First of all, as is well known, Barbados is an Island. It is a geographically disadvantaged island in that there is a shortage of land space but plenty of water all around, and therefore the development of this country must inevitably rely not only upon exploitation of meagre land resources but also largely on what is in the water and under the water, what in technical jargon is known as living and non-living resources of the sea and sea bed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps it is not so well known that 71% of the area of the world is occupied by water and the oceans. It is therefore considered important what happens with that water, its usage and its exploitation, particularly for those persons who find themselves surrounded by water. Barbados has an economic interest in all of this. There are some sources which indicate that the Atlantic Ocean, or that portion of the Atlantic occupied by Barbados and other Caribbean territories, may not be as richly endowed with resources, fisheries etc., as other of the great oceans of the world. Nevertheless, whatever there may be either in the water or under the water, we have a direct interest in, whether it is those deposits of oil which some speculate to lie under the water, or the manganese nodules which will have an economic importance and significance. We have got to take an interest in all this and ensure that we do not fritter away our resources by signing conventions and international agreements which may not in fact be in our own best interest. Maybe we will be told about the different concepts which operate as far as the law of the sea is concerned. We have heard of one concept relating to the patrimonial sea, and I believe the concept embodied in this particular piece of legislation is based on the concept of the patrimonial sea, that is, territorial waters extending beyond that limit. I note also that there is another concept being floated around by a Caribbean territory, the concept of the matrimonial sea, whereby the resources of the Caribbean sea would be shared and be accessible to all persons of the Caribbean, and through some complicated process they would have access jointly to exploit these resources. But I don't think that particular concept has found very wide favour within the Caribbean or beyond either.
3.40 p.m.

The legislation we are considering now tends to be based on the concept of the patrimonial sea.

A number of issues come to mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker. First of all, it is well known that Barbados has an interest in shrimping, and the shrimp tend to be off the coast of Guyana and off the coast of Brazil, and I would have thought that the Minister in introducing this particular measure would have made some reference to this interest of Barbados when dealing with the concept of the patrimonial sea and the relationships that might tend to exist or should exist within the Caribbean and among Caribbean states as far as the direction of the interest of Barbados may be concerned. Indeed, it would have helped us considerably if we could have been told something as to exactly what has happened in relation to the shrimping project that was to have been developed between Barbados and Trinidad & Tobago, and the access to funds from Trinidad & Tobago in setting up this joint shrimping project. I know that it has been very difficult, or has been very difficult over the past weeks and months to get shrimp in this country, and we wonder what is happening as far as that industry is concerned, as far as employment for persons within the industry is concerned, and generally in this matter, because shrimping and shrimps constitute one of the important living resources in which Barbados has an interest. Maybe in his reply the Minister may be able to advert to this particular matter and tell us something about this which is of vital importance to the economy of this country.

The second question that raises itself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, relates to the question of security. It is one thing to pass an Act, to pass legislation relating to the law of the sea and relating to an economic zone of some 200 miles, extending 200 miles from the baseline of the territorial waters, it is another thing to police those areas, and we would want to hear something about the approaches which this small country will use in policing this particular area. *(Asides)* Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am hearing some noises about last week. I made a presentation and from the Opposition benches there was a presentation last week. We were asked to approve defence legislation on the basis of a White Paper that was presented to us, and the burden of our argument was that there was no ....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please get back to the debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is of vital interest to us, the particular approaches towards policing this economic zone. The Minister has spoken about extra regional forces coming into the Caribbean area and fishing, or over fishing, the resources of the Caribbean Sea, and he has elicited some response – I do not know whether that was a newspaper response or whether it followed the normal diplomatic channels or not– but he does not know yet whether he is going to Japan, he cannot respond publicly or in this forum yet on that particular matter, but there are some areas in here, some penalty clauses, which refer to fines – I believe it was $20,000 fine for anyone infringing the terms of this legislation.

There is reference to the seizing of a boat or vessel or structure – I do not know what this structure is, is that the North Point? – Anyhow, our structure, we may seize any of these, the vessel, the boat, the structure or whatever it may be, and the Conservation Officers may

board and they may confiscate the catch and maybe other things on the boat as well, and these are very important and very onerous responsibilities. They are as onerous as seizing arms from some craft which may be flying into this country or which may stop in this country, and we would certainly like to know what would be the forces available to deal with this Act to carry out and enforce the provisions of it. Maybe the few cutters of the Coast Guard, the naval arm of the proposed Defence Force may be operative here, but we will not go into that area at this time. Maybe the Minister can expand on this area about giving effect to this particular piece of legislation when he comes to make his reply.

Of course, a related area also comes to mind. There are certain activities which with the agreement of the Government of Barbados, and in accordance with, I believe it is the 1958 Geneva Convention, that may be carried out in this economic zone. I refer to those freedoms of navigation, of laying pipelines and cables and of over flight, and there was another one for fishing, but that one is restricted by this particular legislation. Silent in this piece of legislation, unless I have missed it and have not read closely enough, maybe any reference to military activities of other countries. It is well known that the navies of the military powers of this world have their submarines and other vessels traversing the seas, watching activities, observing, carrying out manoeuvres and other activities, but a number of activities are prohibited with this economic zone, but the legislation is silent in respect of those measures or activities which may be aggressive in intent or hostile in intent, we do not know. In fact, we may know, because we have been told that on a previous occasion there were some warships of a foreign power which actually jammed the radar and equipment at the airport.

3.50 p.m.

I believe that they might have been within this limit now designated as the economic zone. I have raised these matters as matters of vital interest to the security of this country. I do not think that they should just be glossed over or passed over without any reference to them because we are now in the days when we have got to take into account all of these considerations. I do not intend to be long on this matter. I have raised general issues to which I wanted to make reference, and I have said that the Minister has introduced this very competently.

In the Paper that has been circulated reference has been made to the fact that going back to 1973 Barbados has always taken a vital interest in this question of the law of the sea, the territorial waters and the contiguous economic zone. So, this is something which will find approbation from our side and which is in the interest of this country; and on the basis of the presentation made deserves the support of both sides of the Chamber.

Maybe when we come to the Clauses of the Bill there may be some matters which we would like to raise. There seems to be one typographical error in Clause 11, unless this is the legal spelling of the word "existence"; but as the song goes nowadays, "that is not the way to spell it my boy. That is not the way to spell it." The way that the word is spelt in Clause 11 is "existance". That is one of the things which may be small, but important nonetheless, which the Minister may wish to correct when we come to that particular Clause.

I was just leafing through this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I am sure that I have not omitted any matters to which I wished to make reference; but I believe that when we go into Committee on this Bill any matter to which I did not advert there will be an opportunity to speak on. We are happy to support this particular Bill.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, obviously this measure has so much unanimity that I think that it could have been seconded by members on both sides of the House. I will therefore only briefly reply to some of the matters so ably raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South. The first issue which he raised is our position in relation to the continuing of the shrimping industry in Barbados. Although I am not the Minister in charge of shrimping, my Ministry does have a little to do with such an agreement both from the point of view of the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of External Affairs; but I can say that the Government is at the moment developing an overall plan for the fishing industry, including the continuation and expansion of the shrimping industry in Barbados.

Hon. members may be aware that the Government has rescued International Seafoods Limited from the difficult economic situation which confronted that company. The Government is now a 100% shareholder in the company. In addition, the Government has been re-organising the company, and I am happy to say that instead of the company continuing with the terrible position of losses, its trading position has improved significantly in the first year of its management by this Government. And with the Minister and his officers assuming full responsibility for the management of International Seafoods Limited, the position has improved somewhat; but there is no point having boats unless one has something to bring in on those boats; and this is as true of the North Point to which the hon. member made passing reference as indeed to the shrimping boats.

Now, in the case of the shrimping agreement we had with Trinidad and Brazil for the right to shrimp with up to 21 boats within the Brazilian waters, both territorial waters and the exclusive economic zone, that agreement expired on 31st December, 1977. Well ahead of the expiry of that agreement, discussions had been in existence and continued to be carried on with Brazil on an extension of

the agreement. I myself have had discussions with the Brazilian Foreign Minister, and he has given me an undertaking that the Government of Brazil is interested in reaching an agreement with Barbados which will permit Barbadian vessels to continue to shrimp off the Brazilian coastline. Negotiations should have recommenced in Brasilia on the 30th January, 1978 – that is yesterday; but the notification from the Brazilian Foreign Minister came too late for us to make arrangements to be in Brazilia at the time. We have therefore asked Brazilia to agree to a later date, and the new date suggested is 6th February or 13th February, 1978.

So, it is expected that sometime next month negotiations will continue with Brazil. At the same time, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago has been conducting bilateral negotiations with Brazil for that country's fishing fleet to be allowed to continue to shrimp off the Brazilian coastline. It will be noted that both by ourselves, and I believe Trinidad and Tobago, that it would have been possible to negotiate a tree-way agreement. That has not been ruled out, but at the present stage of the negotiations the Brazilian Government has invited us to try to explore the possibilities of joint ventures between that country and ourselves; and it has not ruled out the possibility of a joint venture between that country, Trinidad and Tobago and ourselves; but whatever final stage it will take, it is reasonably certain that Brazil will concede the privilege of Barbadian fishermen continuing to shrimp within Brazilian waters.

I must say that the exploratory talks have revealed a willingness on the part of Brazilia to use our reasonably advanced technological resources in this respect to assist in developing the fishing or shrimping industry in Brazil; and Brazil has expressed a willingness to put up money by way of equity capital in order not only to share the resources, but the actual assets as well. I am much indebted to the Brazilian Government with whom we have had a very close association, for the quick response to us and I look forward to the fruitful conclusion of an agreement between our countries, and I also look forward to exploring the possibility of reaching an agreement with Trinidad and Tobago as well.

4 p.m.

Let me say that, in dealing with Brazil, we get a quicker recation than we get with some other Latin American States who seem to have a closer interest in this region and who are supposed to be Caribbean countries. It is easier for us to get a reaction from the Foreign Ministry of Brazil than for my diplomats to get a reaction from the Foreign Ministry of a country like Venezuela. I say this as a matter of course, and it is easier for us to deal with Brazil on various matters of this nature with a lot more success than we seem to be having with some other Latin American countries. That is why I am hopeful that our negotiations will be very successful. Brazil does not profess much, but it performs better than those who profess more, if I should put it that way, Sir. *(Asides.)*

The difference here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may draw an analogy, is that the Barbados Labour Party in 15 months has been laying long-term plans and carrying them out. The D.L.P. took 15 years to accomplish a few buildings and it keeps talking about that. You have the analogy, Sir. The hon. member wanted an analogy and I have given him one, Sir. Anyhow, the hon. member has raised another point which, I think, deserves a reply. He raised the security aspect of this matter: How are we going to control this area? It is a vast area particularly to the east of the Island, and what administrative and other arrangements will Government be making? This is one of the reasons why the Government, in its total plan, brought down a White Paper last week setting out its plans for the establishment of a Defence Force and a proper organised Coast Guard Services. *(Asides.)*

Now that the hon. member has recognised the necessity for this; now that the hon. member sees how the Government is planning and not dealing with a situation of *ad hocism,* I am sure that this hon. member will, when the Defence Force Bill comes before the House, give it his unstinted support. He recognises that there is a security problem – a security problem which did not exist in the same manner that existed under his Government, and that this Government is dealing with it with a total and overall planning of all of the areas. The Defence Force with its Coast Guard Division will have primary responsibility for policing these areas. Now, it will need new boats; it will need re-organising, but we have not rested on that.

Sir, I do not want to go into details on this, and I will merely say that the Minister, the Prime Minister as Minister for Defence and Security, and myself have been discussing actively with friendly Caribbean countries and with the administering authority responsible for their Foreign Relations the re-organisation of the Coast Guard Services in such a way as to increase the efficiency of coastal protection both of the fishing and other protection security matters between our respective countries, and we look forward to further discussions with the Government of the United Kingdom and the Governments of St. Vincent and St. Lucia in particular about increased co-operation in this area of security of our coastlines and their respective coastlines. In due course, I hope that we will be in a position to make a wider statement and a more detailed statement on this matter. But until we can get some common arrangement with these countries, we intend to proceed to use our existing and improved resources subject, of course, to the

economy of the ccountry holding up and some form of reasonable restraint being adopted by the country towards how it spends this limited resources. We hope to improve the surveillance in this area.

Now, in relat'on to military activities in the Economic Zone with another area raised by the hon. member, I may say that within our territorial waters in the 12-mile limit no foreign ship has a right to carry out any exercise or, indeed, to pass through the area without prior notification and sanction by us. That provision is contained in the Territorial Waters Act, 1977, and deals with the exclusive sovereignty which we have over the 12-mile limit. Likewise, as happens in air space where foreign military aircraft on peaceful missions gets permission to land over our air space, foreign military warships on peaceful missions will seek and may obtain from us permission to pass through our territorial waters. Within the exclusive Economic Zone they have a right of passage provided that their passage is innocent, because we will not tolerate any warlike acts within the Exclusive Economic Zone.

Now the hon. member may rest assured that the event of which he spoke last time, had our territorial waters been expanded, would have been within our territorial waters, and the Soviet Fleet would have had to have notified us even ahead of any notification we may have had from the United States about its passage within our territorial waters. In so far as collaboration with the United States is concerned, I have no complaints at present. The position has improved considerably. I would like the hon. member to listen to this because he must know this, Sir. The Democratic Labour Party did not establish a Joint Sub-Board to prevent this type of misunderstanding from occurring. I said in the House last year that this type of occurrence has a minimal chance of re-occurring because we will establish such a Board, and we will make sure that important and vital military information relevant to Barbados is dealt with and given to us on a confidential basis. I am happy to say that the Sub-Board is functioning satisfactorily; there is co-operation and there is proper monitoring of any things which we have to monitor.

That is another example, as the hon. member would like me to say this, of the efficiency of the Barbados Labour Party and the fact that it dots its i's and crosses its t's. It does not believe in ad hocism, or swiping, or playing to the Gallery. It takes harsh decisions even if the country might believe that it should take popular decisions, because it believes passionately in Good Government and not spectacular Government at all cost. The hon. member may rest assured about that. I think Barbadians are coming to recognise that we speak sincerely, and we are working hard and honestly in their best interest. No matter what may be the popular approach to Crash Programmes that do not last but crash and that sort of thing, I believe the people will see the wisdom of proper planning.

I am indebted to the hon. member for his comments and, indeed, for his very first-class speech. He is not himself a trained lawyer, but he spoke as well, if not better than most of the lawyers that I have seen in this House, on aspects of a very difficult subject like the Law of the Sea, and he is, obviously, very familiar with the negotiations that have been going on, because some of the matters that he raised were not in the paper that I circulated, Sir. Obviously he has read a lot on the matter, and I want to say that. I welcome a discussion. We have both got in our political points, I believe, without any rancour, but I welcome a discussion at this level.
4.10 p.m.

I hope that I have answered the points raised. There was a point mentioned about extra-regional courses. Again this is an area where we are cooperating with the other Caribbean countries to have a joint approach with countries seeking to fish within the Caribbean sea. In this regard let me say that the Government of Guyana has responded promptly, even ahead of a formal agreement, to our request for the right not only to pass through their waters to go to the Brazilian banks, but that Barbados can go ahead and shrimp off the coast of Guyana without fear of reprisal, and they have asked that as soon as possible we should get together to try to reach an agreement. Not only is this recognition of the high manner in which we conduct our affairs with that country, but it is also recognition of the CARICOM affinity which exists between us, and it is a recognition of the good relations which exist between Barbados and Guyana. As hon. members will recall, the hon. member for St. Michael South West has been making the public believe that we are not even on speaking terms with Guyana's Prime Minister. You will remember he said how badly we treated him at the airport. I sent him some of the telexes to show him that he was mistaken. This is only another example of the good relations that exist between Guyana and ourselves, and indeed in our day to day contact with Guyana and other CARICOM states. There are many other such examples and that is why I remain convinced that, despite all the talk we hear, CARICOM will remain, because the countries have more in common with each other than against each other and can sort out their differences. In fact, I make bold to say that there is a reasonable chance of our reaching a common regional fisheries policy in CARICOM before a similar agreement can be reached in the European Economic Community. If hon. members have been monitoring those discussions fully they would be aware that the meeting of EEC Ministers broke up yesterday in Europe in disarray without agreement. So I am very hopeful and give the assurance that this Government will do everything in its power to make sure that such a policy evolves in the region.

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

*On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.*

*Part 1 was called.*

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would like a little explanation. I see under Section 2 of the Bill where a Barbadian vessel or a Barbadian structure means a vessel or structure, as the case may be, (a) wholly owned by a citizen of Barbados or by a body corporate whose members or, if that body corporate is a company, whose shareholders, as the case may be, are all citizens of Barbados, or (b) certified in writing by the Cabinet as having such substantial economic connections with Barbados in relation to its ownership as to be deemed, for the purposes of this Act, to be a Barbadian vessel or Barbadian structure, as the case may be. I would like the Minister to give some idea of what the Government concedes as "having such substantial economic connections."

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member will notice, under Clause 2(a) we have described the Barbadian vessel as a vessel owned by a citizen of Barbados or a body corporate whose members or shareholders, as the case may be, are citizens of Barbados. But there may be circumstances in which residents of Barbados have formed a company or own vessels and they have a substantial economic investment here; they may also be residents here although not citizens of Barbados, and in these circumstances Cabinet will look at these criteria and allow such a vessel to qualify.

*The question that Part I stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Part 2 was called.*

Mr. SANDIFORD: This raises the question of settling the boundaries of this economic zone where you have territories less than 200 miles apart. This Bill will make provision for any agreement to be laid before Parliament, and I would like to be absolutely clear on this: is it that the intention is that there will be a draft agreement subject to the approval of Parliament, and if that is the case, may I suggest or will the Minister consider, agreements affecting the economic zone should be subject to the approval of Parliament. I am just throwing this out, but I recall that in the Congress of the United States there is a re-negotiation of an agreement or treaty between Panama and the United States, but before that treaty – or indeed I believe most treaties involving the United States and other countries – can become law, they are subject to the approval of the Congress. This raises the principle as to the importance of Parliament. Are we merely to be notified of the agreement and it be laid, or should Parliament be involved in this making of foreign policy? I think it is a matter to which the Minister would want to give very close attention. He has nothing to fear, since he has seventeen over there and we have only seven over here.
4.20 p.m.

I am raising it for the consideration of the Minister whether in fact Parliament should not be vitally involved, because it is the vital interest of this country that is at stake when agreements relating to the economic zone may be considered.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to get the hon. member's assurance that we have nothing to fear. We know that, Sir. The hon. member would recall that when they were 18 over here and we were 6 over there, that they had a lot to be afraid of; now we are 17 over here and they are 7 over there we have nothing to fear. I do not need the assurance. As a matter of fact, even although there are supposed to be several thousands in the DLP and we are supposed to be only a few in the BLP – so they say – we still have nothing to fear, so I really am not bothered about that.

I can assure the hon. member that we have looked at that point as to whether agreements should be made before they have been ratified by Parliament—that is really what the hon. member is asking for– that the agreements should be subject to parliamentary ratification but the constitutional position in Barbados concerning treaties is different from the constitutional position in the United States. There are certain types of agreement in the United States such as executive agreements which the President may sign and for which he has not got to seek the approval of Congress. Those agreements are usually published and indeed laid before the Congress. There are other agreements, however, which may have implications on the internal laws and may particularly affect the State's rights. In relation to those agreements the President invariably has to go to congress.

The position in Barbados is that the executive authority for treaties still resides in Her Majesty, and under the Constitution of Barbados she acts on the advice of her Ministers, which is the Cabinet, and it is only if the agreement calls for an alteration in the internal laws of Barbados that there is any constitutional necessity to bring that agreement before Parliament. That is sound constitutional law, Sir, and I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would appreciate that he can take the law from me on this point, Sir. We will not, however, need to bring an agreement of this nature to Parliament, but we have decided to lay it on the Table of Parliament because we feel that Parliament should at least oversee the agreement, and if Parliament wants to, it can be debated

upon a substantive motion. It was not necessary to have that particular clause at all, but I have put it there because I feel more and more that wherever possible Parliament should be involved in areas of foreign policy such as this, but I do not think we need to come for ratification because most of this agreement will not need any changes in the internal laws on this, except that an agreement will be negotiated on the basis of the principles set out in the Bill.

I trust I have answered the hon. member's fears, Sir.

*The question that Part II stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Part III was called.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In moving that Part III stand part, I would ask for the deletion of the word "existance" as contained in clause 11(1)(c), the fourth word, and the substitution of the word "existence." It is a typographical error, subject to hon. member agreeing. In fact, this morning the Parliamentary Counsel and I went over the Bill and this was not drawn to my attention at the time, otherwise I would have formulated the amendment in writing as well as circulated it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: When I was Attorney General I would just change the "a" to an "e" because it is obvious that it is a typographical error. Do you think I would waste Parliament's time asking to delete "existance" and put in "existence"? I would take my pen and change it and finish with that.

*The question that Part III as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Part IV was called.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In moving, Sir, that Part IV stand part I would like to move the amendment to clause 15(1)(b) in terms of the amendment as circulated, and also that the clause as amended stand part.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I just want an assurance from the Government on this. If you look at clause 14, as I see it the Marine Conservation Officers fall under at least three different Ministers. This is a Bill which in many ways is going to be administered by different Ministers, that is, the Minister of Agriculture, as is right, to say where fish should be sold so as to prevent spoilage; the Minister of Foreign Affairs is involved, and I imagine the Prime Minister as Minister of Defence and Security will also be involved, so that in section 14 you have Fisheries Officers of the Ministry responsible for fisheries, which is Agriculture; you have members of the Defence Force, which is the Prime Minister; you then have members of the Police Force, which is the Attorney General; Customs, the Prime Minister again, the Coast Guard will be the Minister of Defence and any other person approved by Cabinet.

I would like to be assured, although I was a member of the Cabinet for a lot of years, I do appreciate that Cabinet Ministers do in certain areas take Cabinet Papers for the advise of counsel of their colleagues, yet in dealing with a matter of the economic zone and whether boats can come into the zone, or they can overnight, or almost within the twinkling of an eye something could take place within this zone, it can affect not only our security but even the resources of the sea, I am wondering whether in certain circumstances the mere fact that these officers are under three different Ministers, whether there may not be some confusion, because you see under section 21 which we will come to, the Minister responsible for External Affairs can give directions as to how to dispose of the vessel.

I am just drawing it to the Government's attention that when you are dealing with matters of security and matters of this nature whether it would not be better if the administration of the Bill itself was not the responsibility of one particular Minister rather than, as I see here, we have officers from the Regiment, Coast Guard, Fisheries, etc. I am not criticising it, if the Government thinks that this method can work without the Minister of Fisheries and the Prime Minister saying that the Coast Guard is not available or whatever the position is – you see what I am driving at – there are three different Ministers whose officers constitute Marine Conservation, and therefore they are responsible to three different heads, and how can the crossing over, unless there is a panel of, or a designation of specific officers, other than that you can get confusion, and in a state of emergency there might not be the cohesion and the speedy action that a measure of this nature might require.

I am just drawing that to the Government's attention, that Marine Conservation Officers impinge on or come from different Ministries.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the point taken by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was carefully looked at by us. As a matter of fact, the first draft of the Bill contained provisions in which other Ministers were doing set things, and as much as possible we have restricted the authority under the Bill to the Cabinet in clear areas where the responsibility of several Ministers is concerned, or to the Minister of External Affairs in clear areas where an external presence is concerned, but it is not in any way at all thought to exclude the areas of co-operation and, indeed, activity with which other Ministers are concerned.

4.30 p.m.

Therefore the Minister responsible for Fisheries has a very vital interest in any section of this Bill, since Fisheries is going to be one of the main areas of activity; and obviously members of his department will be Conservation Officers and they will want to do conserving of fisheries resources of the area; and we will expect that on the coast guard boats you may find that Fisheries Officers, sometimes members of the Defence Force and sometimes the Police, depending on what activity is being looked at. There may be a case for instance where a fisheries boat is out with a Fisheries Officer on Board, and he discovers something wrong and may be able to take instant action. We will not want to rule out this sort of circumstance from occurring.

I believe that the difficulty to which the hon. member referred can be handled by proper co-operation between separate departments of Government. Only let me say this: co-operation is necessary in most aspects of Government affairs. For instance, although I have the primary responsibility for the Police Force in Barbados, being the Minister responsible for law and order, defence and Security is a matter under the Prime Minister; and in addition to being Prime Minister and having the overall co-ordination of all Government activities, he also is primarily responsible for aspects of Security which may well affect internal law and order; and so there is a day to day co-operation between his Ministry and mine on these matters.

Likewise, although Police is under me as a primary responsibility, the immigration aspect of the Police is under the Prime Minister. So that Immigration Officers are working for the Prime Minister; but they operate particularly, I think, under the Ministry of Communications and Works, at the seaport or at the airport under the Minister of Civil Aviation. Do not get it wrong. This Government combines and combines greatly. That is why it is the great combination; and the hon. member may rest assured that we will combine; and that perhaps in the year 2197 or something like that, when the Barbados Labour Party has set its style, if the hon. member's party is still existing in those days, if they have still survived, whoever succeeds us would have had a legacy of which they can be proud on how to co-ordinate Government activities.

*The question that Part IV as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Part V was called.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Part V stand part.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, there is only one thing that I would like to ask the hon. Minister in charge about. Section 19 says that subject to Section 16 a court may order the property etc. of a person etc. Now, in (b) "no charge has been brought against any person within a reasonable period of time after a seizure ...." Now what is a reasonable time in law? In the diplomatic field a reasonable time – as he said he did not hear from Venezuela – a reasonable time might be three years; or hear from Trinidad. I would prefer to see a specific time which removes any doubt and enables the Crown to know or the Marine Convervation Officers to know that if you seize a boat and you do not bring a charge within three months, six months, nine months, then you run the risk of the boat being given back; but to prove a reasonable time, the Minister or his staff may say that they are carrying out investigations and it makes the law too uncertain in an area where a man or a country's investment in six shrimp boats, or 12 shrimp boats are tied up in Barbados. No charge is brought, and they can be tied up indefinitely.

How can you draft a charge or make a claim for reasonable time? I know that where a man is arrested, then the reasonable time in which he is to be taken before a magistrate is next day or so. That is quite clear since it infringes on human rights, and the Constitution says that he must be taken before a magistrate as soon as possible; but I would prefer a fixed limit, because reasonable time can lead to a lot of hardship and inconvenience to persons in this area, especially when we are involved in consultations with foreign Governments. I would suggest that this "reasonable" time be deleted, and the Minister consider a period of three months or six months within which a charge must be laid just as it is with traffic offences.

You should have a fixed period of time. As the Minister himself pointed out, when you are dealing in the field of diplomatic relations – as in the case of the American base and with the Brazilians with shrimping, no one will accuse you of an unreasonable time because you are depending on the response from the particular country; but when you are taking away a boat to which a man may have a legal right, and the Conservation Officers have to investigate, this can be a serious matter. Section 17 says that no liability attaches to the Crown, a marine conservation officer or a fisheries officer in respect of acts done by that officer in good faith in the performance of his duties under the Act.

You have to give Jack his jacket and let there be a fixed period of time in which a charge must be brought. A reasonable time in law is extremely vague. If you put in a fixed period, the marine conservation officers or any others involved will know that, for instance, three months is a reasonable time. You may be acting as regards boats from South Korea and Japan and you do not get a reply

for a long time. The owners of boats may be waiting to hear from the Ministry. Three months may pass, and the boat is deteriorating in the Careenage.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am very worried. I want to know if the hon. Leader of the Opposition in spite of his being President of the Bar Association, would not know the difference between a case like the one we are dealing with and an indictable offence.
4.40 p.m.

I really want to ask the Attorney General a question. I believe that he has changed the law without the Cabinet knowing anything about it, because I know that the President of the Bar Association would understand that cases would have to be brought before six months before a Magistrate, and that is in the Magistrate's Jurisdiction and Procedure Act. Now, "within a reasonable time" is something that regularly appears, and over and over again the Courts have said in *habeas corpus* cases where the defence is that they are going to bring a charge, the Courts have asserted what is reasonable for the person at the time of bringing a charge and in the light of how soon the case will be tried and so on. I believe that the Attorney General has taken advantage of my absence from Barbados, from time to time, to change the law disadvantageously to the public, and I want to congratulate the President of the Bar Association for drawing this to my attention in this manner!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this law..... *(Aides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Where in this law do you see that? All you have done is to extend the jurisdiction of the Magistrate's Court for the trial of certain offences under this law, but "reasonable time" under this Bill does not connote six months. Do not tell me nonsense!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member on a point of order? Are you making another speech?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: In this law there is nothing which says that the Magistrate's Court Act should aply to this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not want to go any further into it than that, because I believe there is something in the Bill which says..... *(Asides.)*

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I was not goint to get up on this, because he talks about high law. It reminds me that, when the Leader of the Opposition was the Attorney General, he went to the Magistrate's Court with an *animus curiae* in a case brought by the Crown against some people who lived in Halls Road, and injected a statement in a judgment that could not stand up anywhere in this world, and he would like to do the same thing in this Clause. He and nobody during his regime have ever understood court procedure in this country. The only people who have studied court procedure in this country was myself in the Magistrate's Court, and Colin Williams in the Supreme Court. When he talks about court procedure everybody in Barbados should shut his ears. He does not understand what is going on. He can search the books from now until next year, and he will not know where to find it because he does not understand court procedure.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Prime Minister would not allow the Leader of the Opposition to mislead him on this. The Prime Minister has stated the law quite clearly and, indeed, the law is maintained in this Bill. If I may help the Leader of the Opposition once again with some good law, he will note that within this Bill there are two methods of trying the offences created by the Bill: one method is by way of summary jurisdiction. A summary charge in Barbados, unless otherwise stated, is subject to the Magistrate's Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, and such summary charges must be brought within six months. I cannot remember the specific Section of the Magistrate's Jurisdiction and Procedure Act. It may be Section 105 but I am not sure.

Now, on indictable offences, it has always been the law of Barbados from the time of the settlement of this Colony, now an Independent Nation, and it has not changed. It is 1623 and some people say 1627 that the rule of law, or the principle of law, in such cases is that time does not run against the Crown for criminal offences. From time to time the Legislature has sought to alter this where indictable offences have a limitation period of two years or three years after discovery of the offence, or certain offences against the Income Tax Act. The hon. member should be aware that a Court dealing with a construction of Section 19 will have to advert to the rule of the time limit within which to bring cases, and if a case has not been brought summarily in six months, it cannot be brought summarily at all. If it is brought indictably it can be brought at any time, but a Court will advert to the intention of the Legislature in the other Section which is Section 16 or Section 15(3), I believe. This has another provision giving the time as a month.

Now the other point made by the Prime Minister is a point that the hon. member must remember. The Court is the person construing the reasonable time, not a Minister of Government, not an Attorney General. In addition to this the standard of what is a reasonable time is a concept well known and well interpreted in the law, and it is not an open-ended contract.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I just want to draw to your attention that there is no quorum in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clerk, please ring the Bell.

*The Bell was rung, and a quorum was obtained.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I observe there is a quorum now. The hon. Attorney General will, please, continue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the term "reasonable time" is well known to the law. Now in this case what is being said is not that we have an open-ended time within which to bring a charge. It deals with forfeiture, and it assumes that forfeiture has taken place, or no charge has been brought and no forfeiture can take place, because the time for a summary charge has expired, or the Court conceives that you have delayed too long to make an indictable charge.

We have used in drafting this legislation the legislation of several other countries. We have used the legislation of the Bahamas, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Draft U.N. Convention of the Law of the Sea, the Guyana Marine Boundaries Bill, to mention only a few. I am reasonably certain that in drafting this particular Section we have looked very carefully at United Kingdom legislation on the point, and there will be no difficulty of interpretation. The Courts will not have the difficulty which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has. I do not even know if he appreciated the intended implications of the Prime Minister's speech in addressing him, Sir. I wonder if he has forgotton his law!
4.50 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If the Minister will give way, this is a case where I am talking about no charge being brought, so that it does not come before the magistrate and six months pass. For the man to get his boat what must he do? No charge has been brought, so what is the position. Don't think I am a fool; I am not a Queen's Counsel for a joke.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I don't really understand the argument of the hon. member, because section 19 shows quite clearly that a court has jurisdiction to order the boat returned to a person if a charge has not been brought within a reasonable time after seizure, and it refers to Section 15(3) which gives an officer power to seize a boat in certain circumstances. Any charges under the Act may be brought summarily or indictedly. If a summary charge is not brought within six months that is the end of the matter, so that a court will take into account whether or not six months had lapsed.

There may be circumstances in which necessary information has to be got from certain sources and the hon. member must know this. There is no point in getting excited; he does not understand the implications of the matter. If I brought a copy of United Kingdom legislation and showed him, perhaps he might be satisfied; but apparently because it is coming from me he does not believe. The hon. member can rest assured that this good law and he can cite it before the Privy Council if he wants. I will not mislead him.

I am quite happy about the section and do not see any need for amending it, but I will assure the hon. member that we will write him a note showing him the genealogy of the section and the reasons we think it necessary, and if he can persuade us otherwise we will have another look at it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just want to raise one small point. I don't want to get into these legal entanglements, but I want to look at Clause 23 which says that this Act will come into operation on such day as the Governor General appoints by proclamation, and I wonder whether the Minister can give us some insight into the proposed timing of this particular piece of legislation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The time at which we proclaim this Bill may be dictated by the pace at which we get technical assistance. The request was made to the United Kingdom a year ago for assistance in preparing a new series of charts and maps for our territorial waters and we thought we could have had this done before now. But the United Kingdom Marine Arm of the Navy has received our request and I was recently assured by Mrs. Judith Hart that we would soon get assistance on our request. The Minister of Civil Aviation and Caribbean Affairs has assured me that there is one Barbadian surveyor presently in Barbados capable of helping in this field, and we are seeking his assistance. He is Mr. David Trotman, I believe. But we still need the presence of a ship of sufficient size to assist us in charting the area. As soon as the United Kingdom can assist us we will have the matter ready, hopefully before the end of the year. If the United Kingdom cannot assist us by the middle of the year I will seek help from Canada.

*The question that Part 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Schedule form part of the Bill.

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

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

*On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

## CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1978

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the express policy of our party in respect of the establishment of positions in the public service has been that so far as possible acting appointments should be discouraged, that appointments to temporary positions should be discouraged and that appointments should as far as possible be to established posts, and that this will help to reduce the political pressures which have existed in the past with appointments to the public service.
5.00 p.m.

There is no doubt that the fact that temporary posts and acting posts have to be approved by the Minister responsible for Establishments leads to the very considerable possibility of political discrimination; there is no doubt about it. History has proved that even persons of probity, of for example the hon. members for St. Michael South and St. Michael South Central have been unable at times to withstand the temptation to make political appointments to the public service where it lay within their power so to do. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central with his well known candour has admitted this, has agreed with this, has gloried in it, and has justified it. The hon. member for St. Michael South has been more careful, has been more prudent, has nonetheless advisedly followed the same policy as in the past. I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is even on record as saying if he did not give it to them he would not have got those 20 votes. The hon. member for St. Michael South has been less vocal, but no doubt in his heart he thinks that Mr. Jordan who got the catering contract when he was the highest bidder, and he minuted on the file "lowest tender does not necessarily mean best," – of course, what he meant was that it does not mean the best supporter of the Democratic Labour Party – and he thought of that and no doubt he was very glad when Mr. Jordan, perhaps personally, was able to mobilise two or three of the 12 and assist him to be in the House of Assembly at the present time.

Indeed, the 32 appointments made in the School Meals Service in the last two weeks before the election, the 32 people who had been rejected by the Selection Board but who were chosen by a higher board, paradoxically add up to the 32 votes by which the two hon. members won their seats. I do not know who has been talking to the Chief School Meals Officer, but fortunately we are in possession of a very full account indeed of what was said by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central to the Chief School Meals Officer, the first telephone message, the personal conversation, the doubts that the Chief School Meals Officer had, who helped in resolving the doubts and so on, but let that pass, Sir. It has happened and we would not like it to happen again.

Also, there is a much more serious human point that people cannot give of their best in acting appointment and temporary posts. We have had an example recently of a most malicious and unwarranted attack by somebody who should know better on the integrity of a former Harbour Master who was accused of being spiteful against the Government Party because he was in an acting position for nine years. I treat that attack with the contempt with which the behaviour of the lawyer concerned has justly merited.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is referring to the Duffus Commission. He set it up, he should be the last one at this point of time to be commenting on the evidence either of counsel or of witnesses. This can be reported in the paper and it can only prejudice or interfere with the fair trial or assessment of the facts. The Prime Minister must know better than that, it is his tribunal and he is referring to the evidence of the Duffus Commission. We are not idiots in here, and I think he should desist and know better than that. We have to have political morality in this country, and here is a Commission going on and you are ready to establish Clarke in a position where Mr. Duffus will be able to say whether he believes Clarke or not. What are you doing? Are you worried because Clarke's evidence is being destroyed? Let the Commission do its job, but you as a Prime Minister have no right to make statements like you are making here on a pending Commission which you know of and which you caused to be set up. It is not fair, it is not just, it is not decent.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not worrying with the hon. member. Is somebody on trial? Is the Duffus Commission on trial? Have I mentioned Duffus, or have I said that a person has made a malicious and unwarranted attack on a public officer accusing him of having been acting for a certain amount of time? I do not know how come Clarke's name is mentioned, Duffus' name is mentioned and Asquith Philips' name is not mentioned. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: You mentioned Clarke). I did not mention anybody by name, I said the former Harbour Master.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If we could get back to the debate, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The real point of the debate is that evidently it is thought in this country that a matter of this nature is something irksome, something difficult, that if you are in an acting appointment for a long time you can then be accused of being spiteful of the Government. It is something that has to be said. It cannot be hidden, it is there in the newspapers that somebody thinks it a reason to tell a man that he would invent a lie because he was in an action position for nine years, and this is the burden of my speech, that we must reduce acting positions. If there is something which reflects on the Duffus Commission itself it is more about the destruction of Mr. Clarke's evidence. If there is something that reflects on the Duffus Commission it is that. Nobody has denied that the boat was down behind Fergusson, if you want me now to get it in and let us hear whose evidence has been destroyed by that. A man makes an application, gives evidence..... *(Asides)*.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Can the Hon. Prime Minister come back to the main debate?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, these difficulties with the acting appointments are very considerable. Obviously nobody likes to be acting a long time. People often find themselves in acting appointments because the substantive holder of the post has been transferred to a temporary post or to some post which is not of a permanent nature, and therefore you have one man in a non-established or non-unestablished post, and you have somebody acting for him in another post. All of these things happen. We have therefore undertaken an exercise to go through the temporary posts in Government, and we are going through them – I have forgotten how many they were, I had the list in my hands a few days ago but I have not got it handy now, perhaps as many as 1,800 – but we are trying to reduce the number, certainly of the temporary posts. The adjustments which have been made will be found in the Resolution now before the House. In the Treasury there is a replacement, in the Rates and Taxes it will be observed that we are filling a temporary post.

5.10 p.m.

At the Queen Elizabeth Hospital there are a number of posts that are no longer required. For example there is the post of Gate Keeper which is no longer required because of the existence of a Security Guard Service. Therefore at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital we are abolishing all the posts of Gate Keeper and transferring the holders of the posts to other posts in the new structure.

Under Services Commissions there are also alterations by replacing the post of Administrative Assistant by a post of Personnel Officer in the same grade; and under Hotel School we are establishing a number of posts from that of Principal right down to Stenographer/Typist. This means that 14 posts will be put on the Establishment and will be no longer temporary. Also to be put on an established basis are three posts under Judiciary, and under Police the posts of five Clerical Officers and three Stenographer/Typists. There is also the establishment of a post of one Clerical Officer in the Fire Service.

Likewise, Sir, there is the establishment under Services Commissions of two posts of Stenographer/Typist and two Clerical Officers. These are some of the posts which are being established, and others will be seen from a perusal of the Addendum to the Resolution, and these include four posts under the Ministry of Caribbean Affairs.

I do not believe, Sir, that anybody will object to this; and I think that it is important for hon. members to know that I am taking every single one of these posts from under me. Some members of these posts were not supporters of our Party in the past; but I will not subject public officers to any sort of political treatment, and the Public Service Commission can deal with matters of this sort. I am not persuaded that re-organisation of the Public Service would not be better than the establishment of many of these temporary posts.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I want to say something on this Resolution. I want to say that as I understand it, members of the Public Service in this country are protected under the Constitution and by the Public Service Commission. I was the most amazed man when I read that the Barbados Labour Party for the first time in the history of Barbados was inviting Civil Servants to attend the opening of a political party conference, and also that members of the Diplomatic Corps were invited. I would think that diplomats are accredited to Barbados and not to the Barbados Labour Party. I was most amazed that the Minister of External Affairs would be a party to something like that. The Democratic Labour Party never did that. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am speaking about foreign diplomats and Civil Servants, who are supposed to be impartial. If you are invited and do not turn up, the governing party can say that it was an insult. If he turns up, others can say that he is partial to the Governing party and so you are putting him in an invidious position. That is how I feel. *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

*Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS rose.*

*Mr. JOHNSON rose.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Both hon. members will please take their seats.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Let me continue. I was saying that you are putting foreign representatives in an awkward position; and I say that that is wrong. I will say that if I stand alone. As regards the Civil Servants who are supposed to be impartial and who were invited to hear the Prime Minister's speech, I would assume that there are several ways in which the Government or the Prime Minister could let senior Civil Servants know what the Government's policy is. I do not know if they had a book to tick off the names of those who were present and those who were absent, or if there was any other way to note their presence or absence. I am saying that it was placing Civil Servants in a position in which they should not have been placed. I feel very deeply that this should never have happened. I do not know what other Governments would think. We have heard so much about Communism and the taking off of programmes that people wanted to see so that the opening of the Barbados Labour Party conference..... *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I want to repeat that Civil Servants and Foreign Diplomats should not have been invited to the opening of that conference. It is a bad precedent, and it pains me to see that something like this should happen.

5.20 p.m.

It is your business. Your are the Government. You can make them come and make them answer, "No, Sir. Yes, Sir." That is your business.

Let us go back to the Service Commission. I heard on this same T.V. thing, in dealing with the Civil Service, where you sent messages to the civil servants. You could have printed any number of your speeches and handed them around the Department on Monday morning. You have also sent around your Promotion Bulletin. I want to know what the bill for paper is going to be in this Government. I will only look at it and tear it up. You get the *Advocate* in the morning coming into my office at three o'clock. If you want to stop it, you can do so. The impression given to the public is that the Democratic Labour Party used to appoint civil servants in the lower echelons of the Civil Service. Who was the Chairman of the Public Service during the D.L.P.'s time? The man that you have elevated to the Knighthood, President of this, Privy Council, Degree Honours, and so on, who, for the greater part, was the Chairman of the Public Service Commission under the D.L.P. The moment you won the election all honours flowed like the River Ganges. You will get up and tell the public that Neville Nicholls, who you appointed as Chairman, should look into members salaries and condition, Fred Cozier, Mrs. Odle, that they were the tools of the Democratic Labour Party when they formed the Public Service Commission. You want to give the public the impression that we used to dispense favours like anything.

Let me tell the Prime Minister something, if he does not know, or if he lives in Mars. School Meals jobs are still being given on the same basis as I gave them. We were the ones who established the School Meals Scheme when the Barbados Labour Party said that it could not be done.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Would the hon. member, for the benefit of the House, explain on what basis he gave them?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On the same basis that you are giving them to your party hacks now. That is the basis. They will come to you when they want a job. I can call some names, too. Do not play that you are whiter than snow. The people are getting jobs at the Transport Board on the same basis.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central says that the jobs at the School Meals Department are given on the same basis as when he and the hon. member for St. Michael South, the former Minister of Education, dealt with the matter. I am saying that I do not have in my power the right to give anybody any job in the School Meals Department.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If you are not giving the jobs on the same basis just as we gave them to our Party people, you are giving them to your Party people whether you appoint them, O'Brien Trotman appoints them, or the Prime Minister appoints them. I can tell you that. I say so. It happens at the Transport Board. *(Asides.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Will the Leader of the Opposition refer to members of the Other Place by their proper names.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I have not called any names yet. It is being done at the Transport Board and the Labour Party people are getting the jobs. With regard to the first Vice-Chairman, the member for St. Michael West, he says when it comes to executive staff he is not interfering, but when it comes to the man down below they will be all D.L.P's. What are you going to pretend now?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I am very happy to hear these revelations this evening, because the supporters of the Barbados Labour Party are crying out and saying that we are giving the jobs to the Dems. I am glad to hear that we are giving out jobs. I wish I had some jobs to give away. *(Asides.)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You mean Mr. Williams and not me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Will the hon. member for St. James please take his seat! Will the Leader of the Opposition return to the main debate!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am talking about jobs because the Prime Minister wants to give the public the impression that they are lily white or whiter than snow. In this country today jobs, positions on Statutory Boards and the firing of people all depend on whether you belong to the Barbados Labour Party, and we are reaching a stage in this country where.....

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: This could lead to every election people being kicked out of work and put back into work. I can tell you what I know. The jobs in the Government, in Government Boards, and in independent Corporations are being given on party affiliation. I will kiss a stack of bibles on that and I have proof of it.

Mr. Speaker, as I say.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Am I understanding the hon. member to say now that during the 15 years of D.L.P. rule B.L.P. supporters were put out of jobs and the jobs were given to people on the basis of affiliation to the Democratic Labour Party? Will he clarify that?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying that jobs are being given now on the basis of the Barbados Labour Party affiliation. If you want to ask me any questions, you can make your statement. *(Asides.)* Now let us deal with the Schedule. Let me tell you one or two things. With regard to the Public Service Commission, we have always had commissions of independent people. If I had the right to appoint the Chairman of this Commission, the last Chairman in the D.L.P. could not sit on it. It is a vital Commission, and the hon. member for Christ Church East would understand that his presence there – I do not want to call names – who benefited by his appointment? Open your mouth and tell the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The member for Christ Church East benefited by the last Chairman being on the Commission, and he got a lot of help in Christ Church East up there at that school. Anyhow, be that as it may.....

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I just want to put the record straight. I have never had any discussion with any member of any Public Service Commission in Barbados since it was established in early 1950 in respect of any.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the Leader of the Opposition say that you had any discussion with anybody.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying that he got help, and it is not because of his initiative that he is here. That is why the hon. member is in the House today with even less votes than I got in 1976.

Sir, I am going to deal with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Government's policy. The Government's policy is to send home people at 60. I defy the Minister of Agriculture to tell me that he does not have people in executive jobs in the A.D.C. Office who are over 60. Check it out and you will see, and I will call names, too. You have to be fair. You are talking about political morality. The Ministry of Agriculture has in one of its agencies people who are over 60, and yet it is sending home the man in the street who was working for sixty or seventy dollars. Other Ministries also have officers working who are over the age of 60, but the man down below has to go home as soon as he reaches 60. Is that fair? If you want to be fair, you must be fair.

With regard to the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, this is an expanding organisation and it is doing good work. With the establishment of posts there one cannot quarrel. One is happy to see that the Government, at last, is trying to put the Hotel School as well as the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic on a permanent and proper fitting.

5.30 p.m.

As regards the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, people are still waiting from 8 o'clock in the morning until 2 o'clock next morning to get attention. I recently met a woman who went there at 8 o'clock one morning and got home at 2 o'clock the following morning. It is time we take a serious look at that institution from the point of view of the people using its services. Acting appointments in any service are inevitable, and the Prime Minister need not pretend that he is going to have no acting people. Whether he does it or Mr. O'Brien Trotman, people from the Barbados Labour Party opposed the appointment of certain people to certain posts, because wherever it is

possible to appoint people to the public service politicians are constantly intervening, and your Government is not different from any other. And I think the Prime Minister was very wise when he said that his Party is under pressure to give jobs to people who support them, but this is only a remark to fool the people that he is not doing it; everybody knows he is doing it; I know it is being done.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I object to the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has withdrawn his remarks.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But there are a lot of unemployed people still outside looking for the jobs you talked about. And they see other people getting jobs, and I defy you to say that the Barbados Labour Party is not giving jobs to its supporters.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister is making his reply on this matter I would like a few points clarified regarding the Barbados Hotel School. Some time ago I was appointed as one of the advisers to the Minister of Education in connection with the hotel school. When I got there I found that the people who were there as advisers to the Minister were very concerned about the type of tuition at the school, about the low level, but for one reason or another they seemed afraid to speak out on the matter. Appointments were found to be on a political basis without any particular reference to ability or qualification. As a result I had a lengthy discussion with the Minister of Tourism and he made enquiries only to find out that the hotel industry had decided that there was no point in employing people who came out of this school. As a result the Minister made enquiries from the hotel school in the Bahamas and they sent an official to make an investigation into the hotel school here.

No report has been published up to now, but what I am getting at is I do not know whether people occupying these teaching posts at the hotel school are going to become permanent. This would be a tragedy because these persons now teaching should themselves be attending school because they are incompetent. They are not capable of teaching anybody anything in connection with the tourist industry. That is why I want the Prime Minister to clarify whether the people presently in these jobs will be made permanent.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in Barbados you can find excellent cooks, excellent pastry makers, etc., but to find a person who can do this and be a good instructor at the same time is difficult. In other words, you can find a person to do a good job but not with the ability to teach others. We have got Barbadians who make good chefs, cooks, etc., but the ability to transmit their knowledge is lacking. As a result we have had to get teachers from outside. We cannot keep these outside people in these positions for ever because they are only employed on a short term basis. The Canadian Government gives some assistance in paying these instructors, and I understand there are other organizations also willing to help in this. But I do not see how the persons presently in these posts can be made permanent; maybe the post is permanent but the person may be temporary. The point is that I would like the Prime Minister to clarify this situation, because the Advisory Committee has been trying to do a good job and there have been a number of people who have given valuable service to the Advisory Committee, among them Miss Maxwell of Atlantis Hotel, Mr. Millar of the Education Department and others whose names I do not now remember. These people have put a lot of work into the Advisory Committee and they themselves are not satisfied with the teachers at the school. So I just throw these points out at this time so that the Prime Minister can clarify the situation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that my colleague made reference to Miss Maxwell and others who have assisted with the hotel school, for this bears out what the Leader of the Opposition is saying is untrue. I myself came into conflict with one of these people in the election and this will show that there is no vitimization with this Party; and I want to make that quite clear; we are not victimizing anybody.

As regard the statement by the Leader of the Opposition about the Prime Minister inviting members of the Diplomatic Corps and Heads of Civil Service to attend the recent Barbados Labour Party conference, this was just another indication of the fact that we stand for open Government. The Prime Minister did not only invite Civil servants, he also invited the trade unions, the mercantile community and other organizations. Between 1966 and 1976 the Barbados Labour Party brought down Mr. Oliver Jackman and Mr. Williams who were civil servants in diplomatic posts overseas; so I do not understand this onesided argument by the Leader of the Opposition. Rather than any suggestion of politicizing the civil service, the Prime Minister is making it quite clear that he does not agree with having these lengthy appointments which only frustrate the aspirations of people since they do not give of their best in the circumstances.

5.40 p.m.

There is a gentleman, Mr. Reggie Haynes, who has been acting as a Football Coach in Barbados from 1961. For some 15 years that man has been acting in a post. Mr. Pedro Welch at the Labour Department, who was at one time Labour Commissioner, when we were in the

Opposition we fought tooth and nail against the policy of having people acting for such long periods, and the Prime Minister is trying now to rectify this situation.

I also heard the Leader of the Opposition in his "lick out hands" style, as he calls it, say that we are putting people into the School Meals. Mr. Speaker, I do not know, but I am very glad to hear this because I have been asking and it would be expected of me, because if you come to my place on Saturday mornings and see people there, an average of 60 people there every Saturday, supporters, they say, of the Barbados Labour Party, asking me if I can find employment for them because I am the Minister of Labour. Because I am the Minister of Labour I have the jobs, they feel, and they even come from your constituency also, Sir, and from the members' over there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, do help those from St. Peter first.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Whether they are Labour Party supporters or otherwise, Sir, but, Mr. Speaker, you can rest assured that whatever I can do to assist the people of St. Peter I am going to do; so much so that I am giving you a day nursery in Indian Ground shortly. I do not understand this one-sided argument which they are putting up, Sir, that we are making sure that our supporters get jobs as against those of the Democratic Labour Party. I know of an economist working in the Ministry of Finance, the son of a lady called Miss Jackman, who shook the keys in the Leader of the House and Deputy Prime Minister's face, who once ran a canteen at Seawell Airport. Her son is working in the Prime Minister's Office as an economist. I am quite sure that no one can complain that the Prime Minister has in any way tried to impede his progress. We are looking for the best for the Service and for the entire country. I am now told that he was appointed since the Prime Minister was in office.

They talk about tenders, but we gave out tenders to these people at the airport. There is a Mr. Tony Miller and Mr. Vere Miller who have a contract at the airport, there is a Mr. Marshall who, I am told, canvassed against my colleague here, the Acting Minister of Caribbean Affairs, and he has contracts at Queen's College, Community College and Seawell Airport, as against supporters of this party that I know had put in tenders, but we said no, because the Tenders Committee recommended and we accepted. That is how we operate.

Then they talked about inviting people. They went further, Sir, they invited Heads of State to speak on their public platforms. Do they remember that Prime Minister Forbes Burnham, the Head of a State, came to Barbados and spoke in Independence Square on the then Government's platform against this party, and Sir John Carter, and Chief Jonathan almost got into the act? All of these, and nobody heard about immorality of the Civil Service, Sir. They would not be honest enough to get up and say that there are some Permanent Secretaries who openly canvassed against this party who today have been promoted, maybe against the wishes of a number of other civil servants, but the Prime Minister in his wisdom is looking for the best for the country. (You can smile, because you know how well he worked for you), but the Prime Minister sees it in this light, the man is an able man, he has his contribution to make to the country and why should he be victimised, as against what you have done in the past, so I do not understand this twisting, this up and down argument which the Leader, or whatever he is, of the Opposition – I am not quite sure exactly what position he has, today he is leader, tomorrow he is not, and all he is concerned with now is Smith & Smith – and I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition, an experienced parliamentarian, would be able to put up an argument, be able to debate matters of this nature in a more responsible manner.

How can they talk about victimisation and you have supporters of the Barbados Labour Party breathing down your necks telling you they are laughing at us? I hear this every day, that who were against us are getting the jobs. I do not know if the Prime Minister has the time to sit down with Senator O'Brien Trotman picking jobs. I am quite sure if the Leader of the Opposition and the former Minister of Education and Health are honest enough, and I believe they are honest enough, to know that to be plagued with the problems of the country as they left it he would not have time to sit down and determine who is to get a job or who is not to get one. The Prime Minister does not have to worry, seventeen or eighteen hundred votes on "Happy" Bryan are a lot of runs in any country, they cannot get knocked off in a hurry, so we do not have any prized jobs for anybody. We will make sure that Richie Haynes does not get in with your assistance, but I just wanted to make these few remarks to air my views, since I was told in here that I put people at the stadium to work. I do not know what work there is to do at the stadium, the stadium employs four or five people that I found there, and they are still working there, I am told, under the supervision of Mr. Williams.

I have not yet produced the projects, I am trying to get them off the ground where I would be able to find people to work in them, but I do not have the jobs like the Minister of Health, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Communications and Works, they are the ones with the jobs, not me, so do not bring me into something that I am not responsible for. In the meantime, I will warn you that if there were jobs I would surely look into the

north, even for the member for St. Michael South who is one of my constituents, and he can rest assured that I was one of his principal supporters for Principal of the Community College, but unfortunately he did not get through.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make a very long speech about the accusation made by the Leader of the Opposition, because I am accustomed to him making these unfounded statements and then getting up and running out of the Chamber; the actions of a coward. But further than that, I think he is like a horse that is dying, he kicks at everything in his way, he does not worry because he knows he is going to die, and that is his attitude. He makes these slanderous statements about people, and he has already had to pay for his mouth. I am sure he told me out there in the lunch room that any time he is slandering anybody again it will be in here, and when he walks through the door he is not even going to wait to hear the results because he is not going to pay away his pension, so I think it is about time the public understands that when the Leader of the Opposition speaks, as I said earlier today, forget him, he is talking stupidness and nonsense.

He speaks about the Ministry of Agriculture sending home people who are over 60, and there are people still over 60 being retained. If he were a responsible Leader of an Opposition he would understand that in the Corporations which belong to Government we need people with certain technical and specialised skills. We have had two posts established in this Civil Establishment Order, one at the Price Control Division. A Mr. Emtage has been acting as Senior Price Control Inspector from the day I came back to Barbados in 1964, and he has gone home and the post is still an acting post. I have tried from the time I went into the Ministry, particularly where people are reaching the age where they should go home on retirement, to get the posts established or updated, because I believe that their pensions should be gauged on the highest salary and not on any low salary.
5.50 p.m.

Unfortunately, Mr. Emtage has had to go home, and there are two posts being established of which one is an entomological post. People who have gone home from the Ministry are people who are over 60. Anyone working over 60 is probably someone with a specialist skill. If you clean out everybody, then you will hear that the Ministry is doing nothing. That will not happen as far as I am concerned.

They talk about victimisation. Let them look at the Barbados Marketing Corporation. They had one member working in a responsible position who wore shirts canvassing for Walcott. Another one went on a platform and canvassed for Brandford Taitt. I have a book in my office which I only keep for people who want jobs. I say that my people must get jobs too. The member wants to give people the impression that only Barbados Labour Party supporters get jobs.

Take the man who was chief officer in the Land Tax Division. I remember that in St. John when the candidate was told the true position he said, "I do not set the taxes. Ask Mr. Franklyn". Later you heard "Do not blame Mr. Franklyn, Blame me". I would not want to go down the list, although I could do so. People know about George Moe and Waldo Ramsey when he was a diplomat somewhere in the U.S.A. Let us look at Carmeta Fraser. There are a lot of rumours about removing a car. When the time comes I will make available a letter starting from early 1976, and people will be able to see whether it is political victimisation or not. Carmeta Fraser is still at the Agricultural Development Corporation. When they make statements they must understand that we.. *(Asides)*.

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Edward Cumberbatch was an executive member of the Democratic Labour Party. When he left he said that the D.L.P. had no agricultural policy and he decided to leave. I would like to see rules printed that where people like the Leader of the Opposition make these statements they should be made to sit down. He advertises himself as Smith, the lawyer; but he does not care what he says politically. He says that when he goes on T.V. the nation sees him not merely as wearing a jacket but wig. If that is the way that he gets cheap advertisement he must not mislead the people of this country.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be long, but there are a few points that I want to make. I cannot totally agree with my colleague, the hon. member for Christ Church North Central. I am quite aware of the type of product that is being put out by the Hotel School, but I am also aware that there are some conscientious tutors there. If there are any defects in the system, if there is any inefficiency and if the instruction given is not as good as it should be, we may very well think and believe that this is the result of the number of acting appointments. I feel that people who have been in acting posts for a considerable time have got a tendency to become disillusioned and they do not work at their best. You may very well take this as a reason why the instruction given is not very often as good as it should be. I cannot accept the sweeping statements that have been made; and I hope that with the establishment of these posts we can get better work at the Hotel School.

Now, another point which I will like to raise is the question of a Deputy Principal for the Community College. The Community College like the Hotel School is a very important institution; and the Act which set up the Community College does not provide for a Deputy Principal. I am sure that this hon. Chamber will agree with me that if the Hotel School has got provision for a Deputy Principal, that this should be the case with the Community College; and I am inviting the Minister – I am sure that he is aware of this – and I do hope that in the very near future we will have a policy so that we can have a Deputy Principal who will take some of the administrative work load off the Principal of that institution.

On the question of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, I must pay tribute to the tutors who have been producing excellent results over the past years. I must say at this point that there was one particular tutor who has got 90 per cent passes over the four years that he has been employed at the Polytechnic; but when it was known that he was a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party he had a rough time in getting appointed. It was only after this Government came into power that he was considered because some members of this side had to speak out and let certain people know that you cannot play politics with a man's position and appointment.
6 p.m.

We can see that sometimes people whose political leanings are well known are being kept down, and this is exactly what this Party or this Government sets out to rectify. This is a situation which does not augur well for the entire community. Members on this side know too well that it is to the detriment of this country when we go along thinking in terms of appointment on a purely political basis. *(Asides.)* As far as I am concerned, when people come to me asking me for assistance I am not bothered whether they are B.D or C., I do my job for them because I was elected. I am certain that my colleagues on this side, despite what you may hear, Mr. Speaker, members on this side express, they are concerned with the success or the approval given to members of the other Party. I am sure that when people come to them they do not think of political alliances and that they discharge their functions in a very fearless manner, and this is exactly what the general public as a whole has to understand.

I am not going to be satisfied with any member in the Opposition getting in here and accusing us of political patronage. I am not satisfied with that sort of criticism. It is cheap, and it is not based on any foundation at all. They ought to be ashamed of themselves, because members on that side have on several occasions complained to me personally and asked me to get a house or to get a job for members of their Party, and I have done that because I do not feel that I should let politics be the guide-line for my assisting the people of their country.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of this Measure before this Chamber, I hope that the people in this country will see that we are not a Party for victimisation. We feel that people should give the optimum in their work. We feel that the time has come for them to be given that assurance, and that assurance should be in the direction of having them permanently appointed, rather than having temporary appointments and acting appointments. We hope that this will go a long way in helping them to perform better for the good of this country.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, my contribution was not intended to be long, but one final point I must make. From the time I was in the Ministry of Caribbean Affairs from September, 1976, there has been an Acting Receptionist, and Receptionists have been going and coming. I feel that, in a Ministry which handles such a volume of work and in such an important Ministry, we should have a full-time Receptionist. The Minister has one Secretary, and I feel that more staff is necessary in that particular Ministry if we are to get the very best out of it. It is at the moment operating with a few staff, and we hope that this particular Measure will give us the additional staff which would help us to do a better job than we have done in the past.

I must give my wholehearted support to this particular Measure, and I hope that some of the malicious accusations made against the present Government will be exposed. I hope that people will understand that this particular Measure is an attempt to silence those people who have been unfairly and unjustifiably accusing this Government.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, there are a few observations that I would like to make in relation to the Ministry of Education. I am not going to take much of what the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has said very seriously with regard to the School Meals Programme, because enough has been said about it in this Session already. I am sure that the hon. member for St. Michael South will not get up in here and support the hon. member for St. Michael South Central with regard to the policy of staffing in the Ministry of Education.

Now when he was talking, I was working out the number of people who are related to members of the Opposition who work in the Ministry of Education. I am also thinking of the ones who came to work in the

Ministry of Education who have relatives on this side. I cannot think of any from the Government side, but I can certainly think of about four or five who are relatives of members of the Opposition. I am sure that the hon. member for St. Michael South would not get in here and have anything to do with the type of histrionics that we have seen displayed here by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

There are two things that are confusing we with regard to this debate. The hon. member for Christ Church North Central got up and posed certain questions to the Prime Minister in respect of the Ministry of Education. I also heard the Leader of the Opposition make certain remarks about the Ministry of Education and, obviously, he was directing them to the Prime Minister. Now I see the hon. member for St. Michael South East speaking up for the Ministry of Education. I am a little bit puzzled, because I am wondering if the Minister of Education is no longer responsible for this Ministry. I will handle the two points raised: one in respect of the Hotel School. and the other in respect of the Community College. *(Asides.)*

I have inherited at the Hotel School a great state of chaos, and I am asking the members on the other side to get up and deny that, because the records are replete in their own writing that the state of the Hotel School was in disarray. The reason for this was rather indiscreet hiring practices. I do not want to do like so many other members today and start calling people's names, because I do not think it is fair to get in here and use our position to knock people about when they do not have a platform on which to reply. I am nor going to call the names of these people, but it is common knowledge in the Ministry of Education under this Government and under the previous Government that all was not well in the State of Denmark with the Hotel School. Everybody has been acting for a long time; there is no permanence; there are no Established Divisions, but by a strange form of gymnastics people landed in positions that the people in the Ministry only understood after the people had been landed in the positions during the former regime.

6.10 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Michael South knows what I am talking about and we were unhappy about it; so I managed to get people from the Bahamas Hotel School – the director and two others – to come to Barbados and do a study of the hotel school and make firm recommendations for the improvement of the school, and I have received within the last two weeks a copy of the report. I have been getting the type of assistance from the Hotel School Advisory Board that I would have expected, and it grieves me to hear members of the Board making criticisms that were not made to me as the Minister.

Mr. WARD: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker. I would like the hon. Minister to know I have the fullest respect for him in every way, but the Prime Minister had introduced the Bill and I therefore asked him to explain certain matters which he had mentioned. I did not intend to pass over the Minister of Education for whom I have the highest respect.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, if I may proceed. I have recently received the report done by the people from the Bahamas Hotel School, one of the best known in this hemisphere, and I have communicated with the Minister of Tourism and have passed on a copy of the report to him. I have been in consultation with him on the report and in the next few weeks I will be making firm recommendations to the Cabinet on how the school can be restructured.

With regard to the Community College, I agree with the member for St. Michael East that a school with an enrollment of 1,500 students or more, operating day and evening classes, should have a Deputy Principal. It is not fair to expect a principal to carry the weight of a day time and evening institution without a deputy. I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South is in total agreement with me on this. I believe he made that recommendation when he was Minister of Education and the former Prime Minister threatened to fire him. But I am making the recommendation to this present Prime Minister that there should be a deputy principal to the college and he can fire me if he likes. I also believe that the Community College requires a lot more than just a deputy principal. The college was conceived in haste, and apparently brought to some form of maturity in an incubator. There was no clear role defined for the College; it did not seem to know where it was going. It was not staffed by the right people, and when one hears about political considerations if there was one institution that was headed by a man picked purely for political considerations it was the case of the principal when that college was opened in 1969. I must say that I inherited a lot of problems with the Community College and I am trying to straighten them out. And in this regard I must say again I do not want to be unnecessarily flaying the hon. member for St. Michael South, but far from giving jobs to supporters of the Barbados Labour Party I was quite prepared to give him the job of principal of the Community College; all that was required was for him to do the right thing; it did not matter to me whether he was a supporter of this side or not. And if he is still interested let him put in his claim, but he must do the right thing. Further, in making the administration of the college better suited to the numbers of students, I am asking the Minister for Establishments, the Prime Minister, to separate the post

of Registrar/Bursar. It is obvious that the volume of work required – administration, accounts, records, certification, is too much for one person and I am asking to separate the positions and give the college a registrar and a bursar. This is the type of planning that is being initiated for the better operation of the Community College, because I am convinced that even though the college was conceived in haste and perhaps started for the wrong reasons, it can play a very important and vital role in the education of this community.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to speak in this debate because it seems to me that we have forgotten this is a Resolution entitled Civil Establishments (General) (Amendment) Order, 1978 and that it is nothing more or less than what it says.

I am not getting into the arguments about the conception, development or anything like that concerning the Barbados Community College or any other institution for that matter. The point is that it is an educational institution and the task of the present Government is to make the existing institution better and stop talking about inheritance and all that. I seem to recall that recently there was some talk and suggestion to the Prime Minister to take over the Ministry of Agriculture because there was only talk and more talk, jawboning and more jawboning going on all the time. It is rather time to see action in this particular regard, so I am not getting into that kind of argument. I am surprised to hear there was so much support for my application for the post of Principal of the Community College, for I have never had a reply to the application, so I didn't know there was so much support and I don't know what the hon. member for St. George South means about doing the right thing.
6.20 p.m.

But, nevertheless, whatever is the right thing I do not know. Is it "one from seven, or one from seven six to go, or six down," or something like that? I do not know what that is. Obviously the Government would like a bye-election in the constituency of St. Michael South, but I would warn them, the people of St. Michael South stood very firm wherever one was falling all around. A lot of others failed, but St. Michael South stood firm, and when there was this big swing against the Government, almost as big as that against the member for St. Thomas in the last election but one – I believe he won by a mere 74 votes – ...

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. There has never been a swing against me of more than 0.2%, which was a swing against me in 1971 which was a swing against everybody else, nearly as big as the one against the hon. member for St. Michael South who actually suffered a larger average swing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not quite a point of order. Let us carry on with the debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I have had cause to speak about the mathematical wizadry of the member for St. Thomas, and I treat that with the same certainty as we treated his statement to this House at the time that the debate had expired, but Mr. Speaker, he has not yet denied that he won by 74 votes, or some 70 votes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us now begin to do the right thing.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Right, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be difficult. I also wish to come back to this particular Resolution and I think the first point to be made, I said it was a Resolution relating to the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1978, and from all the hullabaloo and all the noises that have been made one would have thought that this was some new step taken by the Government, the Barbados Labour Party Government, in order to do something that it would be unusual to do or that has never been done before. This is simply one measure in a long series of measures which this particular Hon. Chamber has to deal with from time to time. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I would not like anyone to believe that there is something new being done here. It has been customary, a large number of them are introduced in each Session of Parliament, for Civl Establishment (General) (Amendment) Orders to come to this Hon. Chamber in order to establish posts which for one reason or another were temporary before.

When you hear me talk about histrionics, I do not get into histrionics, and I do not have to get into histrionics to make a point, but I think sometimes we have to bring some balance into these matters. It has been customary, the past Government did it on a number of occasions, I believe the present Government has done it before now, I do not believe this is the first Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order that has come in this present Session, but this is customary as you know, Mr. Speaker. When posts have been temporary for some time and the need has been established for those posts to be made permanent, then a Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order is brought, and this is nothing more and nothing less than has been done on numerous occasions by the previous Government, and that trend is now continuing, so to make this out into some big thing that the present Minister responsible for Establishments would not have these things and so on, as though this is some new departure, is, to say the least, beating the chest a little too much on this particular matter.

I want to specifically make the second point now. As far as the Hotel School is concerned, I think the

Minister can battle with whatever problems he has in that particular sphere. If he finds problems, I am certain he is capable of dealing with those problems and finding the solutions to the problems. The point is that when the Hotel School was set up, and when in fact we took the steps to upgrade the Hotel School by moving it out of the Richmond compound and giving it more spacious quarters, and hopefully better facilities, there was still a doubt as to what the final structure of the Hotel School should be, whether it should be an institution on its own or whether it should be part of a larger institution. I think if the Minister searches his files he will find reports there on these matters. There were Canadian experts who made reports on this matter, stated these things, but I do not wish to go into that.

If there are posts which are temporary it may be because the whole structure, final decisions had not been arrived at as far as the structure is concerned, and if the Minister has made up his mind now about the school and he has had these reports, then a decision can be taken to make the posts permanent, but I do not want to get into that area, I believe the Government is now in power to govern and that is exactly what it must do. It must take the decisions and stop talking about an inheritance. Whatever actions I took as Minister of Education I believe I took in the interest of this country and the development of education in this country.

As far as appointments are concerned, there was a particular procedure for making appointments, and I defy any of them to say that when I was Minister of Education that that particular procedure was not followed. There was supposed to be a Committee to scrutinise and to establish that the persons to be appointed at least satisfied that Committee that they could be placed. There might have been differences about priorities, who should go at number one or who should go at number two, but that is what a political head is there for. I have no qualms about those appointments at all, and I am certain that the Government is not saying that persons who have political persuasions of that party are not getting jobs in the School Meals Service. I do not think they will claim that, because I do not think anybody in this country would believe that, and I make no bones about it. People of either persuasion, I do not know about the persuasions which the member for St. Thomas claimed recently, but certainly those who support the Barbados Labour Party and those who support the Democratic Labour Party are to be found within the ranks of the School Meals Service. I am not getting into that type of partisan talk, you can make your noises, but the point is, "by their fruits you shall know them," and if you are appointing on an impartial basis, not looking at political persuasion, this will be obviously in terms of those who get appointments.

I wish, however, to make a major point. The appointments which are listed here as the temporary appointments which are now to be made permanent, I think it must be observed that these are posts to which I believe in most cases appointments would have been made by the Public Service Commission. I believe that most of these posts here would have been made by the Public Service Commission and not by any Minister.

6.30 p.m.

I believe that persons who have been acting in these posts for long periods of time would not have had these acting appointments made by any Minister, but by the Public Service Commission. *(Aside:* Which posts?) I am talking about the posts from the Hotel School back down, and then Judiciary, Police Department, Fire Service, Services Commission. If I am wrong on this I can be corrected by the ....

Mr. SPEAKER: You are only wrong when you repeat yourself so often.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If you rule that way, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Only in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, sir. The point I was making is that when there were constitutional amendments and a proper draft for appointments came into being, that some of these posts may have been appointed after that; but a large number of the persons were in the posts before the Constitutional amendments were made. I want to make a distinction, and it is a distinction which should be as far as the impartiality of the Public Servants is concerned and as far as the performance of the Public Servants is concerned.

There is absolutely nothing wrong with a member of the Public Service as an individual, in the pursuit of his own personal conviction, and the political rights and freedoms as enunciated in the Constitution of this country belonging to any political party or attending a political meeting or attending the Annual Conference of a political party. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that because a public officer is an individual citizen like any other citizen of the country who has his likes and dislikes and his persuasions. I do not condemn any particular public officer for attending a political meeting, conference, convention or whatever in his personal capacity because that is a right guaranteed under the Constitution.

I, however, believe that we are opening a very dangerous door if we command – I do not know – if public officers are commanded – I do not know, but that is the impression I got from the debate – if public officers are commanded to attend or required to attend. I am not saying that.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am obliged that the hon. member has revealed the fact about his impression. It is absolutely and totally wrong to say that any public officer was commanded to go anywhere. It is absolutely wrong. To my knowledge the officers and members of the Barbados Labour Party invited a number of people to one of the open sessions of their conference. The public was invited to come. We would have welcomed the hon. member; but I know it would have been embarrassing to his party. The public was invited to come and we are entitled to ask whom we want. They can come or not come. They are not doing us a favour, nor are they doing us a mischief by not coming.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am glad for the information. If that is the position, I personally see nothing wrong with it; but the impression seems to have been created in the minds of the public that public officers... (Aside: By the lying Leader of the Opposition?)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order from the Government benches. We see now that even amongst members of Parliament it is not each and everyone who understands the meaning of the word "commanded"

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am certain that you understand. I want to raise the question of the Ministry of Agriculture. I notice now that the Minister is in his seat. Now there is one Agricultural Officer and one Senior Clerk whose posts are to be established. I am not certain what will be the function of this particular Agricultural Officer – if he will be an officer at the stations giving advice to the farmers. *(Aside*: You were fast asleep).

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether this Agriculture Officer would be concerned with the collection of statistics or giving advice to farmers about what to plant; and maybe the Minister can tell us what exactly is the position with regard to the planting of okras in this country, and whether there was any ploughing back of okras, and whether advice was given by any institution under his control or by his Agricultural Officers with respect to the planting of okras and whether these okras have been shipped out, or whether farmers have suffered some losses on this particular okra project. The Agricultural Officer may be concerned with this question of okras.

I would also like to know, while on that particular matter, whether the Agricultural Society which is also interested in the collection of statistics – maybe the Minister could tell us whether they have received their sub-vention yet for this year, or for the previous year, for that matter, and thereby allowed to continue in their work of servicing the agricultural sector and the farmers in certain regards.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to raise many other matters; but I see here under the Queen Elizabeth Hospital the question of Orderlies. I have reason to believe that recently there was some distress – or may I say concern – among the Orderlies at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital concerning their duties and other related matters; and I wonder if this is to the knowledge of the Minister and if she can say anything where some distress or concern among the Orderlies is concerned.

I notice, sir, that it is also proposed to change the name of the supervisory post in the Service. Talking about the names of institutions and so on, I heard recently about a ministerial command – I hope that is the right use of that word – a ministerial command that the name of the Mental Hospital would be changed to the Barbados Psychiatric Hospital. I do not know if you can change names by fiat or whether it is not necessary to have changes in the laws which refer to the Mental Hospital because none of those laws refer to the Barbados Psychiatric Hospital.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, after listening to all the speeches, I think that I should make some comments especially because my name was called, either directly or indirectly.
6.40 p.m.

Sir, I believe that the central concern of all the previous speeches centres around the fundamental urgency for the re-organisation of the Civil Service in Barbados. I do not believe that bringing down amendments and changing an Orderly's name to Senior Orderly, or appointing an acting man, is going to solve the problems that exist within this large and unwieldy body. I believe, Sir, that part of the legacy of Government has been a tradition of goals improperly met and Barbados, in this respect, is not different from other countries where this problem exists.

In New York, Sir, for example, the Major had recently to lay off large sections of his established staff because, in spite of the millions of dollars being expended in the Service, the goals of the Government were not being met. I believe that Barbados needs a very cafeful study of its Civil Service. It needs a reorganisation being done to it so that the jobs we have to do within the Service can be done and the results can flow through the system more efficiently than is currently the case.

As I listened to the speech made by the hon. member for St. George South, the Hon. Minister of Education, it became very clear to me that the problem existing between him and the hon. member for Christ Church North Central arises out of the fact that, perhaps, the Hotel School does not belong in the Ministry of Education at all, because almost all of what the Hotel School does has to do with the Ministry of Tourism. It seems to me that you would get more efficient use of that School if it were controlled by the present Minister of Tourism, Caribbean Affairs, etc. *(Asides.)*

The hon. member for St. Michael South is grimacing and saying he does not agree with me, but I believe I am free to say what I think should be done. Looking at it, as it is currently done, I see that there is a bit of – not conflict, Sir, but the smooth type of congruence that should exist between the two Ministries is not existing. *(Asides.)* I have just been informed by the hon. member for Christ Church North Central that this model exists in some other countries where the Hotel School is being administered by the Ministry of Tourism. I think in Barbados we need to take a look at it, because the hotel industry knows what it wants in its employees who work in the industry. I believe it is an unnecessary burden for them to try to communicate those needs to a Ministry of Education for interpretation instructional courses that are followed in the Hotel School. If they had it to do they would be able to go straight to the implementation stage. They would be able to hire the kind of staff because they know precisely what kind of staff they require; they would know what kind of curriculum to devise, and so on and so forth. In that case, I do not believe that the kind of complaints that you now get from the hotel people that the people who are now being trained in the Hotel School are not efficient in the execution of their jobs in the hotel industry would no longer be heard.

I would like to feel, Sir, that addressing the problem of acting in the Civil Service by establishing an acting fellow, or abolishing the acting position, is not really the answer to the problem of upward mobility in the Service. I feel that every man who enters the Civil Service has in the back of his mind that, sooner or later, he will become a Permanent Secretary, a Senior Assistant Secretary, or something of that sort, if he is an ambitious man. I do not believe that anybody goes into the Service hoping to remain a Junior Clerk for the rest of his days. The avenues for upward mobility as is currently established in the Service seems to be, in large measure, through longevity in the Service. I wonder, Sir, if the method of selecting Permanent Secretaries has been reviewed since Job was a boy. I do not believe anybody has taken a serious look at how senior civil servants reach the top. I think the time is now when we should start paying attention to the administrators who are responsible for carrying out the policies of the Government. It is all right for us to sit down and pass legislation here. The problem is not in the passing of the legislation. It is in the implementation of the legislation. Senior civil servants, I feel, ought to be trained in management – every last one of them. I do not believe a civil servant at the senior level should become – *(Asides)*. Even at BIMAC. We could send them down to BIMAC for a couple of weeks or a few months training and it would help them.

Sir, I do not think that we need to believe that a civil servant, by virtue of the fact that he has spent 15 years in the Service, learns any better how to administer the business of Government. As a matter of fact, all that he, probably, will learn is how to do it wrong. If it is being done badly and he is a product of that system, it follows logically that he is going to come out to be a very efficient man at doing it the wrong way. He establishes himself as one who has a vested interest in the continuance of that particular system, and I am saying that the Government would be well advised to sit down and take a serious look at the Service to see whether or not we cannot get people in these positions who understand the importance of Government, and who understand the urgency of the implementation of the legislation we pass in here for the public good. I heard a lot of talk, Sir, being made about School Meals, B.M.C., A.D.C., and the Community College, and okras. I would like to instruct the Leader of the Opposition that in so far as the appointment, or the awarding of positions by the present Government is concerned, I, the member for St. Michael West, would not come into this House, or any place else, and make any apology if a member of the Barbados Labour Party happens to get a job while we were in the Government, because for the last 15 years they have been playing the game by one set of rules. It is unreasonable now when the Barbados Labour Party come into power to tell us that we must not give a Barbados Labour Party member a job because we might be criticised for it. Well, Sir, this member for St. Michael West would like to go on record as saying that if I had one job to give and a member of the Barbados Labour Party shows up, you can bet that 99 times out of 100 he is going to get it. I believe that if we are in power and we continue to discriminate against the members of the Barbados Labour Party something has to be wrong. If they were denied opportunities for the last 15 years, it means that they are not proportionately represented in Government jobs in Barbados now. Sir, 15 years of denial means that many jobs that people who supported this Party did not get, and I am not going to be one of those who will come in here and play pious and say that I am not going to help people who helped me by that X. You must get that straight.

In so far as the Barbados Labour Party's Programme at the Barbados Marketing Corporation is concerned, I would, further, like to go on record as saying that we have tried to pick a staff that is going to be able to carry out the Programme that we have devised.

6.50 p.m.

There has been no recrimination, no discrimination and no harassment of any person working at the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I believe the Minister of Agriculture said that we have some of the most serious DLP supporters in the upper echelons of our administration but they will stay there so long as they carry out the work they are supposed to do. As long as they do their work they have nothing to fear. This Government is not witch hunting or going about looking for people to execute. I am certain the Democratic Labour Party cannot lay such claims because they hounded and harassed the members of the Barbados Labour Party into submission and discriminated left, right and centre to the extent that nearly every last man in the School Meals Service was a card carrying member of the Democratic Labour Party; and I have heard the member for St. Michael South Central say if he did not give jobs he would not have won by the twenty votes he won by.

Now speaking about okras, the Barbados Marketing Corporation does not apologise for the fact that for the first time in the history of Barbados we have been able to find export markets for the crops that the Democratic Labour Party tried to kill out, for all these years they have been taking agricultural land and selling to preferred members of their party. This Government has decided that if we are to progress as a country we will have to do something about the marketing arm of the Ministry of Agriculture; and it happens that the Ministry of Agriculture is going about a vigorous promotion of the export of food, and the Barbados Marketing Corporation in the exercise of this responsibility will in due course be exporting okras from Barbados for the first time in the history of this country. Okras are one of the biggest food crops in the North American market. Mexico has almost the whole market for this, and we can earn valuable foreign exchange by getting into this business. The boxes are here, and some time during this week or next week the first shipment will leave Barbados accompanied by personnel of the BMC and Ministry of Agriculture. Shortly after this, boxes will arrive for yams and they too will be shipped to North America. So I want the Opposition to realize that we are not going to run away from the talk. And I will go further and say that we will shortly be exporting surpluses of flying fish – not from the Barbados Marketing Corporation – we are very good at getting things from abroad – and the local people will not suffer, for there will be no shortage on this account. But we have them and will be using them to gain foreign exchange. I can understand that the Leader of the Opposition will not be able to appreciate good government because it has been missing from these shores since 1961.

Now the hon. member for St. Michael South said that whatever action he took while in the Ministry of Education was in the best interest of the country. I believe him, for I believe him to be a man of integrity. But he did precisely what we are saying should not be done – a piecemeal approach in the administration of his ministerial portfolio. He made no attempt to do anything constructive insofar as the principal and the deputy principal of the hotel school was concerned; at the Community College he appointed one of the most inefficient heads – someone not really suitable for principal of the Community College, one who could not carry out the objectives of the College. We must commend the member who had the foresight for the establishment of the Community College but we must condemn him for putting it in the hands of some one who did not have a clue about what the goals of the college should be. When we appoint someone it will be the right person. We could put a yardfowl in the position but we are not doing that; we are looking for the most efficient head for that institution so that the goals of the institution can be met for the first time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of procedure, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that since I do not think any other hon. member is going to speak and that I myself do not expect to take longer than a quarter of an hour to wind up. It seems to me we could go on to 7.30 p.m. and it would be more convenient than suspending the Sitting now and coming back for a short period after 8 o'clock. I therefore wonder if we could get the agreement of hon. members to suspend the Standing Orders that we could go through until 7.30.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, I really don't want to accept a motion to suspend Standing Orders at this time. With the consent of members of both sides we could shorten the period for dinner and come back at 7.30 p.m. *(Asides)*

## SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It being agreed by both sides of the House, this Sitting is now suspended until 7.45 p.m.

7.00 p.m.

*On Resumption:–*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The sitting is resumed. The hon. member for St. Michael West.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to summarise by re-emphasising the need in my opinion for a more thorough investigation of the present structure of the Civil Service. By this I mean perhaps an organisation and management study conducted by a competent agency so as to determine what indeed we need to do in order to make the Civil Service more responsive to the needs of the country, and I would say that while I appreciate the efforts on the part of the Government to rectify the present situation, I do not at all believe that the mere changing of nomenclature here and there will effectuate the kind of results which we are all searching for.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this has been a long and fruitful debate in which many points not only about the Public Service have been raised but about the administration of certain Departments.

To deal with those first, none of them relates to my Ministries. I suppose the matter of the Hotel School does relate to the fringe of Establishments and Personnel Departments in the Public Service Division of my Ministry, so I would let the hon. members who have contributed to the debate on that subject know that I have already drafted a note to the Chief Personnel Officer indicating the trend of the debate in the House, and suggesting that he bring the debate to the notice of the Public Service Commission. I think that it is time that public officers learn to take note of what is said in the House of Assembly and to appreciate that members of Parliament are very well informed on public affairs, and that sometimes they can get the point of view from members of Parliament that insulated in their ivory towers they might not otherwise acquire.

I will return to the theme of the ivory tower when I deal with the opening remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in a moment, but on the agricultural topics I think there is very little really I can say following the speeches of the Minister of Agriculture and the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

I would like to thank the hon. member for St. Michael South on raising the question of the okras, because this is one of the benefits of adversary politics which there are those who would have us abandon, but thank goodness there is still a large majority who would have us retain. Perhaps I would never have known that the farmers had to plough the okras back into the fields, and equally the hon. member would not have known that they had to plough the okras back in because they planted them before the time advised by the BMC. When they saw the rains I suppose they wanted to catch at them, and therefore the crop was not ready. *(Asides).* I thought this was said, Sir. Are you hearing it for the first time now?

Sir, I gather that that is the explanation. Before the contract buying period was over, and I would suggest.... *(Asides).* I do not mind being interrupted, Sir, this is open Government. I will let the hon. member give the explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON: On a point of elucidation, Sir. The hon. member for St. Michael South is not as informed as he perhaps ought to be in these circumstances. The Prime Minister is partially correct in this respect. Any okras that were ploughed in were ploughed in by persons who were not contracted to the BMC, but there is not a single farmer who was advised to plant for the BMC who has had to abandon any of his crop. A number of people, hearing that okras were being exported, decided to jump on, and planted okras without the advice of the BMC, but all the people who contracted with us knew precisely when to plant and when to expect the export operations to begin.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Just on a point of elucidation. The member for St. Michael West said that I was not as informed as I should be. I was not giving any information, I was seeking information. I simply asked about okras, I did not make any statement about them, I merely asked if there was a problem with okras and whether farmers had to plough okras back in, so it is not a question of my not being informed, in fact I did not know anything about it at all, so I am glad for your explanation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I must congratulate the hon. member, if he was not acting from information, on a piece of most remarkable prescience. Why did he choose okras? Why did he not choose red peppers? Why did he not choose eggplant? Why did he pick out of all things okras, if he had no information on the subject? The one thing that we are planning a big export market in he has seized upon it. (Mr. SANDIFORD: It was in the newspaper). That is the explanation, Sir.

Agricultural statistics. I would not go into any length on that or on the psychiatric hospital, I am sure that these matters will be taken note of by the Minister when the Mental Health Act, as I anticipate is being redrafted, that will be dealt with, but the appropriate nomenclature still appears in the Estimates as hon. members will see when they get their document.

Now, Sir, to the Civil Service. I freely confess that there are two views on the question of opening a political party's conference to members of the public and to invited guests. There are two views on whether it should be open at all, and there are further views if

it is open to who cares to come or whether it should be made a consciously public occasion. I am of the impression that the Democratic Labour Party holds the view that political party conferences should not be open, they should be open only to party members. This is a perfectly tenable view, it is not a view which we have ever shared in the Barbados Labour Party, but it is a view which I can understand even if I do not agree with. I think that leads to inconvenience, I think it is unnecessary, because it is impossible to keep a secret that took place at a party conference. I am satisfied about that. The documentation which was delivered to certain people in respect of the last two DLP conferences leave me in no doubt that if we did not release our documentation to the other side openly, that it would be done in some other way, but as I say, it is possible to hold two views.

We believe in open Government and open political party conferences, some of them. We have open sessions and we have closed sessions. The open sessions are always open to members of the public, then the business sessions of our party conference are totally closed to members of the public and the Press. These are the elections and sundry procedural matters. Indeed, technically we close the elections even to non-delegates, as anybody who has ever been to one of our conferences would recall, the delegates are supposed to withdraw into conference rooms, separate rooms and decide on their elections, and they go under the superintendence of a senior member of the party, a parliamentarian or one of the officers, the Secretary, the Treasurer or who else, who ensures that nobody, not just the public, gets into the room where the election is taking place. And when we have Resolutions we have a rule which I saw was adopted some years ago by the Democratic Labour Party that any member of the Barbados Labour Party can attend that part of our conference that deals with Resolutions, but only delegates may speak or vote. That is our entire system, and we therefore come down to how do we handle our open sessions.

Fifteen years ago when I was first active in the party, our open sessions, even though we were newly in opposition, used to be attended quite widely. I have seen civil servants at them, heads of departments indeed at that time, and they went away at the appropriate moment after the Chairman's address, after having heard the service – I think in those days it was only the service and the Chairman's address that used to be open – and they went away again. On this occasion we decided that an open conference means that persons could feel free to come to it quite openly, something was going to be said about a political party, its relationship with the Government and its relationship with the Civil Service, and a certain dilemma arose.

7.55 p.m.

A certain dilemma arose. This is a country where no matter what you do, some type of criticism, fair or unfair, mainly unfair will be levelled at you. So if you go to a Party Conference and you talk about Civil Servants somebody is going to say in the Civil Service and the Opposition is going to say that you went to a conference and cursed them behind their backs. It was an open conference and we decided to invite Heads of Departments who would have a certain interest in what was said; and I will explain that in a moment; and it was decided also, as is the practice in other countries, to invite members of the Diplomatic Corps to the Conference. That is not unusual. We also invited members of the commercial sector and the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union and so on.

They were free to come and they were free not to come. I do not believe that Frank Walcott would have been in any way compromised, because he invited the hon. member for St. James to attend the B.W.U. Annual Conference, and the hon. member attended. One of the reasons why we think that there is no comparison is because we have come to get a peculiar idea of public servants. We are hypocrites where this is concerned; and in my speech on Sunday I had to expose some of the hypocrisy without using the actual word.

We know that we have a heavily politicised Civil Service. The public servants themselves seem to be the only people that do not recognise it; and I considered and still consider that it is time that some of the feelings of members of the Barbados Labour Party were conveyed to public officers in a forum and at a time when they would understand. They were free to come and hear the message. If they did not care to come they could not come. I prefer a personal approach to matters such as these rather than an approach in a way in which it is impossible for the hon. member for St. Michael South to tell me that he has never seen a Permanent Secretary at the Democratic Labour Party. It would be impossible for him to say so.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I would not have to tell him whether that is so or not. On a point of elucidation. The point which I was making is that I see nothing wrong in a public servant, in his individual capacity attending a Party Conference of the party of his choice because this right is guaranteed under the Constitution. That is the only point that I was making.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I would like him to admit that that Party Conference was incestuous because if he goes to the Library he will read that the first conference was in 1958.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member's memory is reaching back into the past to the happier

days when he was a member of the Barbados Labour Party, and I congratulate him. I have no idea whether the hon. member wishes to count the joint conferences which they used to have at the Barbados Workers Union as Party Conferences. Certainly they were regarded as such and the hon. member was in Union and the party when they were in truth and in fact virtually one organisation; and if he remembers well, when they did not have separate officers; and that is why the two were always held jointly.

Anyhow, I will say that I do not agree even with the hon. member for St. Michael South. Any member of the public is free to attend the open sessions of our Party Conferences, and any public officer no matter what party he belongs to, is also free to attend it as a public officer and not as a supporter; and we are not going to delude ourselves that in asking Permanent Secretaries we are asking any body of devoted party supporters. We are not deluding ourselves in that regard by any means.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, even if they were devoted party supporters, in 15 years the fear of God has been so thoroughly driven into them that they would never have dared to express themselves by any means other than the X in the ballot box. Why we regarded it as important for the Permanent Secretaries to be invited was that they do not understand the feelings of the Barbados Labour Party about the Public Service. I appreciated the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael West although I do not think that the hon. members on the Other Side understand it; but there is no way of explaining to the Chief Personnel Officer – I mention him not as an individual, but as an office – there is no way of explaining to him the deep resentment felt by half of the population of Barbados that for virtually 15 years the great overwhelming majority of the people who passed through his hands have received favourable consideration as supporters of the Democratic Labour Party. I have been here 15 months now. I have never seen a submission from the Chief Personnel Officer which contained the name of an active member of the Barbados Labour Party. I say that without fear of contradiction; and I have seen up to recently submissions which include the names of members of the executive committee of the Democratic Labour Party.

I am not suggesting that the Chief Personnel Officer has access or is even aware of this. He does not understand the system within which he has been taught. He does not understand that the recommendations of the Personnel Officers of the Ministries have all been leaned on by the Democratic Labour Party Ministers in the past at supervisory level within the working departments, that everywhere where casual staff was employed thoses who had a primary responsibility for putting forward names are members of the Democratic Labour Party, usually active members and active canvassers.

This is just not understood in the Personnel Department. And equally it is not understood that there is a deep ground swell of resentment about this state of affairs. Various names have been mentioned in here about jobs and appointments that have been given. I am going to pick out one. I hope that if the name has been mentioned already that Mr. Deputy Speaker will give me some latitude. There is a Mr. Marshall who has been given the contract to run the workers canteen at the airport, at the Community College and at Queen's College as we have heard already. I do not believe that two days pass without a member of the Barbados Labour Party complaining to me. Every time that Mr. Marshall raises the price of a hamburger at the workers canteen or wants to charge more for a soft drink at Queen's College, somebody rings up my office to speak to Senator Trotman or Mr. Roberts. Members of the Cabinet ask me about it every single Cabinet day since he has been appointed.

This is what I mean by pressure; and to some extent Mr. Marshall whose tenure of these posts has not been characterised by any measure of efficiency in my view; because in raising the price of food and coming back for an increase which there is no possibility of his being given, he can save the price of the stationery he is writing on. We have to lean over backwards to make sure that Mr. Marshall, because he is a decent gentleman who ran about behind Mr. Pile in Britton's Hill, that we do not victimise him. Even Norma Jackman who was opposed to us said you should not have given it to Marshall; You should have given it to members of your own party. This will give you an idea of what goes on with political appointments. We get on the one hand a department still churning out the old yard fowls of the Democratic Labour Party seeking to thrust them into the Public Service as they have been doing in the past. All of this is something that Public Officers perhaps should make some effort to understand; and that is what I mean by excluding themselves from half of the community and living in an ivory tower. I will mention the Airport contract. One of the people involved in that contract – I remember when the Deputy Prime Minister lost his seat I was at the Foundation School and so was the Deputy Prime Minister, although he was not Deputy Prime Minister at that time.

8.05 p.m.

This man came and jumped up and down in front of us; shook his hand in the hon. member's face, and he looked at me and said: "You, Tom Adams, I hate you, you dog." I would not tell you what he put between the "you" and the "dog." "I hate you all my life. I would like to see you destroyed. I would like you to drop down

dead on your way home tonight. You had no right winning a seat." I have not stopped him, that wicked man – I think he is a wicked man – from getting a contract or being involved in the Airport cleaning contract. Every day we get complaints about how dirty the Airport is; about how you cannot go into the lavatory; about how they would not employ people; how the Airport Manager makes complaints every single day, and we have not put him out. We have taken legal advice; we are actually leaning over backwards to help him precisely because we do not want the accusation of victimisation. We are, genuinely, trying to put an end to it in the country, but we cannot put an end to it until a fair deal is delivered by one and all. The fair deal has to start from the Public Officers, who are primarily responsible for the administration of the tenders system and the administration of the hiring system, even where politicians have the last word in the matter of temporary appointments, or of acting appointments. These are some of the reasons why the civil servants have to get down from their ivory towers and listen to what people are saying, including the members of the Barbados Labour Party. They did not listen to us when we were in Opposition, my God they are going to listen to us while we are in Government.

If some hard words have to be said, let them be said, but I want the hard words said openly, and I want them said in a forum where they can understand what is going on. Inviting a man to a Party's Conference is not inviting a man to be a member of your Party. We got into power without the support of the Civil Service, and in some cases of the active hostility of some of its members. This will not be the case in future. We have no complaint about their efficiency, but this country cannot go along in the lines of polarisation that helped to destroy Jamaica, that destroyed public amity in Jamaica, the bitter political amities – the commentators are now beginning to write that a part of the reason for the political violence and hostility in Jamaica is that supporters of each Political Party are literally fighting for life and death at an election, because they know their continued employment depends on the continued maintenance in power of their Party. We have to get to a situation, and we have to get to circumstances where these employment practices and these tendering practices no longer give rise to this constant accusation of partiality and favouritism.

It may seem this is the first change over of Government at a time when employment was widespread and, therefore, it may seem very easy to say you are in power now and just give tit for tat. When we have persons like an employee right here in the House of Assembly who can look at a Public Officer appointed to a post overseas and tell him: "This is your last trip. We are going to be back in power in 1981." When we can look at a circumstance like that, can you blame us that we feel that a new initiative has to be taken to re-educate people into a new type of thinking about employment in Government and the employment opportunities afforded by the Government?

There are one or two small matters which were mentioned. *(Asides.)* The diplomats. I really do not think it is so important to deal with the diplomats. The Democratic Labour Party sent out letters soliciting support, during the City by-election campaign, for its Twenty-first Anniversary Celebrations. You put a number of people in an embarrassing position. You put Eric Williams in an embarrassing position, and he sent you a very curt little note of congratulation. You put Michael Manley in an embarrassing position. Burnham, perhaps, was not in quite such an embarrassing position. These are Heads of Government. These are the people that send out the Ambassadors. I do not mind Chief Jonathan. If you thought to solicit support from Chief Jonathan, well that was up to you. I was asked by a prominent member of the Liberal Party of Canada, after I had made a complaint to the Canadian High Commissioner about Mr. Trudeau's cable to a Political Party in Barbados – not to the Government, but to a Political Party – I was particularly asked not to have it raised in the Canadian House of Commons as Mr. Trudeau was, in fact, a good friend of Barbados and it was not altogether appreciated the form that the celebrations were taking and the use that would be made of his cable. Do not tell me anything about putting diplomats on the spot!

Mr. Britton never concealed, despite the talk about destabilisation, when the Democratic Labour Party's backs were to the wall, his support of the Democratic Labour Party and the close personal relationship which he sought with the hon. member for St. John. Mr. Britton, the former American Ambassador, was never hesitant about associating himself with Democratic Labour Party causes, personnel and general policy, and you are telling me about diplomats.

You brought Burnham here – the fact that he was a politician did not stop the fact that he was the Head of a Government – to speak on a political platform. Do you believe I could go to England and speak on a political platform and not cause offence, even though I am a member of the British Labour Party and have been for something like 26 years? Despite that I cannot go and speak on a British Labour Party platform without causing some offence to the Conservatives, the Liberals and, no doubt, even the Scots Nationalists and so on. *(Asides.)*

As far as I know, Mr. Bradshaw attended here to speak to the West Indies Federal Labour Party of which he was a member. There have been times when persons – the then Secretary of State – no he was in Opposition then – when Mr. James Griffith in Opposition, who became Secretary of State for the Colonies, did come to

Barbados to speak on the Barbados Labour Party's platform, but he was an Opposition politician at the time. Nonetheless, I am not hearing anything from a Party that sought to drag in the big names: Trudeau, Manley, Chief Johnathan and so on. I wrote to every single one of them, and I cannot say that I received a dusty answer in any direction. That was when I was in the Opposition. At least I did not write, but the General Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party wrote to make a complaint to every single one of them. Please do not tell me anything about embarrassing diplomats, and embarrassing Governments, and so on.
8.15 p.m.

It was an open session of a party conference and the diplomats attended. The Leader of the Opposition has been in Government for many years, but perhaps he does not realise that in Britain diplomats actually fight to get invitations to party rallies and the Labour Party conference, because it is not every diplomat that can get an invitation. It is not a matter of inviting the diplomatic corps; they struggle to get tickets so that they can attend. In this case, as far as I was concerned, why not save them the trouble of waiting for information on the conference; Let them come in, sit down, hear the speech, see how many people were present, see their reaction and then they can go home and send back a report to their home government and perhaps get a little credit for being able to arrange an entree into the governing party's conference. We have not heard any diplomat complain, and I am not aware that the Leader of the Opposition, although he has a number of diplomats within his constituency, has been given any brief to speak on their behalf. Rather, I believe he may have embarrassed them because they might think that I might think that they complained to him; but nobody has complained to me. The Leader of the Opposition should have thought of this before complaining, because he might be embarrassing or compromising them. It doesn't take anything off diplomats to have a diplomatic illness if they cannot go to something.

To tell the truth, I did not even see who was there. I shook Mr. Basil Forbes' hand when he came in, Mr. K. R. Hunte shook mine, and that was the end of me and the invited guests. At the end of my speech one or two people – I cannot even tell you who they were – may have shaken my hand. On the way I did pass the house of the Leader of the Opposition, but I cannot say I saw him over the paling this time.

Now Mr. Deputy Speaker, the final things I want to say relate to the criticisms made by the hon. member for St. Michael South. He gave a good speech, full of sound party points, but it is a pity that his criticism of Civil Establishment which was lucid and logical just needed a few more facts to make it convincing. The establishment of temporary posts now being dealt with is part of a special project and this is why there is an exceptional number of temporary posts at the present time. Civil Establishment posts that have been coming up deal with reorganization of departments and with subjects like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital where there is the abolition of the post of gatekeeper and the replacement of other posts, the upgrading of one or two posts within the hierarchy, etc. If you look back at the Civil Establishment Orders you will realize that this is the case. The first Civil Establishment Order that I can remember introducing was a major one consolidating all the Orders for many years; that was in 1976. Since then there have been one or two shifts resulting perhaps in shifts in Ministries, shifts in responsibilities, and one or two adjustments as particular programmes demand a particular approach. But these temporary posts are the first instalment of a particular drive to establish temporary posts, for although many temporary posts have been established in the past, it was not on this scale; and the hon. member whose capacity for research is matched only by his lucidity in delivering the results as if he had not looked them up a day of two before but knew them all along, if his capacity for research is applied to Civil Establishment Orders over a long period, I think he will see that this is a special effort and it will be matched by other orders in the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think there is anything else to deal with. As regards the remark I made about one down and six to go, the Democratic Labour Party can destroy a Leader of the Opposition every month as far as I am concerned. It is they who are showing one down and six to go, not me; I am merely embodying in a phrase which even a child can understand, the principles and policies of the Democratic Labour Party.

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

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

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

## ADJOURNMENT

*On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House until Tuesday, 14th February, 1978, at 12 Noon.*
8.25 p.m.