
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th November, 1978.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P. (Speaker); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committee); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of the 31st day of October, 1978.

Dr. HAYNES, Mr. SANDIFORD and Mr. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, Sir, that the Minutes for the 31st October, 1978 be taken as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no observations, these Minutes stand confirmed.

The Minutes of Tuesday, 7th November, 1978.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, before I move the confirmation of the Minutes, Sir, for the 7th day of November, 1978, I should like to draw to your attention on page 2, under "Orders of the Day" where it reads that the Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44 were suspended, Sir, I would like to draw to your attention, Sir, that Standing Order No. 40, not in my wildest dreams, could have been suspended, Sir. I discussed that with the Clerk of the House and he agreed that I did not suspend it.

I would like to move, Sir, that it be amended, and that No. 40 be deleted and the Minutes for the 7th November, 1978 be read as taken and as amended and entered into the records of the House, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter referred to by the Hon. Minister will be referred to the Clerk for the necessary correction and if there are no further observations by hon. members these Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY YOUR HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received a Message from the Other Place addressed to this Honourable House re the Constitution of a Joint Committee to consider certain Bills.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay the Report of the Commission appointed to review the remuneration and pension scheme of Parliamentarians.

I am also committed to lay the Government White Paper on the Review of the Remuneration and Pension Scheme of Parliamentarians.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to lay the following Resolutions:

Resolution to grant the sum of \$9,484,314 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978-79, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79, No. 15, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$405,503 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978-79, Part II — Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79, No. 16, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$102,006 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1978-79, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79, No. 17, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$295,103 from the Harbour Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1978-79, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79, No. 18, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

As envisaged last week, I will be asking the Leader of the House to proceed with all of these Resolutions in all their stages today, that is four Resolutions today. These being the Resolutions relating to the salary increases for public servants, and I believe the Leader of the House is going to take a certain course to enable the Resolutions to be circulated to all members today.

I also beg to give notice, Sir, of a Resolution to fix the salaries and allowances applicable to posts on the Prime Minister's personal staff with effect from 1st April, 1978, and I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the proposals in the White Paper, which I have just laid, Sir, on the Review of the Remuneration and Pensions Scheme of Parliamentarians.

Sir, these will be circulated today and if hon. members wish that these Resolutions can be dealt with because of Government proposals of appointment of a Select Committee, and if hon. members do not wish, we can wait until next week.

12.25 p.m.

If hon. members do not wish, we can wait until next week, that is the Resolution to approve the

proposals in the White Paper. On that aspect of it, we are in the hands of the Opposition. The already agreed salary increases we will wish to deal with today.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the National Emblems and National Anthem of Barbados (Regulations) Act.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, a Bill to amend the National Emblems and National Anthem of Barbados (Regulations) Act, was read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 7, asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South, is still ready.

We propose to give this Reply before we enter Government Business.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, in the light of what the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance indicated earlier, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken for 15 minutes.

This of course, as the Prime Minister indicated, would give the Clerks at the Table a bit of time to circulate a number of items which they might wish to circulate.

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

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

Mr. TAITT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

QUESTION RE BREAKDOWN OF STAFF COMPLEMENT IN PUBLIC SERVICE.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 7 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:— To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning: Would the Minister give a breakdown of the staff complement in the Public Service for the years 1976 and 1977 in terms of the number allocated to the Administrative, Executive, Clerical, Messengerial and other classes, or in terms of the departmental classes, the Administration group, and the Professional Scientific and Technical Classes, or in terms of any other more appropriate classification?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 7 is as follows:—

“Since 1976 posts in the Public Service excluding casual and unestablished staff have been classified into four categories. The number of posts in each of these categories as well as those classified casual and unestablished in the years 1976 and 1977 are as follows:—

	1976	1977
Management and administrative	355	357
Professional and scientific	3,790	3,788
Support services	3,951	3,781
Trades and General Services	1,389	1,251
Unestablished	1,700	1,780
Casual	3,940	4,460

making a total of 15,125 public servants in 1976 and 15,417 public servants in 1977, an increase of 292.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Prime Minister could indicate generally a breakdown of the categories which would come under support and trades and general.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The category of support, Mr. Speaker, consists of occupational groups engaged in providing for programmes serving the public interest and the requirements of internal management.

Having given the Civil Service answer, I will not add that these categories include Public Health Inspectors, work supervisors, the Police, Fire and Prison services and clerical, accounting and stenographic posts.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, can I now ask leave of the House to do the salaries increases? These are the Resolutions of which I have just given notice. Can I now ask that the leave of the House be granted so that we can do them in all their stages today?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, obviously we would not wish to stand in the way of Government getting on with this business the result of which is for the people, as I understand it, but, Sir, even as I speak to you some of the documentation regarding this is being handed out. It is true, I am told, that the Hon. Prime Minister mentioned that he intended to do this today, but I wonder if he has to do it this minute. We have had no approach on the matter. I do not want us to be seen to be in the position of stopping people from getting their money.

12.35 p.m.

We have had no approach on the matter. I do not want us to seem to be in the position of trying to stop people from getting their money, because that is obviously what would be said, but as you yourself would be aware there is some study which has to be done of these documents and I hope the Government will not press the issue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what pressure the hon. member is talking about. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply we have to know whether these Resolutions can be dealt with, whether the House has given leave for them to be dealt with in Committee of Supply. Order No. 1 has an Item on it which comes from last week and which can be the first Item in Committee of Supply, but before we move the House in Committee of Supply we have to know whether Committee of Supply is going to deal with these Resolutions, so that therefore at this stage we have to ask for leave to deal with them in all their stages. When that is done the Hon. member may rest assured that hon. members will be given ample opportunity during the debate on the instant Item on the Order Paper in Committee of Supply to study these matters. They have been before the House on two separate occasions, because we had to approve the Civil Establishments Order, and that is the basis for my having said last week that we would deal with them today in all their stages. So I am asking the leave of the House to deal with them so that the next motion will be that Order No. 1 which will be the first Order of the Day. When it is called, when the

House goes into Committee of Supply, in Committee of Supply, they will be dealt with and the Opposition will then be able to put up their arguments for or against them being done.

I hope I have explained the situation.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned these papers have just been circulated here and if the Government wishes to proceed in the manner as outlined by the Hon. Prime Minister they may do so, but we will not be party to that kind of behaviour as far as we are concerned on this side. I think it is necessary if we are participating in any kind of exercise that we should have the opportunity to make some intelligent contribution by way of having had the opportunity to look at these things before.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I would like to hear that from the hon. member for St. Michael South West who I regard as the spokesman for the Opposition at the moment, not that hon. member. I am not accepting it from the junior No. 11 on the team.

Dr. HAYNES: The Hon. Prime Minister is not going to say who is to speak on this side on any particular matter, it is none of his business; he should speak for himself and that side, not over here.

Mr. SPEAKER: When hon. members are to speak they will be duly called by the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am really surprised at the Hon. Prime Minister. None of the members over here speaks out of turn, anything that is said over here in regard to the procedure is said for all of us over here. The hon. member cannot tell us that he will not listen to something spoken by any hon. member on this side. Mr. Speaker, if he wishes to hear the view of the member for St. Michael South West he can get it, but to say it with some kind of preamble that he is not accepting it from the hon. member is not good enough.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member is enjoying himself but he has missed the point. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central said "we on this side" and I am not accepting from him that he is speaking for that side. I might accept it from the hon. member for St. Michael South West because he is sitting in that seat and might be doing so as Leader of the Opposition at the moment, but when down the line somebody gets up and talks nonsense, I am not accepting that nonsense.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I believe...

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you are on a point of order.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. You will have heard the Hon. Prime Minister refer to the contribution which I made as talking nonsense. I consider that as being unparliamentary and he should be asked to withdraw it immediately.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain what it is the Prime Minister said when he got up the second time. When he got up the first time was he expecting us to be able to see into his mind and know what it is he intended for us? He got up and asked for leave of the House for something to be done, then when he got up the second time he got up and suggested that all he was trying to do was the following, and then he gave us a long involved indication of how they propose to carry on their business. Every hon. member in this House has a right to participate, which I know, Sir, you guard jealously. The Hon. member for St. Michael South Central sits on this side of the House. If one single hon. member on this side is not happy about how a particular procedure should go or with regard to papers which we just got, I am saying he should accept it from the member for St. Michael South Central that that is the situation with the Opposition. We are not happy with this and if he wishes to use his numbers to go ahead he should feel free to do so.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this matter is relatively simple. I think the Prime Minister simply asked for leave to be granted hopefully that all Resolutions can be dealt with in all their stages today. That is the matter of contention now. There is an Item on the Order Paper which we can deal with immediately as those on the Government benches so desire. All we are seeking is leave, and when you put the question all they have to do is vote against it.

I beg to move that leave be granted to deal with these matters in all their stages.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister has already made that motion and you can second it.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance be granted the leave of this Hon. House to deal with five money Resolutions, notice of which was given earlier in the day, and he proposes to deal with all these measures in all their stages. (*A VOICE: Divide*).

The hon. member for St. Lucy has just made a reference to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, calling him an idiot. I ask that the hon. member for St. Lucy withdraw that remark immediately.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, I would wish that the hon. member seek to contain himself; I do not want to name him.
12.45 p.m.

A division has been called for and the question is that leave be granted the Hon. Minister of Finance to deal with a number of money Resolutions in all their stages today.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. ALLEYNE, Mr. BRADSHAW and Mr. ODLE — 11.

Noes: Mr. TAITT, Mr. GREAVES, Dr. HAYNES, Mr. SANDIFORD and Mr. WEEKES — 5.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

The first Order was called — To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with the matters indicated earlier today.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE SUM OF \$133,600 FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND TO SUPPLEMENT THE ESTIMATES 1978-79 PART II — CAPITAL

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the Government is seeking \$133,600 from the Consolidated Fund for the construction of groynes in Christ Church as shown in the addendum to the Resolution, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in seconding this Resolution I wish to make a few remarks concerning Government's plan for the development of the Oistin area.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Before the hon. member continues I wonder if this side

could have any maps or drawings of the project. I believe Government must have such drawings and we would wish.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: There are no maps available at this stage.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, for some time now, particularly since the construction of the Coast Guard station at Oistin, there has been a change in the coastal sands (Cross-talk)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must hear what the hon. member is saying; I will not be annoyed by hon. members talking.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: As I was saying Mr. Chairman, there has been a shift in the coastal sands and settlement between Oistin and St. Lawrence. The Government, as part of the development of the Oistin area, had had a detailed survey done of what is necessary to correct the erosion in the area and what is necessary to carry out the total development of Oistin. The final plans for the Oistin development were handed to the Government a couple of weeks ago and that plan is now being studied by the Planning and Priorities Committee as well as the relevant Ministries that will be involved in the Oistin development. What was made clear to us, however, was that it was necessary to construct five groynes at various areas along the coast line to stop the erosion which is occurring. The five groynes are being established at Welches, Sandhurst, St. Lawrence, and Half Moon Bay. There is a great danger that unless the work is done part of the Welches Road will be submerged.

The project consists basically of the groyne west of the Welches window, to be approximately fifteen meters long, a ten meter extension to the existing groyne at Sheringham Gardens a groyne sixty meters long at the eastern boundary of the Half Moon Hotel, a groyne thirty meters long on the western boundary of the Half Moon Hotel and a groyne seventy meters long on the western boundary of Crescent Beach Hotel. They will all be constructed from the high water mark out to sea to a depth of approximately three meters. This is the first stage necessary in the Government's proposed plan for the physical re-development of Oistin.
12.55 p.m.

It has been necessary to carry out very detailed plans. In the first place, to make sure that we were planning not only for the immediate five years, but that we were planning right up to the period of 1990 for the overall development of the whole of the Oistins and Welches area and the other surrounding districts. So it is a master plan which will be available. It is part of the Government's strategy of showing development not merely in terms of the immediate session of Parliament,

but in the total overall national interest of this country. There are the questions of highway improvement, the correction of soil erosion and sea erosion. All of these are a necessary part of this development.

The Government intends to improve Highway 7 between a point east of the Shopping Plaza and Scarbrough house entrants. It intends to provide a car park in an area west of the fishing market, and to construct a fisheries complex to include the location of the market, to provide a new Magistrates Court, the Police Station and a new Polytechnic; and I am happy to say that already architectural plans for the polytechnic have been completed, and those for the Magistrates Court are being worked on, as well as plans to relocate the Post Office and the Library and the Rates and Taxes Department.

The Government will also see to the expansion of shopping facilities in that area and the employment of the remaining back lands for Housing including the construction of houses which will be undertaken by the National Housing Corporation and a by-pass road linking the road from Oistins to the Enterprise Road and the existing Highway 7. The Government will also improve Oistins Hill. There will be the clearing of lands for the playing fields and associated central developments. There will be a jetty provided and marketing expertise will be put in particularly for the fishermen, and it is hoped that these projects will be continuous during the length of this Parliament and, maybe, beyond.

Some of the finance for this project will come from a grant from the European Development Fund, and part from the Government's own resources; and it is hoped that the private sector will participate in other parts of the project. I think that I should say for the benefit of the Committee that as a person born in that part of Christ Church and who serve the Christ Church constituency as I do, I welcome this firm proposal and the detailed and proper planning which is now being done for the Oistins development. I think that it is a tribute to the sitting member for Christ Church South Central, who was once a former member for Christ Church under the dual member constituencies, the Hon. H. B. St. John that this plan has become an actual reality in the area.

Those of us who set great store on the development of this country, and the continued development of this country, must therefore commend this Government for the work that it is doing both in Oistin and Speightstown. One of the plans for Speightstown is that they will have a polyclinic for the first time. The physical development planning includes provision for terminals and bus lay-bys and the beautifying of the whole of the area; and there are plans for industrial estates in Speightstown. In Oistin the existing facilities, apart from those constructed for the Coast Guard, were constructed during our 10 years of

office. That includes the facilities which exist for the health centre in that area. We intend to upgrade it because we believe that the people of Oistin and the surrounding areas deserve a town of which they can be proud.

I recall that on many occasions the member for Christ Church South Central spoke at length on his views about what we should do for this area. We have now got the opportunity after 15 years and we intend to carry it out. People obviously often have to show little patience; but I think that it is a good thing that within two years we could provide a pre-feasibility study, a feasibility study and the final master plan so that there is total planning for the area, certainly to take it into the 21st Century, starting after we came into power. At that time there was nothing existing from which we could have gone ahead and started to work.

We are today asking this committee to vote funds for starting at least part of the work. I can say that the matter is now before the European Community, and we hope that they will soon pass the necessary funds so that we could get on with that part of the total job. I want to say that I sometimes hear the odd person asking what the Government is doing about this. The country must decide if they want right planning of the coast guard station or the bad planning by which we are still digging out sand every time there is a change of tide and there is a waste of money, or whether it wants proper planning and something that eventually will be of benefit to Barbados.

I do not think that as a politician you can afford to go on in this country merely saying niceties to get quick applause without being frank with the country and saying what is involved in Government. If I may sometimes lose my patience — and I do not often do that, Sir — it is because the idea of populace politics has lent us a lot of white eloquence in this country. I welcome the serious nature, and the serious way in which the Government has gone about this project. I believe that when it is completed it will be a credit to the Barbados Labour Party and this Government, and particularly to the member for Christ Church South Central.

Already last year, Mr. Chairman, you will recall the emphasis which his committee, with the assistance of his wife, who was run down unfairly in the 1971 elections, and about whom a lot of lies were told — and we are still hearing lies about us on political platforms — managed to hold the Oistins Fish Festival; and for seven days showed what could be done to bring some sort of appreciation to the man in the Street and to a town which was becoming a ghost area and a neglected area. I hope that objective historians will not forget too early as some people tend to forget, but give credit where it is due.

When the now hon. member for Christ Church South Central was rejected at the polls in 1971, I said in

this House and outside that it was one of the greatest tragedies that ever happened to Barbados; because his contribution to his constituency and to the country as a whole was one that people should learn to appreciate for the seriousness with which he approached the people's business, and the honesty and integrity of a completely unsoiled man.

1.05 p.m.

I believe that the electorate recognise the error that has been committed then. I believe they recognise it, and within two years this has come up as one of the testimonies of his insistence and dedication to his constituents. He is not here today to speak for himself I welcome the opportunity to speak for him on this issue because I know it is an issue dear to his heart and I do not believe he would want to blow his own trumpet, Sir, and those of us who sit with him and know his persistence on this project and his intention to see it through, I am sure the electorate will keep him on there to see it through on his behalf until 1990. His intention to see it through is serious.

The difference between our approach to this project and the approach to the Coast Guard is that we believe that we are planning for the country longer than the time of any political party in power, Sir, and we believe that it should be properly done and that attention should be given to detail and I therefore have much pleasure in seconding this Resolution.

I would like to assure the Committee and Acting Hon. Leader of the House that I will have greater pleasure later in this session, possibly early next year, in seconding the Resolutions for money for the total overall development as is now being planned by the Government for this area.

As a person born in Water Street, schooled in that area of Christ Church, despite the fact they say I was born in the Almshouse, Sir, I was actually born in a house in Water Street. As a person born in this area and brought up among the people in this area, I have no objection to even being born in the street, Sir, for the benefit of the hon. member, but as a person born in this area I welcome this as a contribution which ought to have been made a long time.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I am indeed happy to hear about the improvement which has been planned for Oistins. Perchance, as the representative for St. Philip South, I deem it my duty to draw to the attention of this Honourable House the condition of the beaches at the Crane and Foul Bay.

In the past, especially at the Crane, it has been a very popular area for bus excursions and so on, but Sir, now the big problem which the Government must face is

to do something for the benefit of the people not only in the parish but throughout the Island. There is sea erosion at the Crane Beach and also at Foul Bay. These popular beaches now, Sir, have reached the stage in which almost all of the sands have just been washed away.

It is now a matter of cheap politics in bringing this matter to the attention of this House. If hon. members want to prove for themselves, I can only suggest to them to visit the two beaches and they would see that it is an urgent matter. It is one which should be given top priority. Some may argue, well if with the former Government it was not done, why should it be drawn to the attention of this House now. But the former Government, Sir, could not have done everything and therefore if the matter has got to be drawn to the attention of this House it is one which should be accepted in good faith by the present members of the Government.

The Crane Beach, Sir, needs sanitary facilities. This is the time now, after we have been hearing the amount of money in the long run which will be spent on improving Oistins, I can only hope that the Government will find it possible in the very near future to allocate some funds to deal with these beaches so that the youngsters in the area and the parish and those throughout the island will be able to enjoy some of the amenities which were formerly enjoyed by others in the past.

1.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter, and I consider it my duty to let this House know that it is a matter of paramount importance, and I can only appeal to members of the Government and especially the appropriate Minister to do all that he possibly can to improve these beaches in the parish of St. Philip.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, it is not difficult for anyone that moves around Barbados to realise how necessary it is for Government to immediately apply itself to the development of Oistins. If you take the four towns of Barbados, Speightstown, Holetown, Bridgetown and Oistins, you will see that Oistins has been grossly neglected by the former Government. I do not know for what purpose; I really do not know, but Holetown received a tremendous amount of attention both by the private sector and by Government. So also did Speightstown and Bridgetown, but Oistins, to be quite honest with you, Mr. Chairman, it is strange that we can call it a town. It is more like a fishing village. It does not have the dignity, it does not have the arrangements as now set out by the Hon. Attorney General. It should have had this many years ago.

Oistins town is very densely populated in the town itself and in the surrounding areas. As far as I can see, if proper

facilities were in Oistins, it would probably be one of the busiest towns in this country, but because it had been neglected, people have got to journey from St. Philip and from the Silver Sands, Enterprise Road into Bridgetown to get many of the services which should be had in Oistins a long time ago.

Now the Attorney General referred to a few things which should be done in Oistins. One of the things, not for Oistins, but for Christ Church is the erection of groynes in the sea. He has not said the type of construction, but I sincerely hope it will not be those concrete, ugly, offensive looking things sticking out in the sea that we see in other parts of the world, but rather something like what is at the Hilton, built of bolsters which more blends itself into the natural coastline than those ugly, concrete structures.

As regards the hon. member for St. Philip, I would just advise him on one point. He referred to groynes at the Crane and also he could have said Sam Lords. It is not easy to build a groyne on that coast in Barbados. This is where the prevailing tides come from, and if he visits the area he will find that nature has provided its own groynes, and it would be very difficult for any construction engineer to build groynes on the coastline with the prevailing seas and winds blowing; but on the Oistins coast going right down to Speightstown many groynes are needed, and we are certainly pleased to see that the Government has set about immediately placing these groynes to preserve our beaches for Barbadians and visitors alike.

Now the Hon. Attorney General referred also to having a new Police Station in Oistins. I would like to say and to emphasise that it is no use having a building unless the manpower is increased. It is no use Government putting up a beautiful structure with pretty windows and doors and glass panes without policemen inside the building. Crime in Christ Church is increasing. We have got to face reality. You call the police out at 1 o'clock in the morning because somebody is loitering around your house and you do not get them until three or four hours later. I am not blaming the police, I am blaming the lack of manpower in the police force of Barbados. On the West Coast the same thing occurs. I spoke of this in the last Estimates, about the Hometown area. Crime is on the increase, and I do not think proper attention was paid to it. The effects are already being seen that we cannot neglect security in this country. Crime is not only on the increase in Barbados, Mr. Chairman. Crime is on the increase universally. I see you want to say something, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Groynes are going to be on the increase.

Mr. WARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. All that has happened is that it is a matter as a result of television. Crime is becoming more sophisticated. Once upon a time you used to get a man living near to your house breaking into your house. However, now he lives fifteen miles away from where he has committed the crime because they are now using transport. So Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasise this and support the Attorney General, because I know he is thinking along the lines that I am, that the Government of Barbados has got to look into increasing the manpower in the police stations right around the country.

Now one last point, Mr. Chairman, and it deals with the area where the fishing village is at the present time. I do not know exactly where the parking area is going to be, but numbers of people would like to be able to stop in Oistins and buy fish, but there is no possible way for them to park their cars, and as the Government of Barbados is so interested in reducing their import bill, too much attention cannot be given to the marketing of fish in this country. I know that the hon. member for Christ Church South who is overseas at the present time has always had a very deep interest in the fishing industry, and many of the advancements even adopted by the last Government have been put forward by that hon. member, and I salute him at this time for his deep interest in fishing in Barbados generally and in the tremendous development in Oistins.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the hon. member for Christ Church West, the Attorney General, for the technical details which he gave in the introduction of this particular Resolution that is before us. We have learnt that some four groynes, I hope I understood him correctly, are to be constructed; one fifteen metres another one sixteen metres, a third one 30 metres and a fourth 70 metres, together with the extension of an existing groyne. I would like to state first of all that I would wish in the Government's reply to be assured of the particular matter relating to the Parks and Beaches Commission and the carrying out of this work. To the best of my knowledge the Parks and Beaches Commission does not have the technical expertise to carry out any direct works in this particular area, and indeed I am not certain that their terms of reference specifically would give them that type of authority in terms of the law under which they operate.

1.25 p.m.

I would like to be told whether the Parks and Beaches Commission will be carrying this work out as direct works or whether it will be done by private enterprise. I think this is some information which this Hon. House should have and I will be glad if the Minister in replying would give some information on this particular matter.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that as far as I am concerned there is a national problem of beach erosion and it is necessary I think for a national approach to this problem in terms of studying the problem in its entirety and trying to come up with a long term development plan for the protection of what is indeed one of the greatest resources of this country. Very few countries are blessed with white sand beaches in terms of the land area which they have as Barbados is and I think that it is a matter of national concern that the stretch of beach around this country should be given the greatest possible protection.

Now the whole question of coastal protection, and indeed beach nourishment, is one about which I do not think very much is known. All of the processes involved, all the factors involved in coastal erosion and coastal protection present problems for the experts, and I think that because of the importance of our beaches it is necessary for the matter to be studied in very great detail and a group of experts put on this problem. I have heard my colleague, the member for St. Philip South, speaking with great feeling about the erosion which has taken place at the Crane and Foul Bay beaches. I personally know of erosion on the West Coast, some of the beaches there are being eroded, and there are other areas as well so we must not take this thing for granted and believe that the beaches will exist in their present form for ever and ever amen. Erosion takes place during heavy seas and the action of the waves and the wind result in a continual movement of sand, and it is necessary therefore in order to protect the beach or to build up beaches to carry out a constant watch on the movement of sand on the beaches in order to ensure that this resource is protected.

The construction of groynes can solve the problem. Groynes, breakwaters and other works may indeed go some way not necessarily towards a complete solution of the problem of erosion because that will continue in spite of the groynes, but what they do is to reduce the level of erosion, and to that extent they represent a useful means of trying to protect this particular resource. We must all be very conscious of the need to concern our natural resources and I would like to join with the member for Christ Church North Central — not South Central, I interpreted the speech of the member for Christ Church West as an attempt to give some political ice cream to the member for Christ Church South Central in his absence.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. Will the hon. member come in from out of the sun before he melts, Sir?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I sat here listening to the member for Christ Church West for quite some time, and I think all of us in here would be agreed that it was not one of his best speeches he made in this

Chamber. I have heard him more forthright, but in his attempts to make the member for Christ Church South Central look good and very important — I do not know why, I do not know if there are any problems within the party and he must be resuscitated now, but he really went to an extreme. I thank him for the technical details. I think on that score he did give us some information, but that was the tenor of the speech and I got the message, it was some speculating hoping that something will rub off on the member. Is he on holiday, though?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order. I would just like to give the answer that the member he has referred to is in England looking after the interest of Barbados, leading a high-powered trade mission, Sir. That is where he is.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I thank him, Mr. Chairman. I am glad the member for St. James has given that information. He has to be there on a high-powered mission, and apparently he has left the leadership of the House to a very low-powered man.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, is the hon. member not admitting that with the state of the Opposition they really need no more steam, Sir?

Mr. SANDIFORD: If I could get back to the matter in hand, Sir, I think I would join with the member for Christ Church North Central in calling for an aesthetic kind of groyne of that south coast, because while these works are necessary for the development and protection of our beaches, I hope at the same time that we do not get any type of construction which would destroy the natural amenities of that particular coastline, and I think that it is a point which all of us would wish. To that extent I wonder if before this debate is finished we could see the drawings the technical details for this particular subject. It is customary, I have seen this done on many occasions. Groynes are constructed in relation to gradients, their height, their length, their depth, but there must be some technical details available which we could look at.

1.35 p.m.

If indeed we are asking that this be a matter which would be very long lasting and of which we all would be proud, I think there must be some technical details which we should be able to look at. So, Mr. Chairman, another reason why I am particularly interested in the technical details is because there is something known as littoral drift, in which the material and sand on the beaches move not only back and forth but also sideways, and if the technical details are not right it may mean that the groyne may be too successful and may prevent the build-up a little further down from the tidal movements. This is the problem you may solve at one particular point; you may build up a lovely beach at one point, but if that groyne is too successful and too far out to sea it

may create a problem at another point down the coast, and that is why I am calling for a complete study of this whole question of beach erosion, not in terms of a small section of our beaches but in toto.

I also believe the time has come when further effort should be made to develop Barbadian expertise in this particular area. I know that in the former administration at least one engineer was given a course through the Training Department to study the problem relating to beach erosion, and I would like to call on the Government to use its resources either in the area of the Training Fund or the National Development Scholarship Fund to ensure that we build up expertise in this particular area. It is one which is of particular concern to us at a national level and I do hope that we will be able eventually to maintain in very good condition our beaches as an amenity both for Barbadians and for those guests who come among us from time to time.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I regret that the hon. member for Christ Church South Central is not here today, because although he would have been able to participate or vote in this debate — and I trust that at least one of the previous speakers on the other side ...

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central has said that if the member for Christ Church South Central was here he would not be able to vote. Is he implying that there would be a conflict of interest, and if there is, will the hon. member please tell it out clearly? Because I am going to deal with him later about the \$50,000 that came down here from New York and challenge him on it.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, if I may continue without rude and irrelevant interruption...

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You see, Mr. Chairman, this is the problem we have. But the day is yet young; there is plenty of time to fix our case.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, before I came in here this morning I heard that there would be a blitz today and I have come prepared.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member suggesting a conflict of interest involving some hon. member on the Government side?

Dr. HAYNES: I did not say so, Mr. Chairman. As I said, I would like to reinforce very much what the previous speaker on this side has been trying to get across, but this is an area where from the scientific and technical view point there is very limited information available and in a development of this kind I am surprised to see that only a sum of \$13,600 will be spent on professional services.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, let me explain to the hon. member. A study of the whole of that area has already been done and is available to the Government. A study of the Speightstown area is being done and the British Government is giving assistance for a technical study for the rest of Barbados. I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. It has been advised that it be done in sections, and the \$13,000 is for this section.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make is that this type of thing should not be done in sections. And since the hon. member for Christ Church West does not know what I am talking about, I wonder if he knows that the whole area between the supermarket and Oistin going back up to Maxwell Hill right down to Rendezvous is owned by senior members of the Barbados Labour Party and supporters of the Barbados Labour Party.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member is now getting beyond himself. The hon. member believes he can continue to make false allegations about hon. members of this House. I challenge him to go outside and repeat allegations of improper conduct by any members of this side. If he has guts, let him put his profession on the line instead of all the dirty insinuations that they continue to do. Does the hon. member want me to get in here and reveal what he owns in Barbados?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must be careful how he imputes improper motives to members of this House. I would advise the hon. member to continue his debate dealing with the section before the Committee.

Dr. HAYNES: I did not say any hon. member present in this House is involved in certain ownership situations and therefore I do not see the reason why there should be this kind of viciousness being directed toward me.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I understand the hon. member to say senior members in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have gone away from this question of improper motives. The hon. member will continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Let him continue; I have asked my colleague not to get up when he is talking. Dr. Mahy is looking for him; leave him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You made your point; please take your seat.

Dr. HAYNES: Dr. Mahy is a good friend of mine and is well aware of my psychiatric position. I am sure

that if many other persons would seek his assistance they would receive a considerable amount of benefit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue with your debate.

Dr. HAYNES: I am trying to continue but I am constantly being interrupted. I was trying to make the point that it is absolutely important ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member accusing the Chair of interrupting him? I have asked him to continue the debate.

1.45 p.m.

It is very important that I make a point on this because I feel that when we are spending money on the development of groynes and so on these might be increasing the value of certain properties on the seaside; and I know for a fact that there has been a very heavy appeal in that particular area for many years for Government to commit itself to expenditure in the area rather than hoteliers in the area contributing to the expenditure for building groynes which would eventually enhance the value of their property. That is my feeling.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member is implying that the reason why the Government has brought this Resolution down — and I want to make the position clear. I do not beat around the bush. The hon. member is implying that the reason why the Government is putting in groynes in this area is because they are improving the property of people connected with the Barbados Labour Party. Let me make this clear. My mother's estate owned a house in Oistins for several years. This passed out of the estate from me to Mr. Cameron Hewitt's daughter or daughters. I do not like these insinuations. I deal with issues quite clearly; so if the hon. member wants to allege any bad faith let him come out. I do not beat around the bush.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the hon. member that in all honesty I did not even know of this particular connection. I was speaking on the general principles.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will agree that all of that has nothing to do with the matter before us.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, all that I was trying to suggest is that where the Government is expending money which is likely to enhance the value of seaside properties in a particular area, some arrangements should be made whereby those who own properties in those areas, particularly commercial properties, make some contribution.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I have read quite a bit about groynes. I have never known any country to have

such a plan as a national plan from one side of the country to the other that will make people build their own groynes. I know of countries where groynes have been built by the Government regardless of who owns the land.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I would like to know if the hon. member can tell me who were the owners of land within the Fontabelle area when the Government spent money to extend the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I draw to Your Honour's attention the rules of debate in this House. (Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: What is the rule?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: There is a procedure for a point of order to relate in a certain way. Two hon. members are continually interrupting the hon. member in carrying on his speech.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have made my point. It is obvious from the nervousness of the hon. members on the other side that I have touched on a very raw nerve which is hurting them badly. (Asides.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Surely, it is not expected of a very good surgeon to touch raw nerves like that.

Dr. HAYNES: I agree with you. I will come off of that in these circumstances. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is a Mr. Compton Bynoe — I think that is his name — who set out many scientific problems associated with the building of groynes; and I believe that one of the problems in this area has certainly been suggested by people with some scientific knowledge; and it was the building of the Coast Guard Station; and it has been suggested that the erosion that has taken place has moved towards Bridgetown over the years while a very excellent beach was created on the other side which might have been consequential on that development. That to me is a very valid point that the hon. member for St. Michael South was trying to make.

That is why it is very important that when you undertake this kind of development, it is very essential to look at the totality of the problem rather than to approach it sectionally. Now, I am a little concerned and many people are concerned, about the deterioration in the state of cleanliness of beaches in Barbados over the past year, and to some extent over the past two years. Now many of us when we see the sum of \$136,000 being made available to the Parks and Beaches Commission hope that with the employment generated, the first people

who would be employed would be those people who were laid off by the present Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN at this stage ruled that certain remarks be expunged from the record.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN report progress was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
1.55 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting now stand suspended until 3.15 p.m. Sir, this is in the light that members on the other side would have enough time to study the papers which they were aware of earlier in the day. I am simply giving this indication as a matter of common decency. I am not supposed to give them that in the light that I have suspended the Standing Orders Sir, and I beg to move Sir, that this House be suspended until 3.15 p.m. I am giving them all the latitude they require.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you rise to second the.....

Mr. TAITT: No, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I consider the intervention by the Leader of the House to be (a) totally uncalled for and (b) inaccurate. In the first place, Sir, the hour which we get from 2 until 3 o'clock is for lunch. If he just thinks that the 15 minutes thereafter.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know of the hour from 2.00 until 3.00 p.m. I know from 2.00 to 3.45 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: It is the same thing, Sir. It will be half an hour. They have indicated Sir and earlier the Prime Minister spoke to me, for example, about a White Paper. The White Paper has not even got here yet and he is now saying that half an hour would be decency, according to him, would be enough time for the studying of papers.

I consider that this attempt to subvert the concept inherent in the holding of a meeting from 12 p.m. and our having lunch from 2 to 2.45 p.m. to be a quite unsuccessful attempt to try to interfere with the normal movement of business in the House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sure you will agree that from 2.00 to 2.45 p.m. is perfectly normal for us and that we should get on with what is perfectly normal.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting until 3.15 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it does revert.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central will have about two or three minutes more.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, at the interruption I was about to conclude my speech, so I am not particularly worried about the two or three minutes although common courtesy might have been indicated that a question might have been asked whether I was about to conclude or not. But I am not accustomed to such courtesies from the other side and I do not expect them either. In fact, I am expecting what they plan to say Sunday night later this evening. That is no problem with me. I am accustomed to personal assaults of that nature.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to re-emphasise and I regret that the hon. member for Christ Church South Central is not here because he would have appreciated what I am going to say. I do not think that there has been sufficient time to study this problem. I think that Tourism in the distant future as far as we can see is going to be very fundamental to the economy of this country. It is a difficult scientific area and I would like to have seen and heard a more comprehensive plan for the protection of erosion of the beaches being brought before this Honourable House.

I did not go to lunch. I went into the Christ Church area over the past hour or so and now that the hon. member for Christ Church West has given further information on these groynes, I am more dissatisfied that there are going to be no major benefits in terms of beach development or protection of beach erosion, that a few institutions in that area and a few people would be benefitting from it and will be paid for from the public purse and that they themselves should be contributing to the cost of those groynes and I sincerely hope that when they benefit from the appreciation of their properties that just as the poor people starting today to receive increases in their property assessments, sometimes up to 60%, that we will see an increase in the property assessment for taxation of those properties that benefit from the building of those groynes.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, and finally I would like to repeat a very deep and heart-felt plea that when these sums of money become available to the Parks and Beaches Commission that some consideration should be given to those people who were dismissed shortly after September, 1976 and who, in my view, were the victims of one of the most vicious kinds of victimisation programmes ever mounted by any administration in this country. Thank you.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. The last words must surely be withdrawn as being unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already warned the hon. member about the use of such language as being unparliamentary. He has already been warned. I will ask him please withdraw those remarks.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I unreservedly withdraw those remarks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. Those remarks must be dropped from the record. Does any other hon. member....

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I was reluctant to speak on this Resolution since it was my view that a Resolution of this nature would not have brought forward the type of fury which I heard from the last speaker who just sat down. It certainly takes a very unusual man who would leave Parliament to say that he would forego lunch to journey to an area quite away from the Parliament Buildings to investigate certain matters which are not of his discipline. One would want to know what type of activity that member was embarking upon.
3.20 p.m.

As a matter of fact, seldom if ever in my life have I heard a speech more loaded with hatred and venom than the one coming from the last hon. member.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, surely those words must be unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I do not know what the hon. member wants withdrawn.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order...

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: A point of order on a point of order?

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order...

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, unless you rule I will not sit down.

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

Mr. TAITT: I am on a point of order.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I want to continue to address you on this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will have to entertain the point of order.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South contain himself, please? Will the hon. member take his seat? (Mr. TAITT sat.)

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

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: On a further point of order...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have it. Please be seated. I have heard remarks from the hon. member for St. Lucy. I will have to warn him.

With respect to the point of order raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, I will ask that the hon. member for St. Andrew withdraw the remarks as being unparliamentary.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, in deference to you...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do want you to withdraw. Please withdraw.

Mr. TAITT rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South please sit?

(Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.)

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, with due deference to your ruling...

Mr. TAITT and Mr. SANDIFORD rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Need I tell hon. members that they must sit when the Chairman stands? Now I will ask the hon. member for St. Andrew to withdraw.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: With due deference to your ruling, I withdraw.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Very much in order. You may now continue your speech.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what do you rise? Is this a point of order on a point of order?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Arising out of something that you said. I am not on that particular point. I will have to state my point. On two occasions recently you called into debate the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must sit. (Mr. SANDIFORD sat.)

Mr. SANDIFORD: I rise on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I am pointing out that on two occasions recently you referred to the hon. member for St. Michael South, and since the resumption of this debate, I have not entered into the debate. I believe you meant the hon. member for St. Michael South West, and I hope for the purpose of the record he will set that straight.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is well taken. Let the Hon. Minister of Agriculture continue.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, we have sat here today and heard coming from the other side...

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not tolerate these interruptions.

Dr. HAYNES: The debates of this House should be conducted in English.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I do not know what the hon. member has really risen on, but certainly he reminds me very much of a toy that you wind and allow to jump about. That is typical of his behaviour since he came into this Honourable House. It is unfortunate that democracy is at work and therefore we have to tolerate the outcome of the process of democracy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair must not be interrupted by any hon. member.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing here with a very vital and important area. We are not concerned at all with who is involved as a handful of individuals. We are concerned with the totality of the problems of the area within the South and the effects to the Island.

We have had a situation where in the previous regime an undertaking was carried out to do with the Coast Guard project and we have found a total and complete fiasco, and I have heard nothing said by the last hon. member who spoke on this subject. Not a word was

said on that, that thousands of dollars of the country's money were thrown down the drain without any account being given to the country over the irresponsible behaviour of an inept Government. Nothing whatever was said. What we are seeking to do now is to right the mal practices of the previous regime. Is it the purpose of the Government to see millions of dollars worth of property go into the sea or being destroyed because a handful of people might benefit as a result? Should it be the policy of any Government at all to be concerned with who benefits so long as it is doing what it considers to be right?

The previous Government took a decision to extend the Deep Water Harbour which was so wisely conceived and expertly executed by the Barbados Labour Party Government, and in the process a number of people who were intimately connected with the last Government have benefited greatly as a result of that extension. Captain Fergusson, a case in point, and his sister. The Tudor family, and I mean Cameron Tudor's sister, benefited as a result. Shamrock Trading Company benefited largely as a result, and I am sure it is to the satisfaction of the hon. member for St. Michael South West that that has been so. Nobody has accused them of corruption or seeking to carry out the project in the interest of the country which will be beneficial to a handful of their friends, but it is clear and positively glaring that a number of their friends would have benefited as a result. I have just called a few names, but there are many more names.

The Government has undertaken to carry out a programme of activity in the Scotland area to conserve one-seventh of the total Island's land mass, which is 104,000 acres, just over 40,000 hectares. In such an execution a number of people who are friends of the former regime and the party that now constitutes the Opposition benches will benefit largely. I have heard no voice in opposition from the Opposition benches about the carrying out of such a project. It is very easy and any fool can accuse. There is no problem about that. People have accused others for doing something to benefit their friends. Anybody can say, it is the easiest thing to say, and especially when you are in Parliament, when you are sheltered by parliamentary immunity, that can always be said, but when you call upon them to call the names of the people whom they are referring to, all of them take shelter.

3.30 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central has an amazing capacity and felicity of trying to implicate people in the scheme of things, but I want to assure him that this side understands his motives very well. We are capable of rebutting whatever he puts up because he puts up nothing. He is trying to constitute himself in this Parliament as a Mother Hubbard who covers everything and touches nothing, and I believe that is the same form

he will go out in 1981, because if he believes that that pattern of behaviour will be accepted by the country at large, I assure him that he will be totally mistaken.

The Oistins area and that part we are seeking to develop is an area that has a great history, but the hon. member for St. Michael South Central does not believe in the history because he himself does not have one, but that area has a history and certainly in the Barbados Labour Party we are proud of that history in the area of Christ Church and we feel that it is deserving of development. We feel the same way about the Scotland area, the Deep Water Harbour area and the St. Peter area of Speightstown and we are not concerned with who is affected by the programmes which we seek to carry out, we are concerned with putting into being the projects which we conceive and believe are in the best interests of the people of this country. We want that to be clearly understood and the quicker that is understood I think is the best for all concerned.

I would not normally have entered into this debate, I believe that this is a simple and straightforward matter that any primer standard child would conceive without any difficulty, but the Opposition thinks it is its duty to oppose; we accept that but we expect them to oppose with a measure of intelligence.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, my contribution on this particular measure has been tempered primarily by the statements made by the hon. member who has just sat down. In the first of his statements he said that the member for St. Michael South West would be satisfied and he indicated that any fool can accuse and then that statements made subsequently can have the shelter of parliamentary immunity. He then went on to name persons who happen for purposes of geographical location to be in the constituency which I have the honour to represent.

The arrangements that were made for those persons who were living at Lands End who would fall within the ambit of the development of the Deep Water Harbour, those arrangements were made for the people within the governmental structure. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the question of the Shamrock was settled, as you very well know, extra the governmental machinery in the courts, and I have no wish to debate that. I just wish to make it clear that I myself have no particular knowledge of the benefits or otherwise which might accrue to any individuals from the establishment or erection of the groynes, and I myself have to say that so far as the creation of groynes on what is called the south western part of the country is concerned, that groynes appear to be the method which will have to be used if we are to prevent the agents of denudation from devastating the particular coastline, and it is unfortunate that in the course of putting forward what was a relatively simple

resolution the member for Christ Church West considered it necessary to put it into the area of partisan discussion. I thought when a Minister introduced something he would introduce it without claiming any partisanship for it. It is when the member for Christ Church West got up and started to put it in a particular arena that the whole problem of pro and con came about.

There is no BLP or DLP way to protect our coast. The question of the protection of the coast is a matter for all Barbadians, and I think that it is not in the interest of the public of this country for us to be making the preservation of our heritage a political football. Wherever we are in the world whether we are inundated by the ravages of the sea or by highwinds or by any other agent, it is necessary and it will be necessary for the administration in power at the time to take those steps that are available to it.

Now, Sir, when it was decided to base the Coast Guard, do you believe that somebody said that we were going to create some additional land there for the people who live on that part of the coast? I do not wish to call any names, somebody said that we were creating a Coast Guard to help some people.

Mr. Chairman, there is no particular expertise that is available to us in Barbados on the question of groynes. I draw to your attention that for as long as the Hilton Hotel has been established the question of groynes has given us problems, very technological problems which apparently have been outside our technological capability. Nature has a way of dealing with matters before it, and if nature through its activity is creating problems in Barbados it is our duty to help solve those problems. I think it is not within the dignity of those of us who go up to the people and tell them that we are going to represent them to keep trying every time something comes up to divide it into a question of BLP and DLP. Mr. Chairman, there is no DLP way to pick up stuff, there is no BLP way to pick up stuff, there is a way in which you pick up stuff, their methodology might be different, their approach might be different and it has to be understood that in the political arena we have to make points pro and con, but I am getting a little tired of every time a measure is introduced we are expected to make some kind of devastating point to demonstrate that every single person in the Government is an idiot. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for everybody to make that point and it is not necessary for them every time an issue comes before us that we must have paraded what I call the Hon. Attorney General's pet speech.

Mr. Chairman, let us take Oistins. I have never made any great fanfare of the fact, no song and dance of the fact that the development of Oistins was conceived, that the question of financing it is a matter which was discussed with the European Economic Community,

specifically the European Development Fund, the bank, all of those agencies who came to the Caribbean saying where are you projects which you wish us to help with, and there is only a small amount of money available on concessional terms, we said Oistins is one of those areas where we would like to see funds from the EEC operating. We also said that the Maurice Byer Clinic which at that time had a different name — it was a multi-purpose clinic which as you know, Mr. Chairman, the Latin and Greek “multi” and “poly” have different meanings, there is a very small difference, but for what it is worth, if the Hon. Minister calls it a polyclinic I have no quarell with that — but the point is that the people of St. Peter are going to benefit from the kind of medical services which all right thinking Barbadians believe that every Barbadian should benefit from.

3.40 p.m.

But that money was negotiated before September 2, 1976, and it has to be understood that in a country like Barbados which is a developing country there has to be continuity of Government. It is nonsense for anyone to suggest that Government in Barbados began on September 2, 1976.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that there were a number of plans, ideas and concepts in the works. These things are conceived not by Ministers only, but by dedicated civil servants whose business it is to advise Ministers. Therefore, if the same set of experts advised the Minister on development of an area at Oistin or recommended a particular type of development in St. Peter, it does not behove us to seek to get special credit and as a result exacerbate the situation which tends to lead Barbados down the wrong path.

Mr. Chairman, let me end by saying — especially to the Minister of Agriculture — that we expect the rule of law in Barbados. We expect that if a person is to be done out of his property for eminent domain such persons will be compensated. If it can be demonstrated that any Government makes a particular decision for a particular group it would be the duty for any parliamentarian if he has such information to air it. So let us try, if we can, in putting forward our points and positions on issues like this to remove some of the hostility; there is plenty of time and place otherwise for hostility.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the acting Leader of the Opposition today chastized the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and the vein in which he spoke today is enough to convince me that he read the sermon of the Rev. Dean Crichlow even if interpreted with a little hypocrisy.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I submit....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must withdraw the word “hypocrisy”.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I withdraw hypocrisy. This Resolution is before us as part of the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto whereby it sets out the development of Oistin, Speightstown, Holetown and Bridgetown — and to go a little further, I think St. George and St. Philip.

Now Sir, it was introduced without any sort of flair. The hon. member for Christ Church West seconded the Resolution, and in seconding all the member did after giving in detail the reason for the Resolution was to pat his colleague on the back and say that the measure was dear to his colleague's heart. I happen to know that since 1966 when I was in the Opposition, because the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party in 1966 also called for the development of Oistin, Speightstown and Holetown.

Now there is an underwater park which is going to be set up in Holetown. We are hopeful of having special facilities at Holetown but we have not heard anything of anybody getting any money out of it. But my colleague just patted his colleague on the back which was richly deserved. I must say it was a speech really not in keeping with the hon. member for St. Michael South. I have been here for the past seven years and you have always picked the ball and stroked it to suit, but you made a bad speech today and set the tone for one of the most vulgar speeches I have ever heard on the floor of this House from 1966 until now, coming out of the mouth of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Not even in the days of the Leader of the Opposition when he was in his heyday did he ever make a speech of that nature.

I have been in politics since 1961 and I have heard all sorts of things said about my political opponents and my colleague and I have heard the Leader of the House publicly assassinated without assassinating. I have seen him brought almost to his knees. Eventually he lost his seat in 1966, but I have never heard from even his greatest detractors that he was a person who could not stand up to the test of integrity; not even his greatest detractors would have said today what the hon. member for St. Michael South Central implied.

It is common knowledge that the Leader of Government has or had an interest in a supermarket in Oistin, the land which I am told is or was owned by a Mr. Trevor Talma for many years.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman...

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am not giving way on a point of elucidation. Never during his twelve years in here has he ever been accused of being a man who had even the slightest tendency toward corrupt practices; not even his greatest detractor has ever said that.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is being suggested that I was trying to suggest or

impute — I wish to be very clear in order that this point of order cannot be disputed. It is being suggested that in the course of my address before this honourable House I was trying to suggest...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are explaining something.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the point of order is that it is being suggested that in my address I made certain remarks impugning the integrity of the hon. member for Christ Church South Central. I wish to make it quite clear....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order. The hon. member will have a chance to speak again if he wishes, but that is no point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, it is said in here that you are not to see strangers in the gallery; but if strangers are in here they will be able to determine for themselves who the hon. member was referring to when he said in his address that senior members on this side had interest...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must inform the hon. member that the remarks which he is referring to were withdrawn by the hon. member in the course of his speech.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Remarks that the Leader of the House, as it was implied, has land stretching from Oistin all through Highgate Gardens and all back down to Broad Street.....

3.50 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I must have some order.

Mr. TAITT: I recall that what the hon. member said — I am not going to repeat what was said; but I draw to Your Honour's attention that it has been struck from the records and that the hon. member cannot now refer to it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member always reminds me of an elephant sitting on a carpet, clumsy. Sir, what is the point? The member for St. Michael South Central went on to say that people should, if they are in private enterprise, put down their own groynes — hoteliers, for example. There is a groyne at Maxwell Point, not done by the Government. There is a groyne at Sheraton Gardens, not done by the Government. There is one at Sand Acres not put down by the Government. There is one at Carlisle not put down by the Government. There is one at Speightstown and one at Southern Palms not put down by the Government, but by private enterprise.

The purpose, therefore, of this Resolution is primarily for the development of the Oistins Area. A

study was done and the report came out in 1978; and all this talk about black and white is a new thing. It was done by consulting engineers, Partnerships Limited. I believe that they are white. I do not know. It is immaterial, and Caribbean Limited. I do not know if they are black or white. That is also immaterial; but I know that Mayhew and Chadderton Engineers are black people, so there is a mixture on this occasion. So they cannot say that we gave it to the David Seale Construction Company. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. No cross talk.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This is what the report says. The stretch of beach under consideration is very widely used by visitors and local residents as evidenced by the number of hotels, apartment complexes and houses which occupy almost the whole of the beach frontage. In order to preserve and improve the basic amenities, the obstruction along the beach should be kept to a minimum, unlike what the member for St. Michael South Central said. He said that the Resolution came in here because certain people wanted to get something out of it so that the values of their properties would go up. What the hon. member for St. Michael South was asking about was to trap the sand while at the same time minimising the erosion downcast caused by littered drift. This can be achieved — and note carefully that we are providing four groynes. The report says that this can be achieved by dividing the coast line into the following littoral styles separated from each other, either by rocky headlands or promontories (a) Oistins Beach, (b) Welches-Maxwell, (c) Maxwell East, (d) Maxwell West and (e) White Sands, St. Lawrence East and St. Lawrence West.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose of this Resolution before this Committee. It is not for the purpose that the member for St. Michael South Central set out. I am going to give the hon. member this challenge now. I have heard him on two occasions. The hon. member is a person who cannot help making wild allegations. I invite my colleagues to cool it. Do not rush him. He told me at Toronto Airport that if he does not work for the remainder of his life his standard of living cannot fall. Cool it. He is capable of making wild allegations both inside and outside. I believe that someone will catch him at first slip. Do not rush him.

He has accused the Leader of the Government of being a person who might force this upon the Government for his own personal aggrandisement. That was the thrust of his speech.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. The hon. member is misleading the House. I think that anyone as far as I am aware, would recognise that the only person who will benefit from groynes are people who have beach property in the area. As far as I am aware, the hon.

member for Christ Church South Central has no beach property in the area. All that I said was...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I know the thrust of his attack. He said that \$50,000 came to Barbados and that it did not reach here yet.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, I said that \$50,000 did not come to Barbados...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the point under consideration.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He repeated it in Speightstown and when he went to New York he asked Broomes in the presence of Clyde Jones to write a report to the Nation. I can call the names, you know. Do not tell me things unless you tell me in the strictest confidence. You said in the presence of Clyde Jones to write a letter to the Nation saying that he is investigating the \$50,000 and clothes. When Broomes asked him about it, he said do not mind that; I will take care of you. I am going to throw down the challenge to the hon. member now. If the hon. member can bring any evidence that anybody on this side, on the front bench or the back bench, in a law court or before President Carter, Trudeau, Barrow, Adams or anyone else, that any member was involved in that sort of behaviour that he has conveyed, I am prepared to resign my seat.

Dr. HAYNES rose.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sit down.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I am telling the hon. member that this has nothing to do with groynes, and that it is not a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am prepared, Sir, to resign my seat and call a by-election in St. James and go into St. James and campaign against this party if such a thing happened; and if the hon. member cannot produce evidence he should resign from the constituency of St. Michael South Central and he can also campaign against his party. I give him from now until the end of December in 1980. I give that challenge. Accept it as a man. Accept it in here or anywhere at all. That challenge is thrown down to him between now and December, 1980. He has a lot of time.
4.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on to the groynes, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Now, Mr. Chairman, I am getting back to let you see why it appeared that I have

digressed for a moment because of the member's approach all the time. Everytime he opens his mouth in here, he tries to accuse this Government of some corrupt practice because his Government lost the Elections because of corrupt practices, but, Sir, Governments do not fall as you may think. They stand the test of time (a) by performance and (b) on what you went down on.

If you and the gang you were associated with were not corrupt you would have been in here all like now so.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The groynes will stand the test of time.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. I believe the hon. member just referred to me and some gang I was with as being corrupt.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, you and your gang.

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

Dr. HAYNES: This statement must be regarded as unparliamentary and must be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I cannot have this. Are you on a point of order?

Dr. HAYNES: I am saying that those remarks referring to me and a gang I was with be withdrawn as being unparliamentary.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That you are in a corrupt gang headed by Sydney Alleyne? That is part and parcel of you. I do not understand how Dr. Caddle...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on with the question under the debate.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am carrying on with the debate in the light that I must rebuke statements made by the Opposition. This is part of the debate, a part of the Resolution and I cannot stand up here and hear some accusations hurled at the Leader of the House, a man whose integrity has never been challenged not until now.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am rising on a point of order. You have asked him to retract a similar statement and I am saying once again that I have never and will never at anytime try to cast any doubt on the integrity of the Leader of the Opposition who I regard as being one of the most honest members on the other side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You mean the Leader of the House. Order please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is a known fact that Oistins, mainly around this time, it is difficult to get a bus to

Oistins. With the extension of the Airport it is even going to be extra work in the Oistins area. We have to make sure that we give a better way of living to the people of Oistins and its surrounding areas and it is unfair to hurl such accusations to the Leader of this Government, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, I would say this, I regret that the member for St. Michael South was even involved in this debate. His standards I have respected, not all the times, some of the times, I have respected the standard of the debates. I have told my colleagues this. He is a man who probably is not as pragmatic as may be the Prime Minister, neither has he got the traits of that tiger in him like some of his friends who are prepared to pull down whoever they can by character assassination for the purpose of cheap political gain. This Government would not come down to that, Sir. This is not only a Government of talkers, this is a Government of power and in the next few years history will tell the tale.

Finally, I just want to give a reply to my colleague over here about parking of cars and so on. I do not think that the member for Christ Church North Central would expect that you are going to have a development at Oistins unless you have proper parking facilities. He has been around the BLP for X amount of years and he will understand that we are a proper planner of things. He does not have to draw to the attention of the Government about a car park. We know that if you are going to improve the facilities at Oistins, Sir, you can be assured that every conceivable thing will be brought in and that is why we have brought in consultants.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Let the hon. member put his case for St. James and let me put mine for Christ Church. If at one stage you have a Church in Oistins, I still will say I want one too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Sir, your point is taken as an explanation. Order please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I look at the people of Barbados, not of a particular area. As Minister of Housing for St. James I could flood the whole area of St. James with houses but I would not do that. I think I would take in St. Lucy too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: St. George, St. George.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Now, Mr. Chairman, I heard something about the Parks and Beaches. I think that was answered by the Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs in the light that he said that in connection with the soil erosion we are getting a National Scholarship which the Minister of Education has already given and that the Government can make a study of this to assist the country. The United Kingdom as you have already been told, has given assistance in this area. The

Parks and Beaches being the arm who is responsible for the beaches and so on did not have the expertise to do it there. They do not have any engineers. That is why you still have a tractor tied up at the Coast Guard that cannot be taken down. That cost \$240,000. You see, if you used to get some expertise, what I am saying is that if I had to go to a doctor I would go to Dr. Hassel now. My trouble in going to other doctors now, Sir, is that the real thing came out of them. Power, the lust of power, not what they have to hand out to the people of this country by way of medicine. It is the lust of power, Sir, power. They do not want any money. They are not interested in medicine, Sir, it is power and you will suffer at the hands of that. I know what I am talking about.

You know he once used to be the second most powerful man. Now he has come down to number 1, 2, 3, 4, drifting down. But he does not stop fighting, Sir, he fights anyhow. Like you he talked about the Leader of the Government today. He said things about him that he has no evidence to support it. That is how you get 40 votes. You always put the weaklings up to the top to knock them down. Keep you out of the way, Sir. You do not know what is going on.

Sir, I do not think there is anything I can say. Now about the Crane and Foul Bay and the bad state about which the member for St. Philip South spoke. I am sorry that now he himself is not in his place.

Mr. SISNETT: On a point of order, Sir. It was not necessary for the member for St. Philip South to make any plea on my behalf. I asked about the Crane and Foul Bay in 1976, long before him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point taken.
4.10 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, my colleague is only reminding me, but the type of pleas I hear coming from the Opposition benches, if I were in their position I would not be asking for anything in Barbados because I heard you were to be in power for 300 years, and all this sort of thing you had at your disposal, and you gave Barbadians Barbados. Nobody was born here until you came alive. You never had a Trade Union in Barbados until the hon. member for St. Lucy came alive. You hear they are celebrating the 40th Anniversary of the Trade Union. All these things. So if I were in the position of the hon. member for St. Philip South I would not be asking. He was a Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Communications and Works, a member of the Government, and now he comes in here begging to have something done up there.

I want to say this about Parks and Beaches. They did a good job under their administration, and under this administration they are going to do a finer job.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will be moderately short, Sir. I must say that there have been things said in this debate that I have really appreciated very much. I particularly appreciated the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South West because I thought that his remarks which were clearly directed to one member of his own side were remarks that need to be made in here. My colleague the hon. member for St. Andrew made a remark with which I am going to disagree. He spoke of certain members of the Opposition thinking they have a duty to oppose. I do not agree with that. There is one member of the Opposition who thinks he has a duty to abuse, and that the only way that Parliamentary business can be conducted is by seeking to undermine the confidence of the people of Barbados not in a political party which forms the Government at the given time, but in the very system by suggesting that those who are in the system are open to the influences and are exercised by the motives which he ascribes to every possible piece of Government business, and the hon. member for St. Michael South West as he spoke, I felt that I did not need to say anything. That is the honest truth, and I am very glad that it came from somebody on his side, because it had to be said sooner or later that we are seeing an attempt conscious or unconscious to destroy parliamentary institutions from within by the very canker of abuse that has dragged down some of our Caricom comrades, Third World countries in Africa, countries in South East Asia, the doctrines of hatred, of destruction which we hear coming from one member of this House. And I join with the hon. member for St. James to say that I have heard more in here since July 1978 that I find distasteful and a disgrace to this House than I heard in all the years that I was a member here or when I used to attend Parliament when in previous days I used to come here when my father and other people were members.

We cannot carry on Government in this country like that, and the people who understand it are not the hon. members on this side, they are hon. members on the Opposition side. They are the only people who have within their hands the control of this hateful, destructive attitude of falsehood that we are being treated to. I heard the speech of the hon. member. He has four times got up to say that he did not mean the Leader of the House when he spoke of senior members on this side who have a financial interest in the groynes now under construction because it will improve their property.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, I believe that I explained when I was speaking and someone rose to a point of order, and said senior members of the Barbados Labour Party; and what the Prime Minister does not understand is that the Barbados Labour Party is not necessarily the Government of Barbados.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There also would have to be a stage where we will have to look at Standing Order No. 32 for persons who persistently disregard the Rules of the House and persistently abuse those rules. We cannot go on forever having persons get up and repeatedly be told that they are not making points of order and still having them get up again. There is a procedure for dealing with these things, and hon. members must be advised that sooner or later we will reach a stage when the temper and patience of all of us in here will not be able to tolerate that. The hon. member now has five times contradicted that he meant the Leader of the House, but he made a statement that the Leader of the House would not vote on this Resolution if he were in here today, or even contribute, so how could he now say he did not mean the Leader of the House? When he sees that everybody is in revulsion at the speech, members on his side and members on this side, he now seeks to say that he did not mean it. In his profession when the hon. member makes a mistake, he buries it. The mistake goes under and cannot be talked about, but in here mistakes cannot be buried.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, the Hon. Prime Minister has just made a statement which I regretfully would have to tell him he is wrong about. When that hon. member makes mistakes in the medical profession, they live to tell him he has made a mistake because in 1969 he told me I had suffered two heart attacks and had two ulcers and that I should never get on a political platform, and then wrote me a letter to say that air is difficult to diagnose. So when he sees me, it is typical of him making mistakes and saying it is not true.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. Order please.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, those remarks were totally untrue and perhaps the judgement in the Court yesterday is more relevant at this time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He cannot help abusing. I said there were two things that I enjoyed in this debate. The first was the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South West. The second was the admission by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that Dr. Mahy, the Superintendent of the Psychiatric Hospital is fully aware of his psychiatric profile, because if he does not know it, this is a case of physician heal thyself, physician give thyself some good advice and ask Dr. Mahy what is wrong with you. That is what I say unto the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Something must be wrong with him that he can reach a level of professional success, of economic success, and yet he cannot help trying to drag down other people. I am actually ashamed to think that I am one of the ranks of Barbados Scholars like the hon. member for St. Michael

South and the hon. member for Christ Church West with him. I actually have to say to myself what is it in Barbados that a man by his own efforts and ability can rise to have an education, rise in the world and come into the House of Assembly and behave the way the hon. member behaves consistently. I cannot understand it, Sir.

This is a very simple Resolution. One of the reasons I am rising is because there is a Minister of Finance and Planning input into it over a period of time, because of an error made in judging the position of the groyne at the Coast Guard, an enormous volume of sand has built up to the South of the Coast Guard groyne. That sand is sand that is produced off the South West of the Island, off Bowbells reef and off the coral reefs to the South West and normally it travels up the coast replenishing the beaches at Oistins and at points north. The sand has been trapped by the Coast Guard barrage. We have never accused anybody in here of corruption in putting up the Coast Guard barrage. We have accused them of not getting good advice. That is it. But the fact is that the beaches at Oistins and points north have been denuded of sand. They do not have the same amount of sand that they used to have. At Cashell there is not the same amount of sand. Engineering opinion has been given that the very road at Welches is likely to be threatened by the sea, because the sea is closer. Certainly I have seen sand washed into the road at Welches quite often. The houses on the little portion at Welches also do not have as much beach as they had before the Coast Guard was built. We have not offered any of those persons compensation; but we are protecting them now against further erosion and protecting the beach which is the heritage of all of us by putting up these groynes.

4.20 p.m.

I do not think the groyne will go, there is permission for a groyne to be where the St. Lawrence Hotel was, I believe. I do not think it was ever built but when that permission was given we did not accuse Mr. Peter Morgan of corruption, I never heard anybody say in here that it was a corrupt practice to give Peter Morgan permission to put up a groyne, but the study is going right to St. Lawrence. St. Lawrence and the St. Lawrence Gap area provide a major source of employment for Barbadians a major source of tourist earnings. We are now encouraging an owner in St. Lawrence Gap to build a 450 room hotel in two phases, 250 first and another 200. I got a letter from him last week but we are encouraging in respect of the existing hotels, we are trying to encourage Barbadians to have developments inside St. Lawrence Gap, we are looking at the drainage of the area, I believe that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is the only man on earth who would say that we are doing this for corrupt purposes in order to come to some kind of deal with the persons who own the hotels.

Speaking for myself, maybe the Secretary of the Party can contradict me, but I doubt it, but I do not know a single member of the Barbados Labour Party who owns a hotel in St. Lawrence Gap, not one, and I know the Dems do. We are trying to do this to preserve the sea coast of this island, as we come right down we are trying our best to make sure that this part of our heritage is not damaged by the ill-considered activity of the Coast Guard station, and that is the purpose of the groynes.

The Oistins development which will give more work, which will mean an increase in the amount of fish landed in this country so that the diet of the population can be supplemented by the fish that Barbadians like and we can reduce our requirements for imported protein, we are trying to produce conditions that will uplift Oistins, a historical area as the hon. member said, but that has not had very much development over a long period of time and we have to be told that the Leader of the House would not vote for this if he were in here because he had a financial interest in the matter. The only beach I know he owns is indeed the Coast Guard beach, because I believe he does own a considerable portion of it. I have heard a lot of people deny it, he has never hidden that he lives on the sea at Enterprise. I suppose that the hon. member in the fullness of time when he is finally repudiated by the Leader of the Opposition would allege that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House got together corruptly to build a Coast Guard station so as to improve Mr. Dean's and the Leader of the House's property. You can expect that, but that is what we descended to in one instance in here. The trouble is, Sir, that while you may say that one rotten apple does not mean that all are rotten, the rotten apple has a way, the germs, the worms, the nastiness come out of the rotten apple and they get at the others and it reaches the stage where people just get a taste for rotten apple skins. That is the danger, and that is why the hon. member for St. Michael South West must be congratulated by all of us on a timely and well thought out and well considered speech on this matter.

I was glad to see the Leader of the Opposition for today standing up to make a statesman like contribution relative to the standard of debate in the House and nobody better than he could deal with this particular problem, because what the Acting Leader of the House and I say may be construed as partisanship, what he says has to be understood as good sense in the interest of us all. I remember Senator MacCarthy carried on for year after year in the United States Senate, nobody was free from his abuse, he would hold up papers.....(Dr. HAYNES: Like the cheques on television). The cheques on television were genuine

cheques, every single one, but MacCarthy said "I have a list here of 250 Communists in the State Department. This man was paid so much and so much." It took the United States Senate from 1950 to 1958 to deal with Senator MacCarthy and he did that country a lot of harm in that time. One nasty stinking apple in a barrel of 96 men, and we have to be very careful indeed that in our 24 do not take eight years or even two years but we smell out the stinking apple very early. And the thing about the hon. member is that he will smile now in the face of Mrs. St. John, he will smile in the face of the family of the hon. member, he would probably smile in his face and try to talk to him as though he was man to man. Let me tell him, he cannot get under the shoes of the hon. member for Christ Church South Central, he is tall enough to reach out with his tongue to lick them, the stinking apple, and it is time that we drive this out of public life in this country. Those who think that love is to be bought, those who think that decency is something to be abused, those who think that the public are people to be fooled, it has to be driven out of public life in Barbados if this country is to survive comfortably.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mind if it survives under the present Prime Minister, the Leader of the House, the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Michael South West, the hon. member for St. Michael South, it can survive which ever party is in power because there is always a fundament of decency in the people's representatives by and large in this country. No Government is entirely bad and no Government is entirely good either. These things have to be understood, but we will all be dragged down into the gutter where \$50 in Eric Sealy's hand will buy you a cursing of everybody on earth where finding a supporter on the other side somebody is open to corruption, somebody is to be described as the most perverted man on earth. What was the description of a certain person from St. George South who found themselves open to corruption, and cut out the weakest spots, a kind of political acupuncture but not to cure the corrupt, to drive the needle in at the point most open to corruption to try to destroy decent people and drag them down to the level that the man knows he really is inside. That is the fundamental problem, he knows what type of person he is and he cannot stand to look at Henry Forde or Bernard St. John or Branford Taitt, the hon. member for St. Michael South West or the Hon. Member for St. Michael South. He knows what he is and he sees what they are. That is what is going to go wrong with political life in this country if we do not put a stop to it early.

4.30 p.m.

And, Sir, a final point relating to the Ministry of Finance and Planning: If the Government carries out a development and private owners are thereby assisted, Government can impose a development charge and a

betterment levy. We do not think that this particular development is of a nature to attract a development charge. I am not saying that this will be the case forever; development charges have been put on in Cave Hill and will be put on at Heywoods and perhaps other areas as we see our projects develop. But the machinery is there. We are reviewing the necessity for a betterment levy, bearing in mind that the new system of taxation valuation may take care of that. But the Government is bearing all these points in mind that where a government development brings great increase in the value of adjacent lands and properties the Government can levy some of the increased value first by way of taxation based on valuation every three years and secondly by way of a development charge by which a certain percentage of the increase in value will be paid to the government on any sale. Government is fully aware of all these matters and will take appropriate steps as it becomes necessary in any development by Government.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to support this Resolution.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the first Resolution of which notice was given this morning, the Resolution for \$9 million, be the next Item of business.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79

NO. 15 FOR THE SUM OF

\$9,484,314

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is part of a general order which sets out new rates of pay for public officers of non-established casual and temporary grades. We do not need to supplement the vote for established staff as that would be paid automatically but we do need to supplement the vote for the wages of unestablished, non-established, casual and temporary staff, and we do need to supplement the allowances for housing and entertainment paid to officers entitled thereto. The necessary calculations have been made and we have come up with the sum of \$9,484,314. This represents the last chapter in what has been a long saga in relation to public officers salaries, and I beg to move that Heads 1 to 19 stand part.

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

The question that Heads 1 to 19 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79
NO. 16 \$405,503

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there is a certain number of staff who are employed on capital projects rather than recurrent. Their emoluments are charged to these research projects in agriculture, soil conservation, the livestock scheme, airport capital works, staff of the Ministry of Communications and Works on certain construction projects, as well as staff at the Ministry of Housing and Lands doing work in connection with the new Land Registry which would be needed to effectuate our purpose when we pass the various land Bills currently before the Joint Select Committee.

I beg to move that the supplement for these Capital Heads 109, 113, 114 and 118 stand part.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79
NO. 17 \$102,006

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Estimates for the Post Office are shown in a separate order from the Estimates and the rest of the Public Service proper, and this supplement of \$102,006 is related to these estimates. We have to supplement personal emolument by that amount.

I would just like to offer a word of praise and congratulation to the hon. members for St. Andrew and St. Joseph on their administration of the Post Office to date this year.

The Post Office for a number of years had been losing money and had not been able to bring revenue in the line of expenditure. But I am very happy to say that consistently so far this year the Post Office has been able to turn its position around and make a consistent profit, and the unbudgeted surplus at the end of September was \$155,509, which will take care of the increase of salaries which we have granted. If this performance continues I have no doubt that the Post Office will show a surplus despite the increase in salary since the date of Budget.

I beg to move that Head 1 of the Annexed Estimates stand part.

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

The question that Head 1 of the annexed Estimates stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79
NO. 18 \$295,103

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the second Head of the annexed Estimates is the Head dealing with the Port Department. It will be understood that salaries and wages of the Port have also increased. Total salaries of Government employees — these are not persons like those in the battle last week in respect of whom the hon. member for St. James had to tell Mr. Frank Walcott to look at these figures and had them accepted by him. These are the employees of the Port Department itself and the required sum of \$295,103.

I beg to move that Head 2 of these Estimates stand part.

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

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of five Resolutions in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

4.40 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that five money Resolutions be now agreed to.

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

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

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE CONDITIONS TO
BE APPLIED TO HEADTEACHERS, DEPUTY
HEADTEACHERS AND THE VARIOUS
CATEGORIES OF TEACHER IN
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The Second Order of the Day was called — a Resolution that with effect from 1st April, 1978, the conditions set out in Schedule A hereto be applied to Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers and the various categories of Teacher in Secondary Schools and that their emoluments shall be as set out in Schedule B hereto and payable with effect from 1st April, 1978.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I will detain you with a very long speech on the question of teachers' pay. We very much regret that we have been unable to reach agreement with the Barbados Union of Teachers on the payment of their members; but we have been able to reach agreement with the Union representing the categories covered in

this Resolution. This Resolution seeks to bring that agreement into course and to identify the new salaries relating to the persons concerned. These will be found in Schedules A and B. We are glad that the Secondary Teachers Union has found it possible to agree to an increase for their members and to get these increases in good time to meet their commitments for Christmas and everything else. I repeat that we very much regret that we have not been able to deal with the Barbados Union of Teachers, but I am hopeful that the agreement will soon be reached. It may very well be that the dispute with the teachers is an internal dispute rather than one with the Government. I regret very much the stand that is still being taken in certain quarters; but the Government holds itself out to discussion with the BUT on conditions of service and so on. These discussions have been going on for years. I stand open to correction, but as far as I know the BUT has never been able to agree with any Government on anything; therefore I do not feel that we are out of line with commonsense or industrial propriety on the stand which we have taken. I do not wish to comment further because the negotiations are still taking place; but I really wish that the BUT would take some cognisance of what the more mature unions bring to negotiations. My only wish is that the leadership of the BUT realise, as they said, that 50 million Frenchmen can't be wrong. Mr. Frank Walcott, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Evelyn Greaves — no, I should not say that — the hon. member for St. Lucy cannot all be wrong and Cumberbatch right.

I only hope that those concerned will become aware of their responsibilities to their members and to Barbados and to continue the negotiating process and demonstrate reasonable behaviour. We are anxious to pay the teachers, and the money has been set aside. We have accumulated a surplus to weather this particular storm and I can say, certainly speaking as Minister responsible for Establishments that we will be glad to see a final settlement.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION RELATING TO RATES OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES TO PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL STAFF

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution of which permission was granted to be dealt with in all its stages today and which relates to the Prime Minister's personal staff, be dealt with in all its stages today.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, this Resolution has to deal with salaries of the personal staff of the Prime Minister. There are three posts affected.

Mr. GREAVES: Of the papers which were circulated, I do not see this one, and I do not know what we are dealing with. I would like to suggest that in respect of other matters for which leave was granted earlier in the day to be worked on, in the first instance we have not been circulated with the Resolution concerning the Prime Minister's personal staff; only today we got the White Paper. I do not see why it cannot be asked that the House be adjourned for a later date so that the Opposition will have an opportunity to look at these matters and take a tentative view of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard the hon. member for St. Lucy. I was paying attention only to his point considering the Prime Minister's personal staff which is what is immediately before the House. I too have not seen a copy of the Paper.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed by the Clerk that copies of these papers have not been circulated and that they are being printed now.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, in view of the fact that members had not received copies, we should not attempt to deal with it at this stage.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not have a copy of it here either myself. If you ask me what the salaries are I could not tell you.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the point, Sir. All hon. members should be in possession of copies first.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What should we do about it, Sir? Suspend while they are circulated or hon. members would prefer to come back tomorrow or whatever?

Mr. SPEAKER: Suspend while they are circulated or adjourn for half an hour.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not have a copy of it here either myself. I cannot tell you what the salaries are.

Mr. SPEAKER: Take a position as to what time would be reasonable.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I, like the Prime Minister and other members have not seen a copy of it. We are not trying to force it down the throats of anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the point, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Alright, Sir, I am getting to the point. The position therefore Mr. Speaker would be if the Opposition would agree, it is up to the Opposition to come back tomorrow morning at 10.00 o'clock or if they would like to have it suspended for half an hour or forty-five minutes, all of this we are prepared to give in to in the interest of all concerned. So if the hon. member on the other side would just say, tomorrow morning or whatever we are quite willing to come back.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The file was given to me with the copies, Sir, and it is still on the files. I have just this minute received them from the Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Make sure that you have it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is the Resolutions, Sir. Yes, these are the copies. For some reason they were not delivered to the Opposition of the House. I cannot tell you why, Sir, but we would still have to suspend to allow people to read them.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, but I do not know who is the spokesman for the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not mind that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. They are complaining about the time factor. I am only trying to find out from them what is convenient for them. The Government is willing to suspend the sitting for X amount of minutes or come back tomorrow morning. We want to accommodate them. That is all we are asking for.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for half an hour.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended till 5.30 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
5.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think I have already moved that the Resolution relating to the three posts be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution relating to the personal staff of the Prime Minister is the instant Order of the Day.

RESOLUTION ON FIX RATES OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES OF PERSONAL STAFF TO THE PRIME MINISTER

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, the Addendum to the Resolution reveals that the salaries of the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister and the Executive Personal Secretary were last fixed in 1973 and the emoluments of the Press Secretary in 1977 when the post was created. In 1973 the Personal Assistant's salary was then fixed at the level of a Senior Assistant Secretary but it was never raised when Senior Assistant Secretaries were raised, so that previous Personal Assistants and present Personal Assistants have been working for five years seeing their emoluments diminishing in relation to the level at which the posts had originally been created, and when you consider that public officers holding the posts are pensionable but these officers are not pensionable, I think it would be agreed that a great injustice is done to the holders of the posts. To make up for the fact that there is no pension, in fact it is not to make up for any fact; the travelling allowance has been fixed at \$250 a month for the Personal Assistant and \$200 a month for the Press Secretary and an entertainment allowance is also being granted.

In the case of the Executive Personal Secretary who was originally employed at the level of a Minister's Secretary, the relativity has been restored and in the case of the Press Secretary a little consideration was given to this post. It is not considered desirable that the Press Secretary should be paid the same level as the Chief Information Officer. Quite clearly he does not have the responsibility of the Chief Information Officer, but at the same time it is considered that his responsibilities are a little greater and the qualifications that may be considered desirable a little more extensive than for an Information Officer, and so opportunity has been taken to grade the Press Secretary's post on the same level as that of the relatively newly created job of Senior Information Officer. That is a post which is again created after mature consideration during the last Government and we are now selecting that grading for the Press Secretary.

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

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, before we took the half an hour break, I intimated at that time that the matter which we were asked to consider is not a simple matter. It has to do, Mr. Speaker, with salaries for what

essentially are political posts, and I indicated that we wanted to be given an opportunity to look at these matters to examine them and indeed to examine the implications of the new salaries and allowances which were now being proposed for the political posts which are set out here in this Resolution.

As you are very well aware, Mr. Speaker, the implications for these are far-reaching and we would like to restate our position to indicate that when we first took a look at the Resolutions which were handed to us, we at that time did not even realise the full impact and implications of the proposals. For example, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking subject to correction, but there is a provision here for an entertainment allowance and a travelling allowance. Now I have been trying to locate in the Estimates whether or not these provisions were there before, whether this is a new item, whether travelling is a new item and whether entertainment is a new item for the Personal Aide or for the Press Secretary. These are matters which I consider we have got to look at very carefully.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is — and I am sure the Prime Minister would be the first to admit — not any big rush to get these things approved. The end of the financial year is not going to be approaching on Friday or next week, and the position which we from the Opposition benches, and I have consulted my colleagues on this, would like to put on this particular matter is that we would like to ask that further consideration of this matter be postponed. I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that we need to have more time to look at the full impact and implications of these matters, and inasmuch as there is not any particular hurry or rush in these particular matters and because of what appears in our opinion to be some new things which have been added, as I said, what appears to be a travelling allowance and an entertainment allowance, I would like on behalf of the Opposition to suggest that we would be happy if these matters could be postponed until the next sitting when all sides would have had an opportunity to look at these matters, so that we would be able to make a meaningful contribution to the debate which would then ensue on the matters concerned.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think I can elucidate something for the hon. member and he can accept it. A travelling allowance was always payable to the Personal Assistant if that is what you wanted to go and study. The Personal Assistant used to get a travelling allowance of \$200 a month in 1973. We are now proposing to raise it to \$250 a month which is a raise so modest that I am surprised. I expect that when he finds out, because he does not know yet, it is so modest, I imagine the Personal Assistant will threaten him. The Press Secretary was paid a travelling allowance of \$1,560 a year and an entertainment allowance of \$1,440 a year.

The only thing that is new is an entertainment allowance for the Personal Assistant. Last year we voted a salary, travelling allowance and entertainment allowance for the Press Secretary, but the Personal Assistant did not get one, and I think that hon. members, considering the relativity of the job, considering the Personal Assistant is so to speak the head of the little establishment of three will not think it right that his juniors should continue to get an emolument to which he is not entitled. In other words, the Press Secretary has been getting an entertainment allowance and we are now giving one to the Personal Assistant, but the rise in the travelling allowances is so modest that I was actually a little hesitant about approving them in the first place. If a man was getting \$200 in 1973 and you offer him only \$250 a month now, I think he should feel aggrieved, not any member of the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed hearing the Senior Assistant Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union asking to have an item postponed that involves the paying of salaries to workers. Only a couple of days ago there were all the problems in the country relating to the payment of salaries and wages to workers. 5.40 p.m.

The Prime Minister introduces a measure which would give the workers money as soon as possible, like all the workers would like to get it, as soon as possible, and to hear the Trade Union's Senior Assistant Secretary asking us to postpone a matter that we could wait probably until the end of March because the financial year finishes at the end of March, and therefore the workers can wait until the end of March when there is another category of workers who always need their money immediately.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the member for St. James is misrepresenting what I said. I never said that this matter could be postponed until the end of March.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Well the end of the financial year is probably in April.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I never said that this matter could be postponed until the end of the financial year. As a matter of fact, I was suggesting that these matters be postponed until the next sitting of the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Even until next Tuesday he is still asking that money for the workers be postponed. I do not understand the inconsistency. The member for St. Lucy is a leader in the Trade Union for workers, the Prime Minister set out to get a Resolution through Parliament to pay the workers on the Prime Minister's office, like the teachers, the civil servants and all the workers in the country. We have heard no kind of

argument about postponing for one category of workers but today we are hearing about postponing until next Tuesday for workers. I cannot understand what is really wrong with the member for St. Lucy; I am baffled. I would have thought that he would be the first person to get up in here this evening and say that the Prime Minister should have brought down the Resolution long ago so the workers could get more money, and now this afternoon the Prime Minister introduces the Resolution to give the workers more money as soon as possible, the member for St. Lucy, a Trade Union leader in his own right, is asking that we postpone it until next Tuesday, and he did say he saw no rush because the end of the financial year is going to be in March, but then he back-tracked by saying until next Tuesday. Indeed he asked for half an hour just now to study it.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. No person on this side asked for any postponement for half hour, next Tuesday or anything, it was the suggestion of the hon. member.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: They wanted time to study it, now they have studied it he comes in again and asks for more time because he does not understand the Resolution and he is asking to postpone the payment to the workers in Barbados. I would have thought that the Trade Union's deputy boss would have been the person to say it should have been here long ago. If I were on the other side I would have asked the Prime Minister to bring it long ago since the great combination was so good to turn around the country's economic position he should have had that as soon as he came in, like the member for St. Michael South as he came in said you should have brought an interim budget. Now that we are trying to give the workers of the country money as soon as possible so that they can get the backpay into their pockets before Christmas he is asking us to postpone it until next Tuesday. You will get up today and vote against whatever comes in here, I only hope when you vote against it you do not go and draw it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the call for further postponement of this matter as proposed by the member for St. Lucy. When the call was made by the member for St. Lucy the Prime Minister, I think quite astutely, tried to perceive the matter of substance which was being raised by the member for St. Lucy and to try to meet that particular position with some argument. I can appreciate that particular approach to the problem, that you are raising a question in relation to travelling allowance, this is the particular information. The member for St. James tries to deal with it in another way, and there is a Latin phrase, I believe it is *nihil ex nihilo*, nothing out of nothing, and I would really calculate his contribution there as a speech of nothing out of nothing. That is the only way I can really characterise his contribution here just now because what

we are really seeing, and this is the essence of it, is that in this particular matter here and any other matter which might be coming up later, that these relate to persons who have not had an increase since 1973, so the principles that are going to apply would obviously be different from the principles which apply as far as the public servants are concerned where there was a general agreement as worked out between the representatives of the Unions — with the exception of one Union, the Barbados Union of Teachers — and the negotiators on behalf of the Government that there would be approximately 10% at the top and 20% at the bottom. That was the principle which we have heard about and which was discussed for quite some time both in the country and in this hon. Chamber, but we have not had — and I am speaking from the Opposition benches, I do not know what information the Government members had — but we do not know the principles, did not know until a few minutes ago what principles are to be applied in respect of those political servants of the people of this country and the personal staff of the Prime Minister, as it is characterised here, we did not know what principles are to be applied. We heard about 10% at the top for the public officers.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is really ascribing very improper motives to me. The addendum says what the principles are, I have made a speech saying what the principles are. Is he saying I was dishonest both in the addendum and in my speech? The principles are set out, the people are paid at a certain level and they are being raised to that level, the level of Senior Assistant Secretary, the level of Senior Information Officer and the level of Secretary to a Minister. He cannot say I did not say what the principles are, the principles are written down and I said them.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, do not let the Prime Minister get too hot on this. If he believes I was saying he was dishonest, I never said so, be it far from me, I think he knows that I would not say that about him or about any other hon. member in this particular Chamber. I am making a simple point and it is that until a few minutes ago the principles on which the political office holders in this country would get an increase, particularly those who have not had an increase since 1973, were not known, whereas we have known for quite some time the principles on which those in the administration, the public officers, would get an increase. I think that is a valid point to make and we would obviously want to know.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I have said over and over that these officers are paid on public officers scales and he is making serious accusations of misleading the House in writing in an addendum when he goes on saying that they do not know. It is set out in the addendum, they are paid on public officers scales and we

are paying them at the same level we have just approved for public officers. I have said all that and he is going on and on saying I have not said it.

5.50 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I will soon make my point because I am supporting the position taken by the hon. member for St. Lucy that this matter should be postponed until the next Sitting of this Honourable Chamber because I believe the general principles that are involved should be given further consideration by those of us who want to examine the matters in depth. I think it is very unsatisfactory that the very Resolution which we are to debate now should be sitting down in the despatch boxes or wherever they were and only given to members a few minutes ago. I think it is very unsatisfactory for the Clerk to be sent scurrying to find out where they are and members only look at them and hear what the Prime Minister says and because he makes a statement we must salute and proceed. I am saying that on any of these matters relating to persons who have not had an increase since 1973 the members of this Chamber should be given adequate time to consider the proposals and not a fifteen minute period. I am saying that there will no harm done to members of the staff of Parliament or members of Parliament if these matters are discussed after giving time for further consideration of the matter. I declare my position quite early; I am voting for an increase for Parliamentarians. I want to make that quite clear because I think there is a clear case for such increase and I will deal with that matter when it comes before this Honourable House, Mr. Speaker, because I may have to put a case for you.

I am asking that the Government listen to the pleas that are coming from the Opposition, and I believe that in conducting the affairs of Parliament it is not always the most astute or salacious approach to believe that we have to win on all occasions. Democracy is a delicate game and running a democracy calls for a level of sophistication which a Government must sometimes show. I do not believe that the Government will lose any face in postponing this matter and I think this is better than giving the impression that they are trying to force this matter through.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the motion for postponement by the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think that in this matter the Government will accede to the request. I am sure the hon. member did not mean to suggest that I deliberately caused members to get only half hour's notice. If I thought that.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker. I would like to assure the hon. Prime Minister that I was not ascribing any kind of improper motives to him.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am much obliged, Sir. After all, the Clerks had it only at 12 o'clock. It merely happened that nobody went to look at the file and to check if there were copies. In the circumstances I think the Government should allow a postponement until the next meeting of the House which I believe will be next Tuesday.

The point that the hon. member made — he is probably aware of the fact that, apart from the reasonableness of his honeyed words, what should prevail with all of us is the plight of the staff, that we should not be hurrying on for ourselves and our personal staff while the staff of the House is still locked in the toils of negotiations with the Barbados Workers Union. As far as the staff of the House is concerned I have seen a document which purports to be something agreed or likely to be agreed. I myself am in the dark about it as I only saw it in passing, but I hope that the staff of the House will also soon get their increase. I do appreciate the points made by the hon. member and appreciate the fact that they are not related exclusively to the straightforward relativities set out in the addendum.

The Government is agreeable that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Further consideration of this Resolution is postponed until the next Sitting of this House.
6.00 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, that is the end of Government Business for today, Sir. I think that we have had a very interesting day, where the Opposition attempted to push the Government against the wall; but we have been always able during the past years to fight off any attacks, and eventually to conquer as we did in 1976, and will continue to do for some time. I think that we can fend off any attacks. The hon. member asked the Government to postpone further consideration, and therefore they have the whole week.

I beg to move that this House now stand adjourned until Tuesday, 21st November, 1978, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion for the adjournment, I do not intend obviously to oppose it. It is now three Tuesdays in a row that the Standing Orders have been suspended. You know that there is the

question of Private Members' Business which necessarily must give way when Government Business is being taken. I have a Resolution before this Honourable House and I hope that the Leader of the House will be in a position to indicate that at the next sitting on Tuesday we will be able to have Private Members' Business which we all consider to be very important.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the hon. member the assurance that we have no plans to suspend the Standing Orders at the next sitting. We are well aware of the fact that there are Resolutions under Private Members' Business and we will make sure that the hon. members on that side have all the time that they are supposed to have.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you mean that at the present you have no intention of suspending the Standing Orders at the next sitting.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, Sir. I am undertaking that we will not suspend the Standing Orders.

ADJOURNMENT

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st November, 1978, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly at 6.05 p.m.