

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th October, 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); 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. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; 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 Committees); Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry) (Leader of the House); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., M.R.C.P., (Edin.).

Prayers were read.

Mr. ALLEYNE and the Hon. L. R. TULL entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will have before them the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 26th September, 1978, but I have been advised that the Minutes were circulated somewhat at a late hour; and in the light of this, I do not think that hon. members would have had time to familiarise themselves to the extent that they would wish, and in the circumstances, I would not like to ask for their confirmation today.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended June, 1978, four months ended July, 1978 and five months ended August, 1978.

The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order 1978.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order 1978.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$1,139,461 from the Consolidated Fund and 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. 12, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took his seat.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members, I have been advised that the hon. member for St. Philip South has requested leave of absence from this Honourable House until 31st October, 1978, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House

go into Committee of Supply to consider a number of Resolutions.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: 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.

HEAD 108 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is one of those matters that you get when public officers are being very careful and conscious of their duties under the Financial Administration and Audit Rules. By virtue of the Act, Chapter 323A, Government has certain statutory responsibilities for the construction and maintenance of the headquarters building of the Caribbean Development Bank. A certain amount of money was kept back on retention – common form practice, Sir, you keep back an appropriate percentage – to make sure that the contractors have installed equipment properly. A certain amount was kept back in connection with kitchen and ventilation equipment supplied under the Act to the Caribbean Development Bank. The retention period has now expired and we want to pay an amount of just under \$3,000 to Electric Sales and Services Limited, but the note “Financial Institutions” under Head 108 – Capital, does not account for the payment of the outstanding balance and we are therefore asking to amend the note so as to allow this sum to be paid to Electric Sales and Services.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

12.25 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978–79 No. 10

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum to this Resolution says, the sum of money which was provided in the current Estimates under this Item has proved to be insufficient. In particular, under Head 108, Item 9, first of all, where it will be observed that as much as \$801,000 was provided, due to the increase of the Government's involvement in specific projects this sum has proved to be insufficient. We originally budgeted for this expenditure of \$801,000, the the budgeted projects have taken up just under \$450,000, but expansion at the BMC which in the end will be reimbursable from project loans has involved us so far in \$60,000 in feasibility expenditure. This is the new BMC operation at Wildey, the processing plant.

As for the Port, we have to spend some money in connection with further feasibility studies at the Port, the Public Investment Unit contract fees – this was a project which had been expected would have come to an end before this financial year but in fact was carried over – and also the plantation and tenancies rural integrated scheme has already begun to attract the expenditure of funds in the amount so far of \$7,644. This, of course, is a major scheme, because it is under this scheme that the Government intends to make it possible for all plantation tenants in Barbados to own the parcels of land which they now rent, as promised in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, but in addition we are entering into what we are calling an integrated rural development scheme by which not only plantation tenants but freeholders in country and agricultural districts of Barbados will be able to get assistance alongside plantation tenants for better cultivation, under irrigation where necessary, and with access to marketing schemes for the plots of land which they now farm in many cases in canes and not under the intensive vegetable production that might bring them a better reward.

These monies have all been spent from this vote, and in addition the Addendum sets out the areas where we will have to spend more money. The rural development scheme which I have just referred to, which at this very moment inspectors are currently circulating in the country districts and speaking to plantation tenants and seeing who would wish to be in the integrated scheme, that will attract \$80,000 in expenditure.

For the Speightstown redevelopment we expect to spend \$165,000 before the end of the year. We are planning the development of building materials based on local clay. We are planning an expansion of clay blocks, we are hoping to produce local building tiles from local clay. We import an enormous amount in the way of floor coverings at the present time when we could very well be using existing clay tiles and very well develop ceramic tiles of the sort which we are importing from Brazil. We are working on this, this has been the subject of interest by the former Minister of Housing, Senator Mapp, he and a public officer who has been of great assistance to the Government in connection with our construction projects and the concept of the form that construction will have to take in the years to come, Mr. Broome Webster in the Ministry of Planning. He and Mr. Mapp have been pursuing this matter and it is being pursued overall by the Ministry of Planning. That will attract about \$200,000.

Although we have abandoned the over-ambitious scheme for the cement plant evolved by the previous regime, we had to abandon it after the spending of, I believe, over \$3 million. Overseas agencies refused to encourage its going on any longer, but we are still investigating the feasibility of a more modest cement plant, and we will have to spend \$103,400 to pay for the current feasibility studies on a vertical shaft cement plant.

Recent visits have been paid to Kenya by Senator Mapp, as well as visits which he and I paid to Switzerland and Germany in connection with cement plant technology, also ably assisted by Mr. Broome Webster. I think in the end we can give the House the assurance that if we take the decision that we will have to continue importing cement it will be based on a most thorough-going and complete study of all the options, and if we take the decision that we can establish a cement plant of one shape or another, it also will be based on a deep and complete thorough-going study of all the possibilities. That will attract over \$100,000.

We are asking for \$10,000 for fisheries development. We have already dealt in the House with the deficiency of the fisheries policy of the past regime. We discussed it then in terms of personnel and we do not have to go into these intricate and narrow corners at any greater length, suffice it to say that the Government considers that between one and two million dollars in fish which we import and help feed our people every year is an expenditure that could be saved. We believe that we should have an adequate food fishing operation carried out at a slightly greater distance from shore than the present in-shore launches can manage, we believe there are many areas where the appetite of Barbadians for fish — and we are one of the great fish eating nations per capita of the world — can be satisfied, and we think that both on the west coast and the east coast we should be pursuing these fishing studies. The Canadians are giving us some assistance, we will be looking into the possibility of improving facilities at Bathsheba and Consert Bay, in particular at Bathsheba where we are investigating the feasibility of building a small fishing harbour making the present anchorage more sheltered and creating better conditions, building out into the sea a quayside next to which the boats can deliver fish.

12.35 p.m.

We are thinking of anchoring this to the movement southward to the East Coast Road and this is partly how the money will be spent. We are also looking to create a similar fishing scheme for the north of the Island, based in Speightstown, and one soon to be started at Oistin. The Ministry of Finance has been seeking assistance — we have already obtained some assistance from the OAS — but we are seeking assistance for further reorganization of the budget and accounting systems and we are asking for a vote of \$50,000 for that.

The water resources study is a most important matter for Barbados. The recommendations in the report are still being studied by officials of the Ministry of Communications and Works. I do not wish to expose in advance the recommendations of the study, but broadly speaking, I think that the Minister of Communications and Works and his predecessor would agree that the study has revealed promising prospects for irrigation in the

drier, flatter parts of Barbados; parts that have a shortage of rainfall appear to have very favourable possibilities of access to underground water, and for the use of this water for irrigation schemes and we will depend on this very largely. Indeed we will be depending very largely on the expectations that have been aroused by the water resources report to provide the irrigation for the rural agricultural development schemes, and we have allotted \$48,700 to feasibility studies under this Head.

Port expansion continues to show a need for feasibility studies. The calculations are in the addendum and I would not have to go through them, but the whole amount needed for these programmes will be \$653,000. This is money related directly to the development of the Port, money directly related to improving the living and economic conditions in agricultural areas, to increasing Barbados's self-sufficiency in building materials, improving production of food by way of fishing, and improving also the budget and accounting systems of Government. I am sure that hon. members will support these worthy aims, and I move that Head 108 stand part.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for \$653,000 relates to a number of projects for the development of this country. At the start I would like to say that I am somewhat amazed at the planning functions being carried out and the manner in which they have been carried out, because when I look at the addendum and note the reasons being advanced for this supplementary Resolution it leads me to ask the question: whether there is any integrated planning taking place or whether there is a degree of *ad hoc* decisions being taken. I note from that addendum that at the beginning of the year — and I am quoting — “substantial sums were expended on projects not included in the original budget and this accounted for the rapid reduction of funds after only five months”. Now I would think that this admission is the antithesis of planning; for an admission to be made on the floor of this House that funds provided have been rapidly reduced on projects not included in the original budget either indicate poor planning in the preparation of the original Budget or it indicates a weakness in the administration of the Budget after it had been drawn up. However it is, whatever may be the reasons, I believe that the Minister of Finance could explain to this House why planning or rather the lack of it, has taken place and why in the Ministry he can allow matters which on the face of it appear to include a large measure of inefficiency. That is the first point I want to make, and I hope that we will see in future an integrated approach to these problems and that from the start we know where we are and what must be expended or is expected to be expended. I am not saying that from time to time new projects will not emerge, or adaptations of existing projects; the circumstances may dictate changes; but when on

admission it is indicated that the rapid reduction of funds after only five months was due to projects not included in the original budget, I think that stands as some condemnation on the approach to these matters.

I would like to raise another point in relation to fisheries development, and I am taking fisheries in the very broadest sense, because I would like to know what is the position in respect of our fishermen who go to do their business in deep waters and may get into difficulties. They may have engine troubles or encounter rough seas or from whatever cause they may be unable to make it back to shore easily. My understanding is that in the past the Coast Guard of Barbados used to provide a rescue service and emergency assistance to Barbadian fishermen who got into difficulty on the fishing banks; and I would like to know what is the present position in respect of these services provided by the Coast Guard, whether these services are still available, whether there have been any calls from fishermen for rescue services by the Coast Guard, and whether the Coast Guard is in a position to render emergency assistance to fishermen who get into difficulties. Indeed this whole question of the Coast Guard Service may be one on which the Minister can give some information, because it may be that the services which fishermen were accustomed to getting are not being given now if the Coast Guard boats are tied up. I believe the Minister should give some explanation on this because the life of Barbadian fishermen may be at stake.

I note too, while talking about fisheries, that some agreement was announced between Guyana and Barbados as far as shrimping operations are concerned — and shrimping is an important aspect of the fishing policies and strategies of this Government.
12.45 p.m.

We would of course hope that that agreement is in the interest of this country. I must admit that there were certain aspects of the announcement in the media that caused me some concern. It seems to me that most of the shrimp or all of it would be left in Guyana. I do not understand, so I do not want to speak any more strongly on that particular matter; but I read that 50% of the shrimp would be sold to the Government of Guyana or its agency, and then another 50% is to be processed in Guyana; and I am not certain that it was set out in all clarity. I am not saying that it is not in the interest of Barbados; but I think that some further explanation of this agreement is required; and indeed I think that this House is due a statement on that particular matter. I hope too that this agreement is sealed, signed and delivered, and that it really represents an agreement so that we will not hear that the Guyana Navy or Air Force takes some objection to this agreement and that it is frustrated as in the case of a recently announced agreement between Barbados and the Government of Brazil.

There is some considerable disquiet in this country as far as the Fisheries Development Project is concerned, embracing shrimping operations because the life or lives of Barbadians have been lost, and the circumstances have not been explained to the satisfaction of the people of this country, and indeed to the immediate families; and I think that some definite statement from the Government front bench is required, not by any lower level Government functionary, but from the ministerial benches. Some statement on this matter is needed because it involves the lives of Barbadians, and it also involves the economic development of this country.

I will say no more on that particular matter at this stage. It is one which concerns the people of this country, and which involves the lives of people of this country; and I would hope that some statement would be made on this matter. Mr. Chairman, these are a few points that I wish to make on this Resolution.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, speaking on this Resolution for a vote of \$653,000, and bearing in mind the projects which have been outlined here today by the Prime Minister relative to the ways in which he proposes to expend this money, there are one or two points I want to make in relation to some of the items which have been outlined in the Resolution.

On the question of water resources, Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a few questions because I think that we have to recognise that our resources are an extremely important national asset, and the conservation and preservation of clean and proper water is something which should be a national gold. In this regard, one sees in the Estimates for this period, 1978-79 on Page 72 that there is a vote for an item called Water Resources Development. Provision is made in the Estimates for, I think, some \$3.5 million in this particular area. What I want to find out from the Prime Minister is whether or not this money has been expended and he is coming for an additional \$48,700.

I want to get some better information on this because I think that it is important that we know what is being done with the money which is being voted, and the progress that is being made in these areas. Now, in this area of water resources and water development, I heard the Prime Minister mention the existence of some water report and the excitement that this has created, in terms of the kinds of possibilities for irrigation particularly in the rural areas.

This, therefore, brings us to the question of water zoning in this country. What I want to find out from the Government is what is the approach to water zoning in this country, whether for example within the last year or so there has been some change or shift in the zoning policy of this country. I want to bring to the attention of

the House, Mr. Chairman, one area in St. James — the Trents area — which according to my information was originally a Zone 1 area; and where, as I understand it, building could not take place. You will recall that the Democratic Labour Party had scheduled the construction of a secondary school at Trents. As I understand it, the school is being built in an area which was originally a Zone 1 area. I would like to know and the public is entitled to know whether or not the area has been re-zoned because, as you would appreciate, the re-zoning of any area has to be public knowledge. This information should be available to the public because I would think that one would want to know whether this situation has changed or whether this has been done only in this particular area, or whether an entirely new zoning arrangement is taking place in the country. I think that we should have some definite statement of policy on this particular matter relative to the entire zoning arrangements in Barbados; because, as I said, I think that it has very important implications for building, for development and a whole range of other activities which hinge in one way or another on the zoning areas in this country. Therefore, what we will want to hear from the Government is what is their policy on zoning. Whether or not there has been a change in this policy; and if there has been a change, whether any announcement has been made, and if not, when do they intend to make this information available publicly so that people would know what is going on. On the other matters in this Resolution I just want to refer to the section which deals with rural development. The Prime Minister has indicated that the Government is pursuing a comprehensive programme of rural development.

12.55 p.m.

And when he was introducing the Resolution he made a passing reference to the expenditure under the Section of Plantations and Tenancies. I would like to get some further information on this. The Prime Minister indicated that at present a survey is being conducted and he is going to talk to the Plantation Managers and Planation owners as to what is going....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I never said anything about talking to the Plantation Managers. There is a dangerous habit of distortion on the Opposition benches. What I said is I will speak to the Plantation tenants to see if they want to take part in the scheme.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your correction is noted.

Mr. GREAVES: The important thing, Mr. Chairman, is that I think we have to recognise and obviously, I am glad to see that this is a policy which the present Government is continuing because most of these projects are a continuation of projects which had already been put into operation, and indeed, even conceptualised so that we are glad to see that the Government is pursuing this particular policy, the policy of road development, because

this holds a prominent position of further development in this country, and I think that it is noted that this is one of the things we have been consistent in having established in this country. I am glad to see provision has been made to continue to move ahead in this particular area.

As far as the other matters are concerned, members of the Opposition have already made their views known on those matters and I just thought I would make a contribution on this.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Prime Minister has introduced here today what looks like a perfectly innocent matter, and as we have seen in his usual manner, almost in a crab like manner, in his original presentation today, he was eager to jump up like a serpent more or less, when in fact the hon. member for St. Lucy did not make any significant misrepresentation of his speech.

However, there can be no doubt that this matter has serious implications and mismanagement. Clearly set out here is a statement that monies were expended on projects not budgeted for and hence the very rapid draw-out of these funds, and now new funds are being sought. It would seem to me that this kind of action is undesirable and I would like to feel that this Honourable House should be treated as a rule to greater courtesy than being presented with this kind of situation. I am not saying that there is no illegality, what I am saying is that there are certain courtesies which should be extended to this Honourable House.

There are also a number of matters covered here that must be a matter of concern to those on this side because we represent probably all Barbadians, but we also have a special obligation to the poor people of this country, many of whom live in tenancies. The Democratic Labour Party by specific legislation has given the kind of security to persons living in this country which never existed before. Very little has happened to the tenancies in this country over the past two years. As you drive around you see very marked deterioration of all the services that were provided in the tenancies, roads, etc.

We find that even where bus services are provided that the buses are running off the road from time to time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Dr. HAYNES: Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you would in no way object if I should draw attention of this Honourable House to specific steps that were taken by the past government in respect to places like Belair in St. George where no progress had been made in making it

possible for people in that area to own the land on which they have lived for several years. I think I am correct in saying that the previous administration had brought that particular area and for many years surveys had been going on. As far as I am aware, very little has taken place since then, and very little development in the Belair area.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Of course, the hon. member does not know what is the pipe line.

Dr. HAYNES: I would also like to draw to the attention of this Honourable House serious concern of people living in the Glebe area in St. George North, many of whom have made heavy investments in their homes in that area, and it would appear as though those investments will be ruined, and I think that some steps should be taken to give people that kind of assurance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I gather the hon. member is aware of what is happening in the Glebe, St. George.

Dr. HAYNES: I warned them in advance what was going to take place and my warnings were not taken seriously, and they are coming in the hundreds now to tell me that they did not realise that I was speaking the truth and that they would have been faced with this fate so soon, nevertheless, this is the situation.
1.05 p.m.

In my constituency there are many people who would wish above all else to get a piece of paper in their hands indicating that they own the right title to the particular area on which they live, and I think indeed that this kind of approach should be taken more seriously and should be accelerated. There are also over-riding and important decisions that must be taken in relation to tenancies. The previous Government as far as I know has had specific surveys done on the tenancies in Barbados, and I have seen information that was put together on the question of these tenancies, and there were several approaches that related to tenancies. (*Asides*) You will have your opportunity to speak. I believe the rules of the House permit you to speak.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, it would seem now that some rational approach needs to be taken on the question of the development of these tenancies. There are many tenancies that are eminently suited for housing development where they are now suited. There are many small tenancies that might lie at the end of a track probably two to three miles long leading to six or seven houses — I believe there are one or two in the parish of St. Thomas — and a different kind of decision may well have to be taken in relation to these tenancies. What is necessary, and we cannot go on year after year keeping people as it were in limbo, is for some definitive decision in relation to the tenancies in Barbados to be arrived at. The Democratic Labour Party made a very substantial

contribution in the past, and so far, despite all the ranting we have heard from the platform of the Barbados Labour Party, we have seen nothing to suggest that they are taking this matter of the tenancies and the plight of the people living on these tenancies with any degree of seriousness.

I do not wish to repeat what was said about the problems of fisheries; all we know is that one Barbadian has died, many are living in circumstances almost as if they are in prison as far as I am aware, but that would be a matter for debate at another time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

On the question of the surreptitious rezoning of the lands in Barbados, this is a very serious matter. I believe that the lands in Barbados were zoned after very, very careful study. Now this has a very important implication for the health of the country. Most of the water that we drink comes from down below, and as you know, Mr. Chairman, Zone I land has had the very strictest procedures applied in relating to building, and we find a situation where there are many poor people living in Seaview, St. James, who are prevented from having running water in their homes, toilets and so on, because they live on Zone I land; and now we find some kind of rezoning of the area, and the only thing I heard as a member from the other side say was that they changed up the zone and the public did not know. Surely these are matters that should be published right here in this Honourable House, Mr. Chairman. (*Asides*) We were told that there has been a change in the zone 1 situation in St. James. We were told that here. I heard it with my own ears.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Did I understand the hon. member to say that coming from the Government side a member said there has been rezoning and changing up of the zone?

Dr. HAYNES: What I said is that someone from the other side mentioned that there has been a change in the zoning in the St. James area, particularly to make it possible.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I am the only member from this side who has spoken and I did not say that. But, Sir, I have sat here listening to the hon. member speaking, and I just hope there is something..... this cannot be a partisan point, but unfortunately we do not have a sufficiently informed or responsible press in this country to make sure that people can separate truth from falsehood. Now the hon. member made a statement that most of the people in Seaview, St. James, are prevented from having running water in their houses or toilets, and this is a very wrong thing to say. In

my worst, most partisan moments I would not accuse the Democratic Labour Party of stopping people from having water or toilets because of water zoning, and it is the sort of statement which unfortunately people pick up in the press and it gets repeated and it goes into history. It is a statement which the other twenty-three of us should put the hon. member right on. Nobody in Barbados was stopped from having running water in his house, not even under the Democratic Labour Party, or from having a toilet in his house because of water zoning.

Mr. TAITT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what has the hon. member risen?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise on a point of explanation. The hon. member has made a statement which I have to clear him up on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which hon. member?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member who has just sat down, the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to give him his full title. Are you satisfied? If you were a lawyer I would say *de minimis non curat lex*; you would understand, but it would be above you.

I am trying to explain to the hon. member. He said "not even under the Democratic Labour Party." The hon. member for St. Michael South Central never said "the Government"; the Water Board under the Democratic Labour Party prevented the people of Seaview, St. James, from installing running water even for shower baths. I am explaining because the hon. member for St. Thomas said "not even under the Democratic Labour Party. I am saying that under the Democratic Labour Party the Water Board prevented the people of Seaview, in St. James, from installing even running water for their toilets or their showers or from building any permanent structure, like when people want to start at the back and come forward with the toilet and kitchen and so on. I just want to clear that up, and that is why we are shocked and flabbergasted that the Government itself should now be breaking the zoning regulations.

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

Dr. HAYNES: I would like to continue after an interruption that certainly did not contribute anything to the debate. I would like to say this: the press in this country is often represented here by many young men trying to establish themselves as professionals under very trying circumstances, and we on this side would like to

assure them that we appreciate the very significant effort that they have made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member dealing with water resources or shifting to something else?

Dr. HAYNES: I am continuing my speech, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What you are saying right now about the press is totally irrelevant to this debate. Order, please! The Committee will not be interrupted by any hon. member in this Chamber.

Dr. HAYNES: On the question of water resources, all I said was that there was a problem in Seaview in terms of people getting running water in their homes. Water is run in, and when water runs in it has to run out, and I do not know if the hon. member for St. Thomas is telling this House that people have water toilets in Seaview even at the present time, because my understanding is different from that. Running water does not simply mean water coming from a tap to drink.
1.15 p.m.

If in any of our homes we have only water for drinking and for cooking, we would still have serious problems, but the point I was trying to make earlier on was that any rezoning or tampering with the water zones in this country should not be done without being published so that everybody would know, and as a matter of fact, I am going to go down St. James and try to find out certain aspects of that rezoning that took place in that area.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member does not have to go to Sea View, I live in Sea View, I have a water toilet in my house, and I have seen bungalows going up in Sea View since I have been living there and I have seen people install water toilets. The hon. member well knows that the appropriate authorities have the power to enforce our zoning regulations, and there are areas in Sea view and in many other locations in Barbados where certain types of building are not allowed, but he must not mislead this House by trying to suggest that people who live in Sea View cannot have running water and water toilets. It is not so. I live in Sea View and I ought to know.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to hear that the hon. member has complete water facilities in her home, but there are many people living in that area who are less fortunate, those who live further down. It is the poor ones we are talking about, I said earlier on we are concerned about those.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, please. The hon. member does not know Sea View, the rich people live at the bottom of Sea View and

the poor live at the top where I live. He has it upside down.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of what you call bottom and what you call top. It depends entirely on how you read the map, but I think we know where the poor people live, that is important.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us carry on with the debate.

Dr. HAYNES: I think this question of rezoning is important, because it has very serious implications for the health of this country in the future. If we should run into a situation where we get our water contaminated, I do not need to say what are the future possibilities in relation to the health of the community will be and the effect it can have on the tourist industry. There is a particular European country that is virtually entirely dependent on tourism, and many of you will recall that there was an outbreak of typhoid that was related to a simple leakage in the sewage system, and that country went through the most serious economic difficulties for some two years. I cannot remember the name of the country, but anyhow this became a very serious problem with respect to tourism. That is all that needs to happen in Barbados, all that needs to happen in Barbados in any particular year is to have serious contamination of your water here and you will see what the effect would be on your tourist industry. Anyhow, I will just caution the Government to ignore all other interests and to concentrate on keeping clean secure water for the people of Barbados.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. chairman, I could not sit here and permit the kind of statements which was made by the last speaker to be made without rising instantly to rebut the veiled insinuations which have been made against the conduct of the Government. The hon. member ought to appreciate that a water resources study was commissioned in Barbados under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party. The report of the water resources study has only recently become available. My understanding of the usual convention in relation to studies which have been financed by international institutions is that after the report has been published a period of time has to be given to them to study the report, and that is the position which the water resources study.

Now, Sir, the second point which I am amazed at is that the hon. member seems to think that in areas other than his own area no developments take place in technology and new knowledge. The fact that a zone in Barbados was fixed with the then state of hydro-geological knowledge, namely the Dr. Sen report, does not mean that subsequently.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of explanation, please. I did not say that the zoning should remain one way for

ever, I said that if it is done it should be published that all Barbadians should know and it should not be done surreptitiously.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member is talking again, and the more he talks the more he proves how irresponsible he is. The fact that a governmental position was based upon a report which was compiled with the then state of geological knowledge does not necessarily mean that the science does not advance and that more precise and detailed methods of delineating particular geological conditions do not come into being. My understanding of the position — and I have not seen the water zoning report, though I am aware of its existence — my understanding is that there has been, as a result of the recommendations of the geologist who carried out the survey, a suggestion that certain areas which formerly were regarded as the boundaries of the particular catchment areas could be amended. That is my understanding of the position, but hon. members should also understand that under the terms of the Town and Country Planning Act in Barbados it is the Chief Town Planner together with the Ministry of Health, together with the Water Board and the Waterworks Department, who are the controllers of the enforcement of the water table in Barbados.

In addition, the hon. member should be aware that under the Town and Country Planning Law the existing physical development plan which was the norm, the general guidelines, are in the course of revision, and I want to give the hon. member the assurance, I want to give the House the assurance that this Government is equally as anxious to preserve the health in this country as the hon. member or the former Government.
1.25 p.m.

When you look at what has happened in public health in this country, the hon. member should know that it was the Barbados Labour Party Government which set out and laid foundations and executed great and dramatic changes in public health in this country, with the result that we won the Ketteridge Shield for low infant mortality rates in Barbados. So do not let the hon. member get up in here and try to fool people who do not know the whole history of governmental activity in this area.

The Ministry of Education under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party were the ones who decided to build a secondary school at Trents. They selected the site, and my understanding of it the Minister of Education will deal with it in detail — my understanding was that the basic place where the school was to be sited was subject to adjustment, but that adjustment related to preventing it from being built in an area which was notorious for flooding.

The question of the Water Resources Study is a matter concerning all Barbadians, not only from the public health point of view but from the point of view that the study has identified that we have water resources in Barbados consistent with our demands for household water, and sufficient to irrigate some 3,000 acres for agricultural purposes. So it is obviously of interest that this information be made known, and it will be made known consistent with our obligations to the Inter American Development Bank or the agency which finances it. This is no question of secrecy. I wish hon. members who talk in here about need for this country not to be divisive would not use every opportunity to impute improper motives and to make insinuations about the conduct of other people which the hon. member knows can only have the effect in this country of dividing the country. If you consistently day after day, week after week, whenever you have the opportunity, come on the floor of this House or go outside of this House and make these speeches based upon no facts, then you are the ones who are the creators of division. But if you want the division, if the hon. member thinks it is in the best interest of Barbados that this division should continue let him continue in the same vein — turning out accusations with no facts to support them; imputing improper motives. If this is his style and conduct, let it be; the public will soon judge him for what he is, totally irresponsible.

Now, Sir, a number of other statements have been made in connection with fishing. I was part and parcel of a delegation that went to Guyana recently and I have been part and parcel of a consulting group set up by this Government to straighten out the situation which we came and found in this country — a situation which is not peculiar to Barbados but a situation which has been created in other countries in the world, arising out of the fact that the Law of the Sea Conference has been dragging out for so long before a consensus can be reached on certain matters on which individual States have taken unilateral action. And I want to place this in proper context. There are disputes in relation to fishing agreement between Canada and the United States of America. As a matter of fact so hot is the dispute that one party has placed it before the International Court of Justice. There have been disputes in the EEC between Iceland and Britain over the North Sea. There were regional disputes between Guyana and Surinam over fishing rights. Japanese fishing production has been cut by one third since the passage of the two hundred mile limit by various countries. In Newfoundland, off the Grand Banks, there has been agitation and disputes with many countries of the world. So that the basic position is that in Latin America off the continental shelf where the fishing resources are, those states have taken action to enforce their two hundred mile limit. Barbados' agreement with Brazil expired last year; everybody knows that. If you follow the enquiry in another place you will

remember that a memorandum was put out on this matter. As long ago as last year November preliminary discussions took place before the expiry of that agreement. If you want, I can call names. Officials who previous to this Government coming into power were responsible for these negotiations — three civil servants who had negotiated the previous agreement — started discussions with Brazil and the Brazilian Government made its position clear that it was not going to renew the type of agreement it had previously. We also found ourselves in the position where the EEC at that particular period of time assumed the responsibility for the territorial waters of the EEC territories, including the departments of France. Surinam also extended its territorial waters to two hundred miles. Further the Venezuelan Government had a twelve mile limit, and the activities of the Venezuelan gun boats are unpredictable, agreement or no agreement. Guyana in October last year passed a law declaring its two hundred mile limit, with no provision for CARICOM. You had to pay \$100,000 unless you based your boat in Guyana; unless you were a foreign boat based in Guyana you have to pay \$100,000. For foreign based boats with no special provision it was \$12,500 plus a mandatory delivery free of charge of 400,000 pounds of the catch. When the hon. member talks about fishing he must talk more precisely about the subject.

1.35 p.m.

That is where we take all of these matters into account. I welcome any opportunity that the hon. member wants to have a debate on this. I want a debate. Bring it forward, and we will expose some of the Barrow's folly — not the hon. member for St. John. We will expose some of the folly of taking up the taxpayers money and putting it in an industry with no long term arrangements for shrimping. We will expose it. So come. Let it come up to surface. Let it float to the top. Let everybody understand.

In any event, I am very pleased to say that as a result of certain discussions which the Minister of Foreign Affairs and I had with the Prime Minister of Guyana and certain other representatives which were made in another place, an agreement has been reached with Guyana in which special recognition has been given to the fact that we are supposed to be part and parcel of one economic community. For the information of the hon. member for St. Michael South, he said one thing that was true, that what he saw in the newspaper was not correct.

The 4,000 lbs of the by-catch of shrimp is to be given to Guyana. That is that when you are shrimping between January to October and you are catching shrimp, you catch other fish which used to be dumped; and the Guyanese say that with a foreign exchange shortage they must be paid for any amount of fish within the 4,000 lbs at rates to be agreed between them and the commercial

company; and it will be a minimum of 38 cents (Guyanese) a pound.

Now, secondly 50 per cent of the shrimp that is caught in Guyanese waters must be landed in Guyana for processing; and the company has to pay for that, as normally it belongs to the International Seafoods Limited. Now the rest of the shrimp catch — you have an option to process that in Barbados. Hon. members will recall that the previous agreement we had with Trinidad was that as a condition of getting fuel at a concessionary rate, the fish caught off Brazil's territorial waters, not the Trinidad territorial waters — 50 per cent of the fish caught was to be processed in Trinidad. So there is no dissimilarity.

That is correct. Under the agreement which you had with Trinidad to get fuel to carry your boats off Brazil, you had to carry back 50% of the shrimp to Trinidad. So what has happened in this area is that there is a need for greater rationalisation because a number of countries went into the shrimping industry, predicating the point of their ability to shrimp in waters which have subsequently become closed. That is a fact. It is like the Japanese fleet being tied up because of the 200 mile limit. And we have to unscramble it. We have to try to bring rationality to the whole area.

Now, Sir, the season is from 1st November to the 28th or 29th March, depending on the year. Barbados' boats are permitted to fish in Guyanese waters for fish, not shrimp. They have to use different nets, and this is a significant difference between the Barbados — Guyana agreement and other agreements; and the Guyanese undertake — because they need fish — that they will buy any amount of that fish at economic rates which are to be worked out between the two countries or their agencies; because as the hon. member will appreciate, when you catch fish in the fishing season you do not only catch big fish, Shark, Carvally and Croaker; and each one brings a different price depending upon its palatability to the public. And so this a significant departure in what we have been able to achieve.

I am very glad that we were able to enter into an agreement with our CARICOM brothers and sisters, people whom we know — an agreement which permits access to shrimping during the shrimping season, and access to fishing outside of the shrimping season. So they will be able to get shrimp for their processing plant which is under-utilised, and what is more important, we will be able to get throughout the year a source of fish which we can store in Barbados when there is a deficiency particularly between the months of June, July and the months of November to December.

In addition to that, we have secured an agreement with European Common Market in respect of a number of fishing days limited to 64 tons. Now, EEC regulations

are exceedingly complex. They are tying the amount of fishing days to 64 tons and in the opinion of those who are technical in this matter, that catch can be made within the compressed period of time between November and December; but outside of that you cannot fish in EEC waters; but we have raised it at the Lome Convention. It is not only in respect of this. There are one or two other territories in the Lome Convention which are very suspicious of the EEC regulations because the EEC has a certain amount of influence in certain West African States which have introduced the 200 mile limit and they are being advised by a number of countries in the EEC, and they are using these regulations to restrict other states which are contiguous.

Now as regards Surinam. Anyone who has had any experience of dealing with Latin America knows that time is apparently of no value. You write letters, and you do not get replies. You write reminders and you still do not get replies. You go there and you get good promises; but these things take a long time. Hon. members will note that after 15 years we have been trying to negotiate a fishing agreement with Trinidad and the Government of Venezuela. We applied to the Government of Venezuela, and we applied to the Government of Trinidad and Tobago on the subject of bilateral talks; and some progress is being made, so that the whole aim of the Government's policy is to try desperately to salvage some of the money of the taxpayers.

With respect to Brazil, the Brazilian Ambassador is to come to see the Government of Barbados tomorrow; so I do not want to say anything here that I would not want to tell him before his face — a recitation of certain facts in respect of Brazil. The Brazilian Government last year made it clear that they were not going to have the same sort of arrangement that they have had previously. Discussions took place between officials of the Ministry of Finance and the Solicitor General and Brazil and drafts of an agreement at governmental level were exchanged. The Government of Brazil, in an exchange of notes with the Government of Barbados, have agreed to an agreement in respect of a fishing agreement on a bilateral basis.

I do not know who is responsible for the Government of Brazil. The Ministry of External Affairs has exchanged notes in the usual form, but apparently there are other powers that be who insist that the specific agreements between commercial companies must have the approval of the Navy.

1.45 p.m.

The Navy says that they are in charge of the Port of Belem, that it is their responsibility in the Port of Belem to ensure that the maritime fishing laws are carried out and they say that their experience in the past has been that a certain amount of stealing of shrimps went on and

that they therefore insisted that an Agreement must provide for a leasing of the boats to a Brazilian Company. That is one criteria.

Secondly, any shrimps caught by boats must be landed in the Port of Belem. Thirdly, every boat that fishes there must be outfitted to a standard which meets their requirements. Fourthly, they must have the right to inspect at anytime on board the boat, they and the Ministry of Agriculture, to ensure that no fish is being hidden away.

Now, in return for this, they are prepared to pay a monthly fee for boats which will cover depreciation, the amortisation of capital and the insurance on the boat. Such an Agreement in accordance with the demands of the Navy has been submitted in respect of Barbados subsequent to the Government's Agreement with the Brazilian Government. It has to go through the Ministry of Agriculture and the Navy.

Now, I want to make the position exceedingly clear. There is no country who has reached as far as Barbados in relation to the realisation of the fact of the benefits of the bilateral agreement between the Governments, and hon. members should note how I put it because having the bilateral Agreement is one thing, but to realise what the Agreement contemplates is a different thing and we are the nearest to that.

Shrimp boats of Barbados are not under arrest in Belem. It was a vulgar rumour in Barbados that the boats were under arrest. This is not correct. As a matter of fact the hon. member may well find that some of these boats are being prepared to go to another country to fish. The only reason why they would not leave is if the hon. member wishes that God puts a catastrophe on them so that they cannot leave. If the hon. member is so desirous of seeing the taxpayers money in this country being thrown down the drain to gain some narrow political advantage, when in truth and in fact he cannot gain any political advantage because it was his Government that invested in the boats without any long-term fishing rights. The hon. member should know that. The Lord is not going to satisfy him. The Lord does not like wicked people. I cannot see how it can be possible for any Barbadian to wish that the boats would not leave Brazil. I not see how can people wish, or whose hearts are so d, or whose minds are so warped as to want such a to happen.

What we have to realise here in Barbados and in the Caribbean is that in our relation with the so-call countries who project themselves as leaders of the Third World, as friends of the gods of the Third World, are in fact more colonialists and neo-colonialists than some of the colonies we have to deal with. Those are the new demands Third World countries have to grapple with. You only have to

look at tariff barriers in South America and look at some of the attitudes and rules which govern the colonies in the world and get their aspirations.

In any event, we will be bringing a comprehensive paper on our efforts in respect of the laws of the Land and Sea negotiations which will straighten out and bring some rationality within the Caribbean Sea before the House, but I wanted to tell the member this. The Agreement has a memorandum of understanding attached to it in respect of certain matters and we will bring the Agreement before the House, but we cannot bring it until a certain time has elapsed and until the commercial parts between the two countries who are already discussing the matter, and not until they have finalised their discussions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are still one or two other matters here that have to be dealt with.

Dr. CADDLE: Now that the Hon. Minister has given way, would he like to throw some light for the benefit of the public, on the present position of the Barbadian seamen.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well you see, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has more information than I have. My understanding is very clear. The hon. member must know this. He says that they are Barbadian seamen. I cannot say they are Barbadian seamen. My understanding is that a very large percentage of the Captains of these boats who employ seamen, and the hon. member understands that if you go in town and you make a special study, and we have to make a study of seamen operating outside. The hon. member would understand that it is a fact what their plight is as I understand it, and there is a good old saying which I think can substantiate this is that a Captain has a family in every port, and a captain who is in a particular port might have a particular preference to who is in that particular port at the particular time.

As far as I know, all of them were offered, if they wanted to come back here during the time of the waiting period. For some reason, and for some of them a certain attraction, very few of them exercised the option to come back. In addition to this, a maintenance allowance is being paid in accordance with the normal regulations. They are paid by a percentage of the catch. The captains and crew were offered to send cheque-off forms for their families here and I understand that a number of them took advantage of that.

1.55 p.m.

I understand that a number of them took advantage of that. We have got the figures here. Fourteen out of the seventy-five took advantage of it, and now I understand that the others did not claim they have families. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has a list of the facts and he will tell hon. members. Hon. members must know that

this Government would not permit a situation to exist in respect of people to whom we owe a responsibility, whether Barbadian nationals or not. There is a representative of the company in Brazil. He is down there seeing that everything is all right. In addition to all this we have a number of other matters. In addition to all this, we also have to remember that, regrettable as it is, there is no way of anybody controlling the conduct of a member of crew when he leaves the boat.

Now with respect to the death of this person, the Government through the Ministry of External Affairs sent an officer from Venezuela to Belem charged specifically with investigating the facts and circumstances including the press report, and that report, as soon as it comes in and is translated and all that, will be made available. I cannot prejudge the report. We have certain information as to what happened, and it is not the first occasion that this unfortunate thing has happened, not only with here, but with Suriname and other places. I do not wish to prejudge the report or anything of that kind, but I know that the Government acted in accordance with well established procedures when similar incidents happened. They have happened in the past, and the thing to do is to get in touch with your Consul, and if you do not have a Consul, you ask the British Government's Consul to inform you, and then you send your officer specifically to bring the details.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 2 o'clock.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: 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.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2 o'clock. This sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

I indicated to the hon. member for St. Michael South West earlier today that I would permit him to table a motion. He may do so now.

RESOLUTION RE VESSELS OF INTERNATIONAL SEAFOODS

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Resolution reads as follows:

Whereas it has been announced that an Agreement was signed between Brazil and Barbados;

And Whereas vessels of International Seafoods Ltd., property of the Barbados Government, left Barbados for Brazilian waters in early June, 1978;

And Whereas reports are that those vessels are or have been detained at the port of Belem or other Brazilian port; and

Whereas much concern has been expressed by anxious families and friends about the plight of crewmen on Board these vessels,

BE IT RESOLVED that this House expresses its profound regret at the loss of life and other hardships suffered by Barbadian crewmen; and

CALLS UPON the Government to take urgent measures to ensure and guarantee the welfare and wellbeing of Barbadian citizens serving on these vessels.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand there are no replies to Questions. Consequently it is now Private Members' Business Time.

Order No. 1 stands in the name of the hon. member for Christ Church East, to move the passing of the Resolution to recommend to Government the establishment of a Working Group to examine all aspects of the Barbados Civil Service and make recommendations for its more efficient functioning.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak quite frankly, I may say that all parties have had a long enough opportunity to speak on this matter and it should be concluded.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you want to ask further consideration be postponed.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I want it to be put to the vote at this point, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member that perhaps all parties have had a considerable length of time to consider this matter. I have no doubt indeed that members on the opposite side

perhaps would support such a Resolution irrespective of the fact that they have been slating the Government for appointing too many commissions and having too many enquiries, but I would like them to know that in this particular case their arguments have not fallen on deaf ears, because as far as I am concerned, Sir, I have listened carefully to the speech, indeed I have had the opportunity of reading the speech of the hon. member the Mover of this Resolution.

2.50 p.m.

I have listened to what some other hon. members have said and I do accept that there may well be a case for some examination of the workings of the Barbados Civil Service. Nonetheless, Sir, we must face the fact that a Constitutional Commission is sitting. It will make recommendations which cover the entire governmental system of this country, and the Civil Service forms an integral part of that governmental system. It may be that the Constitutional Commission will make recommendations relating to streamlining all the systems of Services Commissions, it may be that it will look at controversial as well as non-controversial aspects of the functioning of the Civil Service, but essentially the work of the Constitutional Commission would have to have some overlap as to the work of any working group that may be appointed with meaningful terms of reference at this time. This I cannot see could be achieved without impinging on the terms of reference of the Commission which is sitting, and which it is hoped will report within another few months.

Arising out of that report there may be recommendations which will come to the House for consideration in one form or another, and certainly it will be an opportunity given to members of the House such as has already been given to members of the public who have been supporting the Constitutional Commission in their numbers in its perambulations around the country, and with that in mind, rather than putting this matter to a vote perhaps, I will appeal at an early stage to the hon. member if he could not seek leave from his seconder and from the House, having had this matter ventilated at such great length, to withdraw it for further consideration.

There is also, of course, the possibility of sending the matter to a Select Committee of the House such as I have suggested to the hon. mover of the Resolution, but I do not believe that that is acceptable to the hon. member, even a Select Committee perhaps under his chairmanship, but that will involve of course a great deal of work and expenditure of time on the part of hon. members, and the history of Select Committees in the House does not persuade us that it is easy to have meetings once or twice a week on any meaningful basis over an extended period. I certainly think that the matters which have been adduced do have some merit

and that the abuses, if I do not use too strong a word, which have been identified could carry some examination, and I think that the time for such, and why I suggest a withdrawal as a further alternative to a Select Committee is after the Constitution Commission reports. Let us see what arises out of that and we will then be in a position if it is still thought necessary to pursue the matter further and to carry out an examination such as the hon. member suggests.

Let us make no mistake about it, to have a working group examining all aspects of the Barbados Civil Service, that is, all the 16,000 people who work for the Government, between one-fifth and one-sixth of the labour force of Barbados, will be a very long and serious exercise. Let us not embark lightly on it when corresponding exercises have been going on and when our very terms of reference for such an exercise cannot be adequately drawn at the present time.

I very much hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member will avoid in all the circumstances the putting of this matter to a vote and that the House will give leave for him, bearing in mind the very admirable sentiments expressed in most cases of the problems which have been identified, that these matters be analysed at a latter and more ripe stage of our present development.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved into the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, Mr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. SIMMONS, Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. TAITT, Mr. GREAVES, Dr. CADDLE and Mr. BRADSHAW — 8.

Noes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER and Mr. ODLE — 6.

Abstentions: Hon. L. S. CRAIG and Hon. C. L. BOLDEN — 2.
3.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 2, the hon. member for St. Lucy, his Resolution calling on the Government to give consideration to the establishment of a housing development in St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed as I am not ready to proceed at this stage.

RESOLUTION REPUDIATING CERTAIN STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE BY THE HON. MEMBER FOR ST. JAMES

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Philip North may exercise his right to continue his speech on this matter.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, at the expiration of Private Members' Business last Tuesday I had just made a document of the House a letter which had been written by the mover of this Resolution as he was then Minister of Communications and Works, in which he had asked the then Chairman of the National Housing Corporation for a job for someone whose parents and household were ardent supporters of the Democratic Labour Party. I was on the point of explaining that it appeared to me somewhat hypocritical that we should find the mover of this Resolution to have written that letter as he would have appeared to be guilty himself of political patronage and all that is implied and I did not think he was the best person to move this Resolution as he did not come with clean hands.

The question of political patronage has been a feature of Caribbean politics for as long as we have been around. At the same time one has to be careful of the extent to which, because of the economic system under which we live, political parties dole out political patronage to the detriment and denial of non-partisans. In this whole unsavoury incident, Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone has paid enough tribute to the fact that the Minister after he made his statement subsequently came to this House and made what I consider a full apology and withdrawal of the unfortunate remarks. I believe it takes a big person to see the error of his ways and show contrition for them, and for my part I want it clearly understood that even though I recognize the unfortunate nature of his statement — I am speaking today very slowly and deliberately so that nothing I say can be attributed to another member of this House — I think that we have to recognize that the Minister has perhaps gone further than other persons who formerly sat in this House, and perhaps still sit and have made unfortunate statements in the past and not had the courage to apologise for them either in here or in public. This is the distinguishing feature of this affair that the Minister recognizes himself in the light of the statement made in the House of Assembly and in the light of the interview given to a reporter of the Advocate apologising to the country and having the courage to come here. I think to that extent we are not here as human beings to do him down or as some would say to run him out of public life, and I certainly am not going to be a party to this kind of campaign. We have all made mistakes in our life and paid penalties for them. The adverse criticism, even the abuse which he has suffered as a result of the statement, is enough

punishment, and the sooner we can get this out of the way the better for all concerned. And let us go back to September, 1976 and recall the plea of the Prime Minister for national unity and try in our own way to develop a national consciousness and work in the interest of the country. There will be times when we will have our political differences and we will expect the Opposition to make capital of any shortcomings of the Government. We did it when we were in Opposition; it is part of the game. But I think what has happened, not only recently but over the last eighteen months, is that certain attitudes have been building up in Barbados of we and they, or to put it another way we and the Dems. This cannot be good for the country, because all of us who practise that now will some day die and others will come after, and we have to set an example for future generations.
3.10 p.m.

As I say, we all appreciate the cut and thrust of debate. We all appreciate our political platforms. We need to get across the point with vehemence; but there comes a time when we must sit down and say that this particular attitude or policy is not good for the country — a country such as Barbados. But I believe that there are Third World politicians and many Third World people, who are still very immature especially in politics. I will never forget that when I was a student in London there was a Lord Mayor's Ball. Harold Wilson was then Prime Minister. Heath was the Leader of the Opposition. I saw a headline on the front page of the "Daily Mail" — "Wilson Wipes the Floor With Heath in the House"; and in the "Mail" was a photograph of Heath and the Leader of the Opposition getting into the same car to be taken back to the Lord Mayor's Ball. The two of them went in the same car. Would you see that between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in here now or in the past? (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No way, no way sir.) The Leader of the Opposition tells me no way. I am appealing to him to show his magnanimity and great heartedness; but he tells me no way. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It would have to be a hearse.) (*Asides*) I am not repeating anything that I have not heard. Whoever heard that will deal with that. The point that I was really making was an appeal. I know that there are members of the Opposition who do not genuinely believe that what the Minister said, that he intended it to be put in its full rigor and intensity; but as I say, this is a political matter, and they are entitled to make capital out of it so long as they are honest enough to themselves to know that this Minister is the kind of person that he is, and has always been. They cannot say that he has been affected by promotion to ministerial office.

He is still the same person that he was 15 years ago; and before that, I think that there is at least one member of the Opposition who was close to him over

those years, and perhaps knows him better than some of us. I am appealing to members of the House to believe in their own conscience that the Minister did not mean, as I said, in its rigor and intensity what was blown up in the newspaper — he did not use the word "starve", but the newspaper used a synonym. I am appealing to members to dispose of this Resolution today in the interest of the country, and let us do what is right for all Barbadians. I am obliged, Mr. Speaker.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, my contribution will be very brief for a variety of reasons, because I do not think that anything that I may have to say needs to be repeated; and I am sure that you do not entertain repetitions or tautology. I do not wish to have to repeat anything that has been said by previous members, but there are just one or two objects of misinformation which I would like to clear up. The way that this debate has developed, you would think that this debate is on whether the former Government practised political patronage and this Government does not practise political patronage. The way that the propaganda machine of the Government organises the campaign is to give the impression to this country — backed up by statements made by no less a person than the Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. Thomas, that people were discriminated against in Barbados in getting meaningful employment during my regime. I just want to get that position abundantly clear.

A lot of talk has been indulged in, about passports. I do not know if it was you, Mr. Speaker, or who it was that was entrusted with the task of producing for a reward — a just reward — the first political passports in the history of this island; and I want to give a very, very brief background to this. The reason why the constitution of the political party which we founded in 1955 was enshrined in a document which was presented to each new member and called a "Passport to Democracy", was because the political party to which many of the founder members belonged had no constitution whatsoever. We did not know from one day to the other — there were no rules, there was no treasurer, there was no general secretary as such. The whole party consisted of the parliamentary members, the late Mr. Chappie Crick, the late Mr. Chadderton and about two other members whose names I cannot recall readily at this moment, and when we tried on occasions to get some semblance of regularity into the procedures of that political party, we were told that as youngsters we were trying to teach our grandmothers how to suck eggs, and that the party had existed up to that time successfully without any constitution.

We felt that for a political party which was founded on mass support, there must be some kind of framework whereby people would know the principles to which they were subscribing; and we called our

document "The Passport to Democracy" because on becoming a member of our political party, you were presented with a book which contained the rules of that political party. It had nothing to do with jobs. I would like to say this: In the 15 years in which I had the honour to be Chairman of the Cabinet of Barbados from 1961 to 1976 I do not know of a single case in which any person in Barbados was denied a job because they did not belong to the Democratic Labour Party. I do not know of a single case. I have never on any occasion written any letters to any Government Department or to any Statutory Board. I have written one letter, and as a matter of fact I will tell you of the letter that I wrote.

3.20 p.m.

The only letter that I have ever written in 15 years in Government relating to anybody coming into my office was not in connection with a job, was not in connection with getting a house, was in connection with a gentleman, and I use the word gentleman for want of a lesser charge of contempt, called Earlyn Garnes. One letter in 15 years.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am telling you that is what I know and the only letter I have ever written was to the American Embassy where the gentleman had been deported from the United States of America. He said he wanted a new start in life. He said he was not getting any assistance from the leader of his party, who is now the leader of the Government and he appealed to me. I said to him that it was not my practice to tell the people in the United States Embassy how to run their affairs because they were run under the Immigration Department in the United States, but because he was a member of the Opposition Party.

He was never a member of the Democratic Labour Party, and because his mother who sells at the eastern door of the Fairchild Street bus stand, I do not know if the lady is still alive, made a personal appeal to me to help him get back to his so-called studies in the United States, as he had been thrown out of the United States and that is the only letter I have written in 15 years, and his name was introduced in here as a person who the hon. member for St. Thomas claims was told he had to join the Democratic Labour Party and who has never been a member of the DLP.

I would like to ask the hon. member this, and I just want to finish with Mr. Garnes here once and for all, why were the charges against Mr. Garnes dropped for breaking into some hotels starting in the north of the island right down to the south of the island, including the Paradise Beach Club, including hotels in the south Coast for trying to obtain money by false

pretenses after the hon. member for St. Thomas became Prime Minister of this Island.

Mr. Garnes went about, and I have a tape to the effect which I can give to the hon. member, but not inside here, in which Mr. Garnes will tell you that he was a member of the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party and that he was going to be Director General of Tourism and that he would assist....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we had enough of this, let us now turn to the matter....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:....sworn affidavit from the man who was in the Criminal Court of Barbados during the election time for trying to obtain money under false pretence and it....

Mr. SPEAKER: But I ask that we turn to the Debate now.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member obviously has not given Your Honour any notice that the character of Mr. Garnes was going to become an issue, but the rules of the House says that you cannot put the character of anyone as a public matter. I am hearing things for the first time. I have never heard that he was charged with anything before. I have never heard that he obtained a motor car. I know that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central gave him a car to drive about to canvass for him but I have never heard about the charges or otherwise, and I do not believe it is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have had enough of Garnes and cars.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When the hon. member for St. James made the statement, which is the subject matter of this debate, the hon. member for St. Thomas withdrew and went to the ante-room. Mr. Garnes is now in the ante-room and the hon. member can go and ask Mr. Garnes if he was not charged.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have just said we have had enough of Garnes and all of this. Let us now get on with the debate.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Both hon. members please take your seats and we will have nothing further about Garnes in this debate, from nobody in this Honourable House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member is reflecting on my motives.

He said that when the hon. member for St. James made the statement, I withdrew from the House and went to the ante-room. That is totally false. I was not in house. I never withdraw because I was not here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member for St. James made his statement. After he made his statement the hon. member for St. Thomas came into the Chamber during an exchange between the then Minister of Communications and the hon. member for St. Lucy. The same member who is now saying that it was a slip of the tongue said he was not surprised that the member for St. James spoke in the way in which he spoke.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that I have to get up on these points of order. Nothing was ever said about the slip of the tongue. I saw Frank Walcott had it elaborated in the newspaper and now it is being repeated in here. I have the debate in front of me. Not at any stage did I say it was the slip of the tongue. I used the word "slip" meaning lapse. Not a slip of the tongue. There is a difference to be observed in this matter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I apologise to the hon. member. I was not here. The hon. member said a lapse of the tongue, Sir, or a lapse of memory! I am not quite sure. This is not the point. The point which is germane to the issue is that whether it was a lapse or a slip that the hon. member described it as, at the time immediately after the remark was made, he did not, like two of his Ministers, dissociate himself either from the subject matter or from the statement which was made. He said that he was not surprised that the hon. member spoke in the way in which he spoke.

Now, Sir, I just want to say this. I have made a certain point, and this has nothing to do with patronage. I am saying the only letter I have ever written, and I have never discriminated against anyone during my regime because he was not a member of the Democratic Labour Party. As a matter of fact, it has not been my policy that we should even invite people to join the Democratic Labour Party. Whosoever will may come, including the backbenchers on the other side, Sir. As long as you are prepared to abide by the Rules and the Constitution of the Democratic Labour Party, anyone over the age of 60 is free to join our organisation provided they are of good reputs. They do not have to be of any financial standing but they have to be of good reputation. Some people are annoyed with us because they were not admitted. Mr. Garnes was not admitted. I am not saying he is of bad reputation, the Immigration Authority... I forgot I was not to call his name, that was a lapse Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There will be no lapse when I rule.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That was a complete lapse, Sir. I really....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have waited patiently.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That was a slip, Sir, that was a real lapse, Sir, I really apologise Sir, no offence to the Chair Sir, but what I am really saying is this Sir, whosoever wants to join can come.

To me it is remarkable that in a small country like Barbados that you can stand up and look at me in the face — Mr. Speaker, I know the immediate members of the family of the hon. member for St. James, this is what I find particularly hurtful. He was assisted by members of this party and he cannot deny this because he knows that I know, by helping him get a start in life, by prominent members of this party. They are members of this party unfortunately who are friends of the hon. member. As the hon. member said, not me, it is true I am not a friend of his. He is not a friend of mine. Anybody who makes that statement is not a friend of mine, or friends of Barbados but they are people in this party who knew the hon. member before he slipped, I mean before he lapsed from grace and joined the wrong organisation and who apparently was on reasonably good terms with him and to hear the hon. member who has been associated with them get up and say that if your name is Douglas.....
3.30 p.m.

To hear that hon. member who has been assisted get up and say "if your name is Douglas Leopold Philips, D.L.P. by accident, no dice"! I am not familiar with the term, but I take it that it means the game is done, that the game has not started and the dice do not appear on the table. That is what I understand the interpretation is. There are certain games of chance which I have played. I am not very competent and would get beaten if I ventured with some of the people who are more expert in this House; so I do not play, but I understand that when you say "no dice", it means no dice appear on this table or you do not have a chance. But what I am saying is that the only difference between the statement made on that occasion and statements made by the hon. member on other occasions is that it was reported for the first time. That is all that happened. It was reported for the first time because on that same day after he had made that statement the hon. member got up and asked the Hon. Attorney General whether it was not true that the Leader of the Opposition had been involved in a murder, and I did not hear anybody on that side reprove

him for making statements like that, and this was after he had told them to cool down. There were many statements of that nature and that quality for which, I think, Mr. Speaker, he should have been reproved, but he was not reproved, because this is the general attitude of the member, and this is the way that he sincerely feels, and he turned to his colleague...

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I should stop the hon. member for St. John now. On this statement that you are alleging the Hon. Minister made about the Leader of the Opposition being involved in a murder and things of that sort, did you at that time exercise your right to challenge the hon. member and have the Presiding Officer do what is necessary under the circumstances?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You were in the Chair and I immediately rose; so do not let us go into that. I do not think it is necessary for us to go into that. I am just saying that far from being a slip, that was the whole tenor of his speech; so do not let us start any contest between you and me.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no contest, but one now suddenly arises.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What is the contest?

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Minister made the controversial statement, as far as I know I was not in the Chair, and if he went on subsequently saying what and what, I could not have been in the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: All right. I beg your pardon. I said as far as I remember. You were not in the Chair and I withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am led to believe that the hon. member for St. John is just what we call "bull ragging". The moment that I found you did not know who was in the Chair, I must come to the conclusion that you do not know what you are saying.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I know what was said was true.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg you to make a contribution and keep away from that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to say without any qualification whatsoever that I am sure you could not have been in the Chair now I am reminded, because I am sure the hon. member — because I did protest — would have been made unreservedly to withdraw those remarks about the Leader of the Opposition, and so I deeply apologise to Your Honour for even dreaming that you were in the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I were in the Chair I would have caused him to explain that away.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: And explain himself outside too.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is that. Let us get on.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: As I was saying, it is not the first time he had made statements like this. It probably will not be the last time because that is his general disposition. It is true that in the heat of an exchange, as the hon. member for St. Philip North would say, you can just in retaliation throw out something you know which the Chair may ask you to withdraw, but I am saying that this was the whole calculated fashion in which the hon. member, that is, before I made that unfortunate mistake of suggesting Your Honour was in the Chair, turned to his colleague and warned them not to stop him told his Ministerial colleagues that he knew what he was doing, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, what attitude do you expect the general public or the members of this House to take when a member turns and calls on his ministerial colleagues with an expression, not a mouse but certainly something not a man, but a "softie".

Mr. SPEAKER: I would expect a senior statesman like the hon. member for St. John to lend some assistance to the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir. I always do. As a matter of fact I think Your Honour has survived because I have been assisting you all the time, and I promise to assist you very greatly now to show how deferential I am to the chair, because it is the Chair that I respect and the occupant thereof for the time being whoever he may be.

I am going to sit down before you call on me to sit down because I have other things to do, but I am saying that this is not a question we can gloss over or try to turn into a contest between the DLP regime and the present Government. I just want to say this: the greatest criticism I had as Leader of the Party is that we did not help our own. I can go back but I do not want to go into history right at the beginning of our term of office. The greatest criticism that we had, and I particularly, was that we did not help our own people, and therefore it is very pertinent to hear any member of this House get up and say that at least 47% of this population can go to perdition and strave and die, because this is what it means, if it is a question of looking to the Government for any assistance, because the Government is the largest employer of labour in this country. The opportunities fortunately for patronage are rather limited in Barbados, because we have a Public Service Commission, a Police Service Commission and so on, and therefore you cannot take a friend of yours

and give him any priority in the Civil Service or on entering the Civil Service over other people who are suitably qualified. I have always told my Ministers that for a Minister to write a letter to a Government Department is like writing to yourself and they should not do it. It was very difficult to get some of the Ministers to understand this, but I would like to say, and this you would appreciate, that as political representatives we have grown up in a paternalistic society in which people first had to look to the plantation manager. If you wanted to get some lumber from the lumber yard, it was the plantation manager who wrote the letter to the lumber yard so that you could get a few feet of lumber to repair your house. Then there was the sergeant in the village and the village schoolmaster. They were the people who were more literate and who represented law and order. They made the Wills and so on, so it is always that dependence syndrome that the people of this country had.

Unfortunately in the second half of the 20th Century in Barbados from the time we got the more liberal constitution, people turned to their political leaders and expected them to perform miracles, and I have no doubt there are people who join political parties and expect to get advancement because of their attachment to political parties, but fortunately for us our constitution is of such nature that it inhibits the unlimited exercise of any such form of patronage, but to go into reverse and to say that if somebody appeared on the horizon you would see that they did not get a job is a serious offence. Getting a job for somebody is difficult, but it is not so difficult to stop somebody from getting a job. To stop a person from eating is in my humble opinion one of the most serious offences that you can commit against mankind and to your fellowman.

3.40 p.m.

I would honestly like to feel that there are not people on that side who are not of the same persuasion of the hon. member, but I do not feel so. When we have watched the way in which people have been unceremoniously dismissed in this country, people have lost their jobs without rhyme or reason, journalists have been terrified, some have lost their jobs, people in other departments of life whether in the private or public sector have to walk about the road, it is the beginning of the era which can only spell the end of democracy in a country such as ours, and there is no way we could not appeal for national unity.

They are not the same people we heard on the political platforms trying to destroy the confidence of people in the institutions of this country, which is a very bad thing, because we have a whole generation of lawless people growing up in this country who have no respect

for law and order. You are going to get unity one place. Like I said just now, to see certain people together it would be the same as if you see a hearse with two dead people in it, and this happens only in the Westbury Cemetery.

The policy of political parties is one of adversary politics, but you do not have to carry your adversary politics to the extent where you expect people to starve or die because they do not subscribe to your party.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I will be short in my contribution on this particular Resolution, and I want to begin by drawing the attention of this Hon. House to one of the things which we have to do when we come into this Parliament at the beginning of each day's sitting. We have a Chaplain of this Parliament who says a number of prayers inviting God's blessings on the proceedings, and part of one of the prayers which are said at the opening of the day's session has the following words, Mr. Speaker, "instil in them the spirit of love, charity and wisdom," and we all say 'Amen' or so let it be.

When one examines this one immediately would assume that we have taken the prayers which have been said, the question of love, the question of charity, those two very important qualities, and when we take that and we match it against the statement which was made by the hon. member for St. James on July 11 of this year, we will see very clearly that the seriousness of the statement which the hon. member for St. James has made comes very much to the fore.

A lot of ground has been covered, arguments have been advanced from this side about the ill effects and the ill will which was contained in that particular statement, and I have listened to the defence which has been put up by the Hon. Prime Minister last week that this statement by the member for St. James was a statement which was provoked over a long period, the accusations which were levelled against the Government by this side and a speech which was delivered by Mr. Cameron Tudor, one of the members of the Democratic Labour Party, that these are things which provoked the hon. member for St. James. I must say that I used to think that the Prime Minister was good at defending, but I think that last Tuesday was one of his worst days of defence. As a matter of fact, listening to the member for St. Philip North I must confess that he was rather soothing in his presentation, his appeal for us to return to calm and to national unity, and these are things which must always be in the forefront of our minds, but certainly that was not in the forefront of the mind of the hon. member for St. James on that day, because to regard the statement which he made on July 11 as the Prime Minister would want us to believe, that it was a slip — whether it was a slip of the mind, a slip of the tongue, or whatever slip it was — but the point is, one can see that it was deliberate. In any

situation one would make a statement but not reinforced with the kind of venom, the kind of language in which the Hon. Minister couched his statement. If you have the name Douglas Leopold Phillips, DLP by accident, and remember he prefaced his remarks by indicating to the Prime Minister that if he did not like what he was going to say that the Prime Minister could have the instrument of his appointment as Minister. The member for St. James was at that time Minister of Labour and Community Services, very important portfolios in this country dealing with youth, welfare, sport and what have you, so when you recognise the position which the Hon. Minister occupied, recognise therefore the divisiveness involved with the community, and recognise the potential for danger which was contained in his speech, then I am sure a lot of reasonable people in this country must take exception to that kind of remark, and this is why in the Opposition we are taking particular exception to the remark, because we could not have sat in here and allowed that just to go without drawing the attention of the public to it, and certainly forcing a debate on it.

I know that the hon. members, particularly the Government members, would want to get this Resolution out of the way as soon as possible by way of vote, and I am sure that before Private Members' Business is finished we will be able to do that, but certainly it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is the kind of situation where both the members of the Opposition and the members of the Government should dissociate themselves from that type of behaviour, that kind of thinking, and this statement which was made by the hon. member for St. James.

3.50 p.m.

I cannot understand how any hon. member can rise to defend it or attempt to explain it; but the explanation given here cannot be accepted, particularly in view of what happened on that particular day 11th July. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for St. John referred to a situation which happened on the afternoon of July 11 where when the opportunity was provided for the Hon. Prime Minister, the Leader of the Government party, to try to set the record right, in my view the situation was aggravated even further because of statements made by the Prime Minister to the effect that because of constant harping by the Opposition it was no wonder that the hon. member for St. James spoke in the manner that he did. When you get that kind of situation, what must you expect. One must come to the conclusion that this was the policy or would have been the policy to be pursued by the Barbados Labour Party administration and now we are being asked to forget it; we are told we are catching at straws; the House should overlook the slip; the slip was provoked over a long period of time. All of these are excuses which have been advanced by the Prime Minister and by the hon. member for St. Philip North, both of whom tried to put up some kind of defence. I

doubt any other hon. member of that side would attempt to get up to defend the indefensible, because the statement made by the hon. member for St. James cannot be defended, not even by himself, and I believe that is why we have not heard him intervening in this debate. So when we take into consideration all of the factors both past and present and what is likely to happen in the future, we see very clearly the way we feel about this matter. We often hear emanating from Government sources the fact that the Government is so much in favour of human rights, etc. But the statement made is contrary to the tenets of any human rights convention, whether United Nations convention on human rights to which the Barbados Government has subscribed, or whether it is the section of the country's convention dealing with human rights, or whether it is an espousal of the FAO position on human rights, and the right of people in any country to eat and live a good quality life. All of these are matters to be taken into consideration, facts which we have to use to support our contention that the statement made by the hon. member for St. James must be condemned, especially for the deliberate way in which it was made and made from the floor of this Honourable House. I am not going to say that such statements should have been made from political platforms, but we have it on record that the hon. member for St. James was speaking in that vein on public platforms during the recently concluded by-election; but to come in here and reinforce it and get it on the record, one can understand the way we feel and the feeling that went through the country when for once for a very long time the Advocate newspaper had the guts to publish proceedings of the House of Assembly, — at least that kind of proceeding; and I think I will like to say that in that respect the Advocate has done the country a good because it has revealed the thinking which pervades or seems to pervade the governing party; so that we have to recognize and see this matter as being of extreme importance and one which we cannot as members of the Opposition sit back and allow to go unchallenged. You know, Mr. Speaker, when I think of that statement I often think of you on the Opposition benches, and I can imagine how you would have a field day if such statements had fallen from the lips of a member of the Barbados Labour Party, when you were on Government benches or in Opposition, because you are not the type of person to allow any opportunity to slip; and that I believe was one of the greatest errors which the Government party has made from time to time and one which I am sure the party in Government will live to regret.

We brought this Resolution here because we are very concerned about the level to which this country is being dragged down and the way in which attempts were being made to show how jobs were to be distributed; but a large section of the population which supports a particular party would be confined to a situation where

they would not be able to eat and consequently they would have to starve to death if the then Minister of Labour and Community Services had his way. So we cannot allow him to get away with this, and that is why the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who brought this Resolution is to be congratulated for giving us the opportunity to ventilate our views on this matter and an opportunity to vote on the Resolution, thereby condemning the hon. member for St. James who has made such a damaging and disrespectful statement towards the people of this country.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, having listened to the hon. member who has just sat down, I am at a loss as to what this Resolution is all about. The hon. member has said that he could not allow the statement that was made by a member of the Government to go unchallenged and it seems to me that it is the mere challenge of this statement that has caused members of the Opposition to be so furious in their attack on the statement made by the hon. Minister. Mr. Speaker, this hon. Chamber, and surely the public at large, has been treated by politicians through the years with contemptuous statements and remarks that have brought lots of criticisms and in some cases very harsh feelings. While I do not want to defend a statement which I feel could be unworthy of an hon. member, I want to make it clear that we cannot on one hand seek to condemn a statement made by a Minister of Government and on the other hand we have not in the past sought to condemn more serious statements by members and Ministers of the former administration.

Now we have got to be quite clear as to what we intend to do for people and what we intend to say on certain matters. I remember a statement made by a Minister of the former administration way back in 1974 when he said that he would depressurize, deflate and remove the forces of Opposition. Mr. Speaker, what could be a more outrageous and undemocratic statement made by a man who was supposed to be a Minister of the then Government? We must look at the person who made the statement on that occasion. He was the Chairman of the then governing party and a leading man of that party. He was also the Minister of Education, and what is even worse he was Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs. Now as the Leader of Christianity or the person responsible for religious affairs, that Minister should have been condemned first of all by his colleagues for making such a statement; but at no time even up to today have any of his colleagues got up and sought to exonerate themselves from that statement. What are they saying? That it was good for a Minister of their party in Government to remove completely the forces of Opposition. They were in effect saying they believe in dictatorship; they do not want to have an Opposition at all; that the Barbados Labour Party or any other party should be completely wiped out.

4.00 p.m.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this has been one of the most serious statements ever coming from a responsible Minister of Government, and over the years we have allowed those statements to go by; and no member of that party got up and challenged or sought to exonerate himself from that statement; but what do we have today? What do we see? We see double standards. I, in reading some of the debates from this Hon. Chamber am reminded of a very heated debate which took place on the very floor of this Chamber, in which the then Minister of Agriculture, who was the then representative of the constituency of St. Andrew, told the Leader of the Opposition that he would tear holes in his — I will not go any further.

It was indicated that there was no quorum present. The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying those remarks were unworthy of being said in this Hon. Chamber; and some of them who are sitting here today never got up and tried to exonerate themselves from those remarks. They were unworthy remarks, and the remarks, mind you, were used by a Minister of that administration. What do we find? We also find the Leader of the Opposition go into the Pinelands in 1976, and while addressing a public gathering.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you are referring to the present Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BRADSHAW: I am referring to the hon. member for St. John. He said that as soon as he was returned to power he would push down the shop of a well known and ardent supporter of the Barbados Labour Party. He said that. He called the name of the man, and he said that he was a member of the Barbados Labour Party; and he said that if he was returned to power, the first thing he would do would be to send a bulldozer and push that man's shop down. That is one of the contemptuous statements that can be used; and mind you, Mr. Speaker, that hon. member was then the Prime Minister of this country. Now what was he asking that the man from Pinelands should do? It would be to starve. To push down his shop — his bread and butter would be pushed down by a bulldozer; but you did not hear any of his party members getting up at that time and denouncing the Leader of their party for making such irresponsible statements.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition must understand that people have got ears. I was privileged to hear the former Leader of the Opposition say in Parkinson School that that man, the person who was running Kayes Academy was a member of the Barbados Labour Party; and as long as he was Minister of Education, as long as the Democratic Labour Party was in power that School could not get one cent of the Government's

money to assist the children who were attending that School. It was said by Mr. Frederick Smith who was then Minister of Education. What was he asking us to do on that occasion? He was saying that those children who were attending a school being run by a member of the Opposition should be denied the opportunity of getting assistance from the taxpayers.

That is what he was saying. It was a contemptuous statement; but we have not heard anyone from that party denouncing or rebuking such statements. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we must examine ourselves as politicians. Sometimes we in here play to the public to give them the impression that we are all pure? But if we are going to preach purity, we ourselves have got to be pure. It is not for members of the Opposition to get up in here and try to find ways and means to heap all sorts of attacks and criticisms on a member who may have made a slip.

Mr. Speaker, making a slip is commonplace. There is no man on the earth who has not made a slip. The Bible says that all men are fallible; but what does that mean? It does not mean that every time a man makes a mistake that he must be condemned. Where are our christian feelings? Mr. Speaker, if a man gets up on the floor of this House and says that he is sorry for something that he has said, how can members get up and say that he should still be condemned? The Bible speaks of forgiveness. We on this side who understand the Bible know the teaching of the Bible. We are prepared on this side to excuse the hon. member; and I will go as far as to say that knowing him as I do, he is not the man who would carry out the action that was enunciated in this slip. Everyone knows that the hon. member has been helpful to people from all walks of life. In his career before he was a politician it was demonstrated that this was a man who had the interest of all Barbadians, rich and poor alike at heart; and there are very few politicians who can claim the grass roots heritage as the hon. member who was responsible for the slip.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on; because I remember the hon. member for St. John in 1971 going through a little village called Edgecliff. I remember hearing him saying on that occasion that the people in that village should be separated, because he realised that in that particular area he did not perform very well.

4.10 p.m.

He did not perform very well; and he went as far as to say that he would like to put the people in that area in a narrow confine. He treated the people with so much contempt on that day when he drove around in his victory ride that he took off his cap and waved it at the people, even the people in Edgecliffe. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have never forgotten that behaviour. That

goes to show you that it is nothing for politicians when people do not share their views to be annoyed with them, and the hon. member for St. John is not free from blame. He is not pure in this respect.

How can members from that side get on the Floor of this House and talk about depraved people. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central should understand that the worst thing he could ever do in this country is to think that they are two categories of people. We have been fighting in this party, Mr. Speaker, to make people understand that whether they are rich or poor, whether they are white or black, that they have got a right to survive in this country. Mr. Speaker, it is not very becoming of the hon. member to think in terms of people as coming from the lowest ebb of society. It is not the sort of remark I would want to hear any hon. member on this side of the House to associate himself with.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I honestly think that the hon. member is apparently misleading this House. I think any society is divided among those who are depraved and those who are not depraved, and I will insist that this happens in any society. The hon. member is suggesting here that in my contribution on this subject that in some way I sought to suggest that this society is divided into people who are.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You are elucidating your point.

Dr. HAYNES: Correct Sir. I used the term depraved, a term, Mr. Speaker, which the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation is in a position to confirm in relation to certain events that took place down there not so long ago and several mothers in this country would be able to confirm this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I certainly cannot entertain your point, you are breaking new ground.

Dr. HAYNES: I accept that Sir, but I think you know what I mean.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. member will learn. I never mentioned the hon. member but what I am saying is this. The hon. member must know this that when you can associate yourself with a man who goes into the church and carries away the table on which the wine is being served.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to hear something concerning this debate. It is true that if we drink wine we might still be considered as getting something to eat.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I am saying is that here is a situation where a man went into

the church and removed the table and the wine. The Christians were being fed on wine and this man moved the wine from the church and took it away so he was depriving the Christians from having their wine, and the hon. member has associated himself with one of these persons, Sir, with that person, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You said the hon. member for St. Michael South Central?

Mr. BRADSHAW: Yes, it seems so to me, yes, Sir, that is what the person told me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well let us leave that out for now. Let us get on with the debate now please.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, this is what the Resolution is about. I have seen the hon. member in here with the same man with a hoe turning the soil. Mr. Speaker, when you are turning the soil, you are making a living. I have seen the hon. member for St. Michael South Central with the man, and I have seen him turn the soil in St. George with the man who stole from the church. Let him get up and deny that. He stole from the church, he stole the very wine, Sir, I understand that there are two churches, but the hon. member must understand.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of explanation, Sir, and I doubt it is hardly worthwhile. First of all the statement is not true in that I never had an opportunity to turn the soil in any situation. Mr. Speaker, once I was asked and challenged by the hon. member on the other side who has just sat down, to tell this Honourable House whether or not I was assisted by anyone to turn the soil somewhere, and I.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If you have already spoken in this debate you have lost your chance to do so.

Dr. HAYNES: I agree with you Sir. It is not worth it.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that one has got to be honest. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central was seen in St. George on Mr. Power's land with a hoe in his hand with Eric Sealy in 1976 turning the soil, and he was in white shoes, white shirt, white pants everything white on that occasion. It was in the *Advocate News*, and I want the hon. member for St. Michael South Central to get up and categorically deny that now.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, this is deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. It was your privilege. If you were in St. George, it was your privilege.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is what I say. When we get up as leaders we have got to remember that we owe it to the public to tell them the truth, Mr. Speaker, we have here this debate degenerating to the level which I would call its lowest ebb.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been in the Chair at all times and I would really like you to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. BRADSHAW: I withdraw them Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I want to say is that we have here some contributions that are not really worthy of certain members when it comes to a debate of this nature. Mr. Speaker, we have got to understand what this debate is all about. Are hon. members on that side concerned and worried about the statement? Or are they worried because the remarks were made on the Floor of this House?

When the hon. member for St. Michael North Central introduced the Resolution, the impression I got from him was that he was not annoyed. He was not in anyway concerned whether the statement was used outside, but his concern was that it was used on the Floor of this Honourable Chamber. That was the impression I got. What I am saying is that whether the statement or the remarks were used outside or in here, they are remarks that should not be condoned. We have got to appeal to our christian beliefs, and question as well whether we are going to perpetuate this sort of thing and whether we are going to continue to create the sort of device in policy that we have known many countries to have suffered from. Mr. Speaker, I hope that at the conclusion of this Resolution that belief....

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope you will now conclude.
4.20 p.m.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of this Resolution members will realise that what has come out useful to all of us is that we should try at all times to set a very high standard of debate in this Assembly.

Mr. SISNETT: Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said on this side, a lot has been said on the other side pertaining to the matter which is before the House concerning certain statements which the hon. member for St. James made a few months ago. I believe that much more can be said on both sides of the House, and I equally believe that the debate will continue in here as well as it will continue outside. My contribution to this debate, Sir, is that we take stock. We the politicians should take stock and consider the good or the bad that our debates will have on the people of Barbados.

The Democratic Labour Party has been in power in this country for fifteen years and during that time the Democratic Labour Party has generated a kind of patronage for their people that it became a norm to expect that as long as they were in power, certain privileges would have to be meted out to their supporters. Only two years ago there was a change of Government. The people who supported in those fifteen years the Opposition Barbados Labour Party were the ones who had to bear the grind during those fifteen years. It only becomes necessary in my view that those people who supported this party would as human beings look to their members of Parliament for some kind of patronage. I believe that under the existing climate in Barbados where jobs are hard to find, where people have supported a party and a Government, and where a party was not bent on victimising anyone who happened to be in the privileged position of having a job, that the supporters of this party would become restless when jobs, as they expect it, were not forthcoming. What would be unreasonable in this? I believe that the supporters of the Barbados Labour Party, having fought and won an election were looking forward to this Government to create positions for their supporters, but as the Government was not bent on removing from office those workers who were entrenched in their normal positions the Minister for Labour and Community Services, possibly made a slip out of the general climate in the country.

We find a situation where in the various Ministries, in order to procure a house, in order to procure a job people in the administration were saying you have to bring a letter from the Minister. I do not know. I have not been told since this Government took office that any of the Ministers made it compulsory that anyone who wants a job should produce a letter from him. Those people in Government were acting clearly in my estimation under the premise under the old administration that if you should have a job in any one of the Government Ministries or any one of the Government Departments that it was necessary to have one of those former Ministers stipulating that it was okay with him.

We have seen a situation developing where in the Ministry of Housing and in the Ministry of Welfare and Social Services some officers of these departments were treating the people of Barbados in such a contemptuous manner as if the services belonged to those officers. The Minister as Minister of Community Services has an unblemished record. He has been a champion of the old people in Barbados for many years. No one in Barbados can say that the Minister has in any way favoured people of the Barbados Labour Party against people of the Democratic Labour Party when it comes to administering services in his Ministry. The Minister has done a very creditable job.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that if this debate is allowed to continue, we will see in Barbados the kind of situation that has been prevalent in countries as far afield as Turkey where only yesterday four members of the Labour Party were found shot dead. I believe, Sir that if this two-party system and this patronage idea are allowed to continue, that you will find a situation developing in Barbados as in Jamaica which we would not want to see on our shores.

In the recent St. Michael South Central by-election, after the candidate was declared, Mr. Speaker, the people of Barbados were opened to a kind of embarrassment from supporters of the Democratic Labour Party. I remember that while we were at St. Michael's School members found it very difficult to go back on to the highway because the political climate had generated to a point where the supporters of the Democratic Labour Party had become aggressive and were out to endanger those supporters of the Barbados Labour Party. I would want not to see, Mr. Speaker, the political climate of this country degenerate to such a low ebb. I am therefore calling on both sides of the House and in particular the hon. member who has brought this Resolution to the House to withdraw the Resolution from before the House because there are more serious national issues before the country which both sides can debate in the interest of the people. We would not want to bring our country to such a low ebb where on political grounds members on that side or this side are dividing the country because of our political ideologies. The Minister cannot in any way be found guilty for mere words. If I said, and God forbid, Mr. Speaker, I am going to kill you, I am not guilty; if the Minister of Labour says that D.L.P.-ites should starve, he is not guilty; he cannot be guilty for such statements. Words are just impossible.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you would wind up your debate, you would be doing the greatest good.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. SISNETT: Mr. Speaker, as I said, my contribution is purely to ask the people of Barbados and the people in the House of Assembly, the Parliamentarians, to be more tactful in the solution of this problem. The Minister for Community Services has done an admirable job and I do not believe he should be castigated for any statement which he has made concerning supporters of the former Government. I believe that together we can solve the many problems of this Barbados and I will ask the hon. member who has brought this Resolution to the House to withdraw the Resolution from before the House and let us get along with the business.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I was not present in this Chamber when the alleged statement was made. I have heard several versions of the statement, I have read several versions in the newspaper since the alleged statement has been made, I have heard cross talk from both sides in the debate, I have heard comments by supporters of the Democratic Labour Party, I have heard comments of the Barbados Labour Party and I have heard comments from those persons who are not firmly attached to any political party, that is, non-committed voters.

One thing I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that if the Barbados Labour Party had never undergone pressure throughout its existence it has now undergone serious pressure from its own supporters, because it can be clearly seen that members of the Democratic Labour Party have succeeded to appointments and privileges which are under the control of the Barbados Labour Party Government and which members of the Barbados Labour Party believe that they themselves should have benefited, having supported the party all these years, as they say, in the wilderness, and to their surprise and humiliation the members of the Democratic Labour Party are now reaping the benefits.

I can now confess that I doubt in my whole political career which started in 1965 that I have ever heard more than two public meetings of the Democratic Labour Party until the by-election recently, and I was sitting down in a house in Brittons Hill and I heard the speech of Cameron Tudor and I said that that was the dividing line that would be created in this community, because he started off not by addressing his potential supporters, he started and continued his speech by addressing members of the Barbados Labour Party and he told them in no uncertain terms that they were suffering worse than anybody else in the country because their political party was doing nothing to help them. At the end of his speech the man in whose house I was sitting turned to me and said, "do you see what I told you? I supported you all, we got nothing, but Cameron Tudor can talk about it." But what Cameron Tudor was talking about did not start in 1976, it started way back before 1965 when I entered politics. But I well remember the speech of one of the top members of the Democratic Labour Party at the Garrison, the Drill Hall, when he said in 1966 that what was wanted in Barbados was a little bit more Nkrumahism and he went on to explain what should happen to the members of the Opposition Party and those who supported them. I remember that well, but let us come closer home, you Mr. Speaker would know what I am talking about.

In 1974 I was privileged to have been awarded a travel grant by the US State Department. I went to Washington and I visited the Barbados Government's house in Washington to meet the staff. Living on top of

the building in the flat was Mr. Tom Clarke, my old school buddy. About 5 o'clock that evening when the then Ambassador said to me he was leaving office and would I like to take dinner with him in the evening Tom said, "oh, no, we have a lot to talk, we are old school friends," and I went up to Tom's flat. Tom decided to cook a meal for me and there was a large round table in the room and the stove was over there on that side. I am sitting at the table looking through a number of books that were on the side table, a number of leaflets, etc., and malicious as I am I turned over some papers and what came out was a Democratic Labour Party passport with the name of Tom Clarke and I opened it and it indicated that he became a member of the party in 1974 but payments were backdated to 1971. I said to Tom Clarke, "Tom, what is this?" He said to me, "as you know I am a writer, I believe I can do a lot for Barbados, with my connections with the university I can get scholarships, grants, etc., for young Barbadians to improve their conditions." In order to get the job as Educational Councillor, I think he said they insisted that he joined the Democratic Labour Party and backdate his joining so as to make it look as if he was a member from 1971. I said, "Tom, you have sold your soul to the devil and you will pay for it." So when I heard all this talk in here today about the Minister saying this and dividing the country, this Minister could never divide Barbados as long as he lives because the Democratic Labour Party started it from 1966. But if the Minister even said anything he is a late comer on the scene, he has nothing to say that could impress anybody in Barbados when it comes to dividing between the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that when Tom Clarke came to Barbados you and I witnessed Tom Clarke in the Gallery literally praying before Morgan and you went to him with a pen and said, "Tom, sign the resignation before they fire you."

4.40 p.m.

Tom Clarke came down here crying, and the Leader of the Opposition who talked about he never wrote a letter — tell him don't talk about writing letters because if I talk about the letter the woman hand to me and I steamed open the envelope and read it, he would be surprised. And I will tell him about the harassment I suffered under the Democratic Labour Party. Go and ask Nigel Barrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Don't harass me or Nigel Barrow. We have now come to the end of Private Members' Business for today.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I hope you will appreciate that I have to continue when we start again.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is another start. It is now Government Business. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply to that it now reverts.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I think that the speech I made should assuage any fears hon. members in here or people outside may have about the conduct of the Government in relation to making every effort to ensure that the sphere of fishing for Barbadian inshore and offshore boats has increased. And there was one other question that was raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South in connection with the availability of services of the Coast Guard. Now I represent a constituency which perhaps has the largest number of inshore fishing boats in Barbados and I live very close proximity to the anchorage and am in very close touch with the people who engage in fishing. Indeed, it is one of my pastimes, and I am aware of the fact that services have been rendered; and as I understand it no directive has been given by the Government that these services should be discontinued. I do not know where the hon. member has got his information from but I would be very pleased if he could tell me who gave the instructions for these services to be discontinued. I know that at present this is not the fishing season and all we are having is a little pot fishing; but as far as I am aware there has absolutely been no suggestion on the part of anyone in the Government that any of these services should be discontinued. Indeed, the efforts being made in that direction are to intensify the services of the Coast Guard because the Coast Guard will be the principal interest for policing and protecting the two hundred mile zone which we have declared; and therefore far from removing the services, an increased service will be provided for the fishermen; so I do not think the hon. member should have any fear.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. With all due respect I wish to draw attention to Standing Order No. 30(6) on the question of debates in committee of the whole House. I have noticed from time to time, especially when Government Ministers are speaking, that the tendency has been for them to speak for very long periods. I would like to draw to attention that the particular Standing Order does not make any exemption for Ministers on the other side and I thought I would take the opportunity to draw this to Your Honour's attention.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am not offering any final reply at this stage. Because hon. members are looking so closely at the time

provision, they may take note that each Resolution can only last three hours and by my count we have already gone about two and a half hours.

I would just like to deal with one or two matter which impinge on my Ministry. First of all the hon. member for St. Michael South made certain accusations about bad estimations and bad planning for for teachers. To begin with, most of the monies voted under this Head are reimbursable. Much of these monies represent a vote which we have to carry in the Estimates although we are getting money from elsewhere to do the work. The Ceramics study is one such. The Fisheries study, CIDA, is another. The Cement Plant is a third — we are getting back monies from the IADB and from British Overseas Development.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Hon. Prime Minister is now saying that most of the monies as set out are reimbursable. Perhaps the Prime Minister can explain to us why it is that in setting out the addenda they only have reimbursable under BMC. It is very difficult for members on this side to know that these thing are reimbursable if we take the Resolution we are looking at, and the only thing which appears here to be reimbursable is the BMC expansion, \$60,000, which has already been spent. If we look at the expenditure account, which has been set out, none of it appears in this Resolution as reimbursable.
4.50 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It may be a matter of argument, Sir. I am telling hon. members indeed, that some of it is either reimbursable or may be reimbursable matters which are the subject of final plans like the BMC expansion and the TIU contract fees, and hon. members must know that they are reimbursable. The agreement with them was signed a long time ago. The only reason why we have to have the Port expansion is because we have to keep on the consultants until the Port Bill itself is passed. We may not have completed negotiations, for example, for the reimbursement of the ceramics building material.

There is just one other point. The BMC expansion is marked as reimbursable and may be of a different category from other amounts which are reimbursable in the sense that they will come out of project loans, funds which will arrive in Barbados to cover them, but probably not in this Financial Year at all. We will spend them now and get them back at some future time. The BMC is one that is going to be reimbursable and assignable to this note from the Caribbean Development Bank during this particular time.

I think that the hon. member sees the point, and I take his point in which I think that perhaps he is suggesting that the Addendum would be more helpful if

we indicated which of these feasibility studies relate to project loans and those which we are carrying out from our own resources for projects which we intend to fill. There would not be very many of them, Sir.

We are told that there is something wrong with our planning. Now, Mr. Chairman, in 1975-76 the amount spent under this Item was \$5,000. I do not know how much was voted. I do not have the record here; but in the following year, \$2½ million was voted under this Item, and \$387,000 was spent. Last year, \$3.3 million was voted for this Item and only \$1½ million was spent; and I therefore decided that rather than have these floating votes which lend themselves, like the Purchase of Assets votes to such exercises as the North Point without Parliament being told, that it was better to limit yourself within the limit that you felt you were going to spend the money; and therefore I cut the vote down to \$800,000.

Now, you cannot tell me that if during the course of a Financial Year you get an idea which proves a good idea, and you have to go to the feasibility stage, that you can attack the Government for bad planning and for coming back to Parliament for a vote for a feasibility study; because that is what we have done rather than having these exaggerated votes for millions of dollars which, to put it neutrally, have been known to attract a mis-spending, and even known to cause people by their existence to allow themselves to be rather free of hand with the public purse than they would be allowed to be if they had to come to Parliament. So, rather than having that, we cut down the vote to a more reasonable figure; but since then the ceramics building material idea had come up and we have pursued it in visits as I told hon. members. They will be aware of Senator Mapp's visits to Britain and to Kenya, and his visits jointly with myself, have taken us to Germany and Switzerland, which have taken place comparatively recently. They will know that this is relatively new.

The shift to the vertical shaft cement plant is as a result of negotiations which took place some time last year when I met with officials of the Inter American Development Bank in Washington. The Fisheries Development, small though it is, and envisaged though it was in the past, is also up this year as a new idea; but, indeed, above all, something that has not been mentioned is the Oistin Scheme. The Oistin Scheme has come on so fast, fuelled by the energy and determination, not only of the appropriate Minister, but of the Leader of the House, that we have completed a feasibility study and paid for it and will soon be starting work.

That is the situation. Therefore funds have been used up because the Government is trying to proceed at

a pace more appropriate to the real development needs of Barbados than the pace at which certain Ministers and Ministries were accustomed to proceeding in the past; and that is why we are coming back for a supplementary; and making it possible for the House of Assembly to debate new projects within a few months of their coming up rather than voting a blanket vote which will cover a multitude of sins under the present accounting procedures of Government.

I cannot say too much about the Trents matter, because it does not come under my Ministry. I have, however, since I heard these accusations — I hardly imagine or thought that I would ever live to hear even this Opposition attacking the Government for building a school to educate the children of the nothern parishes. When they grumble about our building a school at Trents, they could only be telling us not to educate the children. What do they want us to do? Stop building the school? That is all I can say. Ten years ago, 11 years ago, the hon. member for St. James asked a question in the House on the 7th November, 1967, to be precise, which led to the plans for the Trents School 10 years ago. Now they are being put into force.

I have here the original zoning plan for St. James. It shows, true enough, that Sea View is in Zone 1. There is a gully which runs at the back of Sea View. It runs from Reeves Hill by the back of St. Thomas Church. Anyhow, it runs from Porey Spring, and that gully is a water catchment area. It feeds water into a general catchment zone that is now tapped by the Molyneux well; and for that reason, severe restrictions have been placed in the area in a circle around Molyneux relating to new development. That does not only include Sea View, St. James, but it includes Reeves Hill in St. Thomas and such other places as Curiosity Hill, York Town and places that I dear say very few hon. members will ever have heard of.

That is passing into Zone 2 as you get near the sea and approach Molyneux Woods and the Ridge, on Zone 4 as you start coming down the hill; and of course the lands near the sea are in Zone 5.

Now, where the school is being built was originally placed in the border between Zone 1 and Zone 5; but over the years it was discovered that it was unnecessary to have Zone 1 any where down the flat land of St. James. Indeed, the original map, if you look at it, was carefully drawn out to reach where Lascelles House stands; but thereafter it seems that a straight line was drawn right up to Porters Hill, and no serious attempt was made to delineate the Zone 1 area with the greatest restrictions on the Zone 5 area of no restrictions. I think that hon. members would understand that Zone 1 and Zone 5 would have a boundary. There cannot be a place where you can build

a house here and it will pollute the water system; but right next door you can do anything you like — empty the sewage here and there and not polluting it.

That boundary was not a work of art; and I come now to the crux of what I think is the unfortunate thing about this debate — the suggestion that in order to accommodate the school at Trents, we have shifted the water zones. I have here in photostat a note made on the 18th February, 1974 indicating that at that stage the water zone was already being shifted in the area of St. James where the Trents School really is. It is as simple as that. I have asked both the Ministers who have handled the Portfolio, and neither of them can remember any decision taken in our time to move the boundaries of Zone 1 in St. James to accommodate the Trents School or otherwise. I will tell you this, Mr. Chairman, that when Trents was being divided up there was an effort made then — the hon. member for St. Michael North Central would know about that. He can ask Mr. Bayne, his nominee in the matter. There was an effort then to relax the water restrictions at Trents itself; and I believe that to some extent those restrictions were relaxed during the division of Trents Plantation.

5 p.m.

It is not my Ministry and I do not intend to do a research to give you the date of each application and its fate and so on, but the hon. member for St. Michael North Central knows about this particular matter

Dr. CADDLE: I am a bit surprise that he is trying to draw me into this matter. I think it would be better if he asked the Hon. Leader of the House about the matters pertaining to Trents.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The only matter I know pertaining to Trents is that the trustees of the estate of Panama made an application before the Supreme Court that Trents was one of their developments and they wanted to sell it to a Company known as Trents Development Company Limited and it went before the Supreme Court and I believe the Judge gave permission for it to be sold in winding up their assets. I certainly did not have any financial interest. Maybe my accountants might tell me there are some fees outstanding, but I was a Barrister in those days so I would not know.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well perhaps the hon. member for St. Michael North Central could get up and make a similar statement that neither he nor his nominees had a financial interest in a Company called Trents Limited. I look forward to that in due course, but that is the only division of Trents in which I am familiar with that had anything to do with water resources.

As far as I know if the other hon. members have other facts than were introduced into the debate I would be glad to hear them. I can assure hon. members that any removal of the water zone was done before we were in power and it has nothing to do with the school. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central got up and said that a European country, whose name he cannot remember, had an outbreak of typhoid and the tourists stopped going to it, whose name he cannot remember. Goodness gracious, Mr. Chairman, has the standard of the debate right inside here reach the level where promoters of the South Sea bubble ask people to subscribe to a Company the name and purpose of which would be made known when the shareholding is completed and the hon. member has attempted to move us by arguing about a country whose name he cannot remember, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Those dangerous and wicked scare tactics talking about typhoid — When last was there an outbreak of typhoid in this country? I believe my father who had typhoid at the age of 11 years, God rest his soul, must have been one of the last people in Barbados to suffer from it. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central I am sure would say he has never seen a case in Barbados.

All our memories go back even before the days of water zoning. Typhoid was here in the 1940's. There may have been one or two cases since then. These additional scare tactics which would tend to drag down the whole of Barbados I can never deplore them in here. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central said I jumped up like a serpent, and I did not even know that serpents jumped up, but I believe the hon. member has a greater acquaintance with the behaviour of reptiles and serpents than I have.

He talked about buses running off the road. I have never before in the House of Assembly heard a Government criticised for not providing a bus service to a tenantry on the grounds that the buses were driven off the road.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the hon. member said he was not replying and he drew your attention to the absolute time limit on the debate of the motion. He has been speaking for a long time. I have not had the opportunity to make a contribution. I wish, Sir, you will take notice of the appropriate Standing Order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Alright. I am replying to the debate so far. I am not stopping the other hon. members from speaking. I have to reply to things that have been said. I am not going to speak again Sir. The business of the Glebe, St. George investment may be ruined. I venture to suggest that if the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, if he

lives up to 120 years, that hundreds of people would not come to him and tell him that he is speaking the truth. Speaking the truth is not such a characteristic of the hon. member to attract the attention of even some of his most devoted supporters.

Talking about the people that their investments might be ruined, the church wants to develop the Glebe. Is the hon. member for St. Michael South Central saying that the Church of England, that the Anglican Church in this country, is out to ruin the investment of people in the Glebe, St. George? That is what you claim — The Government is assisting the church to develop its land to the benefit of the 265 or more tenants who live on it. The church land in St. George has been used since time immemorial as tenantry lands for the surrounding plantations who were thereby allowed to release more of their lands for agriculture.

We started the Anglican Church Scheme at the Glebe St. George, and we think it very wrong and wicked to try to put the people against the church scheme and try to turn people's mind in advance to a progressive and imaginative scheme conceived by the trustees of the Anglican Church. I recall there were never any serious studies done on this. There was a Committee sitting under Mr. Warren Franklyn which never reported.

This Government has made a pledge that plantation tenants will have the opportunity to buy their land and that is still the case, and the only further point I would like to make about water and zoning and people's health is that this Government accommodated their friends by giving them permission at the Belle and Lower Estate, the Belle in particular. You remember how we had to put up a fight in here to avoid all these things — Put a race course at the Belle, and divide the Belle. The Belle is sitting perhaps only 20 feet, 40 feet at the most, over the point of the drinking water reservoir in Barbados, and persons were even depraved, if you want to use the word depraved, to put forward for consideration the development of the Belle for any purpose other than agriculture. We went so far from seeking to pollute the water supply. The Ministry of Agriculture has been refused permission to do any development at Codrington.

5.10 p.m.

The Ministry of Agriculture has been refused permission to do any development at Codrington and Parks and Beaches can do no further development at Codrington because Codrington is sitting 180 feet above a water zone and has fruitful water wells which can produce one million to 1½ million gallons a day. We have avoided putting the very B.M.C. project up there because of the potential danger to the water supply, and yet people will come in here and criticise the Government for these matters. The sum of \$48,700 for

a feasibility study in connection with water resources is money well spent, and the Government has absolutely nothing to be ashamed of in this matter. Other Ministers I am sure will deal with any other points which are sought to be raised in this matter if they have to.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, before I get off on the matter before us, I would just like to point out that we are far from three hours for the benefit of the Prime Minister, because the House started at 12.15 p.m., we went to lunch at 2 o'clock, and this matter was not debated, and since we have resumed it is only half an hour that has gone. We therefore have a lot of time if we need it to debate this matter.

There are a couple of matters in this Resolution which I would like to touch on. In the projects budgeted for there is an item P.I.U., which I take to mean Public Investment Unit, Contract Fees for \$206,000. I would like the Prime Minister, since I also understand that this operates out of his office, to throw some light on this unit. To whom are these fees being paid, who are the contractors, for how long have they been operating in Barbados, what have they been doing and when will they complete their studies be it feasibility or otherwise?

There have been some rumours going around in certain circles in this country that some special firm has been brought in from Canada, and they change their personnel every two weeks, who have been doing some personal studies on civil servants and also on projects conducted by the previous Government, and the activities of these gentlemen have caused some concern among members of the civil service in this country. I would like the Prime Minister to take the opportunity to shed some more light on this Public Investment Unit which operates out of his office.

Sir, on the matter of fisheries development, I recognise that this is of great interest and concern to the people in this country from the point of view of providing adequate diet for the people of Barbados. Today people in Barbados still consume too much carbohydrates, and the results or the consequences of that is manifested in the high evidence of obesity which is only another form of malnutrition and diabetes mellitus which is a serious health problem in Barbados, and therefore any effort which is directed to getting the people to have more proteins in their meals should be a welcome one.

Unfortunately in introducing this Resolution the Hon. Prime Minister has not shed much light on this matter. All we have heard so far is that there is to be a feasibility study and the money is to come out of CIDA, and I would like to know from him, apart from

what has been said today in relation to the shrimping operations, what is being planned or the areas on which this project would look or this feasibility would go. I would also like to remind hon. members on the opposite side that while the grass is growing, a typical Barbadian saying, the horse is starving; and while it is nice to come in here and talk about projects and so in the pipeline one has to be in a position to tell the Barbadian people at this point in time what is being done for them now, because many of these projects may take some time before they produce benefits or results for the people of this country.

In the area of fishing, I would like to say to the Hon. Minister responsible for fishing that in some of the streams in Barbados you find prawns, especially in the northern areas, which are the relatives to the shrimp, and I wonder if some research could not be done in this matter to see if it could be made a commercially viable project, because prawns can be cultivated. In fact I would also like to throw out to the Minister responsible for fisheries that in the Harbour, not very long ago shrimp were discovered as a result of a burst pipe from the Waterworks which had been pumping large quantities of water out in the sea, and when some of this water was tapped for analysis as regards its purity, it was discovered that the larvae of the shrimp were in the water. But more significantly, Sir, in Barbados you find there are a lot of areas which undergo flooding every time we have a lot of rain, and some of these areas provoke a lot of problems and irritation for the residents and also problems for the Government as regards how to solve this flooding. I am throwing it out as I have already thrown it out on previous occasions that I believe that one way of dealing with this problem of flooding in low areas which lends itself to this type of treatment would be to convert them into ponds and do fish farming.

Sir, there is a local fish referred to biologically by the name of tilapia which is a very good source of protein, and you find that fish in the streams of Barbados, and if the same streams are big enough they attain a very large size. These fish have been cultivated in some of the developed countries for the purpose of providing a source of protein for the people of those countries, and I wonder if the Minister responsible for fishing would look at this particular matter while looking at the feasibility study for fishing development in Barbados. Some people may throw this out or dismiss it as trivial or of no consequence, but in a country such as Barbados and other countries similar to Barbados, where you are concerned with improving the protein content of people's food and you are also constrained by the heavy cost of food which has to be imported into the country one must look at any measure which lends itself to commercial exploitation. I believe that in the area of fish farming, and I would

like to point out that we don't need big areas for so doing, we may be able to find some benefit for the people of this country.

Going a step further, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister again that with the establishment of the sewage system in this country and the ultimate functioning of the sewage plant, there will be an effluent from that plant which will be very rich in nutrients which in many parts of the world have been used for the promotion of oyster farming. I can say quite strongly that one acre of oyster farming produced at least 60,000 pounds of meat protein when the year comes. I do not know what plans people have in the area for the effluent coming from the sewage plant. I know that in many countries where it has been pumped into the sea, it has given rise to an abundant growth of seaweed, algae and things of that nature, adding to the pollution, but also I am trying to draw to the attention of the Government that in other countries oyster farms have proved a boon both from the point of view of finding work for people and improving the quality of food that people eat.

I would like to reiterate my point, that we in Barbados consume a very high proportion of carbohydrates in our food and this has some relation with our health needs. I recall that some time ago there was a conference in Barbados at which an attempt was made to develop some national food and nutrition policy. Maybe somewhere in the Ministry of Health or the Ministry of Agriculture the findings of that conference will be available, but I would like to stress quite seriously that when we are looking at the problem of health in Barbados how to contain the ever-increasing cost of health services, how to reduce the incidence of certain diseases, we have to relate some of our efforts to the type of food or the availability of food that obtains in Barbados.

5.20 p.m.

If we are to make good headway in controlling things like obesity and diabetes, and other forms of mal-nutrition in children, we must be in a position to make available to the people of this country at reasonable prices good sources of protein. A country such as Barbados with limited land resources cannot look at the keeping of cows for providing meat, because the amount of land that would be needed to provide the quantity of meat required throughout Barbados is not readily available and we have to look at other sources. We have already examined other sources such as duck and turkey raising, some of which has not been successful, and I am now pointing out to the Minister responsible that one can now start looking at the areas of fish farming and oyster farming and things of that nature. They can lend themselves more readily to adaptation in Barbados in

some form than some of the more ambitious plans that have been carried out in the past. If this can be done I think we will be going a far way in solving part of the mal-nutrition problem which exist at present, obesity, and also help those diabetics who now find it extremely difficult to follow a diet given to them by their physicians. This is very important.

There are large numbers of diabetics in this country, and more and more of them are being discovered every day. We are not going into the reasons, the reasons may very well be of genetic background, the constant in-breeding that is taking place and has taken place over the years, we are not dealing with that right now, what we are dealing with is the problem that people have in following a diet given to them by a doctor, because you will know that with the diabetic there is a very rigid curtailment of the carbohydrates in the diet, and when you put people on such diets they find difficulty and they come back and say that they tried to follow the diet but they could not get vegetables or meat because the prices are too high, and they end up by eating rice, potatoes, breadfruit, yams, etc. which are all carbohydrates in different forms, so this matter I consider very important, and I would like to welcome the interest of the Government in having a feasibility study as regards fisheries development, but I am a bit disappointed that the Hon. Prime Minister in his presentation of this Resolution has not taken any time to give us any indication of where he intends to take fisheries development in Barbados. We have heard a lot about the shrimping operations, I do not want to go into that at this stage, there may be another opportunity so to do, but I think that for a long time we have been overlooking this particular resource and not developing it fully to the satisfaction and the conditions of the people in this country.

Sir, I can only wish the Government well in this particular exercise, because I have a direct interest in it as a professional man.

As regards his plans about zoning of water in Barbados, I take the point because I have been involved in some way, that these things cannot remain constant, and as more and more hydrological information becomes available, and as more and more experimentation and research is done in the hydrological field it becomes more accurate to pinpoint exactly where boundaries should be, but the point I would like to support coming from my colleague on my right is that when these things are done and changes are indicated they should be made public. If you make them public you will save yourself a lot of criticism, some of which you have deplored today and maybe some more you will have to deplore in the future. When these changes have been made and the scientific information on which they have been made is made available, let them publish it and it will allay the fears of

people over and over and over again. Unless you do that you will find yourselves as we were, exposed to all types of suspicion and accusations, many of which will be without foundation, and I can only throw that advice out to you all because we on this side have been through that, although when on all occasions we attempted to draw it to the attention of people that they were operating on suspicions and things of that nature it was dismissed. Now that you are wearing the shoe I dare suppose you can feel how tight the shoe can be.

Sir, there are other points here which can be talked about, but I rather not talk about them at this stage. We have heard a lot about the cement plant, we are still waiting to see something tangible done about the cement plant, because while all this is going on I recognise quite clearly that a cement plant in Barbados is a highly costly effort, both for the Democratic Labour Party and for the Barbados Labour Party, and I do not believe that there is anyone on that side who is going to come out and tell us that they are going to find it really cheaper to set up a cement plant in Barbados, cheaper in the sense that when people start to buy the cement which is being produced here they are going to see a substantial reduction in the cost of a bag of cement. Right now in Barbados there are fears being expressed in Barbados about a cement shortage, and if we are concerned about providing houses for the people of this country we must have less talk and more action, and if the cost of the establishment of a cement plant is too much for Barbados to carry I think it is better that we come out and let the public of Barbados know that rather than trying to play politics with the issue to make the people believe that the DLP could not produce something but here the Barbados Labour Party can produce something even although it may take another seven, eight, nine or ten years. We have to look very seriously at these matters because, as I said, while the grass is growing the horse is starving, and while it is nice to come in here and paint a very rosy picture of all the wonderful projects in the pipeline and what is likely to happen in years to come, right now people in the country are suffering and they are quite concerned not with the future but with the present, because many of them realise that they may not live to see these things come into being.

So I hope the Prime Minister will take the opportunity to let us know something about what is being done right now to make cement available to the people of this country and leave the planning and the fruition of a cement plant maybe to later times and satisfy the needs of the people right now.

In the area of budgeting and accounts systems, I would like to say that I believe the Government is moving in a good direction in that area. I believe that a lot needs to be done in that particular area to make the collection of taxes more efficient in Barbados. I am not putting up

any case for the hounding down of people, I am not putting up a case that the man who pays taxes now and who can be identified as paying taxes should be harassed, but I do recognise in Barbados, especially with the amalgamation of companies into one combine, and also with the presence of people in Barbados who work and still do not pay any tax at all, that some effort should be made to improve your system to such an extent that those people find it less difficult to evade making their contribution towards the welfare of Barbados.

With those comments, I wish those schemes which I have commented on success.

5.30 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, so much has been said in this debate that there is not a lot left to be said except we are going to get some answers on some aspect from the Government side. The hon. Minister and Leader of the House at a point in his intervention said words to the effect that the existing physical development plan is in the course of revision and he went on to announce that his Government is equally concerned with protecting the health of the community. Mr. Chairman, it would be strange if anybody in areas of authority was not interested in the protection of the health of the community, and I do not believe that is the point that needs to be debated. But I wish to take the opportunity of this particular Resolution, especially as it applies to plantation tenancies and since this is the first opportunity that has arisen in the past month or so to bring a very serious situation regarding the health of the people in a particular area. It may seem at first blush to be parish pump politics, but I am dead serious. I have made several attempts to get someone to pay attention to this matter. I am speaking about two areas very close to the Eagle Hall market where we have a continuing basis the exposure of food for sale. There is a road called Jubilee Gap or Taylors Gap. Some one went and put a main in Jubilee Gap and since then a gaping hole has been left in the road. Whenever rain falls the water remains for weeks after. Immediately behind the Post Office, also at Eagle Hall, there is piece of land not more than a hundred yards long when the rain falls for weeks after the water remains settled there. Mr. Chairman, I am raising this because that entire area is a plantation tenantry; I am talking about the area commonly called Hanschell Land. Because the water has been settling for a long and continuous time, for years — (Asides) if they say they are interested in the health of the people they ought to fix the road. What I would like them to do is to realize that mosquitoes are breeding in the water. Representation has been made by almost every person who lives in the area. Representation has been made by me.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I believe this is very improper and unfair, and I

would like to say dishonest, but that is unparliamentary under the circumstances. But Hanschell Land and that area, from the time I came back to Barbados as a lawyer in 1964 when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, the owners of Hanschell Land wanted to fix the road. If it had been created from September 3 it would have been fair and equitable to talk about it. But you have gone to the parish pump now when for fifteen years Hanschell and the last administration have been fighting to clean up the area. So all of a sudden now it is parish pumping in 1978.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. TAITT: Clearly no point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I will not waste time over the hon. member's remarks. I started off by saying there is an area in Eagle Hall, a market place where food is exposed. I would like the Minister who just got up to go and see it, to look behind the Post Office for which he has responsibility.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I never like to see any member muzzled, but really we have gone so far outside this Resolution, I really must submit that the hon. member is out of order on the ground of irrelevance. He has made his point, but if he elaborates now on the Post Office he will be out of order.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I think you should make it clear to the hon. Prime Minister that he should concentrate on trying to run his side of things.

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

Mr. TAITT: The Prime Minister should know perhaps better than anyone else in this House that Hanschell Land is a plantation tenantry (*Asides*) He says now that it is not a plantation tenantry but a city tenantry. But the point I am making is they say they are interested in the health of the community. I went to a private developer and asked him if he could put some stuff in the road to soak up the water. I advised him to go and look at it because when I said in here two years ago that they had directed two developments in certain areas to be stopped they said it was wrong to say so and I have not said it since, and I do not believe I should say so again.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister in an attempt to deal with a question raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South gave us an exercise in that technique which he uses freely on those who may not be *au fait* with what he is talking about. First of all he said that the vast majority of these items are reimbursable. He sought to explain that by saying they are part of projects and that the money from these projects will be

reimbursable. But, Mr. Chairman, the point here is not where the money will come from for a project eventually; the point at issue is the amount stated in the vote at the time the Estimates come out and the Minister of Finance comes to the House and gives the people at large the impression that his Budget is of a certain size and that he has exercised great skill in reducing the Budget; then we have him come in here and say that \$5,000 was in it the year before, \$5 million the year before that, so he deemed it desirable to cut it to under \$1 million this year and five months later he comes back and asks for \$653,000. The valid point being made is that surely the projects in here are projects we have heard about before. Let him get up and tell us what projects here we have not heard about before in this House. The Cement Plant is something that has been talked about for nearly five years. I have no qualms in saying that there was a feasibility done in the context of the Cement Plant in the northern part of the Island. The feasibility study took an extraordinary long time when we were in Government. One million dollars was originally spent, I understand, and since then an additional \$2 million has been spent. We are coming back here now and have shifted from a rotary kiln to a vertical kiln. Then we heard that a Minister has been to Switzerland — I have never understood why anybody would have to go to Switzerland to look at a cement plant, and I heard there was to be another trip into South America to examine existing cement plants there.

5.40 p.m.

I could recall for the benefit of the Committee when he said it on T.V.; but I do not have the time now.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do deny that I ever said anything about a trip to South America. It appears that the hon. member is as ignorant of Geography as his colleague on his immediate left. If Jamaica, Trinidad and the Dominican Republic are in South America, then I said it; but if in fact they are West Indian Islands, then I did not say it. I think the majority of Geographers and Historians alike would agree that they are West Indian islands.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the Hon. Prime Minister is referring to me in that manner. All I said was that I had an idea why he would be going to Switzerland. We all know why people go to Switzerland.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. Let us get ahead.

Mr. TAITT: It is very noticeable that every time the Prime Minister finds himself with his back to the wall he gets up and says that somebody is ignorant. Mr. Chairman, I admit to being ignorant about Switzerland. I

have never had a Swiss Bank Account. I do not have one and I do not expect to have one; so I am bound to be ignorant of the geography of Switzerland.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe that the hon. member has made his contribution. What has all this got to do with the debate? We are asking for high standards of the day.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, it is within your prerogative to shut me up. I have sat in this House and listened to members over there speaking and saying what they like; and time and time again every time someone over here gets up you hear some kind of foolishness.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is not a shouting occasion. Will the hon. member please be seated. I must warn you. I draw the attention of hon. members of this Committee to the behaviour of the hon. member. If he continues, I will have to use the provisions of the Standing Orders. So now you will please take your seat. (*Aside*) Order please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take part in this debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to let you know that you have just about 5 minutes more to wind up.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will take the 5 minutes. When I heard some of the comments made by Senators on the Other Side, and the benighted contribution made particularly by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, I could not but get up and make a few points in this regard. The hon. member has said that there has been no development in tenancies in the last two years. It happens that I represent a constituency which has the largest plantation tenantry in Barbados, and that is a tenantry in Drax Hall; and in the last two years the Government has built a major road for the first time in the tenantry of Drax Hall.

In addition to that, for the very first time there is a bus service going right into the heart of Drax Hall. That is for the very first time in the history of this country. In addition to that, they are now laying telephone cables in Drax Hall. I will tell you what is the position with that. In Drax Hall if one gets ill in the middle of the night they have to travel at least two miles before they can get to a telephone. We have been asking the previous administration to use their good offices to get at least a pay phone up in Drax Hall, and all to no avail. They are running cables up there at this very moment; and the very last area in Drax Hall that has been without electricity — Drax Hall Jump, with which you are very familiar Mr. Chairman, they have done measurements and are ready to drop poles.

When the hon. member gets up here and says that nothing has been done in the tenancies for the past two years, all that I can say is that this is consistent with a number of statements that he has been making both in and outside of here.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have made a statement in this Hon. House that I will not be responding to any remarks made by the hon. member for St. George South. I would just like to remind you and this Hon. Chamber that what I said was that I have not seen any significant developments over the past two years. (*Laughter*) I am not saying that one or two things have not been done; but I did not say that nothing was done; and that is completely untrue.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That was no point of order. It was a point of explanation. Please continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The hon. member said that he would not respond to anything I said in here. He cannot be consistent about that. I am surprised to hear him get up. I would be willing to sit down because if he gets up he would soak up a lot of punishment; but he thinks that it is not significant.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I want to draw Your Honour's attention to the Rule which speaks of members abusing the Rules of the House. People who get up on points of order that are not points of order perhaps contribute as much confusion in here as anything else, especially when a statement is made which may not be objectively true. I do not know what the hon. member said, but my intention was just drawn to the fact by the Leader of the House that I made a note. I did not even remember that I made it; but I have a note here specifically ascribing these words to the hon. member: "So far nothing done by the Barbados Labour Party in respect of the Tenancies."

When people get up and deny a statement made earlier it causes so much trouble and there is no point of order on that. There is no point of order in something like that. I did not see the hon. member speaking from a note. I did not see anybody taking a note. My note is more likely to be accurate than his memory. My note is more likely to report accurately what he said than what he now says. He is not a very truthful person, Sir. Apart from that...

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. That remark is unparliamentary and it should be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will withdraw.

Hon. L. R. Tull rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what do you rise?

Hon. L. R. TULL: What the Hon. Prime Minister should have said is that the truth and the hon. member just do not jell. That is what the hon. member said, and I am glad to hear that the record by the Prime Minister accords with the one that I have got written down here. I am not going to let the hon. member get in here and make these remarks about plantation tenancies in Barbados. He knows what he is doing. He talked about Bellair in St. George.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member for St. George South has just said that the truth and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central just do not jell. May's Parliamentary Rules indicate that even by innuendo such a remark should not be made about an hon. member, and I think that the hon. member should withdraw the remark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. Would the hon. member please continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the hon. member for St. Michael South West is getting into this. He is only doing this because he knows that you have told me that I have only got five minutes, not enough time to deal with him. I want to make the point that when the hon. member talks about Bellair in St. George and the Glebe in St. George, he is going into a territory that will affect me; and I am not going to let him get away with those statements.

Only last week I have had discussions with the attorneys and lawyers of Drax Hall Plantation over a whole plan for the development of tenancies in that particular area; and even before we were in Government I am sure that the Prime Minister will remember that I had discussions with him over provision for the people in plantation tenancies in Barbados to own the house spots on which they live. I told the attorneys and the lawyers for Drax Hall Plantation that I believe that this residual slavery mentality about renting a bunch of people house spots should come to an end.
5.50 p.m.

And the very fact that in many plantation tenancies people are building wall houses against the law, and I have cautioned them not to do it. It is a clear indication that people in Barbados want security of tenure. Now the Government is making plans to enter into negotiation with all these plantation tenancies with a view to developing them for the benefit of the people who long for their own lots in which they live and which appears in the Note of this Resolution and members on the other side get up as if they think they can still tumble the Government by making the identical points they find in the notes here.

I do not believe Mr. Chairman, that it is even worthy to pursue it because we have made our position clear on this matter that the plantation tenancies in their present form can no longer continue and when I hear the member for St. Lucy make some remarks about the school at Trents, what happens is, and the hon. member for St. Michael South should know this, is that the previous administration intended to build a school at Trents. They intended to locate this school on the existing playing field that is used by Maple Cricket Club because the above section was in the water zone.

What has happened since is that there has been a Water Resource Study carried out by the Chief Engineer, Water Works and the lines have been redrawn and when we were about to start the school at Trents, we were told by the Chief Engineer, Water Works Department that we cannot build on the below section because the lines were now changed and we would have to seek another part out.

Now let me make this absolutely clear. Unlike the hon. member for St. Lucy who made his point, and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, I do not believe that the water zone boundaries are like the laws of God which are unchangeable but they can change and we change with them. We change the siting of the school under instructions of the Chief Engineer, Waterworks Department, but I understand what the position is. There are a number of people on that side that have interest in properties at Trents who obviously are interested in what will happen with their interests at Trents. I have no land at Trents. Indeed, I have no land at all, and they need not come in here with their personal interests to try to make a big debate out of it.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point I have to make before I sit down since you told me I have 5 minutes. It is the question on the feasibility studies. It is one I have been concerned about every since I was in the Government. There are feasibility studies, and more and more feasibility studies, and the result is that there is a lot of duplication in Government with these studies, and I also think that with the projects with which I have been intimately involved that there have been too many of them to provide jobs for international civil servants, people who get up in Washington and want a trip down to the Caribbean and other countries, and they come down to Barbados and other Third World countries where you have to borrow money from the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank and so on, they come down with teams of 5, 6, 7, and 8. They make written reports from others that have been done in the past and I have seen it. In fact, I have two in my office done by UNESCO over a period of 4 years of which 80% of what they have given in one Report, appeared in the second Report, so this amounts to finding jobs for these international civil servants, giving them big fees and getting them to run around the Third World and leaving the burden of all of his money on us.

I would like the Government to take a very close look at this question of feasibility studies because this type of duplication and triplication is doing this country no good.

If I may make just one final point, Mr. Chairman, the Rural Development Scheme takes into consideration the Glebe Land in St. George. Everybody has heard of it. It was in the News, I made my statement on it, the Attorney General made his statement on it. I know they will be building a new Co-Ed Primary School in the Glebe Land. I know there will be building a new Polyclinic, a new Police Station, and a new Old Peoples' Home. I know they are building a new lot of things up there and this is part of the planning that is required of these feasibility studies and I cannot understand what the Hon. members on the other side have been complaining about. It seems to me as if they are saying you should not provide any money to prepare reports for improved projects.

The hon. member for St. Michael South is saying something about lack of planning and *ad hoc* policies, saying these things did not appear a few months ago, and to use his words "he believe this type of activity is the antithesis of planning." I would have said it differently, Mr. Chairman, I would have said that this type of action is the antitheses of execution because a lot of the things this Government said it was going to do in respect of Capital projects are well now on the way and members on the other side when they see the large amount of capital projects that this Government is now about to embark upon, you get the type of unnecessary criticisms that we have been getting for much of the evening.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be very long but it seems that the members of the Opposition, and in particular the Leader of the Opposition are finding it necessary to find what we would call good political strategy to say things which are not true now that they are in Opposition, fully well knowing that there are records to bear out the true facts of the situation."

Now I hear the hon. member for St. Michael South Central talk about re-aligning the Zone 1 area. I well remember when I came to Parliament that there were discussions of the re-alignment partly in the area of Trents and it was a member of this House, who is no longer a member of this House who said he had interest in certain land at Trents which was affected by the Zone 1 area.

While the discussions were going on I sent to the Waterworks Department and certain documents were delivered to me which I can make copies of if so desired and make them documents of the House. Now in the first place it says "*Zone 1 Area of Prohibited Building*

Development around Existing and Future Wells. Existing buildings shall continue to use existing sewage disposal systems. Meanwhile, no changes shall be made to such systems except for purposes of routine maintenance. The Water Board may take such steps to secure changes and improvements to existing systems as shall be considered to be necessary."

Mr. Chairman, over and above that, there was a meeting between the then Prime Minister and certain people in Government and this is a copy of the Waterworks document and it is headed "Relaxation of Policy to allow further Development of Existing Houses in Zone 1."

6.00 p.m.

"At a meeting of the Central Bank Committee held on 9th October, 1972, the Prime Minister said that the current restrictions to building in certain areas for the purpose of protecting the underground water supplies needed some reassessment. The Prime Minister felt that in a small Island which was experiencing rapid expansion, it might not be possible to retain indefinitely the current restrictions, and alternative means of safeguarding the water supplies would need to be investigated. The views of the Chief Engineer, Waterworks and those of the Chief Town Planner and of the Public Health Engineer were sought on this matter, and in general it was agreed that (1) the present water protection policy should be maintained and (2) no action should be taken to change the existing water protection policy before the team of consultants now undertaking a feasibility of the sewage in Bridgetown and the Belle areas had submitted its reports to Government."

Mr. Chairman, that decision was taken and it is dated 18/2/74.

I was in the Ministry of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, and I have come up against problems in the Scotland District. The Waterworks does not allow people to put down houses particularly on the East Coast Road because they say technical advice is that run off water from sewage or otherwise would cause slippage, and therefore it is not recommended to put houses in that area.

In connection with Parks and Beaches we were searching for an exhibition ground and we looked at Codrington House. I held a meeting with the Chairman of the Water Board who is the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks, and he said that under no consideration at all will he ever allow us to develop Codrington any further because he says he is afraid that the pollution might enter into the water system and cause havoc in Barbados.

The B.M.C. new project was proposed to have been sited at Cordington, and they said wash water coming out of that building would disrupt the whole water system and it could not be sited there.

There are problems in St. Philip where they are wells. People have applied to sink wells, but in order to protect the water system these have been refused. So when you hear hon. members on that side trying to tell the public that since 1976 the Government has re-aligned zone 1 and has allowed persons to do things which could not have been done before, it is totally untrue and they know it is untrue. Zone 1 has been looked at so far as I know by the water resources study and there has been no re-alignment as far as I know in the Government, because the Ministry of Agriculture, and I was there, was deeply involved in it, because it looked at the agricultural sector, it looked at whether there is more water for increase of irrigation, and I can say that Zone 1 has not been affected so far as I know; so if there has been any re-alignment of the zone it would have been in 1974.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, I think the hon. member for St. Joseph did make an error but he corrected himself after. He said there was no re-alignment in the Government and then he corrected himself and said there was no realignment in the zone. I am certain he would be well aware that there has been a recent re-alignment in the Government in which he has suffered.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79 No. 11

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum I think should give hon. members all the assistance they need in this matter. This item of professional services is provided to meet the expenses of having assistance provided by the Government and the question of service rendered by non-national agencies or institutions. We have purchase of motor cars, peace corps housing, and matters of this sort. When people are sent from abroad to give assistance, and you have to put them up or give them a car, it is met from this vote.

The Addendum indicates that there are a number of increases to some of the projects and more people who have been recruited, and we have to pay more for rental of motor cars for them. It is a very small item. Again hon. members can rest assured that it is because we are developing and because we are taking active development steps that expenditures such as this are needed.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West - I would not go into it in detail - did say something about our having a big vote and then we reduce it and then have to come back to increase it. You know, Sir, a lot of things have to be done some time not by trial and error, that is not the expression, but you have sometimes to feel your way; where something was really being done badly before, you might not hit the exact solution head on the next time. We have tried very hard especially this year. We have been in office in a year of trial and then we have a year of achievement; trial and achievement. The previous Government had trial and error, we have trial and achievement. Since then in the financial year and not taking into account the increases to public officers which are coming very soon the Government has not done too very badly a job, I think of handling Government finances during its time. We had some worries in August, but, Sir, we are managing to keep our heads above water, and I do not think we could be judged very hard for the stringency of the controls which we imposed at the time of the Estimates if we were to have a little slack from time to time. We have fewer supplementaries than was ever the experience of the previous Minister of Finance. The Leader of the Opposition has said in here, what is the use of cutting back at Estimates time when the civil servants tell you they need more money and you still have to come back with supplementaries. That has not been our experience. We have cut back and the cuts have stayed put. For what it is worth current expenditure for the first half of this year is \$127.2 million; for the first half of last year it was \$129.6 million, so we have in fact cut back on wastage, something that the records do not afford any similar achievement in the last ten years. We have managed to cut back on wastage and over a six months' period reduced the Government's current expenditure, and that is without any particular economy in personal emoluments.

6.10 p.m.

Unfortunately, coupled with the decrease in Government current expenditure there has been nothing like a 15% increase in revenue, so while last year Government was already running a deficit of \$21 million, this year the deficit is still under \$4 million, and apart from the civil servants' salary increase we could confidently have expected a modest surplus and one which would have been in absolute terms perhaps the second or third highest ever recorded. But of course that surplus is going to be absorbed by public officers salaries but we hope we will have happy figures to report at the time of the next Budget debate. So I do not think any argument that our pruning of waste was more apparent than real can hold water in the light of these figures. I hope that by the end of next week the House will probably have the figures. We think we really have achieved a reduction in the exaggerated and bloated levels of Government expenditure and nobody

can say we have done it at the expense of economic activity generally, because the PAYE returns show that money wages are going up, the rate of increase in revenue is at the very least twice the rate of inflation, and the unemployment figures which were quoted to the House have shown a significant reduction in unemployment for the part of the year to which they relate. The figures for the first six months of the financial year are being worked on. I do not know what they will show but indications are that receipts in the retail trade and service industries are also up. So I would not like to think that hon. members would cavil at a small vote such as this and the previous Resolution, which are essentially and fundamentally votes of money directly for development projects which will benefit the Island as a whole. Theoretically, when I examine the entire situation I am in fact told — I will not deal with the figures for the whole year — but certainly Government's own financial position cannot be regarded in a particularly pessimistic light at the present time. But we have to keep our fingers crossed. We are a small economy dependent on outside forces and things can blow us off course at any rate. But when hon. members study the accounts and statements which they will receive in a few days time, they may have some cause for satisfaction at the figures that will be shown.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, one cannot blame the Prime Minister for taking the opportunity to put forward what one would say if one was doing a weather forecast: "Tomorrow will be moderately sunny." That is the same as saying tomorrow will be moderately not sunny. But we will wait for the figures. We will take the Central Bank's figures — not necessarily the Central Bank's utterances — because I hear the Prime Minister now saying we will have a modest deficit; and I would prefer to believe that the newspaper erred when it said that the Governor of the Central Bank had said that there was a surplus at this point of time. I just wanted to draw this to his attention.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member would give way on a point of explanation. There has to be a word of caution about the use of the Central Bank report. The Central Bank report is to some extent interpretative; it tends to give calendar year figures and it tends to assess the figures in a slightly different way than the Accountant General. Honourable members may not be aware of this because for so many years they were not getting the Accountant General's report. The Accountant General is under statutory duty to send actual figures of receipts and expenditure to the House of Assembly within a month of the month to which they relate. We have got the Accountant General's office at long last doing this. The accounts for August were recently laid. They are very disheartening if you read them, for a particular reason. The accounts for September will soon be laid, and I would suggest to hon. members that when they get the

accounts they quote from them. That is the base material which the Central Bank uses and all of us can perhaps examine these figures and come to our own interpretations of them.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if hon. members can understand the predicament in which a Minister of Finance finds himself from time to time, we can appreciate the comment which the Minister of Finance has made. But his colleague, the hon. member for St. Philip North, I think will agree with me — I do not want to divulge information which has been coming to us — but if one looks at some of the indicators we have been getting from the Accountant General's Office we would recommend that he pay more attention to the interpretation of the Central Bank reports than the Account General's, for what it is worth. But I do not wish to go into that, because there have been some startling indications as to what the figures from the Accountant General might mean. It may very well be that the Accountant General will put forward at a given month that there is a surplus of X number of dollars and the following month that there is a deficit of twice that amount; and from what we have been hearing it is a question of interpretation between the Auditor General and the Accountant General.

But I wish to get back to the substance of the debate. The Prime Minister said that there should be no cavil at this \$39,000; and indeed there will be none. However, he went on to suggest that this is only a modest little sum and he does not expect too much noise made about it. Now I wish to draw your attention to the actual Estimates at page 15. When we raise questions about the methods that are being used, we are not raising them in a harping manner; we are saying that, as he has at least acknowledged, he is doing a little trial and error, because to admit to error from that position would leave the rest of his team in some problem. But we understand his attempts at trial and achievement. That is a new set of words which we must put forward in the future — trial and achievement. It is one which will last for a long time.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at the approved Estimates for 1976-77, under this Head the Estimates was \$186,932 of which \$170,000 was spent. Now the approved Estimates for 1977-78 were \$200,000. I would suggest that if the Prime Minister's knife at Estimates time had had perhaps a little light at the end of it he would have recognized that, given the amount of \$170,000 that was approved for 1978-79, we would have to be doing a regression because we had spent \$186,000 in 1976-77.

6.20 p.m.

Using his own argument about the progress made in the areas of development, it would have been seen that at the very least we would spend the same

amount of money in 1978-79 that we spent in 1977-78, or even 1976-77, so that we recognise that the \$170,000 could not have been sufficient, and this is the gravamen of the argument we have been putting forward, that it would be better — and I say this now without reference to either political party — I believe that in the question of budgeting that it is better to tell the country what the actual expenditure is going to be for a set of services. Let us come and tell the people these are the services which we hope to perform, these are the ramifications connected with these services, this is what the cost will be. It would serve us a lot better if that were done than for us to have these constant references to supplementary estimates.

I go further, Mr. Chairman. The Prime Minister indicated that under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party there was some system for supplementary estimates which he and his regime apparently have improved on, but as I recall it, there was a fairly rigid system which was applied under the regime which I served as part of it for five years, and we had a system which suggested that the Government would only come down to the House for supplementary estimates in so far as it was humanly possible four times during the year. In other words, to preclude civil servants from asking for supplementaries within weeks of the estimates vote, they would come down every three months or so, and all Departments were required to submit their requirements for supplementary estimates to the Ministry of Finance in sufficient time so that we could have some kind of uniform system, so I think that the Prime Minister was obviously misled in this — I do not wish to accuse him of deliberately misleading the House — I think in this case in trying to put his position as best he can he was misled into thinking that under the Democratic Labour Party the system of supplementary estimates was according to the way he put it, a sort of trial and error, hit or miss. As a matter of fact, on second thought, I do not see how it was possible for the Minister of Finance who is Lord of all he surveys not to have been aware of the methodology used by his predecessor. I am told that generally speaking most of the officials in the Ministry are the same, and while they might have given at the outset indications that somehow their thinking was somehow refreshed or changed, because that would happen with the coming of a new administration, their basic system will remain the same.

I do not wish to reflect on a previous vote, but I think that it would have been helpful if the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance could indicate to the House how it is proposed to improve or re-arrange the accounting system. I think that hon. members of this House would be interested to know how they propose to re-organise the system, because, Mr. Chairman, the present system which arises out of the Financial Rules

and Audit Act of 1974, I think it is, does lend itself to a certain clumsiness in this area of supplementary estimates. I am not one of those persons who is wedded to the concept that virement is a fate equal to death, I believe that virement under certain circumstances and with sufficient direction is infinitely more desirable than the total cost which, if you add it up at the end of the year, accrues from the number of steps that have to be taken for a supplementary vote to be given in this House, I believe that some form of virement ought to be looked at by the Government with a view to preventing us having to vote for \$39,000 under this Head, from which a motor car is likely to be purchased or has been purchased, and in a Head under Capital we have other surveys or feasibility studies being done.

It seems to me that if you have professional services of a certain kind which are related to the total development of the country, that those professional services can be embodied into a single vote and there could be a requirement that prior to expenditure from that vote permission from the Minister of Finance or some other authority must be had, but, Sir, to come down here — and we are going to find more and more of these votes coming in — where a small sum such as \$39,000 might be required and in some cases if you added up the man hours it may very well be that it cost as much as \$39,000 to get this vote of \$39,000.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The matters raised by the hon. member are of course being taken into account. The repetition of these very small votes, some steps have already been taken and instructions have been given that supplementaries should be accumulated so that the House does not have to go week after week with its main business being supplementaries. In fact, in the interest of the economy, I am doing what was never done before, I have personally scrutinised every request for a supplementary. I used to turn down about one in three, but with this experience facing them Ministries then ceased to submit requests for supplementaries, and I hardly ever have to turn down any now, Sir, and the result is a reduction in the overall expenditure.

The hon. member, I think, was led into error, not achievement, when he equated the spending of money with progress. You can spend money and waste it and indeed you can steal money and spend it. I do not think that the \$2 million which has been saved over the six months represents any regression in Barbados. I think he used the expression "regression" and I have endeavoured to show that the fact that revenue is buoyant, which represents the buoyancy of the economy, and that unemployment is down, indicates that the country is not suffering through the pruning of waste.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member will give way, on a point of explanation, I think that the hon. member, perhaps because he was talking while I was making the point, must have missed the gravamen of the point I was making. I am not suggesting that the \$2 million — he said that I fell into error by saying that money spent was progress. I did not even allude to money being spent being progress, what I indicated was, and what I invited him to do, is to look at the expenditure for 1976-77, and if he had looked at that and assumed reasonably that the same officials who are advising him were advising us, and that they had some indication of what the expenditure in this field would be, taking into account the normal inflation, not the large inflation which might have been induced by policies of error, normal inflation, it was not unreasonable at Estimates time to assume that at least in 1978 you would spend what you spent in 1976 which might have turned out to be a saving.

I wish he would get it very clear.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member really must not anticipate me. The whole point of making cuts in expenditure is that you look for areas where there has been wastage. I consider the vote of \$186,000 in 1976 to have been partly a thorough-going waste of money, and it was because I so considered that a reduction was attempted this year, and substantial economies have in fact been made. An increase of 20% in the rental of cars and an expansion in the number of projects are the reasons for this supplementary, because this Item is not the only Item in the Estimates in which there has been a decrease or in which less money is spent now than was spent in 1976. I could take the hon. member over page after page after page after page where he will find decreases. You even find decreases in utilities, if you want to look at the Treasury.

6.30 p.m.

I do not want to go through the exercise. We look at 8(3) and we discover a wastage in the Data Processing, Head 3, Item 7, and we budgeted to spend less this year than we spent in 1976. I have seen no request for a supplementary. You go through the expenses, the operating expenses at the Customs for uniforms and we discover that there was a lot of money being spent on Customs officers' uniforms without the Customs officers getting a new cap or a new pair of shoes. Therefore we cut down the budget, and the accounting officers are asked to account more precisely for all of these votes; and if you go through these budgets, you will find that 50 or perhaps 60 of 80 items where we are budgeting to spend less than we spent in 1976 and only one or two of them will attract a supplementary, because we are achieving a reduction of waste.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. I wish that the Prime Minister will not grasp at the straw of reduction to wade us through the Estimates which we did in April. We are discussing professional services. Professional services are fairly predictable in the context of projects, and the Prime Minister must know that. I am going to give him the credit of knowing that. Therefore to equate that with going down the road of reductions would be to take what I said entirely out of context. All that I am saying is that this vote has a certain specific use. It is used to pay professional people who come down from one or other agencies. Their costs are fairly constant. Therefore the area of predictability here is not one to be equated with Customs uniforms and I wish that he would not take Customs uniforms as a point of departure.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go in for cross talk; but this is a detailed point, a detail which the hon. member simply does not command. If he knew how wrong he was — it is much easier to predict Customs uniforms than professional services. A certain amount of money has to be provided for Customs uniforms by agreement with the Union for a fixed number of Customs officers. You can actually carry out an authenticated calculation and work it in the case of professional services. We worked it out, and we discovered that the calculations were not worked out properly. In the case of professional services, these services expand in the course of a year. Does the hon. member think that what he says, that it is easier to deal with Customs uniforms than with professional services, is true? It is simply not true. There is no basis to it. I do not want to tire the House with petty details.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. If the hon. member thinks that the mere change in the note of his voice is going to lend esteem to what he said, he is completely wrong. He gets up and makes a totally useless statement, said in a particular way, to impress people that he knows what he is doing, and what he is talking about. (*Aside*). If he thinks that he knows, he does not know it for me.

Mr. Chairman, that is obvious, and that is why I will soon be there. (*Laughter*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that if you take into account the predictability of the cost of customs uniforms you have to take into account the cost of the material from which the uniforms will be made. When you come to professional services, the number of people involved in professional services is so

small as to be almost insignificant; and the Prime Minister must understand that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would like to move that the Resolution do now pass. The hon. member has ambitions for this Chair. Perhaps we can understand why he has jumped to study law, knowing that law is a five year course — clearly he has given up hope of being here soon.

I beg to move that this Head stand part, sir.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what stage this debate has reached at the moment. I rise to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have spoken already.

Dr. HAYNES: I have not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Anyhow, you can speak again.

Dr. HAYNES: I thank you. There is no content in certain contributions being made by either side. I was surprised to here that you can predict expenditure on a certain particular area, and you are unable to predict expenditure on professional services. This is what would seem to me to border on gross incompetence on the part of the Minister involved. Now, it is a question of what one considers to be competence. Quite clearly, in any budgeting arrangements, particularly in a situation where the Government, for some reasons, rightly or wrongly, think that they have to cut back on expenditure, or cut back on an increase of expenditure, bearing in mind certain inflationary trends and so on — it is in this area where you will be paying money to people who are not Barbadians — that you will be cutting back and not coming into this Hon. House with this kind of story that you cannot predict the amount of expenditure in this particular area. That is clearly due to gross incompetence.

Mr. Chairman, secondly I would like to support my colleague on my right and not allow him to be intimidated by loud voices, as loud as that of the hon. member for St. Thomas on this particular matter; and it is nothing but gross incompetence for us to have to consider this particular matter today.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Honestly, sir, I think that hon. members must have some belief that I will get up and respond, and that I have an appetite for these things. I have been in the House so long and I have seen that in 1976-77.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. If the hon. member finds it difficult to remain seated for any length of time he should.....

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, there are some doctors in Barbados whom you cannot trust and who walk about and talk about...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. None whatever. Now please let us carry on with the debate. Now what I want to draw to the attention of the Committee is that if any other hon. member wishes to speak, he may not do so unless he introduces new material; and if the Hon. Prime Minister wants to wind up there will be no further debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would really like to wind up now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You may do so.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it was a pleasant lunch or if it was seeing the hon. member for St. Michael South Central so repeatedly making a fool of himself in here that has mellowed me; but really, Sir, there were 44 supplementary Resolutions in 1975-76. I believe that the same sort of arguments that you heard from the two hon. members could be applied to almost everyone of those because a supplementary Resolution represents some kind of shortfall in foresight at the time of the Estimates for some reason or another; and I do not believe that I have ever heard any hon. member in here indicate that the Minister of Finance was incompetent merely by reason of moving Supplementary Resolutions. 6.40 p.m.

I think there should be some new rule in the Standing Orders saying that all supplementary votes shall be the subject of votes of confidence and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central in his lack of knowledge of the circumstances of the House believes that every supplementary is a mark of incompetence. You mean I must send home poor Mr. Emtage, or Mr. Blackett, or Mr. Estwick because of a supplementary vote? I must report him to the Public Service Commission?

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member did not refer to Mr. Blackett, Mr. Emtage or Mr. Estwick. He said that the Minister was incompetent.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please have a seat. That is not part.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir, it was not the supplementary per se that constitutes incompetence, it was the reasons given by the Minister of Finance.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member is entitled to his own opinion of my competence. I am

entitled to my own opinion of his competence as a person, as a doctor, as a member of the House and in many areas where I have had the chance to examine him and have found him equally wanting. I am satisfied that there are certain areas where the rigid axe of economy can sometimes be brought down with the best intentions, and after all, nobody can stand and write every sum into the Estimates. I am satisfied that this can be done. With the best will in the world unexpected matters can arise, and things may escalate.

I do not know what point the hon. member was making when he said that this was for foreigners, not Barbadians. I really waited for him to develop the point, but having uttered the point, I do not know whether he realised it was irrelevant or unimportant. He moved on to the fact that most of the people who benefit from this Vote are not Barbadians into an assault on the incompetence of the Minister of Finance.

You cannot deal with certain arguments. There are some arguments that have no basis or reality and there is no point addressing your mind to them. I mean, if Gearbox gets down in the yard and criticises me, I think I would be better able to deal with that than the hon. member because Gearbox has been around politicians a little longer than the Hon. member and has a better idea of where to direct his attention. Surely Eric Sealy can criticize a little better than the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Eric Sealy should be paying the hon. member to put a case for him, not the hon. member paying Eric Sealy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is how it should really be operated. But I really cannot say anything. This is a small vote. We have more projects than we had at Estimates time. I do not believe that the House would take seriously any reflection on the competence of anybody from the top down to the bottom in the Ministry of Finance if we decided to buy a car instead of continuing to hire one when we are forced to pay 20% more for rental than was contemplated at the time of the Estimates, and if, in order to serve the people of Barbados to get some work for the same generation that the Leader of the Opposition said are lawless and walking about trying to overthrow established institutions if we do what is right; well if we are trying to bring them back into lawfulness, if you assume they were lawless in the first place, if we are trying to do all of that, I have no apologies whatsoever for seeking technical assistance for some development projects that will make the people of Barbados better off as a whole.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the Resolutions were agreed to.

BARBADOS PORT AUTHORITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1978

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 8 standing in the name of the Hon. C. L. Bolden to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Port Authority Act, 1975.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, in January 1975 the Barbados Port Authority Act which appeared in the Register of Bills, Barbados Port Authority Act 1975-19 was passed by this House. That Bill was never promulgated because at that time there were discussions relating to the development of the Port. With the new extension to the Port, it was thought that the new Port Authority should have more autonomy than was granted to it in the Act of 1975. It was therefore necessary to seek the aid of an expert on Port Regulations, etc., and recommendations have been made. These recommendations have been accepted for what they were worth in relation to our situation in Barbados. It therefore became necessary to amend the Act of 1975 to incorporate those aspects of the recommendations which would make the present operations of the Port more feasible.

The amendments have been circulated, Mr. Speaker, and if there are any points which the Opposition would like to know which I cannot answer, the former Minister who has been dealing with the Port for the past two years will be in a position to give the necessary information.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you are seconding the...

Mr. TAITT: No, I heard the hon. member for the City second the motion, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am rising on a point of order on the question of the circulation of this Bill and the other Bills.
6.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Government will find it possible not to continue with this Bill at this time. All of us on this side are suffering the disability of having received our papers in a relatively late time. I do not know if hon. members on that side suffered the same fate, but, Sir, as the Minister has said, this amendment

calls for the amendment of a number of sections to a very complicated Bill, and we would like to be in a position to make meaningful contributions to this amending Bill which we find ourselves unable to do, given the time which has been at our disposal to study this; so I hope the Leader of the House would appreciate the difficulty. We are making the submission that Government does not give further consideration to this or any of the other Bills which have been circulated. One hon. member on this side only received the papers yesterday, and I think hon. members will agree it is impossible to study these matter in the time that they have been available.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, dealing with the same area, I am not by any means a paranoid person, but I must think that there is some kind of conspiracy whereby on the few occasions that I have been in this Honourable House since being elected, there was only one occasion on which I received my papers on a Friday or Saturday, and in this particular instance yesterday large volumes were delivered to me, and on Saturday morning I was subjected to the indignity of a telephone call asking me to come down here to collect my papers myself. I do not know who is responsible for this conspiracy but I owe a responsibility to the people of St. Michael South Central and this country and will not be deprived of it, and I will ask the Government seriously to consider this matter and not to proceed with any of these important items that are here before me, because none of us has had the opportunity to study them, and indeed I will not participate. If they continue I will leave the Chamber.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I am not paranoid myself and I find it exceedingly strange that the hon. member should think that there is conspiracy involving the Government. (*Asides*) Once you talk about conspiracy and you say "Government", and you put two and two together, the impression which you want to create is that the Government is part of the conspiracy. If you do not choose your language very precisely in here, the wrong interpretation can be given.

I would be very glad if you will inform the hon. member and have an enquiry as to the reasons why the hon. member has not got his papers because that is not the responsibility of the Government. That is the responsibility of the servants of the House, and they are the servants of the whole House, not the servants of the Government. For the information of the hon. member, in the course of the 12 or 13 years in which I have been in and out of this House and the Other Place, periodically this happens. Specific provision has been made at the Debates Committee for an officer whose responsibility it is to ensure that hon. members receive their papers in good time. So I would be very glad if Your Honour would have an investigation into the facts surrounding the non-receipt of the papers by the hon. member.

Now, Sir, in respect of this Bill, this Bill has to be passed by 21st October. I appreciate the position. The hon. member obviously does not want to participate because what I say is that the Government is quite willing to have another sitting this week, but this Bill must be done this week in order to have it done before next Tuesday so that it can be dealt with in the Senate. That is our view. It is not any view of our making; it is an agreement that has been signed in respect of the Inter-American Development Bank, and that agreement was signed long ago, and in the provisions there is a legal consultant whose function and responsibility it is to draw the appropriate legislation. When it was drawn and submitted to the Legal Department in Barbados there were a number of provisions which were in disharmony with existing legal provisions in Barbados, and therefore a number of consultations had to take place in order to harmonise the Bill which was drawn by consultants who were unfamiliar with the attitude of the statute law of Barbados that is the occasion for the Bill. I am quite willing to accommodate hon. members but only on the provision that we meet again this week.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything. I just wish to inform hon. members that after hearing the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, I am particularly happy to see the interest some members are taking as to their own importance in this Honourable House, and I would wish to see that it continues. All that has happened is this; some of the papers that members have not received until the late hour were not received from the Government Printers until very nearly six o'clock on Friday afternoon, and then the Deputy Marshal who is charged with the responsibility for delivery had to try and effect delivery as best he could during Friday night and Saturday, and some of the papers came from the Government Printers yesterday. We are aware of the fact that the Government Printery is working under pressure as we understand it, and as a consequence we are suffering under the situation with which we are faced, and I am still hoping and praying that we will eventually overcome such a situation; but I wish to tell hon. members that it is a situation that has been going on for fully twelve years, and I do not think there has ever been a conspiracy on the part of anybody to deny or seek to deprive an hon. member of receiving his papers on time. I would be the last person to subscribe to that.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, in the normal course of things the Government can proceed on the basis and the fact that it gave notice of its intention to deal with this matter today. It was given notice of and read a first time. The Hon. Leader of the House....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you mean the Government can proceed if the Chair accepts the motion.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Notice was given, Mr. Speaker, and the Hon. Leader of the House was quite considerate in his remarks, and I take it that his reply was mainly to do with the points raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South West. His reasonable approach on the subject was certainly much different to that of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Such behaviour of his is to be deplored.

Mr. Speaker, during my period in the Ministry of Communications and Works I had to do with the Port Authority and the IADB people who gave a loan to Government to carry out the extension of the Port, and I gave the undertaking to them which they requested of me that the Act would have to be passed and proclaimed by the 21st of this month.
7.00 p.m.

As a matter of fact, it was to be done by June, and this was according to the terms of the agreement which was negotiated by the previous administration, and therefore they should be well aware of these facts. However, we are quite conscious of the fact that these papers were served late, and therefore the Government is quite willing, as it has always been, to accommodate the Opposition, their behaviour notwithstanding, and we are willing as the Hon. Leader of the House said to meet again on Friday, difficult though it will be for many of us, in order to proceed subject to the will of the House to have such a meeting, and this is greatest concession that the Government will be able to offer at this time, because it is the question of the credibility of the Government with respect to the undertaking given by the IADB people, and there can be no question on that. We would very much prefer to continue with the debate this evening, but we recognise the problem and the Government is willing to bow to any reasonable request on the part of the Opposition.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that I received my papers late. I would also like to point out that on a previous occasion my papers were delivered to another house and the people kept them there for five days....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to hear that other people are getting to know your business.

Dr. CADDLE: That is unimportant from that point of view, but the point I am really stressing is that when I did not find the papers I called up one of the servants of this House and drew it to his attention and he said that the papers had been delivered, and then I was much surprised to find someone lower down on St. Stephen's Road presenting the papers after having kept them for about four days, so that is another matter, but what I really want to mention....

Mr. SPEAKER: It speaks very well for the literacy rate of our people, it is good they were delivered to a house where the people could read and write.

Dr. CADDLE: Maybe they read them first. Now, Sir, I would like to point out that I too recall that we have had the problems when we were in Government and we had Bills we wanted to get through with in a very short space of time and due to problems the papers were not circulated. I can also recall that Bills were brought in here and circulated on the same day and permission asked and given to have them debated in all their stages on the same day. The point I really want to stress is that while I do not see much in this particular Bill, and I have read it, in relation to the other Bills explanatory papers which in themselves run into many papers – and they are big Bills – I do not think that we can proceed with them this week in any case, we need time to go through them and make checks and so, and while personally I have no serious objection – and I am speaking for myself now – to make about proceeding with this particular Bill to amend the Port Authority Act, I would like to invite the Government to be aware that we do not expect them to want to proceed this week with any of these papers.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the amendments in the Port Authority Bill are not amendments which would be controversial. It is a question of the new Port Authority becoming an autonomous body...

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, the Bill is not now before the House.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I am coming to a point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: But if we go on like this we will never end.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The Hon. member who has left the Chamber is new in this Chamber and he would learn to understand at a later stage that nobody in the House would want to hold back Bills. We had raised a question when we were in Opposition...

Mr. SPEAKER: That point has already been explained to the hon. member, and if he fights and runs away he will hardly ever live to fight another day.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: But, Mr. Speaker, the Press is going to pick up what he said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot be worried about the Press.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I have to be worried, because the Bill is in my name at this point.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please let us have the motion.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I just want to make it clear, Sir, that we do not propose to deal with the Bill relating to the reform of the land law, those five Bills, on resumed sitting we intend to let them be circulated for a much longer period, because they are of grave complexity. That is all, we just want to deal with this particular Bill because of the time limitation.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the assurance we have been given by the other side that these amendments are without controversy, the Hon. Leader of the House is saying he is prepared to come back to the House to do it, if the hon. members are prepared to have a short recess this evening so we could examine these amendments, not perhaps in detail, we will be prepared to come back at the dinner hour and look at the one Bill, the Port Authority, because we understand, and having had the experience we understand the commitment given to the international agency to sign by a particular time, we recognise that this Bill would have to go to the Other Place, and we are not trying to be obstreperous, so that we are quite prepared to come back and do this one Bill after we have had a short recess.

Mr. SPEAKER: You prefer to come back in an hour's time than to come back on Friday.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now ten minutes after seven, this sitting stands suspended until 8 o'clock.
7.10 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Mr. TAITT: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister has already introduced the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, and it was seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and National Insurance.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the Hon. Minister would have been a little at sea on this and that the Minister of Agriculture would probably be handling most of it, but there are one or two points I would like to deal with. As I understand it there are to be some changes in the naming system of the Port operations and I would have hoped that in the introduction we would have got some indication as to whether Government was making a fundamental change in its approach and whether for instance stevedoring at the Port would now be done by the Port Authority itself. If this is going to be the case, then I would have to make major query, if it is going to mean that the old Port Contractors — who I do

not mind saying managed when the Port was set up to put the company in the most favourable position of any company in Barbados, for it was a company that had a guaranteed return built into the cost structure of things passing through the Port. In that context I believe an attempt has been made to prevent persons who see themselves as having to suffer as a result of the Deep Water Harbour from having a loss of business, and Port Contractors, as I understand it, was a compromise situation that permitted a number of these firms to come together in one company and be guaranteed a return on their investment.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that there is going to be a Port Authority in Barbados, and I had hoped that any Port Authority we had would tend to operate like those in North America, where the Port Authority would be responsible for all ports in Barbados, that is, the airport and seaport would be under the same Authority. It may be that those closest to the administration felt that it would be better to separate them. The Minister had indicated that paragraph 17 would deal with the point I am making. If he wishes to explain I would be willing to give way.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, and I would advise you not to take instructions from the Minister at this stage because you should not be discussing section by section.

Mr. TAITT: No, Sir. I am endeavouring to discuss the policy of administration of the Port. I believe that one of the most successful statutory boards in the world is the New York Port Authority. This Port Authority which is a compact between three States — New York, New Jersey and one other — these are three States that have formed an interstate compact and have established this statutory body which administers the Port of New York. It is a legal entity and has absolute power under strict constitutional terms. What this has allowed the Port Authority to do is to invest its own funds, run its own operations and make provision for the overall planning for a substantial portion of the Eastern seaboard of the United States of America. And one of the reasons for its success is precisely because it is in a position to control the method of entry not only at seaports but at airports as well. There is a close relation in the movement of trade between airport and seaports, and we are coming into an era where I suppose the major part of importation and perhaps exportation from Barbados and most countries will be done not at seaports but at airports. I am hoping that Government will take a few minutes to explain their position on this question of the overall demand by Ports and I would go so far as to say that the person appointed Chairman of the Port Authority has the confidence of most of Barbados in the areas where he has made public thrust.

But, Sir, I think that one of the reasons why the New York Port Authority has been successful is that from

the Chairman all the way down the persons involved are full-time persons who have no other commitments or employment but the Port. It may be a departure from what we are accustomed to in Barbados but it would be a very good idea if in this context consideration was given in making the Chairman of the Port Authority a full time position so that he could devote his entire time to what will turn out to be a very difficult task. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the concept of the statutory Board which is now prevalent in Barbados, while it has worked well in some cases, it has been an atrocious failure in others and we could do with a step further when we come to look at the 20th and 21st century of Port Administration in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things which go on in ports all over the world and which require a continuous and steadfast vigilance. I am not prepared to make any statement about what goes on at our ports, but most members will be aware that there is a substantial loss at the Port due to a failure to coordinate the systems; I think that is probably the best way to put it.

Another area in which I would have thought that the opportunity would have been taken to examine it is the whole question of policing the Port. There is a school of thought that feels that the kind of skills which is required for an ordinary Police Officer does not reach to the level required for the administration of ports. I would like to hear the Minister on this, as to whether this matter has been given consideration. I know that for some time there was talk of a specialized Police Department for the Port and airport.
8.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time one cannot discuss the Port Authority without remembering the former Customs Chief and some of the systems which I recall that he had recommended for improvement in the Port. I have not heard anything from the Minister in his introduction in this regard, but I would like to hear from the Government what is the present situation with the movement of goods and the collection of revenue in the Port as compared with one year ago, two years ago, or four years ago. It has been suggested in some quarters — I do not necessarily believe it that revenues from the Port have continued to remain fairly stagnant while the volume of goods passing through the Port shows a reasonable rise. I do not know if that is a valid statement, but it would be helpful if one of the Ministers concerned could enlighten us on that.

Mr. Speaker, it would be easy to make and perhaps score certain political points on the question of the administration of the Port; but I believe that the airport and the seaport are areas in which we should tend to have a national outlook rather than a partisan political outlook. Sir, there are certain areas of the Port in which

we can become much more progressive than we have been. I would like to see, for example, that people coming to Barbados for the first time have the impression given to them that we are a people with some cultural ability; and I am inviting the member for Christ Church East to give serious consideration to making a serious thrust — not the kind of thrust that Ministers of Finance have allowed people to make. I am talking about a serious thrust into making sure that handicrafts are very eminent not only at the airport, but especially at the seaport.

Mr. Speaker, a substantial amount of money is not collected in sales in Barbados because we have not put the goods which we have in Barbados on proper display. I believe that there have been leakages in the economy of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the poor administration that we are now discussing?

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. Let me explain the background for your benefit. In the context of the administration of the Port, what I am in fact suggesting, is that all aspects of what goes on in the Port must be the exclusive responsibility of the Port Authority. I will give you an example. The Hon. Leader of this House, within weeks of being elected, gave an assurance on the floor of this House that members of this House would be able to move freely into one or the other of the ports. Since then, Mr. Speaker, I have made several attempts to get a pass to go into the Port. I say that the hon. member when he gave that assurance, gave it without let or hindrance; but the administration of the Port is such that the Customs people are saying or indicating that maybe the Port Department should give the passes, and the Port Department people are saying that maybe it is the Customs people who should give the passes. Mr. Speaker, the Port happens to fall within the boundaries of my constituency and, as you will appreciate, from time to time in the course of representation, if only in the course of representation, there is need to go into the Port.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that some of your constituents reside in the Port.

Mr. TAITT: No, Sir; but they spend a long time within it earning money. However, that is just one indication of what I am talking about. I would hope that with the promulgation of this Act and the coming into force of a Port Authority, I presume that we will be dealing with a streamlined administration of the Port where from taxi drivers to stevedores to ordinary workers will be under no illusion as to who administers the Port.

There is one last point that I want to make. I say it on the floor of the House because one does not wish all the time to bring specific charges against specific people. I would like the Minister to examine a very strange habit

that seems to have been either going on or creeping into the administration of the Port. It has been reported to me that a person who has been told that he is qualified for a particular job in the Port — and I am not talking about people working on the ships — was told yes he was qualified and it looks like he is going to get the job — I am only telling you what I have heard in the highways and byways — but that he has to pay some kind of sum before he gets the job, apparently to some superior whose responsibility it is. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to lay a complaint. (ASIDE: To whom?)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member if he is in possession of any such information that someone in a superior position in the Port is demanding money from people to get them jobs, to hand that information over to the Police for the Director of Public Prosecutions; but do not just throw it out on the floor of this House just to make news in the newspaper.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, when I make statements on the floor of the House of Assembly, I do not make them to get into the newspaper. I make statements in this House of Assembly because I feel that I can.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate what the hon. member is saying. If the hon. member has any specific information to support what he is now saying let him give it now, or if not he must depart from that path and get on with his debate.

Mr. TAITT: I will say that I am endeavouring to get an affidavit and as soon as that affidavit is available I will hand it to the Police, or to the Director of Public Prosecutions or to whomever it should go; but I think that the Minister ought to be aware that such a thing is at least probable. I would like the Minister to indicate what is the technique that will be used in the granting of licences to do stevedoring in the Port. There have been all kinds of questions raised about this. When I was a Minister in another capacity I was asked about this. I do not myself participate in the handing out of stevedoring licences, but I think that it would be useful if this opportunity were taken and Government made a statement indicating what is the broad policy on the question of stevedoring — if in fact it is felt that there are enough stevedores at this point. I think it would be useful if such information were given indicating what the present position is.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few other small queries, but I will reserve those for discussion of the principal clauses.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is...

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like briefly to make a few points before my colleague the hon. member for St. Joseph makes his final reply.
8.20 p.m.

On the question of stevedoring, I am to inform this Hon. House that the Government has advised that the new Port Authority cannot itself be involved in stevedoring. It should be responsible for the licensing of stevedores, but not the actual involvement itself. Stevedoring is considered to be a personal matter and the shipping agents might want to employ for themselves their own stevedoring and if Government tries to regiment the system they might find that shippers might not want to help Barbados in the area of stevedoring and therefore it is not advisable that the new Port Authority should be directly involved in stevedoring.

The new Port Authority, to explain that clearly for the hon. member who has just spoken, will take over all the functions of the Port Contractors Limited, and therefore it is a wholly Government-owned operation. The member spoke about substantial losses within the Port due to the lack of co-ordinated facilities within the Port. I am not quite clear as to what he really means by that. What I do know is that the Port of Bridgetown is gradually becoming one of the most expensive Ports in the area and I want to spell that out.

Barbados is gradually losing all of its trans-shipment freight to the Port of Castries in St. Lucia. In the past we did a lot of trans-shipment trade in the line of cargo to the various areas in the Eastern Caribbean. Today, it is no longer so. With the exception of Trinidad and Tobago, which has a very insufficient type of operation there where boats are tied up for two or three months without being off-loaded, and where Government subsidizes the Port to something like \$1 million TT, Barbados is becoming gradually one of the most expensive ports and what you saw in the past by way of profits might gradually wither away and die if things should continue as they are now going along and you have got to look very carefully at the husbanding of our resources at the Port area, and we have got to be careful lest we find ourselves unable to carry the service charges of the costs for extension of the present operation within the Port.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made a number of very useful points. He talked about the question of the Port being allowed to handle all the functions of the new Port Authority, and he also mentioned that it would be useful to have a Chairman of the Port Authority being a full time officer. We do not exactly share his views on this. We certainly applaud his greatness or bigness in paying tribute to the recently appointed Chairman of the proposed Port Authority, Mr. Frank McConney, who is a very able and efficient man and Mr. McConney is doing a very good job and I do not think he sees the need for the Chairman of the Port Authority to become a full-time officer.

I think that what is needed in the Port Authority are men of good will, men who are prepared to work

hard, and men who are prepared to service their country, and I think in the construction of the new Port Authority that this is what the Government really looked for.

I should like at this point in time to pay tribute to those people who served in the Port Contractors Limited during the time in which they served there. The Chairman of the Port Contractors Limited, and the various members who served for the good work they performed in the past and many of them are still performing in the interest of the Government and the country.

We have had very serious discussions on the question of policing the Port, and we are quite satisfied that we would prefer to have the type of operation which now exists where members of the Royal Barbados Police Force continue to police the area of the Port. We find it to be a very dangerous thing when we have too many authorities existing in a small community like Barbados. We prefer to see the Royal Barbados Police Force operating down there, but we think the maintenance of law and order is a question for the Royal Barbados Police Force and as long as their presence is there within the Harbour, there will be a police complex for the police in that area of the Port and we think there will be no harm and things will function perfectly well.

I should like to just say this I am sure the country will applaud this and will be happy to know that the Government has very recently increased the numbers at the Port Authority by the inclusion of a former President General of the Barbados Workers Union, and a distinguished Trade Unionist Mr. McDonald Blunt on the new Port Authority.

We are particularly concerned in any Port Authority with the plight of the workers there, and we will continue to monitor the situation, we will continue to see that their interest is taken care of and will do nothing to affect the interest of the workers within the Port and I want to give the workers of the Port the reassurance that this Government will do all that is reasonable to ensure that at all times their interest is fully taken care of.

This new Port Authority Act, and the amendment to the Act, seek to streamline the Act as it was in 1975. It seeks to tidy it up to a great extent and I would like to pay tribute to the members of the Attorney General's office for the very good work which they did in printing these amendments. As a matter of fact, the advisors who came down here on behalf of the Inter-American Development Bank people put several drafts to us and as a layman, I was not satisfied with a number of things which they put up, neither was the Attorney General's office. I am happy to say that the new amendments which we have are amendments which were drafted locally and implemented by the Attorney General's office and I would like to go on record for this House as paying

tribute to those draftsmen in the Attorney General's Department for a very good job which they have done, and I want to go on record in saying further that I hope the day will come when developing countries will not have to pay away large fees to outside agencies for advice in areas that can be acquired locally by people who turn out eventually to be even better experts than the people who came from the developing countries to advise them.
8.30 p.m.

I want to go on record as saying further that I hope the day will come when developing countries will not have to be called upon to pay away large fees to external agencies for advice in areas that can be acquired locally by people who turn out eventually to be even better experts than the people who come to the developing countries to advise them. We have seen this very clearly this time in the drafting of this amendment to the Act.

I believe if there are any further points which hon. members would want to be enlightened on that the Minister responsible would be willing to explain. I think I have merely touched the points asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West, but if there is anything else I did not touch on, the Minister may want to mention in his winding up address.

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

On motion of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLI in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, Clause 2 is the insertion of the definition of Port Contractors and Port Department.

I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just one query. I wonder if the Minister could explain why it is necessary to insert this Clause which gives the authority the power to make the charges or dues different from those specified in the tariff book. Do I understand it that it would be too much trouble to amend the tariff book from time to time? I wonder if he could explain that so that I would not ask other questions. I believe if he explained it I would not have to ask further questions.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, under the terms of the agreement which has been signed by the Government and the Inter-American Development Bank, the Port Authority must be an independent authority with powers to raise money by way of charges and levies which are sufficient to provide for a rate of return upon the capital employed independent of the Minister, and the existing power is in the Minister, and the existing charges are in the tariff book, so they have to have a power to vary.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a clause that is causing me considerable concern, but our hands are tied because of the pre-existing agreement. What really hurts me about this clause is that hitherto exports from Barbados were exported in the carenage and the charges to the Government was \$1.00 per ton. Exports from the Deep Water Harbour are \$18.50 a ton. Under the existing situation we find ourselves in a position in which strong representations have been made that under the terms of the Inter-American Development Bank Agreement there are to be no more exports from the carenage; all must go into the shallow draft and there is to be no discrimination in charges. An impasse is developing in this respect, and what is also very clear to us is that regrettably the land which was reclaimed outside of the Port where the flour mill is and the revenue derived from that land cannot be charged under the terms of the existing agreement into the general Port revenue. That is a subject being vested in a separate company called Land Reclaimers Ltd. This pre-existing agreement was signed long before our time, but we are trying to wriggle and to see how we can get around it; but this is an amendment that is necessary because under the terms of the agreement is an independent authority with complete power to raise the charges so as to pay off the capital obligations which they have taken over by a subsequent clause of the Bill, and the agreement says there must be a stipulated rate of return. Obviously there will have to be some scope for re-negotiation in relation to Barbados' exports. I cannot see how you can transform with our dollar as it is now. Our dollar is higher in parity value than a number of our Caricom states. Subsidies being given in some countries, export subsidies which we can get now, will have to pay Port charges. The thing makes it exceedingly worrying, and

we are trying our best to see what escape clauses the lawyers can find to ensure that this is not done, because really and truly I do not think it has been the contemplation of anybody when we extended the Deep Water Harbour that we would have to subsidise exports to the extent of paying Port charges.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, you know in the Bible it says "Unto those who have it shall be given, and from those who have not that shall be taken." Earlier today the hon. member for St. George South made a point which I would like to re-make and re-emphasise. This country is a developing country. It is true there are some people in the international world who believe that we are a developed country, and even in the Caribbean they believe that, but in truth and in fact when compared with the capitalist giants to the North we are a developing country and when we have to sit as legislators and legislate on this piece of legislation, I understand the position the Government is taking; but it is just short of criminal that those people in the international agencies continue to tell the world how much good they are doing for the poor countries, and everytime, Mr. Chairman, you have an agreement with them, they are shafting you. It is the only word that describes exactly what we are talking about. They drive a shaft up.

8.40 p.m.

I am using a little slang and the Reporter looks worried. Shafting, it is the only word to describe exactly what we are talking about, they drive a shaft up. But, Mr. Chairman, quite seriously, the developing countries constantly have to go and negotiate with people who are stronger than them in every respect in order to get a few dollars from them. They put conditions on the developing countries, they force the developing countries to use their third rate people, then their third rate people come down here and force developing countries, not only in Barbados, in almost every developing country, they put you in a position where you have the sword of Damocles hanging over your head. From a political point of view and a developmental point of view sometimes it is the only place you can get the development money, but what they do — it started with President Kennedy's alliance for progress, especially with his alliance for progress — the United States continues to give everybody the impression that they have some money put aside for use by people in the Caribbean and Latin America, and whenever you borrow the money you have to spend it back in the United States, which means that the money is being used to stimulate the United States' economy. And this does not only apply to the United States, it applies to all the developed countries who offer aid. This is a perfect example of it, Mr. Chairman, what they are saying is — I was just on my feet talking about the experiences of the New York Port Authority

and saying how successful the New York Port Authority has been, but the New York Port Authority exists in a capitalist country with a capitalist outlook with a capitalist structure for capitalist gains.

Now, Sir, when you come to a developing country, we can take the best out of that capitalist system and apply here, but he cannot take the system lock, stock and barrel, and that is what they insist on doing all the time. They are saying that if you have a Port Authority it has to be run exactly as their Port Authority is run; they are saying that you have to raise money, the Port Authority must have a certain return on the investment. Similarly, Sir, when we got the loan for the sewage scheme, they insisted that the water rates must go up at a specified time in a specified way without reference to what the capacity of the individual people in the country can handle, and so it is with this Port Authority.

Now, here it is, that we as a country are trying to get an export industry going. We are likely to have our differences as political parties, but Barbados has to get some exports going, otherwise we are not going to survive, and here they come and say to the Government, mind you, to the people of Barbados, you have to pay a piece of change far in excess of what you were paying as an export tax. That is what it is, an export tax. This means, Sir, that all those little people who have managed to get into the stage in one of the Industrial Parks where they can now export a little bit to Trinidad, or a little bit to Grenada — not Grenada much — but a little bit to St. Lucia. I do not think anybody bothers much about wanting to export to Grenada, because they are not certain they will get paid, but a little bit to St. Lucia, St. Vincent, now those small people will not be able to compete, their prices will be such that they will not be able to compete. It does not matter which Government agrees to this kind of proposal, I am not condemning the Government who agreed to the proposal because in a number of cases the Governments in developing countries have no choice. I am condemning the so-called developed world that constantly puts out in the international propaganda machines how well they are doing for the developing countries with their assistance, and every time you examine such assistance you find that there is a drawback. Even in the EEC — and the Hon. Minister for Industry would know what I am talking about — they give you on the one hand on a Monday morning and by Friday they are taking it back.

Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to tell the Minister that he can feel free to tell the IADB to go safe, that we on this side would support him if he says to them not to bother with it on this particular one. There is no point anybody getting up and telling me who negotiated this because I feel this way period, Mr.

Chairman. I happen to have worked with an international agency and they never send the brightest and the sharpest people, you never find them unless they come from developing countries. The brightest and the sharpest people working in those international agencies come from the African, the Caribbean and the Pacific countries, because for them working in the U.N., in the IADB and in the OAS is a promotion upward, for most of the other — people from the developed countries — is a shift across, somebody who cannot find work elsewhere and they come down to developing countries, they have not got a clue as to what is going on in developing countries and they wish to direct the affairs of these countries exactly the same way as the affairs are directed in their own countries.

Mr. Chairman on this matter I do not necessarily speak as a member of a political party, I speak as a Barbadian, recognising that we are constantly being hammered in the international world, and what the politicians have to do it seems to me is to stop making political hay out of every time we acquire a loan here or a loan there. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, we always have to pay it back, except in the odd case of Canada where they give you so many years that you can almost write it off, you can almost say you do not have to pay it back, you always have to pay it back. In the second place, the terms are always favourable to the people who are making the loans.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I have made the point, it is not necessary to go any further.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, speaking on this particular point I do not often find myself in agreement with the Hon. member for St. Michael South West, but he has just made some very pertinent remarks which came up at the recent seminar conducted by the Barbados Manufacturers' Association at Norman House where they were discussing exports generally and transportation and documentation.

8.50 p.m.

One of the issues that figured very prominently at the seminar was that I had the honour to represent the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity was the fact that the shallow draft facilities at the Harbour were likely to be additional charges to the motor vessels at the moment that had to bear the burden of freight to the small islands. Mr. Chairman, as the Hon. member for St. Michael South West indicated, all of the small industries in this country which are dependent on trade with CARICOM partners must depend upon the facilities offered by the shallow draft area of the Port. They have to rely on small schooners, and if the insistence is that small schooners must pay the same tariff as the larger ocean going vessels, one would have to conclude that the principal person likely

to be injured by this will be those persons least able to bear the injury at this point. The small industries in Barbados are in an embryonic stage — furniture manufacturers who export to Trinidad complain that they cannot get money from the banks. Another concern is that having got the money they are not likely to be able to price their products competitively to areas also producing but not relying as heavily on small schooners for transporting their product.

I visited the State of Georgia a few weeks ago, and one of the principal people who did shipping business with Barbados asked me to convey to the Government the fact that Barbados is one of those countries which has to bear the highest burden for open trade. He said it cost as much to ship between the United States and Barbados as it does to ship between the United States and Japan and he said that ocean freighters are going to be constantly requesting, and indeed at this moment are conspiring to request, additional charges and he told me "Please tell your Government to tell the shipping people that they are not going to be allowed additional charges on the present rate." This is a man who does a lot of shipping and who knows what he is talking about. It is a concern to us that if this situation continues Barbados would be placed in a non-competitive position in a lot of areas, and I would suggest to the Minister responsible for the Port Authority that we pay diligent scrutiny to this aspect of the new Bill to make certain that the small business people in Barbados do not get injured because of some arbitrary and illogical arrangement which demands that the small traders be charged at the same rate as ocean going vessels. If he does this, every small businessman in Barbados will be thankful, because they themselves are extremely concerned about this provision, and only last week they spent a lot of time agonizing about it and I would urge the Minister to pay careful attention to this particular aspect of the Resolution.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Mr. BRADSHAW, Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON. His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE and Mr. SIMMONS — 11.

Noes: Mr. TAITT and Dr. CADDLE — 2.

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Clause 5 deals with revenue and expenditure and it is relevant that we look at the agreement. The agreement that I

have here dated 21st February, 1975 was signed by one Errol Walton Barrow and shows very clearly.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN announced the moment of interruption and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now the hour of interruption; is the matter under discussion controversial?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No, Sir, there are just a few more Clauses to deal with.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. ODLE resumed the Chair.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, if I may explain something before the hon. member continues. Since coming into office this Government has been struggling with the IADB. There were two extensions of the period of time for passing this Act and there were other matters which we did not agree with. In August, 1978 an IADB lawyer, one Mr. Cooke, came to Barbados and tried to impress the Government that it was necessary that this Act be passed and in conformity, as he said, Mr. Cooke, reported that the IADB had two basic concerns; (a) that the Port Authority be established in conformity with specific requirements of the loan contract, and (b) that the Port Authority should be financially viable. We put up objections to certain things that they wanted and we have managed to squeeze as much as possible out of the IADB in order to conform with the contract that was signed back in 1975 by the previous Minister of Finance.

9.00 p.m.

All that this Government is doing is carrying through the law as best as we can. We are even seeking a further extension and having a further look at an amendment to the Act. As a matter of fact what was being put up by the IADB the Government did not agree with. There are certain other aspects of the contract which the IADB were insisting on that the Government resisted. So anything that is being done here is only following as closely as possible what has been done before in 1975. I myself have expressed my great concern over international agencies which lend to developing countries. I believe that Barbados now finds itself in a position where it is being regarded as a developed country; and I know one or two of the agencies — I have seen a letter where one of the agencies has expressed their concern over lending money to Barbados.

Therefore, what is being done here is a result of a long struggle between the agencies, the Cabinet and the former Minister of Communications and Works to get better conditions that can be operated in the light of

circumstances in Barbados other than what the lawyer from IADB and the agency itself was asking us to do. As a matter of fact, they even wanted all the land of the Government to be given to the Port Authority. We said it could not be done.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to make this matter an issue between this side and that side because I believe that this matter really transcends this side and that side kind of politics. This is 1978. There are two things that I want to make clear. This Bill was enacted in 1975 in the same year of the agreement. These are amendments to this Bill. Do not hit me with that in 1975 somebody signed it. I will give way shortly; but the point I want to make is that they came in and found an agreement and they threw it out through the window.

Mr. Rook, Mr. Crook or Mr. Book cannot come to Barbados to tell us what to do. You are bringing amendments here. Some Americans do not feel that a Minister in Barbados should have power. So you look at Section 5 and you see what it says. We are going to have to get accustomed to telling these people that this is our country, and we are going to run it. *(Aside)* They are going to take back the money? The Port has been already built. It is no question of an agreement. It is a question that these third rate people come to these countries and want to tell Ministers what to do. They do not believe that people like us should be Ministers at all and tell them what to do; and we are going to have to stand up, if we need 47 countries like we did in Lome, whether we need all the Caribbean to put IADB on notice before the world court of opinion. Whatever we need to do, we have to band together and stop them from sending their people down here telling our people what to do.

It was said from over there today that we have people of higher and better quality in the various departments of this country. We see it every day. In the Attorney General's Chambers we could pick out 12 and carry them to the IADB, the OAS or anyone of the agencies, and we have superior people to what they have. *(ASIDE: Why did you not tell Barrow so?)* You should hear me talking to him. Ask the member for St. Michael North Central. He will tell you. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. You will agree that we should not have cross talk.

Mr. TAITT: The question is important. These are slight jokes which hon. members in a moment of mirth must find. This is serious business and they have to agree with the principle of what I am saying that the time has come where we have to find ways and means to stand up and tell these people that we are sorry, but we cannot agree to that. The agreement says that the

Port should be in a position where it is financially viable. There is another way to do it. Since you are going to raise the question of the agreement there is at least one other way to do it.

We have this clause, the one we have just passed. What it is doing is to give the Port Authority — they are assuming that the Port Authority is going to function like inter-state compacts in North America. Inter-state compacts in North America get assistance from the Federal Government if and when needed. We have no Federal Government in Barbados, but we have revenue that comes from other sources. What they are seeking to ensure is that the money which they lend will be paid back. All that one needs to ask them is what other guarantee do you need to get back your money? We do not necessarily have to bind ourselves to a situation — I know that I am not supposed to speak on these matters; but bad law is bad law no matter who enacts it. We ought not to sit down because somebody else says that an agreement is signed. Do you mean that if we found an agreement in which it says that one young maiden should be put to slaughter once every six months we would have to do it?

Hon. J. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a shorter way for the hon. member to tell us that he has been a student at the law school at Cave Hill for a week now.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if he wants to know let me tell him that it has been a direct venture. I am not one of those people just going up there. Allow me to say that I am not trying to prolong the debate. I am saying it very seriously because I believe very seriously that the International Agencies take advantage of developing countries.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And you are repeating it very seriously too.

Mr. TAITT: What we need is to get down to the job. Go to McNamara. If it is the IADB, go the Secretary General and tell him that you are being unfair. If we had any idea that you would go to the "New York Times" and tell them that they are ramming this down our throats and you promised to do it by the 21st he would say, look. There must be some compromise. See if we can work something else out. Our people are doing their best. The people in the Chambers have sent up this because this is the best they can do in the circumstances. It does not mean that we have to accept it. I thought that we can really push through this Bill, but to tell the truth — *(Aside)* all right. Hon. members are saying that we have to try to hurry and take the Reporters into consideration. I will respect that consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, do not think that the hon. member is at issue with us. It is only a pity that his voice was not heard in the circles of Cabinet with the same vehemence that we heard it here today. This is February 1975, and obviously.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, if the hon. member is asking me to give way under certain considerations, he will have to hold his tongue. He was not in the Cabinet then. He had no idea of what Cabinets were like; and now he is not in a position to discuss what previous Cabinets did.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct one thing that I may have said. The agreement was actually signed by the Ambassador on instructions from the Cabinet, in Washington. The other agreement that was signed was Consultancy Services — The Government of Barbados through its Ambassador. The basic position is that there is no question that all of us on this side are seriously concerned about the question of the impact of export charges to the Order 1850; and we are trying our best with all the skills that we have at our command to ensure that hardships will not fall upon exporters in Barbados. I am giving the hon. member the assurance that we are quite firm in our view that some accommodation has got to be given in respect of this, because we cannot subscribe to the theory that it would be fair and reasonable to expect taxpayers, from the general revenue, to subscribe to the operations of the Port to the extent of the subsidy necessary. All that we want to ensure is that this is not a political football.
9.10 p.m.

It cannot be a political football because all of us must expect change and change brings with it differences from what existed before and there are a number of people who have been confused that the change is necessary and secondly that in carrying out the change it may be done in such a way so as to create an impact upon our competitive position and that is what we have to ensure. We are operating within a frame work of an Agreement which has certain provisions in it but we are trying our best to ensure that it does not exist.

Clauses 1 to 14 were called and passed.

Clause 15 was called.

Mr. TAITT: I realised the time has run out, Sir, but I would like to caution the Government of 43A. Clause 43A puts a time limit of one month and the only saving grace is that it says "may be disposed of". It does not say "shall be disposed of". I think that the hon. member will realise that a one month period under

certain circumstances can be a very close period for persons whose financial resources in business are not as others. The Minister seems to have the answer to it so I will sit.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be more expensive to keep goods in the Harbour longer than one month rather than getting them out as soon as possible. There are times when a carrier might arrive in the Harbour when certain documents are not available for clearance, and it has always been possible, as far as I know to make arrangements between the Port Managers for some modification of the system, but one of the basic reasons for the extension of the Harbour was because there was not enough space.

I remember a few years ago when there was an air-filled area of copper blown up down there, but I do not believe that the Harbour Master or the Port Authority would act contrary to what is natural justice in circumstances like these if there is a good reason for cargo not being put out, but at the sametime one must guard against the use of the Harbour as a storage shed, for persons who might bring cargo into the Island and leave them in the shed rather than bring them out and store them elsewhere.

Mr. TAITT: I think that the Minister has answered the point but it is precisely those persons who were users of the Port. I think you are familiar with this technique which is used in Bridgetown. They leave it in the Port for three months and then they send an agent to buy at auction at a considerably reduced price so that they have had the benefit of the store-room for 3 months, which is a plus, and sometimes they have been known to get the goods at less than what they had cost in the first place. That is why I am asking to exercise some caution in this particular area. I think the hon. member for St. Michael West would be an expert in this business in things staying in the Port for a long time but we do not have time to hear his views.

Clauses 15 and 16 were called and passed.

Clause 17 was called.

Dr. CADDLE: I just want to enquire of the Minister what is the significance of changing the 15th September to the 5th September.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Sir, in the original document, when the date was checked out, it was realized that it either was a misprint or an error but the correct date is the 5th September.

Clause 17 was passed.

Clause 18 was called.

Mr. TAITT: I would like to question Clause 18, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the Minister will impress on the Port Authority, and in this respect I think the Minister of Health would want to help a bit on this, that one of the things which we ought to have in an entity like the Port is provision for an Industrial Health Officer. I am going to call it that so you will understand what I am talking about without using a lot of words. On more than one occasion persons have been injured in the Port and the length of time it has taken to get the person from the Port to the Hospital has been crucial in what subsequently happened in terms of the injury. I see here the prevention of accidents and the procedure to be followed in the case of an accident. I strongly believe that consideration should be given by the Port Authority by having the equivalent of a clinic of first call, if you will, in the Port Authority so that when an accident occurs, that is to say, if you have an industrial accident, a health officer, either a Public Health Nurse, or a nurse, or some medical person, should be on duty on a continuing call basis for the Port.

9.20 p.m.

Although provision is made for Public Health Authorities in both of the areas of entry into Barbados, their major role is to provide vaccinations and that sort of thing. That is not what I am talking about at all. I am talking about arranging for the people who work in the Port with a lot of heavy equipment and industrial machinery when they get injured to get immediate, fast and knowledgeable first relief. The Minister will do well to give this some consideration in his directions to the Port.

The question that Clause 18 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 19 was called and passed.

Clause 20 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 20 stand part, we have a copy of the outline of the Harbour. Although it is not as precise as we would favour, it is proposed to make the correct definition of the Harbour from the point of view of its jurisdiction. As I said, we have to pass the Bill through the House of Assembly first, but there are one or two other things which we would have liked. I believe the hon. member raised a question of arguing a little bit longer with the IADB.

When the 1975 Act was passed, that was passed but not proclaimed, and the IADB objected to the proclamation of this Bill and then further amendments, but I am sure now that the Port Authority is coming into existence, they can make regulations with the permission of the Minister, they can do further tidying up if necessary of the Bill or the outline of what is now the Port Authority jurisdiction. There is a copy here, and there is another copy which we can file with Parliament if required, but I personally believe that a copy of the plan of the Port area should be incorporated into the Act similar to what is done in the Road Traffic Act, because I am sure there obviously will be legal disputes as to what is Port Authority jurisdiction and what is other jurisdiction.

I beg to move that Clause 20 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I take the Minister's explanation and his assurance to the House that he will be coming back with this, but I take this opportunity to draw to his attention something in this clause. If you go about an inch from the bottom of the page, it reads "....near to the junction of Prescod Boulevard and President Kennedy Drive a distance of 530 feet; then in a Northerly direction to the shoreline;" Will this include all that land that has been reclaimed or is in the process of being reclaimed by the Government? In other words, all of the left side of the new road going down Lands End and everything on the left side?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: As a matter of fact, I myself would have liked to have seen the measurement given in the metric system since we are moving towards that system rather than in the imperial system, and that is why I said that there is a possibility we will come back and have it tidied up. The hon. member is asking that I move in the metric measurements here, but we have not done a specific survey of the area, and that is why I say it will have to be amended. These are schedules which can be amended by order of the Minister and laid on the Table of the House.

The question that Clause 20 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 17th October, 1978, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

9.30 p.m.