
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd 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. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; and Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., M.R.C.P. (Edin.)

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Minutes of the meeting of 19th September, 1978 were confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following: Report of the Accountant General for the financial year 1977–78.

Mr. GREAVES entered the House and took his seat.

NOTICES

Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg following:

Resolution to amend note (iv) to Item 1 – Financial Institutions, of Head 108 – Ministry of Finance and Planning.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$653,000 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. 10, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$39,000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1978–79, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978–79, No. 11, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Barbados Port Authority Act, 1975, be read a first time.

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

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

STATEMENT BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish at this time to make a short statement. I received this morning from the hon. member for St. Michael South West a request seeking leave to raise a matter during the course of the day which he considers to be of public importance. The hon. member submitted his request in accordance with Standing Order No. 18. I rule that the request does not in my view meet those conditions which would allow me to grant permission for debate to ensue; that is, the matter sought to be raised is not definite and not urgent, and announcements made during the past seventy two hours remove any semblance of public importance in the matter. In light of the

circumstances, therefore, permission is refused. I must warn the Press, however, and I need not seek to enlighten the hon. member for St. Michael South West — he knows better — but I want to warn the Press on this occasion that there have been times when questions have been refused by the Chair and the Press took it upon itself to publish those questions. I warn the Press this is offending the dignity of the House and the Rules of this House if the Press should attempt to do any such thing.

12.25 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE USE OF LOAN FROM THE CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The third order of the Day was called — A Resolution to approve the use of the sum of U.S. \$67,000 to be borrowed from the C.D.B. to assist in financing the costs of services of Consultants for completing a study of planning and Development of Speightstown.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, sir, by virtue of the Caribbean Development Bank Act, it is necessary for the Government to come to the House to authorise or guarantee certain loans raised under that Act; and that is the reason for coming with this Resolution today. The Resolution will be one dear to your heart, Sir, because it relates to the development of Speightstown in the parish of St. Peter and in the constituency of St. Peter.

In 1966 when a member of us who now occupy the front benches on the Government side in Parliament first began to take an active part in the life of this country, one of the suggestions which we made on behalf of our party and which was accepted and embodied in our General Election Manifesto of that year was that there should be subsidiary urban development in Barbados particularly in Speightstown, Holetown and Oistin, and in the area of Central St. George in the region of St. George's Church and the district of Charles Rowe Bridge. This concept of subsidiary urban development gradually passed into the development strategy of the then Government, and various attempts were made from time to time to carry out schemes of improvement for Oistin and Speightstown.

I cannot say that very much was done for Holetown and St. George. Nonetheless, Sir, 12 years have now passed, during 10 or 11 at least of which the concept of the development of Speightstown has been among the strategies professed by the then Government; but nothing of any seriousness has been done. Committees have been appointed, and these Committees held public meetings of sorts; but no serious steps have been taken until comparatively recently; but where Speightstown is

concerned, we wish to take very serious steps at this time. Around Speightstown of course, there are certain potential developments that have not come on the screen yet, but have been conceptualised during the past regime.

In Speightstown itself, sir, developments have not even been fully conceptualised; and for this purpose we are seeking this loan of \$67,000 (U.S.) in order to put into the hands of consultants our ideas and plans for Speightstown so that we would be in a position to make a take off for a serious development plan for the area. It can be expected that such a plan will include a waterfront development, development of the Speightstown Esplanade; and it will include a Speightstown by-pass road, improving the drainage, and a linkage between the Heywoods Development and Speightstown proper. There is, of course, and you will know, sir, already some housing development in Speightstown initiated long ago under the regime of the Barbados Labour Party. It is hoped that the Housing needs of the people of Speightstown can also be taken into account.

We have already, by thinking of such devices as the Bathsheba-Speightstown bus, brought some expansion of commercial activities to Speightstown. It is to be hoped that this will be developed and improved, and I hope that the Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry is working on the idea of the industrial development of Speightstown, which will necessarily be aimed at Speightstown as a Centre. Fisheries Development in the North of Speightstown have also not been ignored; and we are very much hoping that as a result of the Resolution which we are asking the House to approve, that we will give a new birth of interest and activity in Speightstown and the area of St. Peter as a whole.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE USE OF A LOAN FROM THE CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR GOVERNMENT'S INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

The fourth Order of the Day was called — A Resolution to approve the use of the sum of U.S. \$3.44 million to be borrowed from the C.D.B. to assist with the financing of the Government's Industrial Development Programme.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the same consideration applies to the reason for presenting

this Order to the House. The Hon. Leader of the House, and Deputy Prime Minister, is responsible for the portfolio of Industry, sir, and therefore I will confine my remarks formally to moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Resolution, I just want to say that this is to implement a loan agreement to make for an expansion of the programme of factory building of the Industrial Development Corporation. It is contemplated that seven factories will have been constructed this year and that includes two at Six Cross Roads in St. Philip. It also includes the adaptation of an existing factory building at Grantley Adams Industrial Park. This building was erected a considerable period of time ago, and it was built specifically for the requirements of the then operator, namely, Plessy; and despite strenuous efforts of the Industrial Development Corporation to interest other similar types of operations, mainly electronic operators in this factory, they all required that the factory be changed — that the design and layout of the factory be changed. Rather than to prevent the factory to be used as a warehouse — because that was the only use that the IDC for some period was able to put it. They decided then to change the material of the factory, to open windows and to provide better lighting and things of that kind; and I am pleased to say that with designs for a new layout of the factory they have interested a party who is now in the Newton Industrial Estate, but who now wishes a larger space. The adaptation will result in the factory being used for the purpose for which it was originally designed.

The only other thing that will be of interest in relation to this money is that Pelican Village itself is being upgraded and brought up to date in the present financial year. We have been able to do this because of the fact that we have got other resources, namely this loan to continue our new factory building programme.
12.35 p.m.

So that the resources which are being appropriated by Government to IDC out of the normal annual grant for Factory buildings will be used for bringing Pelican Estate up to par. Hon. members who frequent Pelican Estate will know that for some considerable period of time there was some evidence of deterioration especially in the roofs of these huts. It is hoped that they will improve and a general sprucing up of the Pelican Estate area will take place.

We will next year be also drawing down some more of the funds envisaged in the Lome Agreement because it is a three year programme. Now as to the specific detail of the money generally, the Chairman will be in a position to answer any specific questions. I must say that we have been receiving a large number of applications for

factory space. There are two at Six Cross Roads, there are two being erected, one is actually been completed so far at Newton Industrial Estate and will be shortly occupied by a firm called Sigmon. We are now looking at the expansion of further factories at Newton by putting in additional road works thereby opening up part of that area.

As I understand it IDC has land space under its control somewhere in the vicinity of 66 acres at the present moment. We are committed to the development of an Industrial Estate in the North of Barbados and we have specifically mandated the consultants in the greater Speightstown Physical Plan exercise to identify an area of land and in addition to that it is necessary in the light of previous experience at Industrial Estates for IDC to reserve an area of land which will be used for industries which have a very high fire or environmental constraint potential, so that we have to identify outside of the general industrial estate a specific area of land which you can attract industries to which you do not wish because of the fire hazards or special environmental constraint particularly things like chemical industries. It is not good to have them in an industrial estate.

We would have to have at sometime an acquisition of a parcel of land and I want to assure hon. members that when we come down for it, it is not a question of having a loan and wasting it. We are attracting one or two industries which have special requirements and we do not want to put them in regard to the experience which happened in the foam industry and things like that kind in Grazettes, so we have to give them a larger area of land so that in the event of problems arising of the nature which we experienced as problems, we would be able to isolate them and control many problems without damaging our next door buildings.

Now on the general question of industrial estates and the standard of factory building, both the Chairman and I in the course of our visits have expressed concern about the older type of factory design and an effort would be made in the new programme to ensure that new factory buildings will conform to a standard of amenity both to the work and otherwise which we would like to see. Nevertheless, it will be a challenge to the physical skills of the architects and the engineers because of the fact that air-conditioning costs in Barbados are very high and one has to use ingenuity in the design to ensure that one captures the prevailing winds, and that an effort is being made to ensure that we do not have any more factories with a rather low ceiling so ensuring that they are sealing off the ceiling with costic board or whatever the architects recommend, because the older type buildings, were in our opinion in accordance with the amenities which we would like to see. The Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Health have an interest in this

direction, so that subject to any specific questions I beg to second this Resolution.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if only now a Resolution of this kind has come before the House over the last two years primarily because of its concern with the industrial development in Barbados, I would probably have said nothing. I cannot find any fault with what the Minister has said in regard to this Resolution before us, but Mr. Speaker, I believe I can take this opportunity to make just a few remarks in regard to the question of industrial development in Barbados.

What I have to say Mr. Speaker, is prompted by the recent publication of the Industrial Development Corporation during Industry Week of what they called "Onward with Industry". Sir, anyone who has read that publication, and it appeared in both of the major publications in Barbados, and it is proper that it should during Industry Week, but anyone who read that who has been paying attention to what has been going on in Barbados must have come to the conclusion that industrialisation of this country, although it is supposed to have started 21 years ago, somehow missed out some of those years in the process.

Now, Sir, it would be very strange if the hon. member in this Chamber would do nothing else but to get up to claim to us for some work or works performed in Barbados and I wish to make it clear at the outset that what I have to say is not by itself, and it is not meant to be, it is to suggest some special recognition of any individual and especially in this House.

I hope that what I say will bear some relationship to the attitude which we as a country will bear on this question of industrial development and a number of other related things. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have reached a stage in this country where we can attempt to revise history or to re-write history. I believe that in a matter as serious as industrialisation in Barbados, and at a time when we are calling for a joint effort for the onward march of industry, that we as a people must put aside political partisanship to some extent at least, and get on with the business of the development of the country.

Now, Sir, it must be said that during the five years preceding 1976 I performed the role in industry which was a political role, so we are going to forget this 5 years for the time being, moreover the 5 years when I functioned as a Minister.

12.45 p.m.

Let us say those were the five years when I functioned as a Minister involved in industry.

If you go out into any industrial park in this country and you locate a single industry that is

considered important, that is considered to be making a contribution to the development of this country, I would hazard a guess, in fact I state without fear of contradiction that it would be found that I participated in some way in the development of that industry. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not be heckled by the Government benches.

Mr. TAITT: It will be cheap and uncomfortable for them to suggest that all I want is praise; but, Mr. Speaker, are we to begin a cycle that five years from now or whatever time from now some Government should ignore the contribution which the hon. member for Christ Church East has made to the industrial development of this country? Are we to have situations in which persons - I cannot call his name because he is a public officer at the moment... but the High Commissioner in London made a substantial contribution to the development of industry in this country. The former Minister, perhaps the first Minister of Industry in this country, the hon. member for St. John, made a substantial contribution to the planning and the development of industry in this country, but the matter goes deeper than that. It has nothing to do with the superficial question of whether somebody is recognised. I am charging the Government with a deliberate policy of attempting to give the people of Barbados the impression from their publications that industrial development in this country is something that happened and only happened apparently in the last two years. How can they say it is twenty-one years, onward with industry, and in any look at the chronological development in their own publication you can find large and significant gaps.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the hon. member does not perhaps know he must address the House on a document not before the House, because he is referring to some document that is not here. Can he produce it so that we can look at it? I am sure nobody on this side is so familiar with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not attempting to quote from any document.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He is addressing the House on some document which was written by Ricardo Blackman, I believe, one of his party's yard-fowls, and he is complaining about it now.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is his privilege. Let him enjoy it.

Mr. TAITT: I thank, you, Mr. Speaker. I am really disappointed that a Prime Minister can get up in a House of Assembly and

Mr. SPEAKER: Just address the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: and disown a document that comes out as the official document of the Government enjoining all the people of Barbados to join in the industrial development effort, and he gets up in here and talks about yard fowls.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at some of the factories in this country, if we take for example TRW, TRW is a factory in Wildey that employs a large number of people, but it was promoted in 1968, Mr. Speaker, although it might have been established in 1975. The promotion of TRW started in 1968. I can point to a number of old factories. INTEL has been used by the Government as a indication of Government's efforts in industrial development. Mr. Speaker, INTEL was promoted a full two years before any member of that Government had any contact with any of the people from INTEL. We can go on and list others because as I said categorically, fully 95% of the manufacturing factories for export in this country were promoted long before this Government came into power. I go further; it is going to be at least two or three more years that they will benefit from work that was done long before.

In 1965 the Industrial Development Board after the first ten years of trial and error in this country and indeed in the Caribbean generally on this whole question of industrial development and the modernisation of countries decided to have a feasibility study done by Arthur D. Little Incorporated. They had at the head of this study a man who had had some experience in these matters in Puerto Rico, and arising out of that study it was decided to open a series of offices overseas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are 144 members in the United Nations, you can be certain that there are at least 132 promotion offices in New York City and other cities of the United States and North America generally representing one of these countries. If there are 50 States in the United States, you can be certain, Mr. Speaker, that there is an office from one of these States somewhere in New York City trying to woo industry into that particular State. The same holds good for the province of Canada, the same holds good even for some parts of the Soviet Union. They are all seeking and competing to get manufacturing industry into their respective countries. I pay no attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fledgling noises from one or two of the members on the other side on this question of industrial development because it was only a short two years ago that the policy of the Barbados Labour Party was definitely, clearly and urgently against the type of industrial development which was going on in Barbados. I have no quarrel with that because it took them the opportunity to come into power to understand that foreign investment is something that is vital and necessary, and one of the reasons why there has been no outcry from this side on the whole question of their policies is precisely because they had continued to a

large extent the policies which they found in the area of industrial development in this country. If that is the case, we have said before and we will continue to say that if something is being done in this country and it is being done in a way that will benefit the broad masses in this country, we will support it no matter who initiate it.

The first factory of an overseas nature to come into this country — I am talking of modern factories, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish anyone to say to me now that they had some run refinery seventy years ago — the first one to come into this country was a factory called Data Utilities, a company that was functioning in the data processing business. It was located in Grazettes Industrial park. A few months after that, International Scientific Limited opened up the whole area of the electronic industry as a source of employment for thousands of Barbadians, and from then, Sir, until now, we have had companies of all descriptions coming into Barbados. But contrary to popular belief, Mr. Speaker, they did not come here because the weather is good; they did not come here merely because they happened to be passing through Barbados. They came here because a lot of work is done by a lot of people to induce them to consider coming to Barbados. When you look at something like International Playtex which has managed to reach a standard of productivity that is equal to any and surpasses most of the parent company's other outlets in the world, you need a company like International Playtex to demonstrate to the rest of the manufacturing world that Barbadians have the capabilities and capacity to produce once they get the quality of management that is necessary.

12.55 p.m.

But, Sir, when the election was over the principals of International Playtex from overseas sought to have a meeting with me to find out how the new Government would behave, how the new Government would perform, did I think it was a good idea to continue the investment in Barbados, and do you know what I told them, Mr. Speaker, at the Hilton Hotel? I said to them, this country called Barbados may have political differences, we may have political differences, but I cannot believe that that Government would carry on the business any different in terms of people like yourselves and my advice to you would be to continue in Barbados because you are bound to be satisfied if you have been satisfied before.

Now, Sir, I believe that that is how we could be in this country, I believe that continuity in this country will only be guaranteed if those who have responsibility exercise a high level of integrity as they carry out that responsibility. That high level of integrity does not only apply to the individuals concerned, it must be involved with the total policies of the particular group that has the responsibility. It would make no sense, Mr. Speaker, merely because this side has lost the Government to try

to give overseas investors the impression that Barbados was going to be in a situation where they should pull up and run, and I would never do that, despite the fact that sometimes when you look at some of the shenanigans which pass for Government policy you wonder if they are serious, but I am disappointed that that kind of spirit cannot be seen totally — I say totally, Sir, because in fairness if I am criticising them I should point out that from time to time I have observed the Chairman of the IDC, the hon. member for Christ Church East, and I have found him, even if I say so, I have found him to be a man who is carrying out his duties with a degree of integrity. I have found that, I am sorry I cannot say it for all the members who sit on the other side. I wish I could say it, but I cannot say that for all the members who sit on the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member suggesting?

Mr. TAITT: I am not suggesting anything, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That they are not all carrying out their duties with integrity?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I would never suggest that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Kindly sail away from there because you are wondering into troubled waters.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member did not suggest it, he said it. He said he would never suggest that hon. members on this side, other than the hon. member for Christ Church East, were not carrying out their duties with integrity. He did not suggest it, he said so, he said he cannot say that hon. members other than the hon. member for Christ Church East were carrying out their duties with integrity. He should withdraw it, Sir. He cannot say he did not say it.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, it would have been totally irrelevant if I was talking to other members, I was talking to the hon. member for Christ Church East.

Yes, Sir, the point is that I recall when we were listening at the opening of the Institute of Management and Productivity....(Aside). I do not mind if it appears as if I am seeking kudos when I say that I take full and complete responsibility, along with Dr. Kurleigh King, for the creation of the Institute of Management and Productivity. Mr. Speaker, I do not mind saying at all that even the concept of Industry Week was born in New York City when the then IDC Chairman and his people came up to New York to find ways and means, as they do every year, to bolster and promote the whole concept of our industrial development, and we felt at New York then that if we had something called Industry Week, and

if we promoted it in a particular way, that it would have some effect on the total population, and we refined it later on to insist that the Government hand out awards of excellence to those persons who did well in industry.

Mr. Speaker, the very recruitment of staff, if it were not for the quality of staff, of the persons who ran the IDC over the past 15 years or so, the chances are that we would not be in the position we are in to look at any success story. Well I remember when Dr. Kurleigh King was working as a Dean at Columbia University, and I happened to be with him talking to a group of students from Indiana, and at that time the Industrial Development Corporation was in need of a General Manager, and I remember pleading with Dr. King that he should come to Barbados even though it would mean some difficulty with the acquiring of his Ph.D., and even though it would be at the risk of losing a very sumptuous job as a Professor at Columbia University, and I persuaded him and he came and his contribution is exemplary in terms of the quality he brought to the IDC. I do not feel embarrassed to say that all of the staff who are now functioning at New York, with the possible exception of one person, have benefited from specific individual training given to them when I was in New York.

The whole business of the UNIDO involvement with Barbados — the United Nations Industrial Organisation — and its relationship with Barbados is one which was nurtured and developed through a series of personal contacts between people in the New York Office and the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to the young children who will come afterward to be able to read authoritative documentation in this country and come to believe that no contributions were made by anybody else, except a few persons. It would be entirely wrong for us to talk about the industrial development of this country, to talk about 21 years of industrial development, and selectively leave out persons whose contribution cannot be questioned at all, at any time, for any reason. In the end we are not discussing merely the industrial development or a document, we are discussing a system, we are discussing a way of life in this country. There are 15 years olds in Barbados now who are required or who would be required to know something about what has gone on in Barbados.

1.05 p.m.

It would be entirely wrong, Mr. Speaker, for us to speak of the industrial development of this country, to talk about twenty one years of industrial development and selectively leave out persons whose contribution cannot be questioned at any time for any reason. Mr. Speaker, in the end we are not discussing merely the industrial development programme or a document, we are discussing a system, a way of life in this country. There are fifteen-year olds in Barbados who will want

to know something of what has gone on in Barbados. If it is the policy of the Government to obliterate the fifteen years leading up to 1976 they should say so. But being here in this Honourable House of Assembly, I feel it is part of my duty to put it on the record so that at least somewhere in Barbados it will be recorded that other people made contributions in this country worthy of being noted at the time when you are celebrating twenty one years of industry. "Onward with Industry" means we are going to have to acknowledge that the development plans for handicraft did not arise out of any discussions held between two members over there. The development plans for the development of handicraft in this country arose out of a comprehensive study. No doubt, Sir, you are aware of a gentleman called Sen Gupte, an Indian, who was sent here as a result of consultations with the Commonwealth Secretariat; the Secretary General of the Commonwealth Secretariat agreed that we would cut across the red tape in order to allow Mr. Sen Gupte to come out here under the technical assistance programme and go through the factories and schools and get together with the small businessmen in this country and have developed a handicraft industry. I have said nothing while that handicraft plan has been put forward as a new plan. I have said nothing as the emporium was opened, but anyone who has been connected even remotely with handicraft development in this country — and the hon. member for Christ Church East must know because his staff will have to tell him that that development plan was conceived and executed at the time when we were reviewing industrial development in this country. The whole question of the restaffing of the Industrial Development Corporation may be vetted by the hon. member and I would make bold to say that although the hon. member knows something about what is going, the Minister responsible for industry hasn't got a clue about what is happening at the IDC and in industry in general in Barbados. And I would say that the plans for the staffing of the Industrial Development Corporation, for the review of the offices overseas, the closing down of the Toronto office and the stimulating of the overseas offices in North America — I have a document here which I would gladly make a document of the House, but I believe it is already a document of the House. It is the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto and I wish to quote very briefly from it: "One of the obvious major successes of the Democratic Labour Party has been its industrialization policies. From a mere ten industries in 1961 there are now 183 different industries, with wages ranging from approximately \$1 million in 1961 to over \$33 million in 1975".

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member has now turned to the Government Industrial Development's programme of the future.

Mr. TAITT: I am working towards it, Sir. To continue: "Employment increased from 410 people in 1961 to over 13,000 in 1976. The Party proposes to continue and intensify these policies in the next five years." Mr. Speaker, this is the future; it does not matter which party will do it; it is what is to be done. We organized the Industrial Development Corporation to "provide greater expertise and to stimulate the further development of Barbadian industry, specifically an industrial engineering advisory service; development of local projects for joint investment will be added features of the IDC programme; the manufacture of new products will be researched and explored". When you read the newspapers and see these things coming out as new policy, ask not whence the inspiration came. It goes on: "Expand some of the existing factories and acquire new industrial parks which will continue to be located near our centres of population." We heard about a park in the North. The present general manager of the IDC will confirm that policy directives were sent to the IDC indicating that an industrial park should be located in the parish of St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been looking since 1966 but I cannot find it yet.

Mr. TAITT: I will tell you why you did not get it; we had opened an industrial park in St. Lucy and they continued to tell me we could not put another one in St. Peter; it was too close.

Mr. Speaker, you know very well that the industrial park in St. Lucy is relatively small. It has one large factory in it. We used it for promotion purposes and said that we had an industrial park in St. Lucy. But the officials continued to say that St. Peter was too close to St. Lucy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not too close for comfort.

Mr. TAITT: I wanted to comfort you, Mr. Speaker, but my hands were tied by the officials. Then they said they would wait for the Speightstown Development Scheme which as you will recall had been talked about under the Chairmanship of a man called Edwy Talma. We had an Oistins re-development project, a Speightstown redevelopment project; plans were put on display in Speightstown. And now we hear people acting as though on the 2nd September the sky suddenly parted and God said: "Let there be light." If God had said "Let there be light on that day" do you believe Sir, that the hon. member for Christ Church West or the hon. member for St. Michael West would be sitting there?

Continuing, Sir, "Expand and invest in non-traditional industries to enable even more Barbadians to participate in ownership in industry." Not to stop

Barbadians from enjoying ownership and participation, Mr. Speaker, but to expand. What do we have now? Industrial development for the few. I know that the hon. member for Christ Church East does not believe in that policy; I am certain of that. I have heard him and I know that he too wishes to see Barbadians progress in this country. But there is a force in Barbados that is totally disinterested in the development of ordinary Barbadian people; they do not believe that ordinary Barbadians can manage factories; they believe that such persons must be drawers of water.

I am not going to put anybody's name in the record of this House; those whom the shoe fits will wear it. But it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that under the Democratic Labour Party's regime small businessmen in this country started to feel that there was a place for them in manufacturing industry. I am not going to give a list of those who have made progress; it is well known. Many of the hon. members over there have done legal work for a number of small businesses in Barbados. Some of them have done consulting work; they know that despite the difficulties of getting monies sometimes the Industrial Development Corporation made it a point to give small industries a chance. Mr. Speaker, there are times when I look at the husband and wife team in Pelican Village and see them going from strength to strength, I cheer silently because I feel somehow a little psychological stake in their progress and development. Each time they go further I feel happy. And I know that there are a number of people of goodwill in Barbados who feel that way and it is time that we have a non-partisan approach to this question of letting the little people of this country get a piece of the action. It is time we stop playing politics with this whole question of industrial development.

1.15 p.m.

Sir, whether this is true or false, when we are able to see a newspaper headlines that many small businessmen are going out of their factories, that many small businessmen feel that they cannot speak for fear that something will happen to them — I have seen it in the newspaper, Sir, and I have not seen any denial of it. There is evidence that small businessmen of this country are having extreme difficulty in trying to get ends meet. I believe that the Industrial Development Corporation must do what it was created to do, especially as it applies to small businessmen; and I see that the hon. member for Christ Church East is smiling. I see that the hon. member for Christ Church East has implemented a policy which I have recommended. He says that he is going to recommend it to the Government to give it some consideration.

This is a question of lowering rents for people in the multi-user units in the Harbour Industrial Park, a policy which I recommend heartily, especially in times of financial drought. Despite the words that we are hearing

about the turn around of the economy, those who are involved in the day to day movement of goods and services will know that even if there is a turn around, it will take a long time before it reaches down to them. They are having difficulties with cash flow. They are having difficulties with meeting the wages — some of the wages being very modest in scale. They are having difficulties in meeting that precisely because the export promotion effort, while it has good intentions, has failed to grapple with one of the fundamental requirements for a good export promotion programme.

Mr. Speaker, you must make sure that the base on which the manufacturing operation is based is strong, and you must make sure that the ordinary manufacturer, who has only a turn over of \$25,000 a year, could have a guarantee of his credit; and that he could have consultant services. That is why we tried the tripartite — the IDC on the one hand, the Development Bank on the other and the Institute of Management and Productivity as a third. These three together would provide the natural base for ordinary Barbadians to get a piece of the action.

Mr. Speaker, we have not had that yet, and I lay claim to having a part in bringing this about as the Standards Institution. As to the quality of locally produced items; the quality of locally produced items will only be the same as those that we bring in from overseas if in fact we can hurry with the bringing on of proper standards for them — standards that are created by them for themselves to the satisfaction of Barbadians. These standards, Sir, cannot be brought about in Barbados if the people involved in the development of standards cannot feel that when they have given of their best, that when they have given of themselves, that they are going to have ordinary recognition by their own people.

Mr. Speaker, I could spend a lot of time giving the historical perspective of the number of factories that are now established in Barbados. I hope that no claim is going to be made for some special vision or special ability for the Caribbean Development Bank's loan to produce more factories in Barbados. The Minister of Finance himself must first stop holding back the amount of money that is necessary for the factories to be built. If you go and check any of the industrial parks now — I do not expect the Minister to say it, because, however he might feel about the ineptitude of the Minister of Finance, it would not be proper for him to say so; but he knows what I am talking about. When it comes to certain aspects of finance, that Minister of Finance is quite inept.

If we go into some of these industrial parks for which we have been called to give approval for this money, you will find that after the money has been approved they will have to do studies. They will have to do designs, and by the time that we get to putting up the factory, it will be two or three years from now; and a

number of potential investors in Barbados will have passed us by. What has to be done, Sir, is that a new system has to be found — an improved system — where by the time that the money is ready to be drawn down from the Caribbean Development Bank, all of the systems are set “to go” so that the coordination of the draw down of the money and the erection of the factories will be complete. Otherwise, what we will have in Barbados is a continuation of what we have had before.

In a few weeks there will be a mission off to Europe. A number of businessmen will go for a ride — I do not say so disparagingly — I hope that the Minister and the Chairman will take manufacturers and not persons who will be going to Europe to check on their import houses and to see if everything is all right under the guise of going on a manufacturing promotion; because, Mr. Speaker, there is not likely to be any significant success out of a trip to Britain for industrial development purposes. That market has been explored, re-explored and reworked. Under the Lome Convention, Sir, there is some possibility of manufacturing business coming out of Europe; but they themselves are interested in getting investors from North America, Sir. What this country should be doing is trying to marry North American investors with European investors here in Barbados. It is not as complicated as it may sound.

Under the Lome Convention there are manufacturing companies in the USA who are unable to get their products into Europe duty free or with reduced duty. Barbados, through its negotiations with the EEC together with 45 other developing countries, is able to send its products into Europe at a reduced tariff. If the Chairman of the IDC — there is no point saying the Minister because he does not understand up to now — if the Chairman of the IDC would go up to North America and get manufacturers in North America to understand that if they are located here in Barbados they would have a decided advantage even over manufacturers located in Europe itself. That kind of joint arrangement is something that was started before the present regime took over. I hope that they are continuing it. I expect the Chairman of IDC to announce that he is doing so.

1.25 p.m.

And we must do more to that rather than carrying a group from here to London or touring the continent, a group that has not as yet attuned to what is required in the European market.

An extensive amount of work must be done in Barbados before you can take potential exporters to Europe. How often we see in the newspapers Sir, that people leave here and go on some mission and come back and say that they do not have the capacity to meet the orders they have. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in that context three years ago we embarked on a programme to establish what

we then called a 500 factory. A factory that we would see 500 people working together with foreign management or purchase management, in a productive capacity which would have done two things, Mr. Speaker. It would have demonstrated that Barbadians can produce in a certain way. We have demonstrated it to a large extent in factories like Playtex, but this 500 factory would have given an opportunity to a number of small investors to become involved in a 20th century manufacturing plant.

The IDC itself would have become involved in that it would have owned a substantial part of the factory or all of the factory, that it would have purchased the management, and as the records would show, we have already made it, as it were, with the marketing end or marketing arm of such a factory in North America.

Two years have gone by Sir. I have seen nothing of it, and I have heard nothing of it. Perhaps today we may hear a little about it, but the point is that if we are going to have the kind of industrial package that we had 10 years ago, 15 years ago, it would not be suitable for the kind of marketing reform in 1978. But Mr. Speaker, we cannot look at 1978.

It is the duty in the same way that the people who ran IDC and the Ministry of Trade in the last 21 years in the last 10 years, in the same way they projected towards the future, it is now their duty to lay some ground work, to give some foundation for industrial development of the 1990's, to come here today to hear a Minister of Industry saying that it is going to be a tough job for the designers because they are going to have to find a way for them to get the Trade Winds to blow through. Those words were written 12 years ago Sir, now he comes here today and he says that they are going to continue.

Mr. Speaker, there is not anything that is right about industry in this country. We have a number of problems in industrial parks. There will always be problems in the industrial parks. The Government does not own the parks. The Government only sets up regulations which people have to follow. But if we did not have the parks we would not have found the employment. They have come into a situation where it is their duty to improve on what they find. It is their duty.

If you go through these 9 industrial parks Sir, you can see a pattern of a change in development from park to park. If you start with Grazettes you find one kind of factory. You move from Grazettes to the Harbour and you find a different type of factory and by the time you come to Wildey....

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you say that the Government does not own the parks?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Government owns the factories in terms of the buildings, they own the lands, except at times where it is..... Mr. Speaker, do I have to continue with this noise? I can hardly hear myself. The fact is that the Government does not own the businesses in the industrial parks. It is a figure of speech which is used normally in places where speech is the order of the day. That is what I meant Sir. When I say the Government does not own the parks, I mean the business of the parks. It is known that the Government owns the properties except where they have been purchased and even then the then Government made sure that it would be an arrangement of 99 years where no one could own the building outright.

Sir, the Government as I was saying, each time you come to the industrial parks and the new parks in Wildey, you find that the designs have changed drastically. That is why Sir, we were saying that we need a design centre in Barbados. We need a design centre for two reasons. We need to have architectural designs that are worthy of Barbados, we also need better working conditions in these particular areas for the people who work there and we also need designs centres for the kinds of work produced there otherwise.

The major point I am making Mr. Speaker, Sir, is too often in the last two years this Government has been coming into the House of Assembly and going out into the public, going into the newspapers and giving people the impression that they have come up with a new plan. I have not seen a single, solitary not one iota of newness about anything that has been announced, and they have the nerve to talk about a new development plan in the development plan for industry as if this has been the first time in history that there has been a new development plan, and I hear the hon. member with some mamby jamby explanation that the different sectors are now devising their own plans and then they will put them all together and call them a development plan.

In the first place no self respecting economist would ever look at that and call it a development plan. In the second place, Sir, all development plans are put together by the various sectors of the Company in the private sector indicating what their goals are, how they plan to achieve them, and then a co-ordinator or a group of co-ordinators put together what is probable and arrive at a plan which is only in the end a guideline for the orderly economic development of a country.

Now we have had an economic plan for this country for the last 15 years and anyone who reads the words of an economic plan under the sector "economic development" or "industry", they are bound to find an entire sector devoted to industrial development and development generally. They are perpetrating on the people of Barbados a psychological hoax that there is

some new development plan, that they have somehow come up with a new plan and have included lock, stock and barrel with the handicraft Plan with I almost did with my own hands Sir.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a problem Sir, because they intend to revise history and for the record today I am going to put in the history of this country, anyone who has read Hansard 100 years from now in spite of what the Government would do to obliterate the history of this country, they would find that this is not so. There were other people who worked in this country, there were other people who fought in this country, there were other people with imagination in this country, and that this country is the way it is, and it is on the road to development because of people of all descriptions and people with different political views.

They were more persons sympathetic to the views of the Barbados Labour Party working as professionals than they were when we had the Government. But Sir, we are not concerned with that, we are not concerned with what their political position is, we are concerned with their ability and we join it together, at least Mr. Speaker, I can say that for myself, I can speak for my own administration. I can say that in my area of work, there has not been a single person who has worked in there, and who has not been promoted in some form or other. It is immaterial what their political position was or is.

Sir, what is most important is that their contribution has been recorded so that people who come after them can only believe that if you make a contribution for this country, it is not likely to be obliterated. It is not likely to be blamed for any political prejudice, political vendetta, or any other political purpose.

1.35 p.m.

People must come to feel that, and my appeal in the end is for that side to agree to accept that in some areas we will let political considerations take a second position to the more national consideration. Let us agree that when it comes to industrial development of this country we can quarrel with each other about "the how", but let us not pretend that one side did not exist. Do not let us have a gap from 1957 to 1978, that for the first ten years in the life of Industrial Development Corporation which was then the Barbados Development Board nothing of significance happened. That history is there. The Development Board had a man called Bath; the least said about him the better. It was when Mr. C. B. Williams in his capacity as manager of the Development Board came to the Development Board, brought together a relatively small group of professionals and worked for their country. They were not concerned with political considerations, and it is on record how they worked; and

in our day it was a 19-hour day or 20-hour day in New York whether it was winter, spring, summer or fall; it was perfectly normal; nobody was concerned. And Mr. Speaker, the pay was not anything you would tell anybody about. \$4,800 a year was the basic salary in 1965, and the hon. member for St. George South will tell you that that is not any kind of money for anybody to work for, even a student in those days. But they were people who were committed, and what I am saying, Sir, is that in the next ten years between 1965 and 1975 people like Roy Clarke and Anton Norris made contributions which ought not to go unrewarded or unrecorded. My argument is that in their capacity from 1965 to 1967 or 1965 to 1971 other people made contributions which ought to be recorded, no matter what the political circumstances may be.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at length because, as I said, I wanted to make sure that the record would be there for those who would come after. I do not mind how much abuse is heaped subsequently, but if necessary in another place we will go into more detail; but it is not likely that anyone in Barbados fifteen years old or ten years old can pick up a newspaper and see "Onward with Industry 1957-1978" or whatever the figures are, and get the impression that were it not for K. R. Hunte and people on the board in those days that Barbados would not have had industrial development. Mr. Speaker, if that is acceptable to the hon. member for Christ Church East, that is his business, but it is not acceptable to me, and it is not acceptable to a large number of people who have literally besieged and asked me to raise this question with the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this money that they are borrowing from the Caribbean Development Bank is money which they have to borrow. We contribute to the Caribbean Development Bank and we should have money from the Caribbean Development Bank for factory construction, and any time they come down here for money, any time they come to ask for money to put up factories to provide employment for the people in Barbados, they are likely to find agreement on this side. All we ask them is that they do not try in the course of carrying out our policies to ignore the sources of these policies. We have no quarrel with the way they are carrying them out. We wish you were doing more; there is not enough work in the country. It is not your fault. If you have not got enough ability, it is not your fault, but when the time comes we do not wish to find that they have so confused the people in the country that we are unable to get them to start again.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, during the next Industry Week or the next opening of a factory in Barbados to hearing the hon. member for Christ Church East or the hon. member for Christ Church South Central having the guts to get up and tell the people in Barbados

that although we had nothing to do with the opening of this factory, we are glad to see it opened. Take all the political praise they want, but do not pretend that the factory started yesterday or the day before, because they must know that it will take as many as ten years before some factories come to fruition in Barbados. Hon. members know it and if they refuse to acknowledge it, then I say that a verdict about their reasoning and motivation would have to be made.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, if we are to better our efforts in industrial development in this country, we would need the accommodation and energetic cooperation of all sectors of this community. So well do I understand that and so deeply do I believe it that I am interpreting my responsibility as Chairman of the Industrial Corporation in such a way as to lift it above and beyond petty controversy. I have done my best at all times to stimulate national cooperation and attract national support, and it is in this context, Mr. Speaker, that I regard the contribution made by the last hon. member who has just spoken as easily the most irresponsible statement made in this Chamber since I was here. It was not only irresponsible and inaccurate in content, but it was bitterly divisive in tone. It seems to me to have been designed to appeal to some of the worst elements in this community.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member in questioning my motive in making my speech said that my statement seems to have been designed to appeal to the worst elements.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the way it seems to him. It is a matter of opinion.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned, I regard it as the most irresponsible statement made in here since I have had the honour to sit in this House. It was not only irresponsible, but it was inaccurate and it was divisive. I would very much have hoped that he would have taken the lead from me and see the extent to which I have kept the Industrial Development Corporation out of the pettiness in this country and have put it in such a perspective that it can attract national support and national cooperation. No one can accuse the Industrial Development Corporation under my leadership as being any partisan statutory corporation. Whether it is in relation to the recruitment of personnel or in the question of processing applications under the Fiscal Incentive Legislation in this country, we bring to it and I see to it that I bring to it considerable justice and fair-play and even-handedness, and I think it is very unfortunate indeed that the hon. member, having got up and admitted that he could find no quarrel with what was said in the opening speech by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister, should have then proceeded to make the sort of unworthy and very irresponsible speech that he made.

And having claimed, Mr. Speaker, that he was trying to set the record straight, we were very distressed indeed to learn that he would put the hon. member for St. John as the first Minister of Industry when we know that Mr. M. E. Cox was the first Minister of Industry in this country. We were equally distressed, Mr. Speaker....
1.45 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. The context in which I was speaking has to do with the Barbados Development Board, later the Industrial Development Corporation, and their programmes, and I indicated that the hon. member for St. John was the first Minister of Industry in office. The record will show that, and I am disappointed that the hon. member is attempting to suggest that I would deny Mr. M. E. Cox his rightful recognition.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: The hon. member persists in making points that are pointless. We were equally distressed to hear from him that the Government does not own the industrial parks. I did not think that he was sufficiently long out of office not to remember the very fundamentals of the industrial development sector of this country, I am more distressed to hear from him that the Barbados Labour Party Government was not interested in industrial development in this country ten years ago. We were the first in this country to talk of industrial development way back in 1959-60. I was a little boy sitting in the audience when the late Dr. Cummins and Mr. M. E. Cox still with us made the speech on the occasion of the opening of Banks Breweries. The difference between us is that while we recognise that agricultural development and industrial development must go hand in hand, he was led and continues to be led by an honourable gentleman, the member for St. John, who would have us go in the direction in which there would not be a single cane blade left growing in this country here today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh dear, this cane blade speech.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: That is, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, one of the great differences with this Party. We have always recognised that it was necessary for industrial development to go hand in hand with agricultural development, but he would have had us putting all our eggs in the basket of manufacturing industry and industrial development.

Now, Sir, as I understand the real problem, it is really that he has had some part to play in the industrial development of this country both in his capacity as Consul General and also as Minister of Industry in the last administration, and that in the recent articles in celebration of Industry Week, the supplement, he got little or no mention.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, if the hon. member will give way, I did not say that. I said that was a culmination of an attempt over the last two years to revise history and to deny persons who had participated from being.....

Mr. SPEAKER: All right, let us continue. You have elucidated nothing.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the time has not yet come for detailed writing of the history of industrial development in this country. I believe that when that time comes my friend will secure a place just above the footnote. I believe so, but that time has not as yet come. I believe that no fair-minded historian would want to deny him that place, but I think again it is real small-mindedness on the part of the hon. member that he should seek because of an omission at this stage to make the sort of speech which we heard in here a few minutes ago.

Let me say further, Sir, that I have gone out of my way in my capacity as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of BIMAP to ensure that my predecessor in office shares the platform with me when we come to our yearly graduation ceremony. I have always made it my business to propose — which has been accepted by the entire Board, Sir — that he be made an honorary member of the Board of Trustees. We will soon be having the pictures of all the former Chairmen in the board room, and we have his and it will be permanently and securely hung. Everything that I have done in my capacity as Chairman of the Industrial Development Corporation has been in the national interest, free from pettiness, and giving recognition where recognition is due.

Now, sir, let me turn to one or two of the specific matters to which my friend referred in his speech. I want to make the record clear for all to know and to hear. When I went to the chairmanship of the Industrial Development Corporation I found an organisation that was suffering from a lack of energy. It had exhausted whatever ideas my friend would have put in it and it was literally flat on its back. It had inadequate staff, it had neither energy nor vision, and it had no conception whatsoever as to where it should go next. I want to make that very clear without denying the contribution of anyone who was there before me, and if there is one thing that must be said about the Industrial Development Corporation and about the industrial thrust in this country since 1976 is that it has been energised, and quite unlike what the last speaker has said, I want to pay tribute to the large understanding and to the leadership which has come too from the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Trade and Tourism in this country.

I want to say this without calling any names. All the professional officers around there in the Ministry of Trade who served with him and before him, and serve now with the present Deputy Prime Minister, find him so freely and openly that he is easily the best thing they have ever had around there in terms of his huge conceptual grasp and his ability to get things done and to get on with people without getting into their way and peeping about behind them. He is easily the best thing they have ever had around there, so let us get the record very, very clear indeed.

I want to continue, Sir, by mentioning a few of the specifics about what we have done in the field of industrial development. Now, if indeed a plan, a corpus of ideas put together existed in any way in the past in relation to IDC it might have existed in the head of the last hon. member who spoke and others, but nowhere in any document to be found in this country was there a comprehensive, well laid out document in which he has set forth ideas for now and the future called an industrial development plan. I want to pause for a moment so that if my friend is disposed to stand up and deny that he can. I know he will, Sir. He will, on denying it, tell us where we can find the document.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. First of all, Sir, I recommend that he looks at either one of the Development Plans; secondly, Sir, in denying it I am tired of telling him and his Minister what they must do and where they must look, it is time they find their own two feet. But I think it is most irresponsible for him to suggest that he cannot find this anywhere, because the record of the IDC....

Mr. SPEAKER: What point are you elucidating?

Mr. TAITT: That there is at least one document, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member for Christ Church East continue.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: As I continue, Sir, I will be demonstrating that my friend is really accident prone, but he has exposed himself to a considerable battering which I believe will go on well into the evening in this House today.

Let me say, Sir, that they had no plans, no ideas, a limited and inadequate staff. They were drawing from source countries, the United States and Canada. The Democratic Labour Party of this country had defined the developed world from which we in Barbados could attract industry as North America, meaning Canada and the United States, and he takes delight in the fact that he had a hand in the closing down of the office in Canada.

1.55 p.m.

I have defined the developed world from which we should attract industry to include Europe and Japan, and not the United States of America alone, as the developed world was defined when my friend left office. We have not only so defined it, but we have begun our promotional activity....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is misleading the House. The hon. member must know that seminars for Japanese industrialists and the sending of persons to Japan to explore the possibilities for industrial development were going on long before he came on the scene. The hon. member must know it, since as Chairman that information would be available to him. To stand here now and tell this House that it was only Canada and the United States thought of is misleading the House.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence to be found anywhere that the Government of Barbados ever made any formal attempt to promote Barbados as an off shore manufacturing centre at all. I took the first steps when I addressed a Japanese group at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel a few weeks ago in New York.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is again misleading the House. If he went to the Advocate newspaper he would see a photograph....

Mr. SPEAKER: This Honourable House will never be run by the Advocate newspaper; will the hon. member please take his seat.

It is now 2 p.m. and this House stands suspended until 2.45 p.m.
2 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed and it is now Question Time.

Dr. CADDLE entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that there are no answers ready to hon. members' questions. So we move on to Order No. 1 of Private Members' Business.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: As I understand it Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister wishes to make the Government's position known in relation to my Resolution. Unfortunately, he is not in the House at present, and in the circumstances I am going to ask the House again that this matter be deferred.

Mr. SPEAKER: Further consideration of this matter is postponed. Item 2 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this matter be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Lucy has also requested that Item No. 2 be postponed. Item No. 3.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, on the 11th July this year this House was treated to an example of behaviour which called forth a lot of criticism from workers' representatives and other persons of the public at large. On that occasion the hon. member for St. James found it necessary to make certain remarks directed against the supporters of the Democratic Labour Party, and I would like to draw to your attention, Sir, that these remarks and the style in which they were made have lowered the standard of debate and the general respect for this House of Assembly by the people of this country.

Sir, this Honourable Chamber is the embodiment of long traditions of decency and high standard of behaviour. It is also the embodiment of the aspirations of the people at large in this country who look forward to seeing on the floor of this House reality given to their aspirations and objectives in life. This is also the highest court in the land and it is here where people can seek to have redress of certain problems — social, economic or political — and therefore it is expected by the people of this country that on all occasions those who have been elected to sit in this Honourable Chamber would refrain from saying or doing things which would irritate the people and refrain from doing things which would create in the minds of the people this respect for the position they occupy. It has been very distressing to me to hear on the streets of Barbados that certain people in the House of Assembly would not have done that; that they would never be seen or heard to behave in such a way or utter such remarks. And I would like to throw out to the hon. member that that alone is a serious indictment of his behaviour, because it is his responsibility to ensure that at all times he behaves in such a manner in this Chamber that it would be a credit to his less fortunate brothers in this society and hold up a light for them. I repeat that it is distressing to hear that such remarks would not have been made by certain people, for this seems to suggest you can only expect to hear this kind of behaviour from certain people.

Sir, the hon. member has been in his House for a long time. If you look at anyone of these House papers dealing with the Minutes you will see the position in which his name comes indicates his long period of tenure in this Chamber.
2.50 p.m.

It would be expected that a man who has been here that long would know something of what is expected in terms of behaviour from hon. members. He is a man who has also acted as Prime Minister of this country. Therefore, it is also expected that a person who has been called upon

to act as Prime Minister of this country would hold our high traditions in the best regard; and would seek at all times to keep them at that level rather than seizing the opportunity which presented itself on July 11 to show that he has no regard for the traditions and those standards of behaviour.

Sir, he has presented himself as a man who is concerned with the welfare of old people, a man who has attempted to draw to the hearts of these people himself; and it is only natural that it is the old people who are primarily concerned with the upholding of traditions and all that is decent. I wonder how the hon. gentleman now feels after his outburst. Sir, one would believe that an hon. member who has sat in his Chamber for such a long time, would feel the necessity of upholding our traditions. One would also like to believe that the general atmosphere of this hon. Chamber would be of such as to prevent any hon. member, even to so imagine or trying to behave in that way.

Therefore I will have to submit to you, sir, that somewhere along the line something of the august nature of this House of Assembly has been lost thereby not preventing anyone from getting up and behaving in that way. The behaviour of the hon. member is a reflection on all members of the House of Assembly; because on that particular occasion I recall that no one from either side found it necessary to get up and caution the hon. member or seek to impress upon him that the way in which he was behaving was not fit for a member of this Honourable Chamber. Therefore, the people of this country must look on all of us in the same light; and I take serious objection to that, sir, because I would not like people.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that you are now seeking to condemn all members of the House?

Dr. CADDLE: No, sir. I am just suggesting that the way in which the matter was debated and permitted to be carried on has left a bad taste in the mouth of the general public; and I am saying that I am taking serious objection to that; because while it is true that hon. members might not have got up and asked him hopefully to withdraw, I am certain that they were so shocked at that behaviour that it took them some time to overcome the shock that was created by the remarks of the hon. member.

Sir, to say that people should not eat is not a matter to be treated lightly. In South Africa, in Rhodesia and in other parts of the world people are exposed daily to such circumstances; such conditions. In other parts of the world people are trying their best to urge the regimes of those countries to be more concerned about human rights and the way in which to treat people. If this remark was made on a public platform outside, one might dismiss this as a trivial matter, a matter, maybe, just to please the

people; but when it is said on the floor of this Honourable Chamber by a person who forms part of the Government in power, and when it is said against the background of many incidents in this country which have irritated people and made people feel that they cannot express their views politically as they used to or would like to, then it is time that many of us, while not wanting to criticise the Government unnecessarily, it is necessary for a lot of us who do not share the political views of the hon. member to sit up and take some serious note of what is happening in this country.

When a person does not eat, sir, and we allow him to remain in that condition long enough, he will eventually starve to death. If it is just an exercise of not eating, a voluntary wish or act to decide that you are not eating today, there is no serious problem, because tomorrow or the afternoon of the same day you may change your mind and decide to eat; but if someone puts himself in a position where he can make it difficult or impossible for you to eat, and he can continue to exercise that position long enough, all you can look forward to in the final analysis coming to relieve you of a situation of starvation is death. Starvation, Sir, resulting from prolonged inability to eat, from whatever method or means it comes, is a very serious way of treating people. It is degrading, and it constitutes a threat to the life of an individual.

If you would turn, Sir to Chapter 3 of the Constitution of Barbados, you will find at Section 15 that it is stated quite clearly — Protection from Inhuman Treatment — “No person shall be subjected to torture or inhuman or degrading punishment or other treatment. Nothing contained in or done under the authority of any law shall be held to be inconsistent therefore in contravention of this section to the extent that the law in question authorises the infliction of any punishment, or the administration of any treatment that was lawful in Barbados immediately before November the 30th.” I am saying, sir, that there is no law that I am aware of that permits anybody in this country to exercise a position to prevent other people from eating.

Sir, I am also submitting that to be in a position to prevent other people from eating, leading ultimately to starvation, is inhuman. And when an hon. member can get up on the floor of this Honourable Chamber and make such remarks, he has absolutely no respect or concern for the Constitution of this country. This Chapter, Sir, also preserves the right to life. The life of a person should not be taken away lightly except in cases where we know that there are penalties or laws which permit this to happen; and if you set about to deny people the right to live, and you go about that long enough, you are threatening the life of the individual; and eventually you will take away the life of the individual. Again, Sir, I submit that to make such a statement is to

indicate quite strongly that one is not concerned with the constitutional niceties of this country.
3.00 p.m.

Sir, it is very easy in a moment of anger, maybe in a moment of depression to make remarks, and these things can be accepted outside, but when one has reached the Honourable House of Assembly it is expected that even if in the initial stages you did not refashion your behaviour and your thinking, one believes that in due course in time, before the very end of one's round, you would have refashioned your thinking and behaviour to conform with the honourable traditions of this country and the expectations of this country.

Sir, I would like to make it quite clear that I could not support anybody on this side, either on the Floor of this House or privately, when one makes such remarks, and I want on this occasion to dissociate myself from those remarks and that is why I have been asking in my Resolution that members dissociate themselves from those remarks because not to do so would create the impression or strengthen the belief on the minds of the public that all of us in here are alike. Sir, this type of behaviour, these types of remarks can only cause fear and strengthen the division and disunity that has already been created in the Barbadian society.

If we are concerned about the future of this country, those of us who are sane must rush at the earliest opportunity to condemn these acts regardless of which side they come from. To fail to do so would be to strengthen those fears which would create further disunity in this country and make the efforts of development very difficult and maybe almost impossible.

There have been enough incidents in Barbados already before this one on July 11th, which have agitated the people and made people believe that political persuasion or political considerations play a very important part in how they are treated. Therefore, when this remark comes out, people must become more confused that the experiences which they had previously, were not by accident but were designed.

Sir, you know very well when things are happening they would be dismissed by the general public because they like to take these things in the trend of affairs in a country, but when you get something special happening like what occurred on July 11th, people start seeing these things in a different light and if they were prepared to dismiss these things as a casual outburst or something like that it might have had a special reason for happening, but now they are looking at it in a different light and it strengthens their views that what happened previously to the incident was done purposely. This is what we are concerned about. People are beginning to believe that even if they were accidental, they were done purposely.

It is very difficult, Sir, to accept that this was just an instance of a mere outburst, maybe under a little pressure, or maybe under a little haggling on the Floor of the House of Assembly. When one recalls other incidents, they were remarks made by the hon. members of that side to the effect that people who support the Democratic Labour Party should not work, and things of that nature. These things can be said to your political opponents as a joke, but when they are broadcasted from the Floor of the House, find themselves in the news media.

When they are broadcasted in such a way when people who come here and understand what is going on in the House of Assembly hear these things, it must leave a bad effect on the people of this country. Maybe if these remarks were said privately to one of the members on this side, we might have dismissed it, or joked it off and tell him he should not have said so but under such conditions, on the Floor of this Honourable Chamber, in the presence of members of the press and other members of the public, the impression left must be a bad one and we must seek to correct it.

We must seek to correct it because we do not want any disunity in this country going too far. We admit that people have different political views and always will have as long as democracy prevails. We admit that people will see things differently. This is natural in a society but we do not want a division to be driven so far as to encourage people to take up stances which make the development of this country difficult to the extent that because you belong to a different political party, you are my natural enemy now, and I must oppose you or seek to protect myself on every occasion against you.

When this happens, people cannot sleep peacefully, people cannot be comfortable in their minds, they cannot be comfortable in their jobs and I would like now, Sir, if it were possible to have a survey done in this country to find out how many people in Barbados have been disturbed and are still disturbed as a result of remarks made here in this Honourable Chamber.

I know that the hon. gentleman has apologised, but an apology is not the solution to the problem. An apology is like after you have done something wrong or something serious you then get up and say you are sorry. It does not remove the act, or it does not remove the suffering. The fact that the hon. member has apologised has only gone to strengthen the belief of certain people that what he said he did say and he meant it.

Sir, the people of this country expected the hon. gentleman to remove himself from his other ministerial colleagues and a mere transfer from one post in the Cabinet to another post does not allay the fears of the people who have been aroused by these remarks, because people are likely to feel that as long as he is there in

some way he may seek to carry out his treats. The people would likely believe that as long as he is there he might persuade other members of his Cabinet to think as he is thinking. Therefore, a mere transfer from one position to another in the Cabinet has not done anything to allay the fears of the people of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister has done well if he transferred himself from one post to another.

Mr. GREAVES: Yes, Sir, you maybe right, he may have done it, but the point is that when we seek to allay the fears of the people of this country by some act that we have done previously we have to do something more concrete than just moving from one chair to another chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to urge upon the hon. member and I proposed to urge upon all hon. members in this debate, that we will not use this debate to divide this country further. I have heard the hon. member make reference that this country has been divided so far and should not be divided further. I do not propose sitting here and allowing any hon. member in this debate or in any other debate to divide this country further. I am willing to be removed from the Chair if I am accused of suppressing freedom of speech, or anything, but I am not going to sit here and allow any hon. members to use the Floor of this House to divide the country further.
3.10 p.m.

I am willing to be removed from the Chair if I am accused of suppressing freedom of speech or anything, but I am not going to sit here and allow any hon. member as long as I am here to use the floor of this House to divide this country any further.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear those remarks coming from the Honourable Speaker, and I am comforted to know that at least the presiding officer of this Honourable Chamber is also concerned about the division in the country, and I would invite him that any time my remarks appear to be moving in that direction to let me know, because it is not my intention to further the divisiveness in this country, but at the same time I must comment on the effects which the remarks made by the hon. member for St. James have had on the minds of some people. It is difficult to say how many people have been so affected because no survey has been conducted and people are not interested in carrying out surveys to establish these things, but some people have been affected to the extent that they have come out publicly and condemned his remarks.

Sir, as I was saying before, people look for some concrete action when things have been done to irritate them, and I am saying that up to now there has been no concrete action coming from the hon. member to really

allay the fears of the people of this country, and these fears are apt to continue amongst out people for some time, and maybe as Barbadians say, it will take a long time to erase them from their minds.

Sir, it is unfortunate that the hon. member made these remarks on July 11. It is more unfortunate when one remembers, as I said, in my opening remarks, that ordinary members of the Barbadian public have been saying with a feeling of deep conviction that certain members on that side would never say so, suggesting what more can you expect to come from such an hon. member. In that regard I say he let down those people in this country who have sent him as one of their champions, because as a person who has sprung from among the grass-roots people of the country, they would expect him to be a light, a standard that they would be proud of, to stand up at all times and say "look, you see one of we boys!"

In this society where educational qualifications are lending to another stratification of the Barbadian society and adding to some of the social discrimination that already exists, it is imperative that people who have not been graced by these events due to no fault of their own, when pitchforked into prominent positions in this country should be mindful of the way they behave, otherwise when they behave contrary to what is expected, what they are doing is making the path of climbing for the less fortunate people of this country more difficult, and that is what the hon. member has done. By his behaviour on July 11, he has made the path of people from the grassroots from which he has sprung more difficult, and people are left to believe that you have to go to the University, you must be a lawyer or something of that nature to keep your behaviour to a high standard. I am saying that is not so, and I regret for whatever reasons he may give or whatever apology he made that he found it necessary to behave in that way, strengthening the views of that small clique of people in this society who feel that you have to have a certain quality of educational achievement to hold certain positions in this country.

I do not believe that up to now the hon. member has realised the impact that those remarks have created on the minds of people at all levels in the society. I think if he had he would behave differently. He has been put there by people of whom he is proud. There is no doubt about that, and these people would like to be proud of him and by behaving that way that day, he is making it difficult for them to be proud.

Sir, with those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the Resolution and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I could not let the occasion of this Resolution go by without first of all complimenting my colleague for a very erudite, statesmanlike speech, and secondly to associate myself with all those persons who would wish to be dissociated from the remarks made by the hon. member for St. James.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. James did not make himself a Minister in the classic sense of the term. A person becomes a member of a Cabinet primarily because the person who is to lead that Cabinet chooses that person. If therefore the hon. member for St. James is still a member of the Cabinet, to a large extent it cannot be his fault, and one would have to wonder at the absolute silence which we have had so far from the Leader of the Government on this question which has affected so many people in so many different ways.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that anyone who is Christian-minded indeed even some who are not Christian-minded could want to see the hon. member as a person persecuted, for if that were the wish of anyone, then all one would be doing is subscribing to precisely the views which we on this side are seeking to have condemned. What we have to be careful of is the question of principle involved in the responsibility which some of us assume or have thrust upon us through circumstances which are sufficiently familiar that they do not bear chronically.

The Democratic Labour Party is a political organisation to which all those members who now belong to it or have belonged to it have been proud or are proud. It should never seem even in the ordinary sense of behaviour in our country, a country for which we have been boasting for a very long time we have a very high standard of literacy, a country which we have said to the rest of the world is the freest or among the freest countries in the world, a country whose traditions of parliamentary democracy and parliamentary behaviour have formed the basis for many a treatise or dissertation, in a country such as this we cannot be satisfied to hear that the mere decision to associate oneself with a political party can place one in a position in his own country where he can even be in fear of his life.

Mr. Speaker, I wish for the record to dissociate myself as a member of this Chamber from the remarks made on that day by the hon. member for St. James. I wish further to state that every single member of the Democratic Labour Party was concerned and is concerned not only at the remarks that were made, but the attitude surrounding the remarks which have been observed in the Government.
3.20 p.m.

We had the very sorry spectacle of an aide to the Prime Minister saying specifically and categorically that no action was taken because of the particular statement made, and indicating that it would be unthinkable that any action could have been taken by them as a result of the words uttered.

Mr. Speaker, we claim that our parliamentary system is in the traditions of other great parliamentary systems. There has been a lot of argument as to whether that is true or not, and one of the few written decisions which I have had the honour of seeing from the distinguished Chair of this Hon. House indicated that perhaps from 1639 we started our own traditions. But, Sir, even if we started our own traditions from 1639 they were started in the spirit of those traditions which we read about and hear about. Every person who goes into any form of tertiary education, or even before, hears how much we benefit from these great traditions of parliamentary democracy and parliamentary systems. We use Erskine May's as our bible where the Standing Orders are concerned, and it is a tradition in that place that where a Minister either deliberately or inadvertently commits by omission or otherwise a particular indiscretion, there are certain steps which that Minister takes or which that Government calls upon the Minister to take.

Recently, Sir, there was a one-inch article in the daily Press indicating that a substantial and distinguished Minister in Canada had committed what to some people might be a slight indiscretion. He had made telephonic communications with a judge in a matter concerning a person whom he considered near and dear to him. As soon as it became known, Sir, that Minister took what is considered to be a traditional action. There are many people in this country who have wondered why they have not seen a similar activity in the case of Barbados, but the Government will have to answer that to the people in due course. My position is that if any hon. member on this side or that side can make a statement which suggests that he does not care if a number of Barbadians, however small a number, far less a number as large as that body which associates itself with the Democratic Labour Party, anyone who can indicate that he does not care if such persons should live or die, then that is a person with whom we cannot be associated. But when it is said from the Chamber, this Hon. House, that is considered to be the bastion of parliamentary democracy, then, Sir, the situation is even more grave.

It is time for us to ask ourselves certain questions, and this Resolution brought by my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, is an expression of the answer which this Hon. House should give. It calls for this Hon. House, for members of this House to

dissociate themselves from the remarks. If the hon. members on that side cannot support this Resolution, we and the people in Barbados will come to certain conclusions — conclusions that other people have already reached — that when the hon. member spoke he was not speaking for himself, he was not saying something that he had heard or said for the first time, that he was in fact articulating a policy which is well known to him and to at least some of his colleagues. In those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, one would only conclude, one could only conclude that the time in Barbados is nearer at hand than most people think.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this Resolution, I do so out of a sense of duty, I feel that not to dissociate myself from those remarks would be a betrayal of all of those thousands of persons in the constituency which I represent, and indeed those thousands of persons who are members of the Democratic Labour Party in whose names I speak from time to time. I therefore associate myself with this Resolution and commend it to other hon. members for their similar action.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, in December 1934 a man who was subsequently to engage in activities that caused the loss of lives of millions throughout the world, caused more destruction to humanity than the world had ever seen before, whether it be due to the combination of diseases and natural disasters, a man who on several occasions this Hon. House in the past has condemned, a man whose activities have revolted people throughout the free world, that man, Mr. Speaker, made a statement in that cold winter that the Jews shall not eat. It was only a matter of years when from not eating they were in the gas chambers. Not to eat, Mr. Speaker, is the same thing as saying you shall die. It might seem to be a simplistic remark, but the logical conclusion.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Not eat or drink milk.

Dr. HAYNES: That is right. No milk, no honey, nothing at all. Anyhow, not to eat when you take that to its logical conclusion must mean that you should die. The name of Hitler was used in this Hon. House on that fateful day and when from time to time we honour those from Barbados who gave their lives in that war we must at the same time remember and think of the significance of any remark in this Hon. House which would give even any semblance of dignity to that name. He espoused a political philosophy, a philosophy of racism, a philosophy of economic development, a philosophy of militarism, a philosophy which is usually referred to by the name of fascism.

3.30 p.m.

The statement that we now ask all hon. members of this House to dissociate themselves from is a statement, Mr. Speaker, that has its foundation in Fascist thinking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then you are telling us that the Minister is a Fascist.

Dr. HAYNES: I am not referring to him specifically, Sir; I am referring to Fascism, and I would like to develop the point and you will see exactly where I am going.

Mr. SPEAKER: So that since the statement is founded in Fascism, coming from the Minister he is a Fascist.

Dr. HAYNES: No, Sir, and I would like to make my next statement which would clarify the position.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you make the next statement withdraw the first.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity with the greatest pleasure to withdraw the statement and defer to your better judgment in this matter. But the point I am trying to make is that when Fascism reared its ugly head in Germany and elsewhere, those who did not speak out against it...

Mr. SPEAKER: You are still continuing to tell us that the Minister's theory is one based on Fascism. I do not want at this stage to ask you to take your seat. Please find other ground on which to continue your debate.

Dr. HAYNES: To continue, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Minister in making that statement did not quite understand at the time the totality of its implications. Therefore I would like to join with my colleagues on this side and hopefully with those on the other side in recognizing that the statement has a very fundamental seriousness and challenges the very basis on which we all here would hope to be the future organisation of this society. Indeed, it is very sad that this remark should have come from someone who should clearly understand the problems facing poor people in this country, from someone so long involved in public life in Barbados, and someone who has always projected himself in public life as a champion of the poor and the disadvantaged especially the older people, among whom are DLPs and BLPs. It was in a sense not consistent with previous statements, but nevertheless, I think we have to treat it with the seriousness it deserves and not be involved in personal attack on anyone in this regard. Therefore, it is even sadder, when seen in the context in which I see it, that the hon. Prime Minister of this country and the Government should have treated the public of Barbados with such utter contempt as not to

make any kind of statement in regard to this matter. We are not here to persecute the hon. member who made the unfortunate statement; this is not our purpose. Our purpose is to make sure that the kind of morality which we expect to be associated with those who run the affairs of this country should give vocal expression to that kind of morality and not seek to escape their responsibility by any kind of a moral posturing in any matter as serious as this.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is accusing members of the Government of immoral postures.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I said amoral, which is a different matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now I must tell the hon. member this...

Dr. HAYNES: May I withdraw that remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are learning quickly.

Dr. HAYNES: I would like to say, Sir, that it is the responsibility of the Government to make sure that at all times it takes a moral position in matters of this kind. As more than one hon. member has stated, we are not here to hound down anybody but simply to ensure that a principle is established. Now when this comes against the background where over the past two years we have seen masses of people dismissed from the Government service and agencies of Government — for example, the BMC, the Parks and Beaches Commission, the Ministry of Communications and Works — and whether we like it or not those who have been dismissed, and a large number of people in this community, are fully satisfied that they have been dismissed on political grounds because they support a political party; now when this statement comes on top of all this, and when the Government remains silent and fails to tell the people that they are committed to the principle of democracy, that once they are elected and form the Government of this country they have an obligation not only to their yardfowls but to the total community; this is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, and it is important that so long as such beliefs exist in this community it is important that the Government take steps to correct this. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I need not draw it to your attention that consequential on this kind of partisan behaviour which found expression in successive Jamaican Government, this has been one of the root causes of the deterioration of that society. It is one of the fundamental causes of crime in that society; it is one of the fundamental reasons; and if we assume this kind of posture we will be heading for the same kind of trouble in the future.

This resolution is of fundamental importance and marks the time when each one of us must stand up and be counted and reaffirm our belief in the fundamental democratic principle which will allow us to be divided by party but come to Parliament and put our case one way or another but keep a united society with all of us dedicated to the development of society. But if one side cannot eat, it is a perfect recipe for civil war.

On another occasion in this Honourable House I made the remark that it might be necessary for a future Democratic Labour Party Government to consider making changes in the Constitution of Barbados to make it clear that all Barbadians had a Constitutional right to a job.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member made the statement in this House he cannot set about quoting it, because he made it just a few days ago.

Dr. HAYNES: I am not quoting it Mr. Speaker, I am just establishing the same idea. I cannot change my principles, and it is a fundamental principle.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is right, but we do not want you to refer to it.

Dr. HAYNES: I shall avoid referring to it Sir, and I do appreciate where you are coming from. But the point I am trying to make is that the situation of Barbados no such provision is made as far as I am aware. I believe that a Committee was set up to study changes in the Constitution of Trinidad and this idea of a right to a job was one which was extensively discussed, but because of certain complicating factors it was thought better to exclude it. But if we find that thinking creeping into the politics of Barbados, then it will be necessary for all of us who share the belief that each and every person has the right to enjoy the fruits of labour in this country, according to his ability, to include this right in subsequent Constitutional provisions.

3.40 p.m.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned with many aspects; but I do not think that any aspect is causing greater concern to the public at large than the position of the hon. member for St. Thomas and the position of the Barbados Government, in relation to this matter. If they share this belief, then they will have the opportunity to stand up and say so. If they do not have that belief, then they will have an equal opportunity to stand up and be counted and say that we are prepared to vote with you on this one because we do not share the belief, that sections of Barbados shall not work. I mean shall not eat. If they oppose us, If they vote against us, then it will be a confirmation of what everyone in Barbados has been saying for the past two years — that the main hallmark of their policy has been vindictiveness and hate; because this,

sir, is what comes through very strikingly in those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member suggesting that this Resolution is brought against the wrong person?

Dr. HAYNES: I am not suggesting that; but I think that from a democratic point of view, when we think of the Constitution and so on, I think that we have a fundamental interest in the Government; because I am somewhat concerned that the member for St. James was mouthing what was accepted Government policy. I do not know. We are waiting to hear from them. It may well be that what the hon. member for St. James was saying was just an articulation — an emotional articulation of what has been Government's policy for the last two years. Now the opportunity will arise where they can tell us whether this is their policy or not.

On the question, Mr. Speaker, of the resignation of the hon. member for St. James from Government, or whether he should have been dismissed from Government, this will of course depend on the thinking of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will depend on what?

Dr. HAYNES: On the thinking of the Government on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought you said that it was an exercise in futility.

Dr. HAYNES: I believe, Sir, that any calls for resignation on this side will be an exercise in futility; but certainly, when one is not asked to resign or one is not dismissed under such circumstances, one must feel that there is some community of thought between the person expressing the views and his other colleagues. I think that this is a reasonable assumption; and so, my view would be that we must take steps to eliminate this kind of political thinking — I do not think that we must necessarily set about to harass anyone, because in the long term it is the Government's thinking that would count; because you may exchange one Minister for another; but so long as that is the prominent thinking in Government, then you will find expressions, if not in words, then expressions in deeds that I referred to in respect of the B.M.C., the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Parks and Beaches Commission etc. will continue; so that in a sense the hon. member for St. James might have done the country a favour in a strange kind of a way by drawing to the attention of the country as a whole the kind of political thinking that exists within the Government of which he is a member, and therefore, having done so, and therefore, having given expression to a view shared by his colleagues, then it will be difficult, of course, to dismiss him from office and merely sidelining him to another

Ministry might be the only way to save face. This is the only kind of construction that I can put on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: On hearing the hon. member, my only fear is that, sitting here and seeing you so deranged, I am wondering when or where will the whirlwind come.

Dr. HAYNES: Well, Sir, the whirlwind might come much sooner than you think if such statements are not corrected, and if the Government does not take the appropriate decisions and the correct posture or posturings in this particular matter; because their posturings today have certainly not helped the situation in any particular way. Thank you.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am taking the somewhat unusual course of making an early intervention in this matter. I would like to say that I do have some responsibility for who sit on ministerial benches; and I do take this opportunity — although I know that at a later stage an amendment may be moved to the Resolution which may occasion yet another series of speeches — the spectacle of Satan rebuking sin is never an edifying one. I was treated to it at length in respect of gambling by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central when he was a candidate at the recent by-election; and I have been treated to it in this matter also not at first hand from him because he has not been in the House long enough to share in the earlier occasions in which statements such as that made by the hon. member for St. James have been given to the House; but certainly he shares in the general statements that have been expressed by members of his party.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that I thought beyond doubt in this country, it is that the Democratic Labour Party had a reputation for giving jobs to its supporters and excluding its opponents from jobs. If there is one thing about which 95 per cent of Barbadians can agree, if they are honest, it is on that. The hon. mover of this Resolution, the doctor, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central — there is on record a letter from the hon. member recommending a woman called Anita Bailey for favourable consideration by the National Housing Corporation because her parents were ardent supporters of the Democratic Labour Party. (*Aside.* Dr. CADDLE: "Produce it") That letter will be produced in the House.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We have in my memory — I do not know how far the researchers have been able to turn up the actual debates — we have on at least two separate occasions in here heard Mr. DaCosta Edwards make specific statements about giving jobs only to holders of Democratic Labour Party passports.
3.50 p.m.

We have heard Mr. Frederick Gladstone Smith in here acknowledge that he obtained the 20 votes which brought him into the House of Assembly by means of jobs that he shared out in the School Meals Service in the month previous to the election. That was said in here.

Mr. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir, is the hon. member for St. Thomas saying that a member of the Democratic Labour Party in the past has said that members of the Barbados Labour Party should not eat?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Tell the hon. member to behave himself. The entire School Meals Service had a long history in this matter, not of saying that you could not eat; in the School Meals Service we had Mr. Gameron Tudor specifically saying in here that the first slate of persons selected for employment in the School Meals Service had to be rejected because many supporters of the Barbados Labour Party were in it, and there were fears that they would sabotage the service; and I can tell the House that the method of appointing temporary, unestablished and casual workers was changed because the then Permanent Secretary at the Ministry of Education refused to appoint the people in the School Meals Service whom Mr. Tudor wanted appointed to the posts, and recommended to the then Governor in 1963 a list of members of the Democratic Labour Party for employment. He came into the House and defended this on various grounds. One was 'sabotage' on one occasion, and on another occasion he said that the School Meals Service was specifically the brain child of the Democratic Labour Party and you could only expect members of the DLP to get jobs in it. All of that.

I am sorry the hon. member for St. Michael South is not in his seat. He will remember when he said that it was necessary to "depressurise the Opposition", he will remember that he said "remove and depressurise the Opposition." That is a more immediate process than not eating.

We will also remember the Leader of the Opposition using the word "starve", in connection with a labour dispute: "they must work or starve". The very expression "passport" was put forward as a passport to what society had to offer for jobs and things in the gifts of Government.

I have here Sir, a letter which I am going to make a document of the House right away. It is a letter written by Mr. Earlyn Garnes upon hearing of this matter. I am going to make it a document of the House. I am going to read it out, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, before you read that letter, I hope that it is not one of the letters which says that the hon. member for St. James preaches what

the Dems practice. I will not be having that letter read in here.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Sir, it is a letter setting out facts. I am not even going to....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am going to read the letter, Sir. It is dated 25th July, 1978, it is addressed to the Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams, M.P.

"Dear Prime Minister,

I am absolutely shocked by the vicious, maligning attacks of the Opposition relative to certain statements made recently by one of your Ministers. I am happy to supply the following information and you can read this to the House of Assembly and make it a document of the House.

About the middle of February 1976, I visited the Office of the then Prime Minister, Errol Walton Barrow and asked that action be taken for me to obtain a loan from the National Housing Corporation. Mr. Barrow said to me "Brother Garnes you must have it right away." He then summoned Senator Leroy Brathwaite to his office (Brathwaite was then Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) and gave him instructions. I was then escorted to Mr. Brathwaite's office whereupon he produced an application for membership of the Democratic Labour Party and told me I did not have to pay the membership fees but once I filled the application a loan of \$5,000 would be granted immediately.

Mr. Brathwaite then took me in his car to the house of the then Chairman of the National Housing Corporation, Senator Deighton Griffith and told Senator Griffith in my presence that a loan must be granted from the National Housing Corporation because I can be an asset to the Democratic Labour Party. Senator Griffith then called a Mr. Haynes at the National Housing Corporation and instructed him to get all documents in motion for a \$5,000 loan to Mr. Earlyn Garnes. Senator Brathwaite then took me to Mr. Haynes' office at National Housing Corporation and told Mr. Haynes that I had just joined the Party and must be granted a loan right away and I should not be chased for re-payment. I filled all the forms necessary and was instructed to get Mr. Asquith Phillips to sign one of the documents for me. I visited Mr. Phillips' office on James Street and before signing such Mr. Phillips asked me if I had joined the Party. I replied yes and he signed the document. I got the loan a few days after.

I hereby swear that this a true declaration of what took place in respect of a citizen seeking assistance from a Government Institution.

Dated and signed this 25th day of July, 1978.

(Sgd.) Earlyn Garnes."

Dr. HAYNES: Surely, Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two hon. members on their feet. Just a minute. Mr. Prime Minister, the hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Dr. HAYNES: Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is an insult to this House to read any letter from Earlyn Garnes who is regarded as the most depraved of Barbadians. That is not what was said.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Please, just a minute.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central must know that Earlyn Garnes is not here to defend himself and it is perhaps of some significance that the hon. member is in a position above all others to rise and speak about Earlyn Garnes, but I would like him to desist from doing this in the future.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think, Sir, that Garnes is only a victim. What we have heard is again only Satan rebuking sin. The instrument of Garnes' depravity is perhaps speaking. But I really do not know what to say. I have in my possession a photostat copy of a cheque signed by the hon. member and given to Earlyn Garnes for canvassing for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He used to pay Earlyn Garnes \$140.00 a week to canvass for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is what I mean about Satan rebuking sin, when he spoke about Garnes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said in this House earlier than the wind was being sound and there would be a whirlwind.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I know it is a fact, indeed that Mr. George Drummond has admitted to me, that the hon. member used to send Garnes down to Drumfield Ltd. a duty-free liquor store at the Port, to

receive payments for canvassing for him in the by-election and I have a copy of a cheque delivered for that purpose. 4.00 p.m.

Talking about Garnes, I am saying as a fact that Mr. Garnes carried Mr. Courtenay Selman up in the office of the Honourable Member, when Courtenay Selman told Garnes he wanted a politician to rob, and Courtenay Selman was entered on his payroll during, not the recent by-election but the General Election. He would be in a first class position to speak on these matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: When you say "he" whom do you mean, Mr. Prime Minister?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I mean the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. I can give so many examples of the viciousness practised in days gone by. There is a man called Douglas Smith who lives at Bush Hall Yard Gap, St. Michael. His case has been on record in here. I do not specially want to call the names of the two former members of the Housing Authority who told him that his job as a driver at the Housing Authority was in danger so long as he worked as a chauffeur for Sir Grantley Adams, but he was dismissed from the Housing Authority. Douglas Smith, Bush Hall Yard Gap, now an employee at Geddes Grant Ltd. There is Hugh Nesfield known as "Petter" who has changed sides many times since, I believe, due to economic necessity, who was also dismissed from the Housing Authority being told by members of the Democratic Labour Party that he was too friendly with Sir Grantley Adams. Everybody knows that Petter was fired. I have a document here. Sir, so far I have been going back to 1963. I have something now from 1975.

There is an inspector called James Watkins, otherwise known as Lightfoot Kid at the Housing Corporation and he was asked to pronounce on an application by a poor man with a chattel house called Ifill, and his comment on that application was this, when he was asked to report: "Please note that the applicant is not working and is walking around with a man who works at Yonkers Gas Station saying he is canvassing for a B.L.P. candidate." And they have the nerve to stand up and condemn people talking about not eating and starving. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: We must have some order in this Honourable House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The B.M.C., Parks and Beaches and the M.C.W. Has it ever been doubted that of necessity the people laid off at Parks and Beaches were mainly supporters of the D.L.P? I will confess that, if it is a matter for confession. I will state it if it is a matter of assertion; but why? 250 canvassers were taken on by Mr. Carmichael for the City by-election and the general election on a programme that was to end at the

end of September 1976, and they are the people who went home. They were not laid off. The programme for which they were employed was a temporary programme due to come to an end on September 30, 1976. Carmichael and the Dems felt that they would have served their purpose one way or the other by the end of September 1976 however it came. They were taken on because they were members of the DLP, and when their employment period came to an end, as far as I know they were still members of the DLP. Do you mean we should have kept them on because they were Dems? The Dems said there was a programme that would end on September 30, and because they only employed Dems in it, that is an argument for coming to the conclusion which they have made.

I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South West speak of 41 or 49, I think, people being laid off from the B.M.C. and he knew for sure that 41 were Dems. But how did he know 41 were Dems? Because he placed them in the jobs for the purpose of canvassing for him at election time.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is casting aspersions on my integrity by suggesting.... (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must be heard in silence.

Mr. TAITT: The Hon. member stated that when I was functioning in my capacity as Minister, I placed persons in jobs because they were canvassers. Mr. Speaker, in the first place it was not my duty to place people. In the second place, Sir, all of the persons at the Barbados Marketing Corporation so far as I know were persons who were employed to do a job they could do, and to say that they were put on there because they were canvassers is not only untrue, but casts unnecessary aspersions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Tell me when you are going to state your point of order.

Mr. TAITT: The hon. member is misleading the House by telling a falsehood.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now you must withdraw that forthwith.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: And take your seat.

Mr. TAITT: All right, Sir, if that is the way it is.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Do you mean the hon. member is telling people for whom he got jobs that they did not get the jobs because they were his supporters? Who is lying then? Is he telling people who

were employed at the BMC that the only determinant of employment was a DLP passport? Is he telling them that the DLP passport did not matter? They will judge who is telling the truth. How does he know that they were 41? (Asides)

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: How could he possibly

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be no crosstalk. I am trying to avoid having to order any hon. member out of the Chamber at this particular moment.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There are 41 persons who were laid off. I will just put it this way. It is a remarkable and unprecedented coincidence that 20% of the most recent employees of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, in fact it is like 90% of the most recently employed at the Barbados Marketing Corporation, who form perhaps 20% of the whole of the work force, all these were persons from the constituency of the Minister responsible for the BMC. It is one of those spectacular coincidences. God moves in mysterious ways His wonders to perform; and from nowhere at all, without any intention of not letting members of the Barbados Labour Party eat, by good fortune 41 persons from the constituency of the hon. member who was going to run for St. Michael South West and who was in charge of the BMC, at the time received employment out of 49. That is a great coincidence. That is the sort of coincidence that, to touch on a sore nerve, you get 41 jackpots on a stretch, and there is more chance of the hon. member striking 41 jackpots on a stretch than of his making anybody in here believe that he had no hand in employing 41 people from his own constituency out of 49 taken on around election time.

At every level this business of jobs for the boys has pervaded Barbados for 15 years. A Permanent Secretary has said to a member of the present Cabinet that in order to receive advancement to the higher ranks of the civil service, it was wise to join the DLP. A Permanent Secretary has said so. We have no intention of embarrassing any of the public officers who have had to tell us what they went through under the old Ministries. 4.10 p.m.

I have never heard anything like it, Sir, these hon. members opposite getting up and one after the other laying their hands on their hearts and deploring a slip by the hon. member for St. James. The BMC, Parks and Beaches and MCW. I remember seeing a cartoon in the London Express once, Sir, and seeing the hon. member for St. Michael South West reminds me of it, it was soon after the debate which led to the legislation of homosexuality in Britain performed in private, and in this cartoon Lady Littlehampton is seen saying: "What I

enjoyed at that debate was every member managing to convey to the House that he personally had never been acquainted with a homosexual." The hon. member for St. Michael South West has laid his hand on his heart in respect of even the very topic to which I have adverted, and now once again he lays his hand on his heart and he explains that the Barbados Labour Party is wicked — he didn't go the whole hog, he didn't overstate his case like the hon. member for St. Michael South Central — that the Barbados Labour Party is wicked and it is a vicious party, and so on because they do not wish members of the Opposition to receive even a little bit of what they have been sharing out to members of our party for the last 15 years.

The point is this, the thing that hurts us is this, that we received criticism from members of our party for our fairness. That is the thing. You try to promote people on merit, you try to destroy political favouritism and on the one hand you are told, "why turn the other cheek?" Well, we don't mind turning the other cheek in these circumstances. The hon. member for St. James was pushed and provoked by this long succession of arrogant, aggressive statements in here by Tudor, Edwards and other hon. members whose names I cannot mention. There is a public officer employed in the Ministry of Community Development, canvassed for the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, who told the hon. member for St. Michael South East that he was canvassing, that he didn't care whether he lost his job or not. We have not fired the man, although he is in obvious breach of public orders. He was called by the Chief Personnel Officer and warned, and he went out and cursed the Chief Personnel Officer. Have we fired him? But that man's job is in my hand at this very minute. Have we fired him? Let him continue to be an inefficient officer dealing with playing fields. He has just left the House, instead of doing his work he has been in the House of Assembly a good part of the afternoon. He is an inefficient officer often reported in the past for his inefficiency. If you wanted to go about it in a roundabout way you could have thrown him out. He was up and down with the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, and the former Minister of Labour who is accused of making these statements actually put up a strong case against any discipline for that man, and it is suggested that this hon. member is a person who is out to see members of the Opposition starve?

The hon. member, I believe, was asked a question at an early stage in his tenure as Minister of Housing in connection with the employment of a Rent Collector. The Rent Collector in question had recently been taken on, and had given great offence to certain persons well known to me during the bye-election. He was in favour of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, and a particular evening I was telephoned and told that I should call the police, this man said that he is going to see to it that Tom Adams gets assassinated, that Tom

Adams wants destroying. The Minister of Agriculture heard it but the Honourable Member for St. James refused to interfere in the matter of employing the man recently, and you talk about starving? They have the nerve to accuse us of wanting to starve members of the Opposition?

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central always overstates the case. According to him in December 1934 Hitler said Jews shall not eat; that may or may not be so, the hon. member would be taking a leaf out of the book of his political mentor in quoting non-quotations uttered on non-dates by non-persons, and therefore I think that we should not be too very hard on him if it turns out that Hitler said nothing of the sort in December 1934, but you hear how the argument develops? He threatens us with civil war. Hon. members who heard the hon. member speaking will judge on which side the balance of vindictiveness and hate lies. All other members who have heard the hon. member for St. Michael South Central on the platform and in here will judge how well qualified he is to talk about vindictiveness and hate.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is suggesting that I threatened in the course of the debate someone or some persons unmentioned with civil war. This is incorrect and it certainly reflects on me as a person and as a member of this House, and I think those remarks should be withdrawn.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I was only quoting the hon. member, I don't mind if you delete the remarks from his speech, I can delete them from mine, Sir.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that a statement of that kind could lead to civil war.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is exactly what the member is saying.

Dr. HAYNES: But he said something different.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member will be judged not by posterity but by his colleagues. He is already being judged by them and in due course he will be judged by the electorate.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order and asked that certain things be withdrawn and I have heard no withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you are attempting to challenge the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: I was not aware that you had ruled one way or another.

Mr. SPEAKER: As time goes by you will learn.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member should punish his colleagues because his colleagues consciously sit down and let him put himself in these things.

Sir, at the time the remark was made by the hon. member for St. James I was not in the House. On my return to the House I was told of the remark by various people and I said then, and I see no reason to change my opinion, that the remark was not one which conformed with -- if you can say so, the part of the Constitution which has been cited -- but I regarded it as a slip provoked over a long period of conscious knowledge of what has been practiced against members of the Barbados Labour Party.

4.20 p.m.

I felt that the hon. member -- when one considered that other hon. members had made more specific statements and acted on them in the past -- could have offered a suitable apology if he wanted and easily asked members of the House and the public to overlook his slip. And I am still of that opinion. In the fullness of time, as I said, an amendment will be moved, but there is just a final sentiment which I would offer to the House about this matter. It is very tempting when you are in Opposition to catch at slips and push them for all they are worth, and I do not blame the Opposition for this; if you cannot oppose active policy you must catch at straws. But I will counsel all concerned -- and my remarks are not addressed to members of the Opposition but to the public -- I will counsel all concerned against stances that can draw accusations of double standards. The public over a period of years came almost to shrugging off the policy of favouritism that was practised by the Democratic Labour Party. Eventually the public threw the Democratic Labour Party out, notwithstanding the favouritism. But the fact is that for a long time it was well known and accepted that jobs were shared out on a political basis by the Democratic Labour Party. I therefore ask of those who have launched themselves on the attack against the hon. member for St. James why their voices were so silent when Cameron Tudor got up in the House and spoke of the selection of jobs for the School Meals Service; when Joy Edwards got up and spoke about the necessity for having a passport to get a job. I call on all those persons, whether in the pulpit or on political platforms or in the Press to say why they did not stand up and be counted in the days when a positive policy of political discrimination was being practised. Some say it is a tribute to open government that you can attack the Government without fear of the

sort of retaliation you would have incurred in days gone by. I don't know what the reason is but I want the public to learn to question themselves as well as their leaders; to look into their own eyes and cast out the beam therefrom before attempting to take out the mote from others. For all those years the Dems have been getting jobs and the Labourites were left out in the cold and nobody raised one hundredth of the uproar that was raised when the hon. member for St. James allowed himself one very small slip in the House of Assembly, and the uproar has continued even after — unlike the others — he came to the House and apologised for the slip and withdrew the words. I cannot understand this. Where were these people in the days when the whip was laid on our backs? And the whip was not even cracked in this case; the existence of the whip was merely alluded to by the hon. member. Where were these critics, these persons who now seek to savage the hon. member for St. James? Why did they not savage Cameron Tudor who with the School Meals programme instituted an entirely new system of appointing casual workers, putting it into the hands of Ministers and not of public officers? I really can't understand it. I cannot call it hypocrisy; we are not allowed to use that word in here; but I venture to say that if that word was used outside no court in this Island could find other than fair comment.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Resolution in this present form.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, ever so often in politics, whether Barbadian politics or international politics, those concerned with politics are wont to make certain slips as the Prime Minister has so described it. Put another way, people are sometimes apt to make unfortunate statements which opponents will hold on to and rise with a view to gaining some kind of support for their position. If we look at the present situation in Southern Africa, I believe the condition of Rhodesia today is the result of Harold Wilson's saying in 1965 that the British Government would not use force in Rhodesia. Having said that, Ian Smith was assured that he could do as he liked with the blacks in Rhodesia without fear of reprisals immediately.

In Barbadian politics we have heard people here at one stage supporting Independence for Barbados as part of a Federal structure suddenly cut adrift from that position when they noted the mood of the crowd. We have heard people saying that one morning we might wake up and find that we no longer have a country; or that they long to see the day when there will not be a cane blade in this Island. Or more recently, in 1974, members of the general public, the press, judges, and priests were abused from this very floor of this House during the Constitutional debate; vilified and held up to ridicule and contempt.

People and politicians over the years, as I have said, have made unfortunate statements. The hon. member for St. Michael South who is not in his place today, as the then Vice Chairman of the Democratic Labour Party said when we were in Opposition that it might be necessary to depressurize and remove us. And what amazes me about today's debate is that none of those persons to whom I have alluded as having made unfortunate statements have had the courage at any time subsequent to making those statements to apologise for them. The present Minister of Housing, shortly after he made that speech — a couple of weeks later — came into this House of Assembly and apologised in a manner that displayed his full contrition for what he had said.

Now, Sir, I want to examine the premise of this Resolution to show that it is engendered by a desire for sensationalism.
4.30 p.m.

The last part of it says: "Be it further resolved that this House dissociate itself from the statements of the hon. member for the Constituency for St. James made in this Honourable House as aforesaid and deplore his conduct on that occasion." All of that. The record of the proceedings of this House, Mr. Speaker, will show that when the statement complained of was made, the Minister said "as far as he was concerned." That was his view — as far as he was concerned. He went on to say: "I know that the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister and Attorney General do not agree with me", and yet I hear members on the other side, in spite of the fact that the maker of the statement dissociated other members of the Cabinet from his remarks, yet for short term political gain, the members of the Opposition seem to ignore that and want the same people who were dissociated by the hon. member to get up in here and make statements.

The member for St. Michael South West, when he spoke, said that no statement had come from the Leader of the Government. What do you want a statement for when the Minister said that he was exempting him from his views. In other words he knew when he said "as far as I am concerned" he was exempting the Prime Minister. He said they did not agree with him and you want him to make a statement. He made a statement. You must mark, read and inwardly digest.

You know, Sir, nobody yet has referred to what provoked the Hon. Minister into making the statement at the time. Even today, and at the time of the statement, and for the last "umpteen" months, members of the Opposition have been accusing this Government of practising victimisation in areas of jobs, giving people jobs, firing them and things like that, Sir; and yet it was Mr. Cameron Tudor the architect — so they say — of the campaign for the hon. member for St. Michael South West — a very top ranking Dem — who in the speech that must have provoked the Hon. Minister into making the

statement — it was Mr. Cameron Tudor as he now is, who addressed the crowd; and what was he accusing the Government of? Of giving members of the Democratic Labour Party jobs to the exclusion of members of the Barbados Labour Party. Cameron Tudor himself was saying, if you like Sir, that this Party was victimising its own supporters. He said that he wanted to speak to members of the Barbados Labour Party and show them how we were treating them. Now if we have been practising a policy of victimisation, surely Mr. Cameron Tudor would have had no say that night. Surely Mr. Cameron Tudor would have been on a wicket to bat and show that we had been only looking after our people and not members of the Dems; but that was not it. It was Mr. Cameron Tudor who is, perhaps, the most dangerously divisive force in this country now. I am making very strong statements in relation to him; because the slur, the innuendo, the nastiness inherent in that article, inherent in the last two that he wrote in the "Nation" dealing with the Cabinet reshuffle, make him in my view the most actually — not potentially — dangerous and divisive force in this country today.

I have no apologies to make for so designating Cameron Tudor; and I had an experience with him during the by-election which confirms my view. Now, Sir, in the light of the historical facts over the last two years which prompted Cameron Tudor to say that we were not looking after our people, but giving Dems jobs, how could you feel as a Minister of Government when you get in here and hear members of the Opposition accusing you of victimisation? That is when one of their biggest leaders who is not saying the same thing. That is where the hypocrisy in this whole thing originates.

But today we had a little double thing and double talk from the mover of the Resolution. Now this is what he said, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister had made the statement at a public meeting it would have been a different thing; but to have made it in the House was the most deplorable aspect of it. Now, Sir, the statement, *per se*, in its nature is either worthy of condemnation or it is not. Do not tell me that you can draw a distinction as to what somebody says in here and what he says on a public platform, unless you are giving licence to those who feel that they can get on a public platform and say anything. It is either an innately bad statement and it should not be made anywhere or it is a statement that you could pass; and I know that members of the Opposition know in their own hearts that even though the Minister may have made that statement in here, they know that he at the time did not believe and mean in its intensity what was said in here. You know that. They know that. They know that he is a different kind of person. He could not have meant it.

Now, all of a sudden, it is a good political whipping horse; and we find a Resolution moved on all kinds of

constitutional rights, and this, that and the other; and the Democratic Labour Party is holding itself up as holier than thou. They would not have said it. They did it. It used to be said that they had a number of good lawyers in the Barbados Labour Party. Any of us ever had an opportunity to give advice to any organisation in Barbados connected with the Barbados Labour Party? Any statutory board? No. None of the good lawyers that they talk about in the Barbados Labour Party ever got the chance to represent any Board. Any of us were anything? Any of us used to appear on television?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member may be misleading the House inadvertently.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just point out what the hon. member is doing.

Mr. TAITT: He is saying that none of the good lawyers of his party ever worked for the Government when the Democratic Labour Party was in power. The one that I recall right now, Sir, is Peter Williams who was an adviser for the B.M.C.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Peter Williams is a member of the Barbados Labour Party. He is thinking of Hudson Williams who was a big Dem, his father. Do not confuse the kiddy with the goat.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I was saying, when we were in Opposition we were excluded from any of the activities run by the Government. Think of the C.P.A., Mr. Speaker, something quite dear to your heart. Members of the Opposition themselves, including Mr. Eyre Hoppin, and Mr. Russel Lowe — when we went on the boat trip last year when there was a conference. To show how things have changed, they welcomed the fact that they were invited to the C.P.A. functions; but we were never invited when we were in Opposition.

Now, I believe, Sir, that if you are serious, as the mover of a Resolution, you must come in here — when you make all these fancy statements about the Constitution and its protection of fundamental rights, and saying that the statement has provoked dissatisfaction among sections of the population and so on — all this high flown language in this Resolution must be written with clean hands, Sir. If they have something to hide do not bring this. Now I have an example at the Housing Authority for it. You have never heard me in this kind of situation in here yet. I do not get into this; but when I see people adopting double standards, the public and the country must know.

4.40 p.m.

And I let them pass it by, but today, remembering that the member for St. Michael North Central had written this, and it is now only appearing

in the files, and Sir, I have to deal with his own words, Sir, I want to make this photostat copy a document of the House, but first I would like the member for St. Michael North Central to see his own writing:

" Ministry of Communications and Works,
P.O. Box 25,
St. Michael,
Barbados.

The Chairman
National Housing Corporation.
Sir,

Ms. Anita Belle who resides at St. Barnabas St. Michael North Central, is seeking employment. She attended Lynch's Secondary School.

It would be appreciated if she is offered employment even if temporary.

Her parents and household are *ardent supporters*.....(it is underlined, Sir, *ardent supporters underlined*).....
of the Democratic Labour Party.

Yours faithfully
(sgd.) R. B. Caddle."

Ardent supporters of the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Mr. GREAVES: In reply to the letter you just read is there anything to suggest that somebody in the Barbados Labour Party should not eat in that letter.

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

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if Joan Belle, not Anita.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Alright, let us say the Dems should eat all.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is this, Sir, that if John Belle, or Mike Turner, or Anita had applied for a job at the same time and he was a BLP, he could not get it, so what that letter was saying is that the preference must be given to Anita.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time now being 4.45 p.m. it brings us to the end of Private Members' Business for today. We now revert to Government's Business.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Government Business is now resumed.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I will continue about the Democratic Labour Party's tenure of office in relation to industrial development by charging quite specifically, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they inadequately prepared this country for what I regard as phase II of our industrial development effort. What do I mean by that? We in this country have reached the stage where we are moving from simple assembly operations where hands, even unskilled hands were needed to the point where we in this country are now manufacturing items in Barbados.

They are what are known as prisms which are being produced in Barbados today, made in Barbados, and manufactured in Barbados. That is what is written on these prisms and they are being exported to Europe.

If the the DLP had any faith in what they were doing in relation to industrial development, or if they were not negligent, they would have foreseen that we would have in the normal course of things reached this point and this Government would not be left in the state in which we have found ourselves having literally to telescope time, by trying to train on a crash basis dozens of our young people in a whole region of technical skills, so that present efforts would not be frustrated, and all that arose out of the fact that the Democratic Labour Party never planned any industrial development in Barbados and to that extent they could not foresee what would have arisen in Barbados in the normal course of things.

The very Companies like Intel and Micro Data are at the point now where they need persons with a whole range of technical skills, in particular, people with digital arithmetic in computer logics, and if, as the last speaker had said, they were so aware of what had happened, they would have anticipated this development and would have already had the young people prepared to do these things, but I was left with the responsibility of having to set up a task force to survey the problems, identify the present resources and get ahead with the

job working in conjunction with the Ministry of Education, the Community College and the Polytechnic to put these young people on a crash Training Programme.

Why is it that the last speaker, the Hon. member for St. Michael South West did not claim any bouquets for the task force. I want, Sir, to turn to the whole question of small business men in this country. The lame, irresponsible and cavalier manner, the charge that small businesses in this country are closing down, and small businessmen are reluctant and afraid to speak and that the BLP is not a party for small businessmen and all the rest, I want to make the point, Sir, that we are in danger of having that view crystallised in the part of the political mythology of this country that the BLP is not a party for the small businessman in this country. It is one of the propaganda successes of the DLP.

I would like to know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which party was responsible for the export guarantee scheme which is of considerable significance and assistance for small businessmen. I would like to know which party took steps to bring an industrial engineer here to help small businesses with design and layout. I would like to know which party was responsible for negotiating the \$600,000 loan from CIDA which we are now receiving for assistance to small businessmen through BIMAP. I would like to know which party has been responsible for the creation of the Export Promotion Agency in Barbados which is of great assistance to businessmen small and large in identifying markets overseas.

All of that is already part of the record of this administration and I want to give the lie to any suggestion that the BLP is other than the Party in helping small people in this country. We were born as a party looking after the small man in this country. We have had responsibility of national leadership in this country and to that extent we have had to be a party for all the people, paying attention to the interests of the small as well as the big, the strong as well as the weak, and making sure that this country progresses as a socially integrated and united country, not for one group and not for the other, for all, and I deeply deplore any attempt and I would certainly resist it as long as I remain in public life, I would continue to resist the suggestion that the BLP does not care about the small businessman and the small man in this country.

4.50 p.m.

I deeply deplore any attempt and I certainly would be resisting it for as long as I remain in public life, that the Barbados Labour Party does not care about the small businessman and the small man in this country. This party has been born as a party committed to the interest of the small man. It has continued in that tradition and will I believe continue in this tradition. Worst still when he attempted to suggest that a lot of prominence has been given to people like K. R. Hunte in the supplement that came out. I believe that it is not without significance that his name was pounced upon. I want to make the position clear. The supplement was no attempt by the Industrial Development Corporation to write any detailed history of industrial development. J. E. R. Associates were given the job to write the supplement. They wrote a piece on me and I did not even see it before it went to press. It had several errors in it which I did not even have the opportunity of correcting. It was not a thing written by me or by any member of the Industrial Development Corporation. J. E. R. Associates, Ricardo Blackman and Company were the ones that produced the supplement. If it is that the last people were left out and no mention was made of his contribution, nobody on this side, nobody at the Industrial Development Corporation is to be blamed for that.

But what I perceived when the last speaker dwelt on the name of K.R. Hunte was that he was trying indirectly to support those in this country who have been introducing race and colour once again in national politics, and that is part of his irresponsibility. That is one of the most dangerous crimes in the public life of this country at the moment, that a few irresponsible people are trying to reintroduce colour into the national and political discussions. As far as I am concerned, Sir, those who try directly or indirectly to introduce race into the discussion on national issues are rendering a great disservice to this country and may just be described as public enemies. If the last speaker wants to put himself into that category, that is his business, but I think that those of us who are responsible and who have the total national interest at heart must resist any attempt to introduce race into discussions on national issues.

Quite unfairly and inaccurately he says that I have taken credit for the Barbados Labour Party administration for the Handicraft Development Plan. I went out of my way to describe it as a powerful document. I said I came to office and found the Handicraft Development Plan in existence. I went out of my way to say that from the floor of this House, I have said it on CBC-TV and elsewhere. He knows that, has complimented me in the past for acknowledging it and gets on the floor of this

House today and says I am taking credit for the Handicraft Development Plan. How do you describe, how do you categorise an hon. gentleman? Do you withdraw the word "honourable" for "gentleman"? How do you do it, or do you withdraw both, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Both Anton Norris and Roy Clarke are part of the history of industrial development in this country, and considerable wordage was devoted to the contribution of both of them in the supplement. I do not know how he can justly claim that no recognition has been given to their contribution. The supplement is still fresh in our minds and it is open to all hon. members to go and re-read it or read it afresh if they have not seen it.

Coming back to the Barbados Labour Party's contribution to the small man, even in recent times, I want to refer to the efforts of the Barbados Development Bank. It is a fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that prior to 1976 there were small men in this country, joiners, fishermen, shoemakers who could not get a loan from the Barbados Development Bank. It is now true that dozens of these persons have been given assistance with this Barbados Labour Party taking office. Fishermen could not get their boats insured until we came up with the State Insurance Corporation, and they have devised a new insurance plan whereby fishermen can have their boats insured. All of this is part of the effort of the Barbados Labour Party towards assisting small businesses in this country.

At page 16 of the IDC-Development Plan a new deal plan has been set out for the small man. I have taken it on myself to work out a formula whereby small businesses already heavily subsidised will get a further reduction in rent of 25%. It was not easy because if you have already borrowed money at a certain interest rate that is supposed to be amortised over a certain given period and you have already predicated your rent structure on those premises, how are you going to change this in mid-stream except by some ingenuity? I have done it. Is my friend, the last speaker, wanting to take credit for that too? They were 15 years in office; why did they not do all these things? I did not think I would have come here today having to make a speech in defence of the Barbados Labour Party in the area of industrial development; but when we were subjected to that lawless and irresponsible speech, we on this side had no alternative but to get up and answer, because the last honourable speaker has a certain amount of regard by some people in the community, and it is very important that what he says be carefully researched, should be accurate and reasonable, and when we get a speaker like that who is abusing the standing that he has, you have to

deal with him very severely indeed, and that is the reason why I thought it necessary to set the records straight.

The Industrial Development Corporation has done better than it has ever done in its history. We created 1,544 jobs last year and 980 the year before both in the years of the Barbados Labour Party, and previous to that there were 700, 600 and 800. I believe that before 1981 it will be 2,000, and it is not coming about as a result of our wishing it to happen. It is coming about as a result of the visionary leadership and energy given to industrial development in the last two years.

5.00 p.m.

I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that no attempt has been made to rewrite or reverse history by the Barbados Labour Party since coming into office. There has been no attempt to deny the contribution of the Democratic Labour Party with its few strengths and major weaknesses. What we are involved in is simply an attempt to use the levers of power to ensure that our industrial development thrust is carried forward with greater intelligence and energy to the benefit of all Barbadians. I dearly hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the speech made by the last hon. member will soon be forgotten and that it will never be repeated.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for St. Michael South West today made a very important contribution to this debate, and indeed I am a little concerned that it should have evoked such an attack by the hon. member for Christ Church East. More in fact, the hon. member for St. Michael South West was saying that a certain document appeared and when the document was scrutinized it would appear that the large number of people who had made significant contributions had been omitted from that document. Now I understand that you did not set out to publish a full history of the Industrial Development Corporation, but at the same time I think his criticism has some legitimacy.

We should remember that people who make major contributions in any field like to feel that they are appreciated by succeeding governments, and more care should be exercised in that regard, otherwise it builds up a lot of frustration among those who have contributed — and I do not include frustrated politicians. If you wish to exclude all the politicians, I have no complaint in that regard; but there are many other people who make contributions in every sector of the life of Barbados, and when publications of this kind are put out it is important to scrutinize them carefully. I was a little surprised to

hear the hon. member for Christ Church East confess that he had handed this out to some firm or other and did not have the chance to look at it before it was published. I would suggest to him that he look at such things in the future.

This brings to mind another publication — one relating to the Barbados Development Bank — in June or July this year when all the photographs of persons receiving loans were photographs of people who had received loans under the Democratic Labour Party; but the way the public relations job came across it would appear that these loans were made for small businessmen under the BLP regime. And many Barbadians remain very upset over the publication last Independence Day which looked as though it was the first Independence Day for Barbados. If the contribution of the hon. member for St. Michael South West has had a major effect on this hon. House, I hope it will be in the recognition that publications of this kind should be scrutinized very carefully, particularly when the cost is being underwritten by public organisations, because the charge was about the representation of the facts as he knew them and that such representation could be considered fraudulent if it was published with the knowledge of those responsible for these agencies; but the charge of fraud cannot stand if the hon. member knew nothing about it; and perhaps the firm to which he gave it omitted the names of certain persons because they did not want to run the risk of not getting more work. I am not suggesting that there was any intellectual fraud associated with the publication; I do not think the hon. member for St. Michael South West intended that.

But when all is said and done, there is no doubt that the Democratic Labour Party has been responsible to a large extent for the industrialisation of this society and has created jobs for thousands of people; and they have done this over the years under the most bitter attack from the Barbados Labour Party. I wonder if hon. members remember such terms as slave labour in *Gazettes*. I wonder if they remember also that after the Barbados Labour Party came into power it was no longer a question of slave labour but a question of no increase, and then a five percent increase; and indeed these guidelines stopped a lot of people from getting legitimate increases in their wages in the industrial sector, or resulted in the postponement of these increases; and there is no doubt in my mind that over the past two years there has been a substantial reduction in the standard of living of people employed on the industrial estates in this country. We have heard serious criticism of the fiscal incentives legislation in this country and I have not heard of any changes. We have heard of tax rights for foreigners

to come in in order to exploit the people of this country; we have heard that over the years. Now we hear of cushy environments being created to attract capital. I think if I were to make any concession to these irresponsible criticisms of the past there was some doubt as to the net contribution to the growth of the economy which the type of industrialization that we had over the years made in the long run to the development of the society; and I hope that as we plan for the 90s that when these plans come out we will see a clear statement as to the contribution industrialization is making in terms of real growth, because there is a sector of economic thinking which would regard the whole industrial exercise that has taken place in Barbados over the past twenty one years as a useful stop-gap operation, but that in the long term a kind of agro-industrial programme linked to the tourist industry and to effective export policies with proper market evaluations might be a much more useful plan for the economic development of Barbados. And this is because of the raw material situation. I rather suspect that as the cost of raw materials rise, as the cost of fuel has risen, the contribution of the type of industrialization we are pursuing now might well not give the same returns as ten years ago. However, this is a matter for those who have responsibility in this area, and I would certainly suggest that instead of trying to find out who did what we should remember that the Democratic Labour Party provided employment for thousands of people, and if you continue the same kind of stop-gap measures you will continue to provide further employment. But when one quotes the thousands of jobs generated in the past year or two one must also consider those who have lost work.

5.10 p.m.

You must consider those on a three or four day week; the factories that have closed down. These things have to be balanced one against the other. However, I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this should be an occasion for some seriousness; and indeed I feel that it is important that Barbados Industrial Development Programme should probably move into areas where there will be less and less competition in the future. I think that it requires an examination of what you have available to you in terms of your raw materials; and if I may put it that way, it would seem to me that we have people who are basically well educated and capable of being trained in particular areas, highly skilled areas, because they have the basic education, and therefore the ability to transfer from one area of knowledge to another area is much easier. The training situation becomes a lot easier, and we will find it, and continue to find it difficult to compete with areas which can produce masses of people with no basic education, and doing jobs of a routine nature, when in point of fact there might be more satisfaction and greater productivity at lower wage levels if people are doing work that more relates to a lower level of education and a lower level of understanding.

We have the hordes of Asia and elsewhere to compete with in that regard. In Barbados we have highly educated people who are capable of getting into the skilled type of industrialisation, for example, things like watch making, precision tools and so on. I have a funny feeling that this is the direction in which Barbados' industry should be moving in the future; and when you start thinking in terms of planning for the 1990s you should recognise that what took place in the last 15 years has been a tremendous boom to thousands of Barbadians who have had jobs that they could call their own for the first time; and it is as a spin off from this kind of exercise that there must be the next stage of development.

I am aware that the member for Christ Church East mentioned this in passing as Phase 2. Very well. We accept this; but you must also accept that it is now your responsibility to move into that phase as rapidly as possible; and that is fundamentally important because I think that by the 1990s, with the type of industrialisation that we have in Barbados you will be getting less and less returns. I want to repeat that point, that it is important that the Government sets about making an evaluation of precisely what is happening in the industrial sector in terms of its overall contribution to the economy. I know that it is employing people; but you may be employing people as a long term thing; and it may be a total loss in economic development. I am not saying that that is the case, but I think that some kind of study is very necessary; and I think that unless you begin to understand what industrialisation should mean to a country, until you can identify clearly what steps you must take when you bring a given item into this country to be converted into another one, that you should clearly understand what is staying in Barbados and what contribution it is making to Barbados' development.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I was trying to give the benefit of what little knowledge I have acquired in terms of industrialisation in relation to developing territories to the member for Christ Church East and his Minister, and hopefully to those who would have joined in listening to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, try, try, try again. You may succeed.

Dr. HAYNES: I know that it is difficult, Sir, as you suggest from your remarks; nevertheless, I will continue trying. I was speaking of the need to have another look at the whole question of industrialisation in Barbados and that it is necessary in relation to the overall economy to make sure that in whatever programmes we design for the future they should give a greater and greater yield;

because it is not necessarily true that if you continue along the same lines of industrialisation that you will get more and more returns for Barbados as an economic unit in the future; and it may be necessary to move to a slightly different type of industrialisation which moves away from the kind of competition which you will get from countries which have masses of people prepared to work long hours for small wages and produce products that can under-sell you in the world markets; and you get into a situation where you are competing in a more sophisticated market with higher yields to Barbados and better wages for Barbadians, and making use of the skills available, thereby generating better job satisfaction for those involved in industry and at the same time increasing productivity.

Therefore, I think that this debate so far certainly would have drawn the attention of this Honourable House to the need for restraint on the part of the Government when it is making publications, to make sure that they give proper acknowledgement — exclude the politicians if you like — but give proper acknowledgement to the other Barbadian citizens who have contributed; and that when the IDC in the future puts out a publication, that they take the trouble to look at it before it is published.

On the question of small businessmen, one appreciates that the Government has made an effort to help small businessmen; but I think that the time has come when it is not a question of soft loans, when it is not a question of providing export facilities, when it is not merely a question of helping them with markets. The time has come when serious consideration will have to be given towards a capital input in the individual businesses of the small businessmen; because it is an incontestable fact, Mr. Speaker, that although all of these facilities might exist, small businessmen find it more and more difficult to survive.

Now, how does one face this problem? I am firmly committed to the belief that the society must promote an entrepreneurial class, and that class should come from among all sectors of the community and particularly reflect in a proportionate way the various groups within the society. You can get all the soft loans in the world. You can have all the export promotion facilities that you like, you can have all the markets. You can even make sure that they get paid — and by the way there are many people who are still owed money, and there are many people who are still owed money from Jamaica. I think that the Government should seriously consider this class of entrepreneurs, if these small businessmen are going to survive.

5.20 p.m.

And if it is a question of capital depletion that has taken place over the years, depletion in a situation where capital was always limited among the small businessmen in this

country that the Government might have to take a further step of capital injection and not try to remove certain businesses from the Directorship of certain Companies, but to give them succour and encouragement and appropriate financial control and other factors that may be necessary for the development of the particular unit. Each one that fails reflects on each and everyone of us.

Everytime a small business goes under always remember that every single one of us suffers a little and we suffer a little because this is a new experience among people who not so long ago were slaves. It is a very important experience. If you compare West Indians as a whole or other groups, or even sub-groups within Barbados, you will find it is Barbadians who usually cannot cope with the demands of business. First the capital, second the management experience and most importantly is business expansion.

The question of control, financial and otherwise within that business arises, because cost control for example is a major problem. I may be launching into the fields of certain people but this is the situation as I perceive it in Barbados and therefore Government must look very urgently to the question as to whether or not, for the survival of this class that it would not be necessary to do more than just burden them with more and more loans because eventually these loans worsen the situation, it prevents any situation whereby they can be capital in a particular Company or group of smaller companies and therefore it is necessary to look at the whole question of capital injection and not be satisfied because this Government seems to me to be completely satisfied once they can say, and that as long as they can say that a number of people got loans from the Barbados Development Bank.

This is not good enough. We need to fight for the survival of this class of people. If they go under, and there is every chance that they will go under, and they will be swallowed up by people who have made no contribution to the industrial effort of this country over the past 10 years and now for the first time are looking for lateral extension of their business because they consider that the people with the kind of vertical development they have been having would not yield sufficient profits in the future. You will find more and more of them being swallowed up. Now is the time for intervention and I speak most advisably.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to intervene at this stage to make my contribution. We are discussing a very important area of national development. The question of industrial programme which the Government is endeavouring to pursue by the borrowing of \$3.44 million U.S. from the Caribbean Development Bank, this money has to arise with the finance of the

industrial development programme of the Government. Now Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said today about the writing and re-writing of history. You will recall that before we went out to lunch that the member for St. Michael South West referred to this particular matter, and I understood the concept which he expressed on it and this was verified further.

When I listened to the hon. member for Christ Church East I believe at a stage that he lost almost complete control of his senses when he indicated that the Democratic Labour Party never planned any industrial development in Barbados and that is why we are now in the position we are now in. These are the exact words of the member for Christ Church East.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that no right thinking person would want to spend an amount of time in this debate recounting history as it were. The two colleagues from this side who have spoken, the member for St. Michael South Central and the member for St. Michael South West, have indicated very clearly the contribution which has been made over the past 15 years or so by the former Government for the industrial development of this country, but I do not want to get into this because I believe that this has been well documented.

Mr. SPEAKER: It will be well to know that the Standing Orders are totally against repeating your argument or the tedious repetition of the argument of others.

Mr. GREAVES: And that is why I said Mr. Speaker, I would not be involved in that. Now when we look at the purpose of this Resolution, I want, Mr. Speaker, to refer, and since reference has been made to the Development Plan which has been put out by the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation, on page 11 it says that "Barbados, like other developing countries, is crying out for entrepreneurs. That an individual or group takes the risks that are necessary to put together and operate a new business enterprise for profit." I think we have to examine this statement, examine the purpose for which we are being asked to approve this money here today in the context of what in my view is happening in industry and generally speaking in a number of industrial parks in this country.

It seems that the Government is very taken up in this mad rush for industrialisation, this mad rush for attracting entrepreneurs of whatever style, whatever fashion, and whatever objective to the shores of this country and I believe that some words of caution have got to be issued here, particularly in view of experiences which are developing relative to the way in which a number of these industrialists seem to be regarding the Barbadian work force and treating them.

Within the last three or four weeks, Mr. Speaker, the Barbados Workers' Union which represent workers in industrial estates have been having a lot of confrontations, small in some instances, and major in others. This type of industrialist seems to be attracted to these shores of ours. That is why I think it is important that we recognise in our mad rush for industrialisation that they are certain guidelines and standards which are laid down and that proper assessment must be established to ensure that these guidelines which are laid down are followed and pursued otherwise we are going to run into a whole set of problems and difficulties and you know that Barbados has been able to sell itself and promote our industrial programmes on the basis of very stable labour relations which exist in this country.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that if the kind of attitude we have been seeing emanating from employers in this country continues, then I am saying that the state of relations which have been witnessed in this country cannot be maintained and I would hope that the Chairman of the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation and the member for Christ Church East and the Deputy Prime Minister, who is also Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry would recognise this and re-emphasise the fact that we cannot have industrialists who are going to come to Barbados and would want to drag, as it were, the Barbadian workers on the ground and certainly, the Barbados Workers Union would not stand for that.

5.30 p.m.

Certainly the Barbados Workers' Union would not stand for that. As far as the industrial development programme is concerned, Mr. Speaker, one has got to examine what has been happening in this country, and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central who has just sat down made a very valid point, that what we have to look at very clearly is that we have got to establish some means of helping people to identify the real impact of our industrialisation programme to see what we are gaining out of all this. When one takes into consideration, for example, that a factory like Elite Shirt Factory which has been operating in this country for a number of years, certainly I believe over twenty years, has recently had to close its doors thereby making almost 80 workers redundant, one has got to wonder what indeed is happening. One would have thought that this was an established factory, and if they are going to be reaching a point where they cannot continue the operations, I think it raises some very serious questions, Mr. Speaker, about the whole direction in which our industrial programme is taking, and there is need for us to look very closely at these matters to examine where the problems lie and if indeed and in truth and in fact there are problems.

In examining the question of the future of industrialisation in this country and what we are doing

about ensuring expansion of the industrial programme, I recall that there has been a lot of play before lunch about the new direction, according to the Chairman of the IDC, which this Government is embarking on relative to attempts which are being made to woo Japanese businessmen to enter into partnership and investment in this country. I recall and you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for St. Michael South West who was the former Minister of Trade and Industry in this country indicated there was nothing new in this and that attempts were made, I believe, as early as 1973 to encourage Japanese businessmen to come into this country to invest in our industrialisation programme. During the luncheon break I had the good fortune to meet up in the Public Buildings yard the former Chairman of the Industrial Development Corporation, the former Senator Sam Ashby, and I asked him if he recalled any attempts which were made by the IDC under his Chairmanship to Japanese businessmen, and he said categorically that in 1973 the former Minister of Trade and himself had a meeting in New York with Japanese businessmen for the express purpose of getting them down to Barbados to invest in the industrialisation programme and develop the programme which was being pursued in this country; so that to say it was only within the last year or two that the Barbados Government sought to interest Japanese concerns in Barbados is obviously in my view an attempt to re-write history. But we will move on.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope you will move on to get the Japanese businessmen here.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, you know it is not my duty to get the businessmen here.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk of industrialisation, the money which the Government is seeking to vote here this evening relates to the construction of factories. The Hon. Minister of Trade and Industry made an interesting observation. I think that I would want to support him on this particular point, that is, that in the construction of factories, one has got to be very careful that we do not construct the kind of factories which would lead to what he described as a sweatshop situation. We have to be careful about our designs and we have to ensure that the conditions under which people are asked to work would take into account proper lighting, the question of heat and other facilities which are necessary for a good and comfortable working environment, and in this particular regard I would want to impress upon the Minister that some very careful attention should be given to the designs of the factories, of having proper facilities such as rest room facilities, lunch room facilities, and the kind of working environment which would encourage people to feel more comfortable in that particular situation.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that in the question of constructing factories and establishing industrial parks in

this country, one has to look at another factor which I do not think has been looked at yet, and it has to do with the question of the provision of shuttle type transportation service. One of the points which we have got to look at is the question of providing transportation for workers to the various industrial estates in this country. Let me explain what I mean. We have, Mr. Speaker, a big industrial park at Grazettes in St. Michael which draws its work force from various parts of Barbados, northern, southern and central areas, but you will recognise that there is no consistent arrangement, no proper bus service which operates between the factory in Grazettes and, let us say, a central point whether it is in Bridgetown or whether it is on the outskirts of Bridgetown and what-have-you.

5.40 p.m.

What I would therefore like to suggest is that a shuttle service could be established from, say, Black Rock Super Centre to take up those people coming from the northern parts of the island; another could operate from the Low Bus Stand and one from Fairchild Street to take people from other parts of the Island and shuttle them over to Grazettes. The same thing would go for the Wildey area, a big area which I think draws its workers from various parts of the island. The same kind of policy could be pursued because when we are talking in terms of providing jobs and having workers employed we will have to ensure that we establish the wherewithal to ensure that they are able to get to work on time. I am advised by the hon. member for St. Michael South West that in 1975 such a study was undertaken by the Ministry and a submission made by the IDC, and I think this is a matter which could be pursued.

The other point I want to raise relates to one of the very important aspects of industrialization. In any industrialization programme we are looking to provide jobs and technical skills and managerial skills to as many Barbadians as possible, and I am a little worried about what seems to be developing. I would like to get assurance from the Government that they are pursuing assiduously the principle that businesses which come into Barbados provide adequate training for Barbadians to eventually take over the management of their operations. I think this is a particularly important aspect of the industrialization programme that you have to emphasise and must not be taken in by devices being employed by management to keep out Barbadians from training in management. I am aware of this and I think that the hon. member for Christ Church East and the Minister should ensure that this particular aspect is not allowed to continue much longer.

Then we have the matter allied to all of this — factory legislation. It is my view that any industrialization programme must have as a very solid plank and foundation the regulating of working conditions, and

regulating the kind of equipment and chemicals which could be harmful to the worker. These kinds of things should be regulated. I believe a Committee was set up in 1973 to make recommendations for a revision of the Factories Act, but so far all we have been hearing is that the Factories Act is coming. I would like to think that when it does come it will be a modern piece of legislation which will establish certain fundamental guarantees for workers to ensure that they are protected as much as possible by legislation. So I would like to think that when we look on this matter of industrialization and its importance for our country it will be recognized that the question of industrialization was pursued without fear by the Democratic Labour Party and was a policy which has brought tremendous benefits to this country. And I think that the matter which is now being pursued by the present administration is more or less a continuation of that policy which the Democratic Labour Party pursued, and is contrary to what the hon. member for Christ Church East said when he indicated that we never had any industrial plans for Barbados. I am sure that that particular point has been laid to rest. And one has to be very careful about these attempts of rewriting history. I recently read a book by one F. A. Hoyos which was so full of inaccuracies that I hope that the children of our schools will not be exposed to that kind of historical distortion.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Christ Church East has effectively exposed the content of the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South West and has saved me from having to clear up a number of matters which if left not dealt with would have given the impression to the public of Barbados that the content of the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South West was worthy of serious consideration. But there are a few other matters which I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members. In the course of listening to the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South West I was amazed at the bold-face inaccuracies which he attempted to put forward to this House, and I sent for the annual reports of the Barbados Development Board and I have in my possession reports from as long ago as 1969; and anyone who takes the time to read the reports from 1959 onwards would recognize very clearly that the Barbados Labour Party when it was in power in those days had a very clear and distinct policy in relation to industrial development, agricultural development and tourist development. In short from the beginning of the thrust instituted by this political party we saw very clearly that there was an integral connection between industrialization, agriculture and tourism in Barbados. Now, Sir, that is a policy which as the hon. member for St. Michael South Central pointed out today received endorsement by eminent economic opinion as being the best type policy to pursue in the context of countries such as Barbados and the Caribbean area. I would also like to point out that on this question of

attempting to rewrite history I have also got hold of a copy of the supplement in the Advocate newspaper — I was not here when it was published. But I ought to learn now that very little that the hon. member for St. Michael South West that he is embarking on his quest for political recognition — from now on we must learn and understand that what comes from his mouth in the future will be nothing but the pursuit of a deliberate campaign in his quest for political recognition to distort the truth on matters of that kind.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has stated that everything that comes from my mouth will be an attempt to distort the truth. I ask that the hon. member withdraw the remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: He never said everything that comes from your mouth in this House.

Mr. TAITT: But, Sir....

Mr. SPEAKER: He never said "in this House". I listened quite carefully. He never said "everything that comes from your mouth in this House."

Mr. TAITT: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, if he said everything....

Mr. SPEAKER: You never argue with the Chair. Please take your seat. If he had said "everything that comes from your mouth in this House", he would have had to withdraw immediately.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Let us get this clear, Sir. The hon. member got in here today and said that what was published was an attempt to rewrite history. Look at page 2 — I will make this document a document of the House — it sets out very clearly and is the only place in the article which attempts any kind of historical summary and it sets out from the first Chairman to the last Chairman prior to the present one — the hon. member for Christ Church East. It shows the picture of Sir John Saint, professor Sydney Dash, Mr. K. R. Hunte, Mr. Douglas Lynch and Mr. Sam Ashby, and the period of time that they occupied the position.
5.50 p.m.

The hon. member is obviously annoyed at the fact that it did not say that he held an office in New York. That is what has got under the skin of the hon. member — the fact that they did not mention that; but it never purported to set out in any place the people who held offices of the type that the hon. member held. It never purported to set out former Ministers of Trade or the present Minister of Trade, and they did not mention that. The articles in this paper did not deal with the political element. The article in this paper is a limited summary of the course of progress over the period of time of the last

21 years; and it deals with the views of people who are de facto in industry and it sets out the present Board members. It gives the names and the offices. It even had a picture of Mr. Lewis, President of the National Bank. Is the hon. member quarrelling about that? Is he saying that you are attempting to re-write history? It has an article on population. It has an article by Mr. Humphrey who held until very recently a very important job. It has an article on Mr. Browne who is the head of the Craft Industry. We have an article by Miss Bishop. It has pictures of Mr. Sealy, the Chief Accountant, and it has articles by Mr. Yearwood, the Chief Technical Officer.

There is the Chairman pointing and explaining the question of Stage 2 of the Development Plan. It has a letter from the Prime Minister. It has a picture of Mr. Chase, the General Manager. It has Mr. Tony Vanderpool as Divisional Head. It has Mr. Arthur Norris and Mr. Hyland, Mr. Roy Clarke and Mr. Allan Taylor and others, and Miss Felicia Trotman, I did not even know that she used to work there.

Mr. Chairman, the basic position is this: There is no attempt in this to get any political mileage as the Chairman, the hon. member for Christ Church East has very clearly pointed out — and I am very glad that he mentioned it — that this job was a special assignment which was given by IDC to JER Associates, a group of young Barbadians who hold themselves out as being Public Relations Consultants, and as being part of the small businessmen in Barbados who need help. About their political affiliations I care not; but I know what it is, and it is not on this side; but it does not make any difference to me, because we have always pursued a policy as long ago as 1965 in granting loans and dispensing work at IDC without favouring any person because of their political views, but giving all equal treatment and equal opportunity.

So my position, Mr. Speaker, is very clear and distinct that the suggestion that the IDC used "21 Years of Industry" to re-write history and ignore the efforts of the Democratic Labour Party is one that is without any foundation, and there is absolutely no evidence to support that contention. I will repeat that for the record. I want it in the record. It is purely a case of sour grapes. The hon. member has behaved like a little boy whose ego is so great that it must be fed every day; and the best way of feeding that ego is to see himself in the newspaper everyday.

Now, sir, we continue. A lot has been said about me and the Ministry, and about my not knowing what I am doing. The best judge of that, of course, is not the hon. member. The hon. member is not a manufacturer. He is not a distributor. He is neither a banker. He has absolutely no connection with any of the institutions dealing with industry in Barbados. I am not in a position

to judge the competence of the hon. member as a consultant. Previously, BIMAP had that opportunity and they weighed them in the scales and found them wanting; but the basic position is that the hon. member is a politician, and I would not expect the hon. member to get up in here and praise the work of a politician who is in opposition. Not today. That might have been before the hon. member had hatched the idea that he has one other aim in life now, and that is to pursue rigorously his quest for political power in this country.

As we continue, sir, we must face the speech of the hon. member in its correct context. This is nothing more than a common bit of political electioneering and political spite being exercised by the hon. member. Now, everybody who had the opportunity of looking at what has happened in the Ministry of Trade and Industry since I have been in there will recognise three distinctive things that have occurred. (1) We have been able to persuade the Ministry of Finance to devote a considerable amount more of resources to be channelled to the Ministry of Trade and Industry than the hon. member was able to persuade his Prime Minister and Minister of Finance.

As a matter of fact, on the records of this House, the hon. member himself got up before — before not after — and said in here that he was glad to see that we had been able to get additional posts created in the Ministry of Trade and Industry because he had tried, and successfully to persuade the Minister of Finance in his regime to get it done. We have created additional posts in the planning section. I have been able to get the Chief Economist upgraded, and what is of some significance is because of the fact that there was a shortage of applicants with the requisite qualifications and experience in Barbados, despite the fact that it was twice advertised, despite the fact that it was offered to every economist with the requisite qualifications in the Ministry of Finance and Planning, and they turned it down, we had one applicant from the university, and I was still able to get the Ministry of Finance and the Cabinet to agree to give special consideration to bringing the salary that was offered — despite Civil Service regulations — up to parity; and this is the subject matter of this Resolution today.
6.00 p.m.

The fundamental distinction between the Hon. member as Minister and myself as Minister is this. I am now the star, I am now forced to function through guidelines set out by me. The hon. member has Monday and Tuesday mornings to go down there and walk around peeping to see who is doing this and who is doing that. He is a technician, and he is limited as a technician, and he has carried that limitation into his office as a Minister. That is a fact, and we are learning now. As a technician he never forgot that he was once an employee of the Industrial Development Corporation in New York and from the time he assumed the new position he wanted to run the

Corporation as though he was still an employee and General Manager instead of only laying down guidelines and permitting the people who are appointed normally to carry out the job.

The basic position is also that we have been able to get in respect to export promotion, a whole new structure with its own staffing after our own ideas were very clearly set out. We cross-checked those ideas with the experiences of other Caribbean countries and in addition to that, we looked at the developments that had taken place in places like Singapore, Malaysia and South Korea, three of the fastest growing of the Third World countries and we saw very clearly that they had separated the industry from export promotion, but obviously, the fact that you separate them does not mean that you do not have some machinery for coordination and we created the National Advisory Council which has representatives of the Industrial Development Corporation, representatives of the workers, representatives of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and representatives of the BAS so that we were able to harmonise and settle industrial agricultural efforts in this direction so that I do not know how the Hon. member could honestly get up here and say that I do not know what is going on.

Let me tell the Hon. member something else that he does not know. We are now in our Ministry putting the finishing touches on the question of energy in Barbados, not for the next two or three years, but to the year 2,000 and we are clearly trying to identify in great detail and project the scale of industrial development that will take place in Barbados and trying to plan for the question of the type of energy that would be needed for that type of development.

We are even going further, the hon. member has never heard of this. We have commissioned studies about utilisation of our local raw materials like stone and clay because we felt that one of the great areas of neglect of the Democratic Labour Party Government was that it never used its political power to ensure that greater use was made of the clay in Barbados in the form of the clay box industries, and we are going further, and I am going to shock the hon. member.

We have an investigation going along now as to the utilisation of the limestone for the making of textiles in this country because North Korea has successfully discovered the technology to make textiles for clothing out of limestone. One of the greatest areas of defect in our garment industry is that we depend upon the import of textiles and all we are getting here is a little bit of design but basically we are making up other people's textiles.

If you read the Trinidad Guardian within the last three days you will see that an investigation is going on in

the garment industry in Trinidad. You will see the President of the garment industry is saying that the reason why Trinidad is not competitive is because of the fact that the market is so small in the Caribbean that they have to depend upon imported textiles and that they are countries who are competing with them in the stitching aspects, the design aspects, and the making up aspects of the garments, particularly in countries like Brazil and Korea have such large domestic populations that they can afford a market of the scale necessary for the synthetic fibre industry or that they produce cotton and things of that kind.

These kinds of sophisticated analyses of the problems of the garment industry the hon. member has never undertaken, at least if he undertook them he did not put them down on the files in the Ministry, because, like the hon. member for Christ Church East I never found anything on the files of the Ministry but maybe he used to operate somewhere else, not in the Ministry.

Let us go further, Sir, as the Chairman would be able to tell you that we have established within IDC a Planning Unit, and a Research Unit specifically to carry out in conjunction with the Export Promotion Agencies and the other Planning Agencies of Government, detailed investigations as to what type of industries we should attract in Barbados or encourage in Barbados and not to find ourselves in the position in which you expect the expectations of the young people in Barbados to put them in jobs that they did not have any long term future in those jobs, because the bottom of the market for the produce they are producing might be dropped because of projectionists in developing countries or because of their technological changes. We have studied the impact of the changes in technology, particularly the micro electronic industry, micro processors and things of that kind.

As the hon. member for Christ Church East will tell you that every Tuesday evening of every week we spend discussing this question of the electronic industry and try to keep ourselves up-to-date with the latest projections as to the use of the electronic industry and trying to adapt the type of electronics we produce in Barbados to suit the future Resolution because now the electronic industry in the United Kingdom is just a paper commission because it is felt that with the rise of silicone technology and micro processors that any country in the world which does not have access to that type of technology will be regarded as an underdeveloped country. And in the *Times Newspaper* two weeks ago we saw where the Department of Industry in the United Kingdom had commissioned a study as to the impact into the future of micro processors from industrial developments, and one of the first things we have done, that is, the hon. member for Christ Church East and myself, is to send for a copy so that we can keep ourselves up-to-date and abreast of things.

I do not have to walk about blowing my own trumpet because the manufacturers do that for me, others do that for me. Now, Sir, there has been a lot of talk in here and outside, a lot of distortion of the record of the Barbados Labour Party in relation to the small business man. Indeed, let me tell the hon. member this, everywhere in the world there is a definition of a small business man. There is a cut off point. In the Caribbean, in Trinidad, it is \$250,000 turn over. In Barbados my understanding of it was, and IDC's understanding of it was that it was \$250,000. Of late, I understand that some small business men in Barbados want to change the memorandum and articles of their associations to a different figure from that. Now we cannot get this. Sometimes a man is so successful that he graduates. 6.10 p.m.

Now there are some people who want to use associations not for the purpose of furthering the interest of the associations, but for the purpose of furthering their own interests. Now I want to make it positively clear that the Barbados Government, IDC and the other agencies have a definition of small businessman or small businesswoman, and I am not going to treat and deal with people who masquerade as small businessmen when in truth and in fact they are not small businessmen or small businesswomen. There has got to be a definition if one is to have clarity. Secondly, the agencies for lending of money to small businessmen is the Barbados Development Bank. Clear criteria have been set out and published. This Government was the Government that amended the law to permit the Barbados Development Bank to lend money by way of a bill of sale specifically to permit machinery to be bought by small businessmen by way of a loan without having to tie up their land, their insurance policy and all that which used to operate under the Democratic Labour Party regime. Under the DLP regime, to get a loan from the Barbados Development Bank, you had to mortgage your life insurance or your land; you could not use the machinery itself as collateral, because the laws were not amended to permit a company to give a bill of sale on any specific asset other than land. We changed that law and yet still one has to sit down in here and listen to a lot of politically inspired misinformation trotted out by the hon. member for St. Michael South West in his quest for political power in this country, and in his quest so desperate is he that he would distort the record of fact and of law in order to get that. We go further; with the help of the Central Bank.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member as he has been discussing for the last two minutes, obviously is insulting. He is suggesting that in his quest for political power the hon. member for St. Michael South West was throwing out misinformation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought he was going on to prove it.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: When the hon. member was in here insulting me before the Gallery and saying I did not know what I was doing, I took everything. Well I will show you what I am doing now. I am bringing facts to show and to expose you for what you are.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member would withdraw those remarks forthwith.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir, I withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: You do not say "Yes, Sir, I withdraw." You withdraw them immediately.

Mr. TAITT: I said I withdraw them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: When you say "Yes, Sir, I withdraw....."

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw the remarks, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I withdraw the remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your seat. And let me warn the hon. member for St. Michael South West. In taking your seat I overheard the remarks which you hurled at the Chair. I warn you; make it the last time. (*Asides*) You would not have heard them. I have to hear them. I hope this will be the last time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: As I was saying, Sir. The hon. member for Christ Church East mentioned the effort that was made in conjunction with the Central Bank for export credit and the insurance guarantee scheme. Let us go further, and this is something else that the people of this country must recognise. The Export Agency cannot fulfil an order for a manufacturer. That is not the function of the Export Agency. The Export Agency has to identify the markets, to look at the documentation, the transport and the constraints of those markets. It is for the individual manufacturer to decide whether he can fulfil the commitments of the particular market. You can help them, you can encourage them, you can motivate them, you can point out the difficulties, but you cannot run the business of the people. I want to say this; we have only heard about one particular manufacturer who went to Trinidad who got orders, fulfilled those orders and who has exported those orders. Why didn't we hear about them? There are certain agencies in this country who can be manipulated by some people and the object of the manipulation is to discredit the effort of the Barbados Labour Party, my Ministry and the other Ministers in this country, but when you start and you declare war, I only hope you will stand some of the blows that your opponents can give you. I sat here and listened. Why didn't we talk of the the fact that on the Trinidad Trade Mission there were a number of furniture

manufacturers — I am not going to call the names of any of them — but there is such a thing as over-ambition. I do not know if I can go into a country and never exported before, and somebody gives me a million dollars in orders, I never had a million dollars in orders but all of a sudden in three months I can say I have the capacity to fulfil them. Well of course some people will learn.

I am very glad to see that as a result of discussions that have been taking place those manufacturers of furniture in Barbados who bit off what they could chew fulfilled their orders. Some of them have never been in the export market before, but I regard it as a great contribution of the Export Promotion Agency to the manufacturing industries in Barbados that they were able in conjunction with the Manufacturers Association to help people to go to Trinidad, and they have chalked up a new number of manufacturers who in the future have got the experience to fulfil and no doubt will get repeat orders. This is helping the small businessman.

Let us go further. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central raised a very good point about the financial management and things of that kind. Of course he is speaking from great experience. He knows the dangers financial and otherwise in putting business in the hands of some people whose conceptions of their status and the expenditure that is necessary to fulfil that status and to service that status may be the capacity of the particular goods and services that the firm is required to match. The hon. member knows about that. I have gone through a list of report of the Development Board from the beginning, and I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South Central say that we were forcing the small businessman to the wall.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member when he is making a serious contribution should avoid misquoting what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: You want to elucidate a point.

Dr. HAYNES: Yes. I want to elucidate a point. I am always grateful for your distinguished guidance.

Mr. SPEAKER: Don't mind all that. Just elucidate your point.
6.20 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: What I did say was that because of a combination of circumstances small businessmen in fact find themselves in a very difficult situation today, and that Government has to look beyond the traditional methods of assisting and financing and so on and seriously consider either participation or some means — this is a matter for the Great Combination — some means of capital injection in these small businesses.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point well elucidated.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I was listening very distinctly over here, because I was waiting for the intervention, and I thought I heard the hon. member say that the Development Bank should go along the lines the hon. member has just spoken about instead of trying to force people to the wall who had not paid them. I thought I distinctly heard that, if the hon. member said he did not say that, very well, but I want to say this, that people must understand who borrow from Government institutions or any institution in Barbados that a banker is responsible to the depositors for their money and a banker cannot take up other people's money and lend it to people and then the people do not repay it. That is the beginning of bankruptcy of the bank.

I did the liquidation and the receivership of the Barbados Co-Operative Bank, one of the greatest black businessmen concerns ever to take place in Barbados. Not only because of the fact that it was started as long ago as 1937, but because of the fact that it ran from 1937 to 1961 and it built up a loan portfolio of over 13,000 people in this country, and one of the reasons why it defaulted and in the end had to go under was because of the fact that many of the borrowers who when they received their money after the deep water harbour came in in 1961 did not pay off for the spots in Carringtons Village and the other places, and the depositors got scared because the underlying assets of the bank were mostly in real estate and you had a rush, and that is the reason why it failed.

I did that analysis, a minute analysis of the failure and that taught me one thing as early as 1961 about banking. I saw a bank not from when it started, I saw a bank from the collapse and had to work back from the collapse. The hon. member for St. Michael South West has had an American education and he would know that the best method of being educated sometimes is by case methods. The only problem is that the hon. member was exposed to the cases but he apparently did not benefit from them.

Now, Sir, the position is this. The Barbados Development Bank, like any other bank, has been directed under our philosophy to try and give as much length of time for repayment as possible, and that is what we have also introduced, and increase in the term period for repayment. We did it in the hotel industry in relation to the Development Bank. It is now 15 years, it was not that long before, and in addition to all of this, as part of the backup comprehensive service to the Development Bank, the Export Promotion Agency, as the hon. member for Christ Church East said, they successfully with BIMAP negotiated a loan of some \$400,000 (Can.) for small businessmen counselling, and that is a most important thing, because we are trying to bring in financial expertise

marketing expertise into the factory situation or the retail situation so that the technicians and others will have the benefit of counselling as they go along. But, Mr. Speaker, despite that there are still some people who will not take advice, and what are we going to do about them? What are we going to do about those who despite the fact that you have given them the best advice, given them the best loans conditions they still want to pursue their own ways. There is only one answer for them, you have given them every help, you must let them go their own ways and that will be the position.

The Government cannot afford to deprive other people of assistance who will make good use of the assistance to try and pursue a policy of continuing to throw good money after bad for people who will not take advice, and I will tell you something, Sir. This phenomenon we have on a small scale, but I have a Times of England here which just carried out a comprehensive report, an annual report on conditions in the European Economic Community. Four or five articles are devoted to the efforts of the National Enterprise Board in the United Kingdom to bail out companies like Leyland, Rolls Royce, Ferrari and others, and one of the conclusions the commentators have come to is that only in very restrictive circumstances can you have a radical change, can you expect to turn a company around, and the experience there has been that Leyland, Chrysler, many of the divisions of Rolls Royce except the overseas division — but Feranti was the one in which the most radical change was adopted, because lock, stock and barrel from supervisor up were just paid out and new management and new ideas were brought in. So it is very interesting to see that our problems on a small scale here are being duplicated in other countries with a longer history of industrial development, and it has all arisen because of the fact that there is a contraction of demand, there is more competition and the old rule still applies, the old rule is the survival of the fittest, except that the fittest in this sense means those who can keep up to date.

With all those facts in mind therefore I hope and trust that the hon. members on the other side will no longer in the future attempt to make a political football out of this question of industrial development, because whether we are in power or they are in power you will have bankruptcies in this country. You will always have bankruptcy as long as there is business. You will have successful businesses, you will also have people who want to live above their means. Not only in business, in the law, in medicine and in politics as well. There are some people who were just born like that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister will wish to speak within his time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I will finish now, Sir. It is very interesting to note that when you go back to 1959

you will see one of the first firms there was L&H Miller which in those days used to make detergents and soap powder. I remember when the Democratic Labour Party put up the man's building in Reed Street for sale, but I am very pleased to say that that man has so much resilience that he is back now, it is still L&H Miller, but this time he is on a better wicket, he has pepper sauce and all kinds of industries for which there is a demand. He has resilience, and I hope that you and I, Sir, will be able to have the same resilience.

Mr. JOHNSON: The hon. member for St. Michael South West made a speech today that reminded me of the lamentations of Ezekiel.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. With all due respect to the Chair, we on this side were under the impression that the Hon. Minister was winding up the debate, because the Hon. Minister spoke at length. I know that the Minister is capable of speaking at length, but we were under the impression that the hon. member was winding up the debate. Is the Chairman of the BMC now about to wind up the wind up?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should know that the Chair expects every hon. member from the time he is elected to be sensible.

Mr. JOHNSON: Sir, I can understand the hon. member's desire to have the heat abated a bit, but we still have about 15 or so more minutes of cooking to do, and I should like to bring the attention of this Hon. Chamber to the fact that the only noteworthy thing about that long speech that he gave today seems to be his cry, his plea that his name did not figure prominently in the documents circulated by the Industrial Development Corporation and that the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation had sought to eliminate him from his rightful place in the annals of the history of development in this country. I believe that we have to come to recognise that industrial development should not be a partisan affair, and one would have hoped that the former Minister who claims to have made such a large contribution, we feel that he should have felt it his duty to get up and make a purposeful speech based on something noteworthy rather than to seek to introduce partisan considerations into a very noble enterprise which this Government is now undertaking.

One must bear in mind that he seems always to fancy himself larger than he really is — not physically — because I sat here and I am sure that I did not misread what he was saying at that time and heard him say that he makes no bones about the fact that he had a large share in the development of the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity, and agency which figures very prominently in the promotion of small industry in this country and in management generally.

6.30 p.m.

But, Sir, I believe that when former Ministers get up to speak they ought to let their words be centered and based fundamentally on identifiable elements. This is not the first time I have heard the hon. former Minister say this, but not in the House of Assembly. The hon. member had absolutely nothing to do — except in his own imagination — with the establishment of the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is deliberately misleading the House. The hon. member must know even at the time when he was up to be interviewed for a job at the Institute of Management and Productivity — he must know since he worked there that when I represented Barbados overseas Kurleigh King and I sat down and conceptualized the idea of an Institute of Management and Productivity and helped to formulate it. He must know this because he worked there. He is deliberately misleading this House.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, there is a document put out by an expert, Dr. Agustin Barrero in February 1970. That document is the basic document which sets out the principles and the concepts for BIMAP, and the names that figure in it are Kurleigh King and Dr. Agustin Barrero; but nowhere in that document does the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South West appear.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In those days when I was working for Barbados overseas I was disinterested in having my name appear in many documents in which my ideas figured. I made one error but I won't say what it is.

Mr. JOHNSON: The hon. member is admitting that he understands why his name is not in the document; he had nothing to do with it. Just as he claims he was instrumental in setting up a blueprint for development in this country, which neither the Minister responsible nor the IDC can find because it is all a figment of his overgrown imagination, and ever since he has been elected to the Presidency of the Democratic Labour Party he has been walking around conceptualizing his own importance. His first statement was that the BMC brought in chicken to help get the hon. member for St. Michael South Central elected to the House of Assembly. And now he comes in here and wants people to believe that he had this large role to play in setting up the organization which I have the honour to be associated with in another capacity. But these things are not important; all I am seeking to do is to point out that the hon. member can get up and castigate this Government for its programme of industrial development and is basing his whole speech on evidence that does not exist; it is all amorphous and hazy and is in his own mind.

Now, Sir, I have heard people say that the small businessman in Barbados is in great jeopardy. I believe

that of all hon. members in this Chamber I know more about the history of small business than anybody else. For the last five years I have been associated with small business at BIMAP and I know that during the time when the Democratic Labour Party was in power in the years 1973 to 1976 we had to go to the banks on bended knee begging and pleading with them to make loans available to small businessmen. Yet they now talk about small businessmen being in jeopardy. All the furniture manufacturers — I know them all — passed through those dark days, when they were joiners working with the hand saw and we had to fight with the Barbados Development Bank for money so that these men could get money to obtain power tools. Today one of those men who was struggling in the Ivy now commands a large factory on an industrial estate in St. Philip South built by the Barbados Labour Party under the Chairmanship of the hon. member for Christ Church East.

6.40 p.m.

All of these people, Sir, were people who were just slowly drifting with the wind, and were waiting for their demise until the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity, and now the Industrial Development Corporation under an enlightened chairmanship came to their rescue. The Barbados Government — this was the 1976 variety — implemented the Export Loan Guarantee Scheme so that these same small industries which would not have benefited from export opportunities can now go and get financing to get the necessary production put out.

I attended a seminar only this week on transportation and documentation at Norman Centre; and one of the greatest things that these people were complaining about is the fact that even now, when things have become so significantly better, they are still having some difficulties with certain private institutions to get the necessary finance to have their orders put out. I was in Miami two weeks ago....

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Surely, I take it that you are referring to something that the hon. member misquoted in reference to something that you said in the course of your speech. Is that right?

Dr. HAYNES: I am referring to a misrepresentation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of something that you said?

Dr. HAYNES: Yes. Of something that I referred to. If I remember correctly, I said that the protocol for the system was set up, but there was some problem in getting the commercial banks to co-operate in the scheme; and it was only when that co-operation was secured by the Barbados Labour Party when they came into power....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the point that you wish to make?

Dr. HAYNES: Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I know that there is a move afoot that the Democratic Labour Party is still in Government. So I can understand why they may think that something implemented in July of this year came out of them. I have been under the misapprehension that this scheme was in fact set up by the Democratic Labour Party; but the Barbados Labour Party came into power on September 2nd, 1976; and in July of this year the Export Loan Guarantee Scheme was implemented. The Barbados Labour Party Government was in power and we implemented that.

I would like to point out this; the hon. member for St. Michael South West got up, and suggested that everything that went on for the last two years had been under negotiations for the last five years. On the question of INTEL he wants us to believe that he had been working on that since 1971, and that it is only now that it has come to fruition; but the difference between us....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. I referred to INTEL. I did not say that negotiations started with INTEL in 1971. INTEL became a factory in 1975, and in 1976 they made a decision to locate here.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what you said?

Mr. TAITT: That is what I said, and that is what has been misrepresented by suggestions that I said from 1971.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is taken.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to teach the hon. member for St. Michael South West that it is not to him who was trying to do something to whom credit is given but to him who does it, credit is given. The problem with the Democratic Labour Party is that they have been trying for a long time to do a lot of things for 15 years, but they could not get it worked out. The Barbados Labour Party has been able to get things done. If he wants to take credit for trying to get things done, he can have it. We will take the credit for doing things.

I would like him to remember that during his regime industries used to be brought to Barbados, and would disappear the next morning. Like Data Craft and Solar Dynamics. I give him two. I can give him five if he wants, but two will suffice. That is what he called for. These Industries used to come and make a lot of fanfare, and the hon. member would be in his blue suit standing up there and saying look what wonders we have wrought; and the next morning those very industries would be

packing up and returning to the land from which they came. This Government has been doing its business. The IDC has been doing its business and bringing responsible industries to this country, industries that will survive.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is misleading the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: These are fraudulent interjections.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, if I may.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I say that there are fraudulent interjections.

Mr. TAITT: I say that they are not following interjections.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave the House now, at once, for the balance of the day. If you do not leave in peace, I will ask for a Resolution to have you suspended from this sitting of this House. Be sensible and leave in peace.

Mr. TAITT left the House.

Mr. JOHNSON: Yes Sir. I was indicating that I was in Miami only two weeks ago, and one of the first questions that I was asked, without anybody knowing whether or not I was connected with the Government — I was asked what is the name of that Minister who is responsible for industry in Barbados? I said you mean H. B. St. St. John. The man who was at the convention centre at Miami went on to give me a barrage of praise about the man who is now responsible for industry in this country. Only recently people abroad are beginning to recognise that a new wind is blowing in the industrial development of this nation and people are becoming impressed for the first time that Barbados offers a good and stable climate in which they can come and see their businesses grow.

We are people who represent large national corporations. I do not mean people who come here with bogus credentials and two sewing machines and that kind of thing. I mean people of substance who will come here and locate and do our country a great service in providing work for people who are currently unemployed. In speaking about the small business development programme, Sir, I am aware of the fact that large industries take a major share of the cake, so to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want the hon. member to wind up his speech in four minutes' time. That is by 7 o'clock. We would then have had three hours' debate on this Resolution. It must be completed by 7 o'clock, so please wind up your speech in four minutes' time.

Mr. JOHNSON: I can wind up faster than that. Mr. Speaker, on the subject of small businesses, I am absolutely certain in my mind that there are no small businessmen in this country who can get up and say with a clear conscience that the climate of small business development in Barbados is not healthier now than it has been in the last fifteen years. They were able to get large loans to refurbish their industries and to buy new machines, people who as I mentioned earlier, would not have been able to do it in past years. Even fishermen — and I have said this already in this House — when they went to the Barbados Development Bank to get loans they were told that the then Prime Minister had issued instructions — I am sorry that he is not present — that they were not to loan money to fishermen because they take the boats out to sea, take out the mortgage and then do not pay back the money to the bank. Today, Sir, it is possible for small fishermen to seize the opportunity of going into fishing as an industry. Instead of two boats going with two colleagues, they can have three boats. These men are now beginning to recognise that fishing is not a hazardous, nasty job for a few people, but it is a job in which any self-respecting Barbadian can engage, and which will offer opportunities for employment and an elevated standard of living to people who have been in the past only relegated to dirty-smelling boats at Oistin Harbour.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the hon. member for Christ Church East and the member responsible for industry for the tremendous job which they have done in bringing Barbados to the point which it has reached in this remarkably short time; and I am certain that with the loan that we are considering in this Resolution, the industrial development of small businesses in Barbados will increase apace and our nation will be able to look proudly at the record of the Barbados Labour Party and to say that we have done more in the time that the people of Barbados have allocated to us to serve them in this capacity.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Item No. 2, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 2 is the instant order of the day.

SECOND READING OF A BILL TO AMEND THE DOGS ACT, 1975

Hon. B. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in moving the second reading of this Bill to amend the Dogs Act, 1975, there are several points which it is necessary that I think, for want of a better word, to elucidate for the benefit of hon. members.

The Dogs Act, 1975, was due to have been put into operation by proclamation, Mr. Speaker, and was not done so during the year 1976 on account of the fact that regulations thereunder had not been made. In the interim, it was felt that certain amendments were necessary in order that the Act could operate in a more effective manner.

There are several amendments, Mr. Speaker, some more important than others. The first important amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to be found in the definition section.

Mr. SPEAKER: How many minutes does the Minister think she will take to go through with these amendments?

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Quite a while, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Alright, we will take the adjournment now.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: I will be much obliged, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting now stands suspended until 8.00 p.m.
7.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

THE DOGS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1978

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, there are quite a number of sections to the Act which it is proposed should be amended, and the whole aim is for more efficient operation of the Act. I think I say the obvious when I say that the Barbadian public's attitude to stray dogs in our community is now hardened to the point where I think this legislation which has been long in coming would be more than welcome. Stray dogs are largely the result of irresponsible owners in the society.

Stray dogs in our community, Mr. Speaker, cost Barbados, and I do not exaggerate when I say, hundreds of thousands of dollars every year. They are for a start, from the Ministry of Health's point of view, a major public health hazard. Stray dogs, like so many animals in our community, Mr. Speaker, spread certain diseases which are trans-missible from animal to man; so from the zoonosis aspect it is important that we should control strays on our streets. From the sanitation point of view, and the public has taken note of this in letters to the press, letters to the Ministry, there is ample evidence and

we see it with our eyes every day, we have a garbage collection and disposal problem, and stray dogs play a starring role in that problem. Barbadians are now beginning to understand that garbage must be properly containerised; it must be properly packaged before people put it into cans or whatever other kind of container they are advised to use.

Stray dogs too, Mr. Speaker, attack livestock. Barbadian farmers have complained loud and long of this problem. They lost hundreds of thousands of dollars every year. Sheep are well known to be the prime target for stray dogs. Chickens and other members of the poultry family are also known to be targets of stray dogs, and children too and sometimes adults have been attacked by stray dogs. When I say stray dogs, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of dogs some of which have owners, because our definition of a stray is a dog which is not under the immediate control of the owner; so that many dogs which have owners often are let loose at night in the mistaken belief that they will guard people's property, and sometimes in a deliberate belief that they will maraud other people's premises and property. The owner's attitude often is that as long as they do not damage their own property they do not particularly care what they do to their neighbour's and other people's.

All of these reasons and more, Mr. Speaker, lie behind the whole business of dog control. The Act and the Regulations under the Act will set out the system, which we will be very busy in the coming weeks to advertise and educate people about, will set out the system for the licensing of all dogs. The licence will come in the form of a little metal tag which may be attached to the collar of one's dog or dogs. Dogs which are owned and licensed can still fall into the definition of strays, and this is what we have to get across to the Barbadian public. If you licence your dog and it has got its collar on and the tag bearing the licence attached to the collar and you let it out at night to rampage other people's property, then properly speaking your dog under these conditions is a stray and can be picked up by the authorities under this Act.

It is important that we should licence all dogs and that people should, every year just as they license their cars and other bits of property, license dogs. It is important that we capture as many of the strays as we can do at the earliest opportunity. I do not hesitate to say, Mr. Speaker, that our initial thrust will be against those dogs, both individual dogs and packs of dogs which are known to attack property, person and premises. It is important, too, Mr. Speaker, and the legislation and the regulations thereunder make careful provision, that dogs which have been picked up by our authorities must be picked up in a proper and humane fashion. Dogs which are impounded will be treated in a humane fashion during the time they are impounded and dogs which have not

been claimed and have eventually to be put down must be done so in a humane fashion as approved by a Veterinary Officer.

The technique which which will be involved, Mr. Speaker, is that we will have, as we are training at the moment, a number of dog catchers, and there is a technique of dog catching. There will be no hitting of dogs over the head or kicking of dogs and that sort of thing. They will be properly trained in the technique of catching dogs. Dogs picked up will be taken to the dog pound in Black Rock in vehicles, will be first of all deloused there, and as far as possible, if they are carriers of disease, that of course will be corrected insofar as it is possible for us to do so. Dogs will be kept for a specific number of days. Their owners, if they have licence tags on them, will be notified and they will have a specific number of days in which to claim the dogs. If after those number of days dogs have not been claimed, these dogs will be put down as common unowned strays are. The dog pound it must be clearly understood is not going to be a charitable home away from home for pedigree dogs. It will be costing the taxpayers to feed, maintain and keep these dogs clean while they are impounded, and the fine which dog owners will have to pay for dogs which are found straying is really designed to cover these keeping and maintenance costs.

Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that there may be some debate over the size of the fines which this Bill proposes. I am entirely convinced that the maximum fine of \$5,000 in some instances and \$250 in other instances is not an exorbitant figure. It is possible for one dog to destroy as many as six or seven, and even in one case I believe almost one dozen sheep in one night's marauding. The value of the sheep will not necessarily always have a bearing on the size of the fine which the magistrate may inflict, because there will be other avenues to which livestock owners may have recourse.

8.10 p.m.

But there are other areas, Mr. Speaker, where dogs — small packs of dogs, sometimes individual dogs — in a few hour's time can do thousands of dollars' damage. It must be borne in mind that like all the fines under the Health Services Act the \$5,000 is an upper limit, is a maximum, and the magistrate will have it in his power having heard the facts of the case if need be to fine from \$1.00, \$5.00, \$10.00 and upward. I should not like the public to run away with the belief, as some people were want to do when we amended the Health Services legislation earlier in the year, that \$5,000 is the maximum fine.

The long term aim of course is to educate Barbadian dog owners, all animal and pet owners, because the dog pound — although it is already popularly known as the dog pound — in fact properly named the Animal

Control Centre, and in due course other animals will fall into its care, but the long term aim is to educate Barbadian animal owners, animals of all sorts, not only pets, about the importance of care of their animals, about the importance of not creating nuisances by way of ownership of animals. We hope very soon to start this education programme, particularly among our school children. Very often the first introduction potential dog owners get to ownership of an animal occurs during one's childhood. A dog or a cat is a gift often given as early perhaps as the age of 2 or 3 and we believe that if we can start in the schools and in the youth clubs at this early stage an education programme to teach our young people about the care and protection of animals, all the important aspects of ownership of animals, that it will in the end perhaps make the creature known as the stray dog in Barbados today disappear into the annals of history.

We believe, and it is very difficult to estimate, Mr. Speaker, that there are somewhere between 50 to 100,000 stray dogs on the streets of Barbados. It is very difficult to estimate, but we believe that it is somewhere over 50,000 and may not be as many as 100,000 stray dogs. It is not going to be an easy task at the beginning. As much as people cried out for this legislation as they cried out for the service we are now going to be offering them, they are going to cry out when we first put it to the test, but we hope that the animal control officers who will man the dog pound and the officers in the Environmental Health Division of the Ministry will be able to cope with this.

We believe that we have the support of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in this matter, and I would like to appeal to Barbadians to get on with the business of licensing their dogs as soon as this Act is proclaimed. It is my intention that a reasonable time should be allowed for people to license their dogs, and I propose that perhaps by the end of this year, because this matter shall go to the Senate and then to be proclaimed, and I believe that the weeks intervening between that time and the end of the year is a reasonable period of time for people to license their dogs, to go down to the Rates and Taxes Office just as they go to license their cars. Following the end of this year, barring an act of God, Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Health will begin in the new year to pick up stray dogs.

As I said, we are going to mount an education programme so that people will understand what is involved with licensing an animal, the difference between an animal or a couple of dogs and a kennel, the age from which dogs must be licensed; we have looked at all these things. It is important to enact these amendments, particularly in respect of the business of licensing dogs, and the distinction very clearly for the public to

understand the difference between owning two or three dogs and having a kennel.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I just rise to state that we on this side have no objection to the general objectives of the Bill. Indeed, it might be characterised as a new deal for dogs under the Barbados Labour Party, and indeed if similar enthusiasm were shown towards the poor under the Barbados Labour Party I think that things might begin to move in some way.

8.20 p.m.

That apart, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a movement in the right direction. One is a little concerned about the size of these fines, although it has been indicated that it lies within the discretion of the magistrate; but it does appear to some of us to be a bit on the high side. And I take it that nothing in this Act will in any way interfere with strict quarantine arrangement in respect of dogs as far as Barbados is concerned.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Clause 2 is the definition section of the Bill. The amendment is in respect of the definition of the word "kennel". It is proposed that a kennel should be enclosure premises, etc., in which five or more dogs of at least six months of age are kept for commercial or non-commercial purposes. The substantive Act did not particularize as to the age or number of dogs. It is important that these matters should be specified because many people keep a pet dog or two and often may have a litter of six or eight dogs and sometimes it takes as long as 3, 4 or 5 months to get rid of these dogs either by selling them or giving them away — and I am speaking of ordinary household that do not in any way pretend to be a commercial kennel. So it is important that we should be able to distinguish quite clearly between a commercial kennel or not, and owners should know from what age dogs would become licensable. It is not considered fair for persons to have to licence eight pups and then have to give them away.

I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

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

Clauses 3 to 9 were called and passed.

Clause 10 was called.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the amendment in respect of Clause 10 is an important one concerning a matter of dogs being under direct control of their owner. The amendment here is proposing that the dog in a public place should be kept on a lead or leash, but the Clause does not specify that the dog be necessarily accompanied by its owner. The substantive Act created a situation where a dog could only be taken into a public place by its owner and would not necessarily have to be on a lead or leash.

I beg to move that Clause 10 stand part.

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

The question that Clause 10 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 11 was called and passed.

Part 6 was called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, I believe we can take Part 6 in its entirety rather than separate the Clauses.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Clause 11 contains all of the amendments, so by accepting Clause 11 the totality of Part 6 of the Act is amended and Clause 11 substituted therefor.

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

8.30 p.m.

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 to consider a number of Resolutions for the service of this Island.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: 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, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

RESOLUTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE ANNEXED ESTIMATES 1978-79

The next Order was called — a Resolution to grant the sum of \$10,255 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1978-79 as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79 No. 8 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, in November 1976 the Government took a decision to extend the Philatelic Bureau of the Post Office, and in so doing discussions were held with the Ministry of Finance, the then Minister of Communications and Works and the Postmaster General. As a result of those discussions, the three travelled to St. Vincent where they had a look at the Philatelic Bureau in St. Vincent, and they further consulted with the Crown Agents; and it was agreed that an expert should be brought to Barbados to advise on the extension of this service. The adviser has now arrived. He is Mr. Stubbs and will have discussions between the parties concerned. His advice has been accepted that there should be certain improvements and increases made in staff at the General Post Office; and certain adjustments are necessary from the point of view of providing office furniture for the office of the adviser and the Deputy Manager who will understudy the advice during the period of one year that the Adviser will be in Barbados.

This Resolution is therefore for the sum of \$10,255 to provide the necessary furniture and fittings. An area has been allocated in the left wing of the Public Buildings, the area which was used by the Parks and Beaches Commission and was temporarily used by the Clerk of Parliament. Renovations have already begun, and it is necessary to have the necessary furniture for the operation of the Philatelic Bureau. All indications are that this will be commercially viable and that Barbados will benefit from such an operation. The Minister has had a look at what is happening in Trinidad and St. Vincent. There are other West Indian islands operating such Philatelic Bureaux, and they will obviously bring an increase in employment and financial benefits to the Government of Barbados.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one or two comments in relation to the Post Office service in

the constituency which I have the honour to represent. Some time ago there was a suggestion to establish a Post Office in the Rock Dundo area, but nothing has come of it so far. I would like to know when the Ministry proposes, if it is proposed, to establish a Post Office at, for example, the Rock Dundo Park shopping area. We have a vast number of persons living in that area and in the Cave Hill area generally; and I would like to know when this new Post Office will be erected because it was part of some Cave Hill master plan which I had the privilege of seeing; but I would really like to know what is going to happen about that. The Grazettes area also is in dire need of a post office. The persons who live in that area have to move as far down as the Highway 1 road before they can post a letter, and some of them have to come to town in order to post letters. I think that some consideration should be given to the provision of a post box in the Grazettes area.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I will keep in mind what the hon. member has said. As soon as I can find more information about it, I will indicate that information to him.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Sir, I can inform the Committee and the hon. member who posed the question that somewhere about two years ago when the complex was under construction one of the persons who was responsible for the letting of premises up there was Mr. Lennie St. Hill; and at the time the Ministry of Communications and Works had a look at the area to see if that complex could be used for a postal service and I think that the cost was something like \$300 a month. I speak under correction, but I think that it was in that vicinity. When I got wind of it that they were paying rents for a considerably long time, it came to the point in time when it had to be considered whether or not they should continue with the postal service in that complex, bearing in mind that there is a post office at Eagle Hall, and that they were also looking at an area within the Cave Hill situation where they could construct postal services. In those circumstances I thought it was not good sense to continue to pay rent for a place that you are uncertain about, and therefore I discontinued the rental within that complex.

I assure the hon. member that the Ministry was still looking — I do not know what will be the policy of the present Minister — but I have no doubt whatever in my mind that he will continue any policy which will go towards alleviating any sufferings of the people within the area of Cave Hill. I assure the hon. member that this was looked at and will continue to be looked at. As far as post boxes are concerned, although the practice has always been to look at the areas and to look at the people who live there, take note of the service which is available and make up your mind whether or not you should extend postal facilities by way of a letter box, I

do not think that this should be a problem. If the people are suffering there and an appeal is made to the Postmaster General, he is always quite willing to look into services of this kind. If the hon. member himself thinks that there is this problem, he can write directly to the Postmaster General on this matter.

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO ITEM 17 –
HEAD I – POST OFFICE OF THE 1978–79
ANNEXED ESTIMATES

The next Order of the Day was called – a Resolution to amend the note to Item 17 – Head I – Post Office of the 1978–79 Annexed Estimates.
8.40 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, as a result of the Resolution which has just been passed, it is therefore necessary that the note under Annexed Estimates Post Office, Head I, Item 17, be amended to include the necessary equipment, Mr. Chairman, which will be purchased. If you will bear with me for a minute, I will give you what is to be included. Furniture Fittings – The words to be added should be “also provides for the purchase of desks, executive chairs, typist desk and chair, conference table, upright chairs, safes, calculator, filing cabinets, bookcase, typewriter and fan for additional staff for the Philatelic Bureau. Mr.

Mr. Chairman, I beg that the Resolution be known and be so amended.

The Resolution was put and resolved in the affirmative.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978–79
No. 5

To move the passing of the Resolution to grant the sum of \$77,533 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978–79, Part II – Capital as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1978–79 No. 5 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. TULL: Mr. Chairman, in 1973, I think it was, Illaro Court was allocated to the Ministry of Education for multi-purpose complex for culture. In the situation prevailing between 1973 and 1976 it was not possible because of a certain lack of planning in the Ministry of Culture for that work to be carried out at Illaro Court. However, so as not to have any further deterioration in what is essentially a fine building, and until such time as a plan is worked out for the multi-purpose complex there, we are asking in this

resolution to provide the sum of \$74,533 to do certain redecoration and restoration of the roof. This is based on an estimate done by the Ministry of Communications and Works and this work will be done only on the roof for the time being until such time as a UNESCO team of cultural experts who are currently on the island, have submitted their report to the Ministry of Education to tell us how best to utilise Illaro Court, and this sum we are seeking is only for the roof.

In respect to the section dealing with the new Hotel School, we are asking for the sum of \$3,000 to carry out certain work on sanitary conditions in the Hotel School and an amount of \$10,000 was voted in last year's Estimates, 1977/78 to meet the cost to provide these additional facilities for the Hotel School, but work on the project was not commenced during the financial year and indeed the funds that were then voted lapsed for that reason. Since it was anticipated that the work would have been completed within that financial year, a new vote was sought during the last annual estimates, so this figure we are now asking \$3,000 to be provided so that we can carry out the renovations of the facilities that I have just alluded to. I beg to move that this sum of \$77,533 be now passed.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I am just speaking on Item 9 on the restoration of Illaro Court. As the Minister has indicated, this was purchased by the former Administration in 1973 for the purpose of establishing a multi-purpose complex for culture. I think what has come through by the presentation of the Minister is a very clear indication that Illaro Court was a good buy and we have to ensure that it does not deteriorate so that we would obviously want to see that this is put in a good condition.

I was rather heartened, Mr. Chairman, to hear the hon. minister making reference to the impending visit of the UNESCO team to Barbados to advise government on the use of this property presumably for the purpose of some kind of educational or cultural activity. One point which I think we should make is clearly the indication that the former administration had started to move in the direction of establishing some area of culture within this operation.

As I understand it, there was some original arrangement between the Government of Barbados and the Venezuelan Government to establish some cultural centre here at Illaro Court and I am not sure what has become of this particular arrangement, it might have fallen through, but the point is that it was clearly demonstrated that there was some movement in the direction of establishing a cultural activity in Barbados, and as I said before, I was particularly glad to hear the Minister indicating of this impending visit of the UNESCO team because one began to hear some comments to the

fact that Illaro Court was going to be the official residence of the Prime Minister, so that now he has indicated that this is going to be used for the purpose for which it was originally designed I am very glad for that clarification by the hon. Minister.

Hon. L. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct what is a wrong impression taken by the hon. member for St. Lucy. I am not at all suggesting that Illaro Court will basically be used as a Cultural centre. What I am in fact saying is that at the moment there is in the island a UNESCO team, an architect and a cultural consultant who are taking a look at Illaro Court and will eventually advise me as to the suitability of Illaro Court as a cultural center and auditorium.

Until such time as I have been given that report, I cannot give the indication that that is the purpose for which it will be used. Let me also point out that Illaro Court is a fine building, it is a large building but it has not been occupied for many years and it is in a very serious state of disrepair and it will take, as a conservative estimate, three quarter million dollars to put it in shape, and while it is the best place for a national auditorium or cultural centre. I really do not know, so I am leaving it up until I get the report, before I advise on that.
8.50 p.m.

I am waiting until I get a report before I can probably advise on that; so I do not want the hon. member for St. Lucy to leave with the impression that I am saying that it will be used for that purpose. Frankly my own view is that I would like to see a new auditorium and cultural centre built somewhere else entirely. I do not want to see any building renovated and restored and try to twist it and turn it into a cultural centre and auditorium. Certainly that is not what I would want. I am waiting on the report and eventually I am sure that the collective wisdom of my colleagues will come out with whatever is the best solution.

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO
ITEM 8 – OTHER STATIONS UNDER
HEAD 110 – MINISTRY OF
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution stands in the name of the Attorney General. It is a short Resolution and it is needed because a vehicle was ordered in August 1977, and the amount of money for a 1,000 gallon vehicle for the Fire Station at the Airport was appropriated in the last financial year, but the Crown Agents did not send in the final account until the current financial year; so that it is necessary in order to cover the money under the existing vote to have this note amended so as to make it clear that this amount of

money is being used to pay for an obligation which was incurred in the last financial year, but is only now being settled in this financial year. That is the simple object of this amendment to abide with the Financial Rules and Regulations. The vehicle has been delivered but the bill was not sent until this financial year.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978–79
No. 5

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have not been given any papers in connection with this matter, and perhaps you will in the fullness of time care to draw it to the attention of the Clerks of Parliament that they should prepare some kind of paper briefing for the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs when he has to supplement the vote of Parliament. But chiding apart, this item is for a matter well known to Parliamentarians, because it is intended to cover visits other than CPA visits by members of this Parliament to other Parliaments and other Parliaments to this Parliament.

In Barbados we have in the last few years entertained a number of delegations from the Provinces of Canada not necessarily coming under CPA auspices. We have also entertained a delegation from the Netherlands Antilles including one member of Parliament in that State with the good Barbadian name and indeed prominence of Ward. He comes from the constituency represented by the hon. member for St. Lucy, and we have never as far as I can remember had a vote to enable us either to return these visits or to give entertainment to these delegations on a proper scale. I think that exchanges with other Parliaments in the Caribbean area, the Parliament of Netherlands Antilles of course springs to mind, are healthy. I can conceive that the Parliament of Suriname would be a highly suitable Parliament for us to open relations with. The Surinamese are persons much like us, and we are moving into the area of better relations with Suriname.

I have had the pleasure of meeting the Prime Minister on more than one occasion, Mr. Arran. In addition to Suriname, Mr. Chairman, one may also envisage that Venezuela and Costa Rica which are both countries with which we have the friendliest of relations, also have Parliaments which it may be desirable to open relations with in due course; and of course, Mr. Chairman,

the Parliaments of our great northern neighbour, the Dominion of Canada, the Provincial Parliament. We have already enjoyed good relations with especially the Parliament of Ontario and of Nova Scotia. So all these matters, Sir, will be covered by the new note. The new appropriation is intended to cover the recent parliamentary exchange visit, one part of which has taken place and the other part is still to come, mainly the exchange with the Provincial Parliament of the Province of Ontario. A delegation to Ontario was recently led by the Attorney General and we expect a return visit some time during the Canadian winter.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 9 o'clock, the Moment of Interruption. Is there any controversy over the matter under discussion?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must report progress to His Honour the Speaker and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time of Interruption has been reached. Is the matter under discussion controversial?

I understand it is not controversial; so the sitting may continue.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the Hon. Prime Minister wish to continue?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have finished, Sir. I have moved that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we on this side have no quarrel with this kind of expenditure because it is an area in which there can be some improvement in international relations and where it could also be of benefit to all participants. However, we are a little concerned here to know that a sum of money was advanced from another source in order to cover the recent visit by Parliamentarians from here to Ontario, and this House is now being asked to approve an expenditure that has already been made.

9.00 p.m.

It would be of interest to know what the other source was, how much, and whether this is in accordance

with the usual financial practices of Government and so on. This is a legitimate concern on our part.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am informed that Commonwealth Parliamentary Association advanced funds, which I think it is entitled to do. If however the hon. member wishes to ask the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and to investigate the actions of the Clerks of Parliament in facilitating our delegation in going away, I am sure that the appropriate letter from the hon. member to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee would bring results, but I am informed that the CPA advanced the funds. The CPA does have a vote of its own.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79

No. 7

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head stands part I will draw attention to the first Item of \$7,000 for a paper shredder. There are so many leaks going on these days that we would at least like to confine the leaks to oral leaks. We really do not want to document the leakages, Sir, therefore the Prime Minister's officer needs a paper shredder and some typewriters.

I do not know if we are going to have a long talk about the by-election, Sir. The by-election was won by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, obviously, and it is necessary to find \$6,045 to pay the electoral officers. I have a list somewhere, if hon. members want a breakdown. We have recently appointed a Chief Economist to the Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry. We have employed him on a one year contract, he is a lecturer at the university and it is necessary to make counterbalancing arrangements to preserve his pension rights at the university. We also have to pay him personnel and housing allowances, Sir, so we need \$6,066 for that.

I cannot deal with it at any great length, Sir, but obviously hon. members will be able to question the substantive Minister.

A matter of some importance under the Ministry of External Affairs, the Government is opening an office in Brussels for the purpose of facilitating the attendance of an officer of the Ministry of External Affairs at negotiations with the European Economic Community relating to Lome and so on, and it is also necessary to obtain a bilingual secretary. These things cost money, of course, Sir, and we have to deal not only with negotiations, but we do have special interest in the talks which are going on on trade corporation matters,

including the sale of rum in Europe, industrial corporation and also discussion of these developed land locked and island states, discussions of suitable aid forms for these states. There are a number of meetings going on at the moment, Sir, meetings I believe this week on agricultural corporation, meetings that deal with industrial corporation and regional corporation, and perhaps also some preparatory ACP meetings, so the funds are urgently needed in order to allow us to establish an officer who has been identified in Brussels. The major part of his work will be negotiations of a separate agreement to Lome as set out in the Addendum.

Finally, Sir, part of the supplementary, \$1.221 million, is to provide allowances for Government pensioners. We have to be very careful how the Press reports us these days, Sir. These persons are not old age pensioners and they are not national insurance old age pensioners, they are retired civil servants who are receiving Government pensions. These pensions, as I said a fortnight ago, I think it was, will be supplemented for those who receive certain pensions and allowances of less than \$250 a month, an amount of \$25 a month, and those who receive \$250 or more an amount of \$30 a month. The annual additional cost is estimated to be just under \$1¼ million.

I beg to move that Head 5(1) stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that we had opposed the Resolution which involves a number of items. Nevertheless, I want to deal with some of the Items involved because some of them in my view are of fundamental importance. You will note, Mr. Chairman, the rather hedgy presentation of the Prime Minister, particularly in Item 1, because encouched in Item 1 is a matter relating to the establishment of one of the new Ministries created by the Prime Minister in the now famous Cabinet reshuffle, and it has to do with the provision of office equipment consequent upon the appointment of a Minister without Portfolio. I assume this is the Minister for Broadcasting, Senator Nigel Barrow. And then also in this Resolution we are being asked to look at the voting of money for the appointment of another person for the post of Chief Economist, and I want to make the point of indicating that it is somewhat ironic that tonight we are looking at the elevation or appointment or transfer or what have you of two employees or former employees of the University of the West Indies.

Now I have not been able to get any real reason for the appointment of a Minister of broadcasting, and one must really question the need for establishing such a Ministry in the Government, particularly when it is

recognized that there is already in existence the Government Information Service, and there is also the existence of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, two areas in which the Government usses its great advantage to be able to propagandize or spread its work. So that we have the situation where now on top of all of this the country is being saddled with a Minister of Broadcasting. We will have to look at this matter in a very serious light because we were led to believe that the former administration had too many Ministries; and the present Government when it acquired office in 1976, based on promises it had made to the electorate that it would reduce the number of Ministries in existence under the last administration, did reduce the number of Ministries, but it would seem they did not indicate to the electorate — and this was apparently all part of the tricks of '76 — that this would only be for a time; so that after doing what they said they would in reducing the number of Ministries they have now turned around and expanded their operations back to the level of eleven Ministries.

I think one must make the point that if we are going to be talking in terms of trying to establish efficiency in the administration and relating the establishment of offices and Ministries to direct economic benefits of the country one must really question what is the real benefit of this. And there is absolutely no justification for this particular Ministry. But it is significant too, Mr. Chairman, that with the existence of the supposedly great combination and a backbench which is alleged to be more formidable than the front bench, the Prime Minister could not find within the ranks of the back bench, for example, the hon. member for St. Michael South who has the record of the largest number of acting appointments as Minister in any Government — thirty six I understand — he makes a boast that nobody has acted more times than he has — and I was looking forward to his elevation to a Ministry, and he must be extremely disappointed that he was not preferred by the Prime Minister. Perhaps he is holding on and living in hope, not realizing that he will never reach that stage.

On the other matter, Mr. Chairman, the question relating to the employment of a Chief Economist at the Ministry of Trade.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we are only dealing with Head 5(1) at the moment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Mr. GREAVES: You went through all of them; what is this talk now about one by one?

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it must have been quite apparent to all members that several Resolutions were dealt with with the utmost speed because they

represented various legitimate expenditure, and indeed we gave our support. We asked one question on one occasion and got a very tiresome and resentful answer. Nevertheless, we feel it is our right to ask questions when the occasion warrants it. This matter before us, the question of voting sums of money consequential on the appointment of the Minister without portfolio with special responsibility for Government propaganda is a matter of some concern.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not aware that there is a Minister of Government propaganda.

Dr. HAYNES: Well, Information; propaganda is just a tidier word which means the same thing. But indeed the hon. member for St. Lucy has already drawn to the attention of this Honourable House the budding stars on the back bench — and I am satisfied that they are far more able than the lesser stars on the front bench — this comes across very forcibly that none of them was offered the position in this situation. They faced the electorate, and the people of Barbados are asking whether they did not want the job or want to take the responsibility. And I think it is a bad reflection on members of the back bench.

Now we are being asked to vote money for a man who has never done a day's work in his life — a man who as far as I am aware would have been given a one year contract by the University at the end of his current contract as an indication that his work on a research level and at an academic level as far as lecturing was concerned, was unsatisfactory and they were prepared to accommodate him by transferring him to Trinidad for a year in order that he could start his professional training. 9.20 p.m.

This is information that I have, and we find ourselves now being committed to spending more money when we have already in this House voted to borrow millions of dollars in the not too distant past. We are being asked to spend money on a desk, as far as I see here. Is that right? Oh, I see that there is no desk because if there was a desk I would have pointed out to the hon. member for St. Thomas that the last time a desk was allocated to this particular Minister without Portfolio he spent all day with his feet on the desk; so we think that it would be better to buy him a footstool rather than a desk.

It is a matter of interest to see, Mr. Chairman, that one of the most urgent matters involved is a paper shredder. When you make up propaganda and an urgent need is for a paper shredder, then you begin to understand the kind of role which it is envisaged that he will play; because the only reason why they would want a paper shredder.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. member to consider Rule 28(9) which says: "The conduct of Her Majesty the Queen, Members of the Royal Family, His Excellency the Governor-General, Members of either House of Parliament, Judges, or the performance of judicial functions by any person may not be referred to except upon a substantive motion."

On the performance of Senator Barrow at the University as a teacher, I do not think that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has ever been entrusted by anybody — other than teaching at Modern High School many years ago — with this pedagogy; but anyhow we will not enter into that. His conduct as a teacher, whether he put his feet on the desk or not, no matter what he does, Sir, — whether he has carried out financial extortion in his profession — none of these things could possibly be permitted under Rule 28(9); and there is no Minister of Propaganda in this Government, Sir, as far as I know of.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would just like the hon. member for St. Thomas to know that I have been teaching for my entire life and have never stopped doing so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would still like hon. members to desist from these references.

Dr. HAYNES: I would be happy to deal with the particular matters; but you may have heard it said that a certain person left a message with the Secretary at Cave Hill to say that if the Prime Minister calls say that I am with the Dean; and if the Dean calls, say that I am with the Prime Minister; and if Mr. X calls in respect of that say that I will be down very shortly. Now, I am not referring to any particular person in this matter; but I think it is a good description of the operations of certain people. Today we are not happy to see that this House is being asked to vote money of this kind in such circumstances and we would hope, that although it is at the discretion of the Prime Minister, that some greater respect would be shown to the wishes of Barbados. When you make appointments of people who have been rejected by the electorate, and then rejected in another constituency and could not even become a candidate — I do not want to talk about his response to that defect in respect of the treatment of certain persons at CBC, including members of this Hon. House — I do not want to do that; but I think that it is important to take these kinds of things into consideration; and I can assure you that those of us who are asked to vote for sums to accommodate persons of this kind must feel badly about it, and must vote against it; and I think that that is our legitimate right.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have never myself and I am thinking very hard — even

when we were dealing with a former crook like Joy Edwards heard any member make any attack on a Minister or a Minister's appointment such as we have just heard. The hon. member can attack him as much as he likes. All I ask him is please do not try to bewitch Senator Barrow, neither you nor anyone else. Do not try to bewitch him. Just let him try to get on with his job. I have never really heard a personal attack of that sort in here. *(Aside)*. He will know what I mean. I do not know if he was a spectator at the game that the hon. member referred to. I have certainly never seen him taking part in one. Perhaps there are sporting aspects of Senator Barrow's activities with which I am not familiar; but I am satisfied that he is a man of talent, ability and sincerity and integrity; and his rejection by the electorate of St. George North was at least by a smaller margin than the rejection of the hon. member in the same constituency in the last elections; and at least he did not take a margin of 400 and turn it into a defeat of 600 as the hon. member.

I must say that it lies very ill in the mouth of the hon. member, having been humiliated in the same constituency in which Senator Barrow once ran, to criticise Senator Barrow about his defeat on that occasion. He was rejected by the electorate of St. George by fewer votes, by less than half of the votes by which the hon. member was rejected in St. George South on an earlier occasion.

Anyhow, I will not bother with all of that, sir. The hon. Minister I am sure, will give the Government admirable service, and he has shown his capacity for dealing with matters of information and public relations. Certain other subjects are being transferred to his portfolio. Film censorship is one, and there are one or two other matters relating to the portfolio which he holds at the present time; and I have no doubt that his advice will prove useful and that we can expect many more years of service to the people of Barbados.

As regards the speech made by the hon. member for St. Lucy referring to an hon. member of the House acting 36 times, at least that is 36 time more than anybody has ever trusted the hon. member for St. Lucy to act as a Minister or in any other capacity. He would have difficulty in acting 36 times as General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union because Frank Walcott would not trust him that much — a man of good and sound commonsense at some times. Certainly he exercises commonsense in what he practises even if not in what he says.

I beg to move that the Head stand part.

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

Head 5(3) was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is the by-election. I beg to move that Head 5(3) stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, under Head 5(3) this is a rather interesting situation which we are seeing developing here. Now, as I understand it, this Resolution is seeking a supplementary provision in the sum of \$6,066 to meet the payment of housing and personal allowance of the Chief Economist recently employed on contract in the first instance and the payment of contribution.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No. On a point of order, sir, this Head is 5(3) dealing with the by-election. It has nothing to do with the Chief Economist.

Mr. GREAVES: I was following the notes, I am sorry.

The question that Head 5(3) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
9.30 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now report to the Speaker the passing of the requisite number of Resolutions in Committee and ask leave to sit again. I think that Your Honour has passed 6 Resolutions. I beg that Your Honour report the passing of 6 Resolutions in Committee and ask leave to sit again. This will not include the Head we are now discussing. We will sit again on that. You will have your chance with the Chief Economist on that.

The question that the Chairman report to His Honour the Speaker the passing of 5 Resolutions and ask for leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported to me the passing of 5 Resolutions in Committee.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the sitting be now suspended until 10.00 o'clock tomorrow morning, Wednesday, October 4, 1978.

The question that this sitting be now suspended until 10.00 o'clock tomorrow morning, 4th October, 1978 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
9.40 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker Sir, on the front page of today's edition of the *Advocate News* under the headline "Remarks were a Slip" three paragraphs from the ending of that article says:—

"Government backbencher Mr. David Simmons said that if the Minister had made the statements at a public meeting rather than in the House of Assembly it might have been a different thing.

Touching on the question of victimisation Mr. Simmons said: 'When we were in Opposition we were excluded from areas of activity by the Government.'

Mr. Simmons was speaking when the time for Private Members' Business expired."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, my complaint about this article, Sir and my submission that it offends the privileges of the House is based on the fact, Sir, that I never at any time in the debate said that if the Minister had made statements at a public meeting rather than in the House of Assembly it might have been a different thing. It was the hon. member for St. Michael North Central.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you are submitting that the official report of this House cannot support what is written in today's paper.

Mr. SIMMONS: That is absolutely correct, Sir. I have been mis-reported and it is not the first time that it has been done to me and I am so angry this morning, Mr. Speaker, because I think this holds me up to ridicule in the eyes of all the people of Barbados, and especially those who were in the House of Assembly yesterday, and I took particular pains to point out that it was the member for St. Michael North Central who had made the comment and I found that it was nonsense because, Mr. Speaker, I said at the time.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I only want you to state your breach of privilege.

Mr. SIMMONS: Well Mr. Speaker, I have stated it and it is in Your Honour's hands to deal with it because it is a gross and rigid distortion of the events in the House yesterday, and in particular, what I said. Let me see if they have the courage to print these words that I said.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of privilege, I would like to point out that this matter of reporting of what the hon. member for St. James has

supposed to have said, has already gone before the Committee of Privileges. One Foster, C. G. or Cecil Foster, put a headline in the *Advocate* or wrote to say the story was over his by-line about the Minister on people starving. This has been reported to the *Advocate*, so I would really ask as a matter of privilege that Your Honour look at the *Advocate's* entire reporting of yesterday's debate because I am saying that it was a deliberate and calculated attempt to misrepresent the proceedings of the House in every respect. There is a limit to which you cannot go with dis-honest reporting. The speech of the hon. member for Christ Church East was entirely ignored. I am accusing the man Foster of being a deliberate, conscious and willing and vicious agent of misrepresenting the opinions of the Parliament of this country in the column.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is noted. In view of the fact that the matter has already been reported to the Committee of Privileges I would suggest that we await the findings of the Committee.

I would also like to draw the attention of this Honourable House to a report appearing on Column 7 of today's *Advocate*, the bottom of Column 7 "Taitt ordered out of House". Anyone reading that report of the incident must find that it is a deliberate attempt to make a mockery of the Chair, but all I would like to suggest at this time is that the *Advocate* be given a reasonable time to present in the same column, on the same page, an accurate report of what took place. Failing this, the hon. House will be asked to take action in this matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Speaking further on a point of privilege may I ask Sir, that the same time the *Advocate* is asked to deal with that that it be asked to deal also with the question of a fair report of the debate on the industrial matter and a fair report on the debate on the speech of the Hon. member for St. James on that matter. The fact that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central could be reported at such length and the *Advocate* ignored that a letter was produced in the House showing him to be guilty of the same conduct over his own signature, that he condemned and that does not appear on the pages of the *Advocate*, that by itself in a responsible Parliament would be enough for any speaker to call the *bona fides* of that newspaper's representation of Parliament in question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to pre-judge the issue, but the matter to which the Hon. Prime Minister referred might have far more serious consequences than asking for an accurate report.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that your honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: A suspension was taken. For the sake of the timetable, Sir, and the sake of getting through our business today I would wish to move the suspension of Standing Orders, so we can have lunch at an earlier hour, Sir, and we can continue through until we finish this, because this is all the Government intends to deal with. We just want to complete Item 1, Sir, we are not in a position to go ahead with 5 to 10, so we will like to suspend the Standing Orders, Sir, so we can complete Item 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the purpose for suspending the Standing Orders?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: So we can have lunch at 1.00 p.m. Sir. From 10.00 a.m. to 2.00 p.m. is a long time to ask hon. members to sit without refreshments.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are we sure we will be here at 2.00 p.m.?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I say it is possible, I do not know. If your Honour would like to wait and see if the necessity for suspending them arises later, I would be only too happy to do that. It is only the time table.

Mr. SPEAKER: I much prefer this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well I beg to move that your honour do now leave the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee, to that it now reverts.

The Speaker left the Chair and the Chairman resumed the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79 No. 7

The Clerk said Item 1(b) - resumes.

To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$1,292,760 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978-79, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79, No. 7 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

HEAD 5(3) - ELECTORAL OFFICE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee the Prime Minister moved that Head 5(3) - Electoral Office - stand part. It was seconded by the hon. member for Christ Church North Central, I believe. I will now put the question.

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

10.10 a.m.

HEAD 12(1) - DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 12(1) - Direction and Policy Formulation - was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head, I would like to give a little background to hon. members.

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

Last year Cabinet approved the regrading of one of the posts of Senior Economists in the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Tourism to that of Chief Economist. A number of advertisements were inserted in the Official Gazette and in the newspapers calling for applicants for this post. A number of specific qualifications were set out and the basic one was that the applicant had to have a degree in economics or business administration with a requisite number of, namely, five years' practical experience in this area. Of all of the applications that were received only one could meet the requirements set out in the advertisement. He was a Barbadian who was residing in London and was working in the Economic planning sector of the British Post Office. He was interviewed by the High Commissioner and the then Permanent Secretary in my Ministry and found suitable, and he was offered the post by the Public Service Commission. However before he could come to Barbados on 1st May, a regrading took place in the United Kingdom, and as a consequence the post which he formerly held was considerably upgraded and he withdrew his acceptance of the post.

The post was re-advertised in Barbados and the only applicant with the requisite qualification was a person who was holding the post of Lecturer at the University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus. Negotiations were started with this gentleman and it appeared quite clearly that a considerable loss in personal income would be suffered by the applicant if he were to be employed on the terms and conditions set out in the advertisement, notwithstanding that the basic salary of the job was being revised. In order to ensure therefore that at least comparable remuneration was paid to the person who had applied, and had indicated an interest in the job and not with similar terms to the remuneration which he was presently receiving, a submission had to be made to the Establishments Division and consequential adjustments were made. Cabinet subsequently approved these consequential adjustments by way of personal allowance, and it was necessary under the circumstances to

supplement Head 12(1) in the sum set out in Items 3 and 14(a). That is the explanation of the need and necessity for this Resolution.

I do not think that hon. members would feel that a Ministry which deals with such important matters as international trade and industry does not deserve a person as head of the economic section of that Ministry who has lesser experience than five years.

Accordingly I beg to move that Head 12(1) — Direction and Policy Formulation — stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to hear the arguments which were advanced by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Trade relative to the appointment of the person who has been appointed to fill the post of Chief Economist in the Ministry of Trade. He purported to give the background to this particular post and what led up to the person who has been finally selected to fill this post, and in doing so he sought to indicate that there was, as it were, a paucity of applicants for the post of Chief Economist. It seems to me that we have to make a number of points in this and indeed to ask a number of questions.

In the first place it is a bit difficult to understand how out of all the number of economists who are personally employed in the public service and who are in Barbados, their criticisms about the large number of economists who are produced and who come out of the University of the West Indies every year the Government finds itself in so much difficulty in being able to recruit a person into the position of Chief Economist which presumably is a fairly senior post in the Government Service.

Now the Minister introducing this Resolution indicated that one of the qualifications which they required was that the person should have, I think he said, not less than five years' experience. Now I really would want to find out when the Government talks in terms of five years' experience whether they are talking in terms of five years' experience in teaching or five years' experience in the kind of work or in the practical area. I do not want to be uncharitable to the goodly gentleman, but I think that facts are facts. If one were to examine the record of the individual who has been recruited into this position, one has got to ask a number of questions because as I understand it, this person was a former Lecturer at the University of the West Indies whose contract was on the verge of being terminated. As a matter of fact, he was given a three-year contract in the first instance, it was renewed, and then the last year he was put on a one-year contract.

Now in University circles as I understand it, when a lecturer or any person on the teaching staff is put on a

one-year contract, that is notice which is given to that person to look for a job; so what do we see here? Last night I referred to the instance of another person who has joined the Government as a Minister who was also put on notice. We do not want to go over what has been already covered. In as much as the person has been made a Minister, one cannot talk on it, but that is a matter for them. The point is that we have in this instance a person who was given notice that he is going to be fired from his job, and we see the Government coming along and offering him this position based presumably on the experience which he is supposed to have had. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very serious matter, and one has got to raise a number of questions.

It is within our knowledge that the same gentleman poses and is indeed one of the main economic advisers of the Barbados Labour Party. He made a boast about this. As a matter of fact, he has boasted that he has been the architect of the economic planning of the Barbados Labour Party; he has been instrumental in impressing upon the Prime Minister the wisdom of imposing the unemployment levy and a lot of other economic measures which have been introduced by this Government, so that it is as it were a job for one of the boys.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at this matter in proper perspective. Now we are looking at the post of Chief Economist.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should hope the hon. member is not attempting to impute improper motives on any one.

Mr. GREAVES: Not at all, Mr. Chairman. Why would I want to impute improper motives when one can see very clearly what is happening? But let us go on. We have a situation where we are looking at the position of Chief Economist.

10.20 a.m.

There are other positions of Chief Economist in the public service of this country, but look what we are doing. There are three in the Ministry of Finance and Planning and I believe that there is also one in the Ministry of Agriculture, so that we have a situation now where you have this special Chief Economist, this person who I am yet to hear what particular contribution to economic knowledge and thought he has made other than of course being an adviser to the Barbados Labour party. I want to know what is so special about this particular person that we are going to be offering all these perks of office to him. As I said, there are other positions of Chief Economist in this Government but not one of them enjoys the privileges which this particular Chief Economist is going to get. They do not get housing allowance, they do not get personal allowance and think that the Minister needs to explain in much more detail and much more convincingly the reason why the Government is now

seeking to provide these kinds of perks for a person who has obviously demonstrated his incapacity in other areas and we have got to be very clear about this, because when you have a situation where you are going to provide these kinds of facilities and these kinds of perks for one person when they are others in the same position — because if you look in the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, you will see that the position of Chief Economist falls under the super scale F, and there are other people in the public service in that scale, and I am saying this is going to cause disruption and dissatisfaction within the ranks of the service. I am sorry that the officers at that level are not members of the Barbados Workers' Union, because I would be the first to lead a confrontation against the Government on what is obviously an unfair advantage which is being given to one officer over the other officers in that particular position. There is no reason why that should be so, and as I am saying, this is going to cause a disruption in the service because of this special treatment which is being given. The other people who are under the F scale, and particularly Chief Economists have a good case now to make out for housing allowance and personal allowance, and I would like the Minister to let us know when he gets up to reply whether or not with the salary which the Chief Economist is getting, with the housing allowance which the Government is arranging for this officer, and with the personal allowance which he will be getting, whether this particular officer would not now be drawing the salary in excess of that the Permanent Secretary and some other Permanent Secretaries who are at present in the service, and whether they consider that is fair.

It is to my knowledge that when all the allowances are added up along with the salary that he will be getting more salary than one of the Permanent Secretaries, and this is going to be a very serious matter and I think that the Minister should further tell the House whether when this post was advertised there was any indication that the applicants could have the option of a contract — it is true that we know that the person is not a Barbadian, he might be a legalised Barbadian, but certainly the person who has been appointed in this position is not a Barbadian — but I think we have to recognise very clearly and we want to find out whether any indication in the advertisement was given that the person could have the option of a contract or any of the other facilities, and whether the person would have access to a housing allowance and a personal allowance, the kind of facilities which are now offered to this person.

I am worried Mr. Chairman, to see this kind of back-bending accommodation which the Government is affording to this particular person who has recently joined the ranks of the service. Bearing in mind that the person has recently made a post that he is coming in in

the first instance — and notice, Mr. Chairman, the note is very cleverly written — the gentleman is walking about saying the understanding on which he is joining the service is that at the end of year one and the beginning of year 2 he will be given a Permanent Secretaryship, that this is the promise which was made to him.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I would be most grateful to the hon. member if he would give details or who gave that promise and when the alleged officer made that statement. That is a most serious thing.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, all I am saying is let the Minister deny that the officer has stated that he expects and has been promised to be made a Permanent Secretary after the completion of the first year's contract.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am asking the hon. member to say to whom the officer said that and who made the promise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member comply?

Mr. GREAVES: Certainly not. Let him ask the officer. As we were saying, Mr. Chairman, I think that we have got to look at this matter, this is a very serious matter, and there is no reason to duck out of this situation because no attempt to duck out will absolve the Government for what appears to be a very unusual situation with the kind of privileges which are being extended here, and as I said, I want to know what is so special about this officer that these kinds of provisions are being made for him. As I see it, Mr. Chairman, it is going to cause a lot of confusion, and it is definitely unfair to other members of the Public Service to make these special concessions for a particular officer when in the first instance we have other Chief Economists in other Departments and we have other people in the F scale under which this officer falls, and no such provision is made for these officers, so I think the Government has got to do a lot of explaining on this particular matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Leader of the House is going to deal with some aspects of this matter, but some of the allegations that have been made relate to the position of the Minister responsible for Establishments.

First of all, I am not aware that anybody can make a promise to anybody that he is going to be a Permanent Secretary. I think that the members of the Public Service Commission and the Prime Minister would have to conspire together and come to an agreement that somebody was going to become a Permanent

Secretary. I am confident that the hon. member is not going to allege that any member of the Public Service Commission has made any promise to the gentleman in question about a Permanent Secretaryship, and I can assure the hon. member that I have not spoken, sent a message, had any discussion with the officer concerned about his position in the Public Service, this job, Permanent Secretary, or anything. The first that I knew that he was to be employed was when a file came to me with certain recommendations on it. I did not know that he had applied, that anybody else had applied, I had no conversation even with the Leader of the House about it. Now, I don't say this to go on the defensive, I am saying this because the House has to take a serious and considered look at some of the statements that are made in here.

A member of the House has got up and said that somebody has promised a man that he is to be Permanent Secretary, or made an insinuation to the effect that somebody has held out to a person at the University that he is going to be appointed Permanent Secretary in the Government. Now, in many Parliaments, Sir, when people make wild, unfounded, false allegations such as these...

10.30 a.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You are sitting in the Chair. The Prime Minister was not in here. You are aware that I said that the gentleman concerned is walking around boasting that he has been promised to be made a Permanent Secretary, the Prime Minister should deny that if it is not so.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The gentleman is not in this Chamber to defend himself or to expose the truth or falsehood of your allegations. You cannot just go on charging people like that on the floor of the House.

The hon. member should be asked to state where and to whom the statement was made. If the hon. member cannot justify it, he should ask the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition has been in here, with a break of 18 months, for 27 years now; and he will tell the hon. member that you do not get up in Parliament and make accusations about people unless you are prepared to justify them.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of personal explanation. The hon. member has called my name. I was not in this debate. I have not opened my mouth for the whole day, sir. I understood the hon. member to say that the officer was going around making this statement. The hon. member did not say that the officer had been promised. The hon. member said that the particular officer already had been

recruited. So the salary of the officer which legitimately before the House now — the officer has been going around making these allegations that is what the hon. member said; so I do not want to be invoked here as any authority because of longevity in Parliament or otherwise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The person to whom the hon. member referred is not in this Hon. Chamber.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think that the intervention by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition means that he is going to speak privately to the member for St. Lucy, and I appreciate that. That is exactly what it means. As soon as he comes as mild as that, you know, Mr. Chairman that he is accepting the argument being put forward from these benches. Mr. Chairman, a man's salary is at stake, and a member comes into the House and says that he should not get the salary or should get it, but argues about the salary because he says the man is walking around saying this, that and the next. This is a very serious allegation; and he should, I think, either say to whom this statement was made or where it was made, or withdraw it. The Rules have a provision that before you call somebody's name, or make allegations about any person that notice must be given to the Chair. I am absolutely sure that no notice has been given. As Minister responsible for Establishment, I would have called the officer concerned and either got an admission from him, or what I would have demanded is a denial in writing that he had ever made such a statement; but when you come in here carrying on with this character assassination — I know that the Rules say that you cannot say under the cloak of parliamentary privilege, Sir — when you come in here and you say these things, very often your lackeys in the Press print them, and the Government's case perhaps through some decency never makes its way through to the public. There is a popular song about "Okay, they like to abuse people's and so on — I am speaking to the Leader of the Opposition — that when you meet a situation where his colleagues — I cannot say tell a lie on a man, Sir, — but make allegations about somebody which, if untrue, would be popularised in the phrase tell lies on the man — if his colleague does that he just sits relatively mute or indeed gets up to say what he has said in these circumstances.

On the Establishments point, Sir, briefly it should not be unknown to the House that there are a number of contract officers who get salaries and allowances in excess of those of persons doing the same or similar work in other parts of the Public Service. There are certain times when you want a man, and to contract him you have to give him a certain salary. I did not hear anyone complain when a consultant was taken on at the Caves Authority at a salary of \$4,000 a month.

Mr. Olsen was taken on before the Authority was formed. He was consultant to the Caves Authority.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of this. I wish that the hon. member would give me the details at some time about how this consultant was taken on at \$4,000 a month. This is the first time that I have heard mention of that.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I heard a comment on the last occasion that the Leader of the Opposition was in here, Sir, and you come to a realisation sometimes that a lot of things do go on that we do not know about. I fully accept that Senator Field was able to expose to us money wasting of the Caves Authority more than was perhaps revealed to any Minister of finance. Anyhow, that is a slightly separate point, Sir. In a later debate in here we are going to discuss the appointment of a contract officer in a department, and I believe that his salary will be larger than that of the Permanent Secretary of the department. That is what happens when you want particular officers to carry out particular functions. The Minister for Trade and Industry will be able to say if there were any other suitable applicants: but if you need a man and he cannot be accommodated within the existing Public Service structure, you just have to employ and accommodate at the terms and conditions on which he can be accommodated. Efficiency in Government demands that at certain times you just have to hire staff; and you are talking about a few people out of 16,000.

I suppose it is possible that you can make a song and dance because you do not like a man, and you are angry that he in particular has been hired. Would the hon. member say the same thing if it was Frank Alleyne? I doubt it. Would he say the same thing if it was Wendell McClean? Well, he might now; but would he have said the same thing five years ago if it was Frank Alleyne or Wendell McClean? I am sure that he would not. Well, we cannot have arguments *ad hominem* in here. We cannot have arguments which deal with the particular man. We must have arguments which relate to principles. It is necessary to have a good economist to deal with very important matters under the control of the Deputy Prime Minister; and the Deputy Prime Minister and those responsible for this appointment have my full support in this matter as Minister responsible for Establishments, notwithstanding accusations made by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If no other hon. member wishes to speak.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is customary, I believe, for the Presiding Officer to look around before the Presiding Officer comes to any conclusion about contributions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I need not be reminded of that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am glad to hear that, Sir. I also wish to make my contribution to this debate on a matter of principle. Maybe the principles by which I am guided are not the principles by which the hon. member who has just sat down happens to be guided. I have had to deal with the Public Service in Barbados and the various Public Service Commissions for a long period of time. I need not remind you of how long a period of time. Except in so far as the law of this island invested me with authority to make certain recommendations and certain appointments such as the Governor-General, the Chief Justice and so on, I have throughout the whole period in which I was associated with the running of Government, never tried to impose any particular officer on a Services Commission. I do not think that apart from certain jobs under the control of the Prime Minister's Office in which the Prime Minister must have a say — such as the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister and so on, you do not seek to create job opportunities for people simply because they perform services for any particular political party. I think that the points made by the member for St. Lucy are very valid points, and they have not been answered so far. You have three Senior Economists in the Ministry of Finance and one Senior Economist in the Ministry of Agriculture, and their salary scale is designated as Z 1. There are officers, I remember, who have served in the Government for long periods of time.

10.40 a.m.

You have other officers who have worked in the Ministry of Trade who may not have the official title of Economist I or II or Senior Economist, but who certainly have had to deal with the mercantile community, to deal with CARICOM subjects, advise Ministers on conferences in the pre-CARICOM and pre-CARIFTA days, carry the exercise all the way through, attend meetings related to the foundation of the ACP countries which was largely the creation of the energy of the then Minister of Trade in Barbados, the hon. member for St. Michael South West, and the now Deputy Prime Minister of Jamaica, Mr. Patterson. And all along we did not have to offer these public officers any special inducements to carry out work of quality and with a degree of exactitude unknown in any of the public services of the Caribbean prior to the foundation of the association of the European Economic Community or the Inauguration of the Caribbean Free Trade Area Agreement and so on. That kind of work was creative work, work which was demanding and which was carried out to the satisfaction of everybody concerned. The Minister of Trade now feels himself in the position

where he needs somebody who is a super economist: not somebody of the calibre of professor Sir Arthur Lewis, now head of the Department of Princeton University — you would understand, Mr. Chairman; not somebody of the calibre of the former Governor of the Central Bank of Jamaica, Mr. Arthur Brown; not somebody of the calibre of Mr. Allistair McIntyre who is now in Brussels, or of the calibre of Dr. Demas who is head of the Caribbean Development Bank — all of whom are international figures — but a person who is not even number three on the Cave Hill Campus of the University of the West Indies and whose two seniors who have been mentioned here today are mercurial in their economic prognostications and stability — Mr. Frank Alleyne and Mr. Wendel MacClean — if you want to know about them ask the Governor of the Central Bank of Barbados and he will give you an assessment. I like them both; to me they are both objects of study. I find them very interesting persons, and I hope that one of these days they will develop some kind of maturity. But they are number one and number two at the Campus, and I am not sure whether the gentleman hired is number three. But what I know is that they had the same security of tenure and the gentleman we are going to call on to advise the Minister of Trade — who himself is not an economist, but I am sure from the kind of recommendations which have been made by the appointee that if you left the Deputy Prime Minister to himself he would probably make sounder recommendations to the Government of Barbados than this appointee has given.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will agree that a third wicket batsman is still a good batsman.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, but sometimes a third wicket batsman gets dropped from the team all together. And this is what I am a bit concerned about. This is nothing personal; I do not know the gentleman. We know that some of the things he has recommended have not worked in other countries; that is all I can say. But anything that is novel in Barbados that the DLP did not do has a certain attraction for the present Prime Minister; so good luck to him but good luck to us too, because we know that they are not going to work. But the point I am making is that there are people in the government service who would be looking forward to some kind of promotion who have more of the necessary qualifications — I am surprised that the Public Service Commissions cannot let down their buckets among the existing economic staff of the Ministry of Agriculture, the economists in the Ministry of Finance, all of whom have more than five years experience, practical experience plus the academic qualifications; because somebody who has left Montserrat or St. Kitts and got a degree and gone straight to teaching at a number three four or five level at the Cave Hill Campus and has had no other exposure is of

no value as far as I am concerned to the Minister of Trade in the kind of exercises that he says he wants to indulge in. And I think that the principle is bad because you are creating a situation in which an officer who is a technical officer as it were is not only getting more than his peers with equal qualifications but he is getting more than the Permanent Secretary when you add all his fringe benefits and emoluments together. The scale in which you had Senior Economists was Z6 to Z1; that used to go from \$15,072 to \$18,552. Now the Chief Economist scale is an S scale which is now the super scale because the top of the Senior Economist scale ends at the bottom of the super scale and the S scale is two above the bottom of the super scale. The permanent Secretary is position B in the super scale. Now the top of the super scale since the division we approved a couple of weeks ago is \$30,000. We do not know at what point the officer is going to be appointed but we know the specific allocation of the allowances, the global sum which is to be there and the personal allowances, etc., and how it is being allocated. But the retention portion of it must be comparatively small compared with a personal allowance side of it. Therefore if you add the \$22,716 which is now the S scale in the super scale for the Chief Economist to the allowances, he is going to come out with a total disbursement in excess of what the people at the top of the super scale are getting. (ASIDES) The Hon. member made a point not if you add in their allowances. Yes, but more than their basic. The hon. member is right on that because Permanent Secretaries do not get personal allowances though they do get a house allowance. This Officer is being given a personal allowance, so the hon. member is quite right for if you add on the housing allowance that the Permanent Secretary gets then this officer would not be quite as high as the Permanent Secretaries but he will be in there with what I call the muck and mucks in the Civil Service, a new man coming in over all the economists in the Government except the Director of Finance and Planning and the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Finance. He will be right up there, so the people who have been slogging away all those years in the Ministry of Trade, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Finance must feel that somebody from Montserrat or St. Kitts with the same degree, the same five years but without practical experience is being looked upon as being more consequential than they who have given dedicated service to the Government. As far as I am concerned it does not affect me but we must look at the overall picture. I hope that the Government is going to get value for their money and I would have hoped that if they had to bring in somebody from outside it would have been somebody who had worked with trade problems on a practical basis rather than someone who is purely an academician whose authority and respect in the academic field we are not quite certain about.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, in view of the impropriety, in my opinion, of the allegations made by the hon. member, I sent for the file dealing with the whole history of the post of Chief Economist in the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Tourism, and I am very happy to be in a position to demonstrate clearly that the foul allegations that were made by the hon. member for St. Lucy have absolutely no foundation in fact. He said that we created a post for this man because he was a member of the Barbados Labour Party; that is what he said — jobs for the boys.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will have to withdraw that. I never said the post was created for a member of the Barbados Labour Party. What I said was that a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party got the job; that is completely different.
10.50 a.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Anybody listening to the hon. member when he uses the term like "jobs for the points" in the context of politics, in the context of the type of politics that is practised, which his Government practised, which he practises in the Union, everybody would know what he is saying and the allegation that he was making is that we deliberately created a post because he was fired or was about to be fired by the University.

Now I am going to deal with all of the facts. The post of Chief Economist was created since April, 1977. It was created subsequent to my entry into the Ministry because I felt that the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Caribbean Affairs was of equal importance to the Ministry of Finance and Planning and there was no post in there before of Chief Economist. There was a post of Senior Economist. It was upgraded to Chief Economist and Mr. Carl Hinkson, who had been holding the post of Senior Economist was immediately appointed to act pending the Public Service Commission appointing him in the post.

Mr. Hinkson acted in that post and as he was about to be confirmed, he was offered a job in the Ministry of External Affairs in the London Office, and Mr. Hinkson was transferred to the London Office. The post was advertised and they were two applicants for the post. The post was first advertised with a closing date of 30th September, 1977, and it was advertised on the 31st August, 1977.

There were two applications for the post from Barbados, and I will call all the names, Mr. Andrew Lewis who was then a Senior Research Officer in the Ministry of Tourism and Mr. Carvello who was from the Ministry of Finance and Planning. Both of them were interviewed, not by me, because I do not interview people for posts, by the Permanent Secretary in the

Ministry of Trade and the comments of the Permanent Secretary were that both of these people had had the requisite experience and that in view of the fact that Mr. Carvello had had more experience in general planning than Mr. Lewis, that he would prefer that.

Mr. Carvello immediately withdrew before the letter could go out to him because he then became acting Chief Economist in the Ministry of Planning, so the offer was made to Mr. Andrew Lewis, but before Mr. Lewis could take up the job, Mr. Lewis' own job was upgraded which had been in the Ministry for many years. The question of upgrading the Tourism Research Department had been in the former Ministry of Tourism and Information for many years, and his job was upgraded by the Ministry of Establishments among a long series of jobs which had been in Establishment for many years, and the hon. member, Leader of the Opposition now, he ran his business in such a way that these matters remained there for years, and left officers frustrated. (*Aside.*) Of course he was frustrated that is why he wanted to move from Tourism for which he was specially trained to get the differences in the change. Of course he was frustrated. You think if a person who is a specialist in tourism and the job he was doing had a comparable pay to another job that he would want to move?

Now Sir, we went even further. We then had to readvertise the job and we received no applications from any Senior Economists in the Government Service in Barbados. As a matter of fact, the Chief Establishment Officer as well as the Chief Personnel Officer wrote on the file that he regarded it as most remarkable that a number of the junior economists in the Ministry of Planning thought so much of the Ministry of Planning, that they did not want to accept a challenging post in the Ministry of Trade, etc. That is what they said, and I replied on that saying that that is irrelevant that what I want is a man to do the job. I do not care whether they think the Ministry of Planning is some demi-god Ministry. It might have been so under the hon. member, but not today, because each Ministry in this country has its own responsibility and we are not going to have this centralisation like the hon. member had in which you held up the work in other Departments. You would not allow them any independence, not even to create ideas and put them forward for coordination by your Ministry. (*Asides.*) Yes, I said it last week and I will say it again this week.

Now, let us go further. Two people came and were interviewed in London. We even sent the application with conditions and terms of conditions of the job to the High Commissions and Embassies abroad. Two people indicated their interest in London, a Mr. Sandiford and a Mr. Brown. Mr. Sandiford was actually

appointed to the job. He had two problems, not with me, with Establishment and Personnel and they worked and worked until those problems were solved. They thought that the gentleman would be coming from the 1st January, 1978, but he wrote and said he had to give notice to the Post Office where he was working in the Planning Section and he could not come before the 1st May, 1978.

Despite the fact that there was no post there, because Mr. Brown who was the Economist was then in Mexico on a U.N. Fellowship dealing with National Trade and after that he was going to Geneva to do another course, then Mr. Sandiford wrote back and said that he had investigated the cost of living in Barbados and now that they had had an increase he was no longer interested in the post in Barbados.

Mr. Brown had never any experience at all other than working in the Inland Revenue Department in some post there. (*Asides.*) Mr. Brown from England, some Mr. Brown, I do not even know his name. He was a Barbadian living in England. He was not recommended by Mr. Hinkson to the High Commissioner or to Mr. Williams who went from the Lome Convention in Brussels subsequently to interview these candidates on a delegation from the Chief Personnel Office.
11.00 a.m.

He was not recommended by Mr. Hinkson, the High Commissioner nor Mr. Williams who went from the Lome Convention in Brussels specifically to interview this candidate on a delegation of the Chief Personnel Officer. The post was re-advertised and Mr. Sommersall wrote to the Ministry saying that he saw the post, that the University permitted and were indeed encouraging their officers to get experience in Government Departments. This is what he said; I am telling you what he wrote; and that he would be prepared to accept the job if the terms and conditions of service would be made equal to what he was getting, because as part of the programme they were supposed to get experience and things of that kind in the way how Governments work, and he had undertaken specifically a course in project planning and project finance run by the Inter-American Development Bank specifically for people around so as to teach them and expose them to the skills of Government planning and things of that kind.

Now, from there on everything took place between the Permanent Secretary in my Ministry and Mr. Sommersall and the Chief of Establishments and the Chief Personnel Officer. I did not have anything to do with it. When I saw the salary that the lecturers at the University got, I must admit that. I think they are considerably better off than a lot of us. In any event

the actual salary without the salary revision at the University that he was drawing was \$25,314; he got a housing allowance of \$5,063 and he got a children's allowance of \$1,200 making a total emolument of \$31,577. That is what a lecturer gets. Now out of that he had to take out 5% for pension contributions and the University put in 10%. That could not be matched fully by the Government, but he agreed to take into account when it was pointed out to him that there was specific provision in Barbadian recruitment procedure for people to be on contract and that at the end of the contract period you get a gratuity, so what he would be getting would be a gratuity in addition to the salary in lieu of pension, so that had to be credited back in before he compared the two salaries. This went along and went along.

The hon. member for St. Lucy has obviously never been exposed to how the Establishments Office and Personnel Office work in Barbados. They do not agree to pay out the money especially when it brings salaries on par with theirs, especially when you get in sight. And a lot of bargaining and cross-talk went along. In the end what was agreed was that he would be paid a personal allowance and a housing allowance of a lesser value than the equivalent of his two allowances at the University, but the basic salary would remain the same. But then we ran into a problem because the University said they were not seconding anybody for two years. So he could not be offered a two-year contract because the University insisted that they were not going to release him for two years; they would release him for one year on the condition that the Government of Barbados paid into the pension fund the contributions which the University had to pay and additional costs that they would have to pay, and then we had to go back and an agreement was reached where Mr. Sommersall himself had to pay part of the pension contributions which he agreed to to the University; because we were not going to give him gratuity and pension, so that over-all the two allowances that he gets are a housing allowance of \$3,600, \$3,000 personal allowance which is \$6,600, and he gets \$20,496; so that is \$27,000 odd, plus he would get his gratuity like any other officer.

I do not know how the hon. member can arrive at the conclusion that he is getting more than a Permanent Secretary. He does not get as much as the hon. member; so I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. The more one goes into these facts, the more one sees clearly that this was an attempt by the Government of Barbados to ensure that an important Ministry has available to it...

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Minister indicated that the salary of the holder of the post is at present \$20,496. I wonder if he has taken into consideration what it would be in the new scheme of things, because we understand it is \$22,716.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is precisely why it was pointed out that the salaries were under review, and the salary at the time of his application was only \$24,435, but by the time you took up the appointment in September his University salary would have been \$25,314. So even if you add it to what the present amount is, and it must be about 10% in that category or 7½% at that level, it still does not come back to any salary near the Permanent Secretary, not even the low grade Permanent Secretary's salary.

Mr. Chairman, now that the facts have been made clear, I hope the hon. member recognises that the attempt that he made to suggest that we on this side made special provision in order to give a job to people whom he alleges are sympathetic to this side is totally unworthy and without foundation. As to whether the University and the gentleman have differences of opinion as to his competence, I only say this; if that is true, the University personnel are a bunch of hypocrites, including the Principal. If what you say is true, the Principal is a hypocrite, because at no stage did the University ever communicate with the Ministry that this officer was under any one year contract or anything of the kind, and a University has an obligation if they know that an officer whom they employ is not fit and proper person to deal with the officer or to inform anybody who wants to employ him; and I am not mincing my words. Either that allegation that the hon. member made in here is totally false or the University and their administration up there are a bunch of hypocrites. But I am not mincing any words in here when I come in here and have to face the voilent allegations falling from the mouth of the hon. member without any foundation. We will deal with them in the manner in which they should be dealt with; we will expose them for what they are, and by exposing them, one knows the true character of the officer.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I want, Mr. Chairman, to make just a very brief contribution to this debate. I do not want to get myself into the suitability of the candidate, Mr. Sommersall, for this office. I have known him perhaps better than any person else in this House. It was way back in 1962 that I first met him and we worked together at close range for many years, and I have no doubt that he has the basic mental equipment that will allow him, once he applies himself, to do this job satisfactorily. I just want to say in fairness to him as I go along that it was way back in 1964 that he graduated with a good Honours degree in Upper Second Class Honours from the University of the West Indies, and he went on to Chicago and did a Master's degree, and since then he has been teaching both at the University of the West Indies and at other institutions in North America.

11.10 p.m.

He went on to Chicago and did a Masters Degree, and since then he has been in teaching both at the University of the West Indies and at other institutions in North America. Although it is true that he does not have the reputation of a Sir Arthur Lewis, or an Arthur Browne, or a Willie Demas or an Allister MacIntyre, there can be no doubt that basically he has the equipment and the background that will allow him to do this job satisfactorily once he applies himself.

What I really want to comment on, however, is what I regard as an important breakthrough which has been achieved in bringing someone from outside the Civil Service, namely the university world, and fitting them in with adjustments to the Civil Service structure. I have long contended, Mr. Chairman, that the Civil Service in this country has been too immutable and that the Civil Service can benefit from a cross fertilisation of ideas which will result from bringing people from the world of trade unionism, for instance, from the world of industry, from the world of commerce, from the world of the university and fitting them in on short or long assignments within the Civil Service structure. Equally, I would like to see people from the Civil Service go out into the world of the university for two years, go out into the world of commerce for two years, go out into the world of industry for two, three or four years. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that can only be to the benefit of the Civil Service, and to that extent I greatly welcome this departure. I think it is a tribute to the strength of the present Minister of Industry, the Deputy Prime Minister, that when in the end Mr. Sommersall was the only candidate, that he fought the Establishments Department and the Personnel Department to ensure that notwithstanding the fact that special concessions had to be made for Mr. Sommersall, that they would be allowed to have him.

The Personnel Office, the Establishments Office, indeed all civil servants look very jealously on people coming into their system and getting what they regard as better terms and conditions than they enjoy at a particular level and they try to turn down everything, but I think it is a very important departure that we have been able to go into the world of the university and bring some person into the Civil Service structure. I hope that we see more of that, and equally I hope that we will see people in the Civil Service going out into the wider world, getting some experience and coming back in. I feel, as I said earlier, that the Civil Service has been too inward looking in the past, and that the Civil Service could benefit greatly from this cross fertilisation of ideas.

I do not want to get myself into any discussion as to the suitability of the particular candidate for the office, he has not perhaps appeared in print as often as those of us who knew the promise which he showed as

early as 1963-64 would have expected, but I have no doubt that he has the basic mental equipment and the training that would allow him to perform with satisfaction in the present job to which he will be going in another week or so.

The question that Head 12(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 16(1) was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this sum under this Head is to supplement Head 16 -- Rental of Property in order to provide accommodation in Brussels for an officer in the Ministry of External Affairs who has been seconded for a period of ten months to the European Economic Community Headquarters in Brussels to monitor and look after Barbados' interest during the course of the Lome negotiations, re-negotiations for a successor agreement to follow Lome, and it expires in March, 1980.

Barbados does not have an Ambassador resident in Brussels, the EEC is serviced by the Ambassador to the United Kingdom, who is also designated as Ambassador to the EEC. The negotiations are likely to be a long drawn out affair, and they do not require the presence of a Minister in Brussels permanently although they do require the presence of the representative of the Government of Barbados who will work along with other Caribbean Ambassadors and Charge d'Affaires in order to ensure that the interest of the Caribbean is adequately put forward and protected.

It is envisaged that there will be a number of ministerial meetings but that a number of the non-essential points will be dealt with at official level. I am instructed, Sir, that Mr. H.D.B. Babb had been seconded to the CARICOM Secretariat during the negotiations of the Lome Convention to perform a similar role. The importance of the Lome Convention and any successor agreement with the European Economic Community to the problems of Barbados is well known, and I believe the whole of the area, but I would point out that on this occasion there is no re-negotiation of the sugar protocol which has a life beyond the Lome Convention. Nevertheless, Barbados has a specific interest in revision of the terms of the protocol dealing with rum, industrial co-operation, trade promotion, fishing in particular now that the EEC has assumed responsibility for regulating the 200 mile limit of the European economic states, and in view of the fact that Cayenne, Martinique, Gaudeloupe are well within geographical areas of Barbados, and in view of the fact that we also have interest in fishing, particularly off Cayenne, we also have particular interest in the question of transportation and tourism, and particularly along with the Governments of

the Seychelles, Fiji, Mauritius, Ivory Coast, etc. a particular interest in seeing that sympathetic consideration is given in any successor agreement to Lome to the question of the difficulties of ACP States in getting adequate air routes from Europe to promote tourism.

I have given a clear outline of the areas of interest that we have particular interest in, and I think hon. members will agree that it is vitally necessary in this stage of the negotiations for Barbados to have, like Trinidad and others, a permanent presence there. It is also envisaged that a review of Barbados' representation on the continent of Europe during the course of the ten months would be undertaken and the Ministry of External Affairs is analysing the pros and cons of the establishment of a permanent Ministry there. The vital and material matter, of course, is the question of cost and benefits, bearing in mind the particular interest not only in Lome but also in the rising tourism that we are receiving from Europe. It is this year anticipated that we could have from the European Countries, excluding the United Kingdom and Ireland, somewhere in the vicinity of 45,000 tourists, and the most significant thing about it is that they have been coming here at the period of time when it is the soft period in Barbados, from the months of October and November in particular, and they start back again in great force from as early as May, and we really as part of our strategy are interested in trying to increase tourism in the summer months, and we are advised that Europe is one of the geographical areas where we should concentrate our efforts.

11.20 a.m.

That will be one of the geographical areas that we should concentrate our efforts on to improve our performance during the summer.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

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

Head 20 was called.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING PENSIONS — ITEM 4

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have already explained on more than one occasion the calculations for improving the position of Government pensioners. This is a Resolution which seeks to appropriate the necessary funds to give increases of \$25 and \$30 a month, Sir.

I beg to move that this Head do now stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has said that he has on more than one occasion explained the calculations on this. I would just like, for the purpose of the record, to indicate what in my view seems to be back tracking on the part of the Government on a promise which was made relative to public officers. On Page 12 of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party it was stated that part of the provisions which the party was making for old age pensioners particularly those who have retired — in the second column it states as follows: "The party (will also) adjust the pensions of retired public officers to take account of the salary being currently and from time to time paid to the relevant office holder rather than pegging the pensions to the salary paid to an officer at the date of his retirement".

It is evident from the remarks already made by the Prime Minister, and the provisions which are set out are no where near the promise which was made. It would seem that the promise which was contained in the Manifesto was a hollow promise; or the Government apparently recognised that it could not deliver what it had promised to do; because certainly to give a pensioner who is getting \$250 a month an increase of \$25 a month and those who are getting over \$250 a month an increase of \$30, in my view cannot square when you take into consideration the salaries which the present people will be getting, with the promise which was made; and I think that this is one area where the Government has got to accept that they have made a promise which they cannot keep; and we would really hope, and we look forward that very soon this particular matter will be put right because, Mr. Chairman, because after all, a promise is a promise and it should be honoured.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. member wish to speak on this?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, when I introduced the Civil Establishment Resolution dealing with these areas of salary increases, I went into this matter very fully. I then explained that of the 39,000 pensions, over 3,000 cannot possibly come within the promise referred to in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. Looking again at the list, in my opinion no more than 100 could be affected. I said then that the matter is still receiving attention. I indicated then that you have to introduce another factor, which is that the responsibility of the office may have altered since the retirement of the pensioner. I said, and I gave as an example advisedly the post of Chief Education Officer. The Chief Education Officer was getting less, I believe, at the time of his retirement than the headmaster of Harrison College. He now gets more than a Permanent Secretary because his responsibilities have increased; and there is a difficulty in dealing with these regraded posts. If you ignore the regrading, I venture to say that there is

no Government pensioner who is worse off than the pensioners at the grade at which they resigned.

The hon. member is talking about promises that cannot be carried out. We heard this yesterday. I remember that in 1961 the Democratic Labour Party promised that if elected to power it would hold another General Election within three years, and that undoubtedly was the major and most important promise ever broken in this country. I did not hear hon. members talking about that. That is what I mean about Satan rebuking sin. That is what Satan rebuking sin means. The hon. member must bide his time and make analyses co-incidentally with those being made by the Establishments Division.

We have discovered that cost of living allowances such as those which are being given to Government pensioners, are putting Government pensioners in many cases in a better position vis a vis the salary grade at which they retired than if we followed blindly the principle set out in the Manifesto. A classic example is the couple of railway pensioners that are being paid. I believe that the maximum railway pension is about \$8 a month; but in fact the couple of railway pensioners who are still alive have been getting considerable cost of living allowances almost giving them around \$200 a month. Now since 1959 they will be getting about \$100 a month. In other words, a pension of about \$8 a month has been supplemented by allowances of just over \$100 a month; and this is more generous than the principle which the hon. member is asking us to adopt. Does he want me then to say that the railway pensioners must get back to getting \$10 or \$12 a month? I do not believe that he means that. The point is that the problem is being dealt with by a slightly different means which is achieving for the great overwhelming majority of pensioners the payment of, and for the minority of pensioners who have not benefited to the same extent because they have not participated in the regrading of the post from which they retired. A special look is being taken to see how far it is possible to meet their legitimate claims in the light of the new responsibilities that may be causing the post from which they retired to attract higher salaries.

11.30 a.m.

And for the minority of pensioners who are not benefitting to the same extent because they have not participated in the regradings of the post from which they retired, a special look is being taken to see how far it is possible to meet their legitimate claims in the light of the new responsibilities that may be causing the post from which they retired to attract higher salaries.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 20 stand part.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. chairman, I remember various unions making a tremendous fuss

about the unqualified teachers and how badly they were being treated by the Government. They were being badly treated by a Government that has given them every chance to qualify and now even when they did not qualify we are giving them severance pay. As I rose to move this Resolution, the only representative of organized labour in the House of Assembly, the hon. member for St. Lucy, far from thanking the Government and congratulating it on a successful solution to the problem of the unqualified teachers, a problem whose solution had eluded the Democratic Labour Party for years, the hon. member for St. Lucy runs out of the House and leaves a Chamber consisting of Government members only to pass the Resolution. Anyhow, let us be thankful that these 54 teachers will get one month's pay for every month of service.

However, I think I must inform the House that although we are appropriating this money today, the money cannot be paid out until an amendment to the Pensions Act, because it has been agreed with the representatives of the teachers that if they take this money they cannot use these years of service towards pensionable service should they re-enter the public service at some future time. So we have to amend the Pensions Act to provide for that. In other words, if they are paid out now for the years of service they gave as unqualified teachers and they get a Government job again they have to start from scratch. I want them to understand this and I want the public in addition to understand this, should the matter arise at some later stage. The Act is in preparation; indeed notice of it could have been given this week but there were one or two matters to be finalised and we hope it will soon be passed. But we cannot pay these monies that are being appropriated until the legislative framework is there to protect that part of the Exchequer that is assigned to payment of public servants' salaries.

This being so, I beg to move that Head 20 stand part.

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

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

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Resolutions were read a first time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the adjournment is taken, I wish to give my ruling on the matter of privilege raised by the hon. member for St. Philip North this morning. I rule that a *prima facie* case has been made out and that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the Committee of Privileges look carefully at the matter and summon all who have to be summoned before it and deal with the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will try to have this matter dealt with as expeditiously as possible, but in any case justice has got to prevail in the circumstances.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, there is one other point — and I wish the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had not left the Chamber. I said earlier that the salary of the advisor to the Caves Authority was \$4,000. That was a misleading figure; that is the value of his emoluments. Actually the salary was only \$3,000. I would not like this session to end without my correcting this because these things get caught up with later and you know how it is. There is also a housing allowance and the use of a car. The correct figure is a salary of \$36,000 a year and a housing allowance of \$4,000 and the use of a Ranger Rover.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will instruct the Clerk to have the appropriate corrections made in consultation with the Hansard Reporters.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am also asked to correct a slip of the tongue I made earlier. I said that the gratuity for the displaced teachers would be one

month's pay for every month of service; it should be a month for every year of service.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 10th October, 1978 at 12 Noon.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 10th October, 1978 at 12 o'clock Noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
11.40 a.m.