THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 31st October, 1978

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

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); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Mr. V. L. JOHNSON M.A.; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; and Mr. L. L. SISNETT;

Prayers were read.

Mr. GREAVES and Mr. ALLEYNE entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 24th October, 1978, are before you for confirmation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes as printed for the 28th October, 1978, be confirmed.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations, those Minutes stand confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:–

Plans for the proposed Flood Control Area.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to authorise the Minister responsible for Finance to borrow, by the issue of Treasury Bills, further sums not exceeding $40 million.

Resolution to grant the sum of $104,531 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. 13, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution of which I have just given notice relates to severance pay for members of the Coast Guard, and we are going to have other matters dealing with pay to members of the military forces during the course of today's debate. It is intended to take them first and subject to what the Opposition may say, I intend to ask leave of the House to deal with that matter today. These are people who are awaiting compensation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve the Shops (Amendment) Order, 1978.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the Dogs Act 1975.

I shall be seeking leave to have this matter dealt with in all its stages today.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to amend the Promissory Oaths Act.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, a Bill to amend the Promissory Oaths Act, was read a first time.

Mr. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took his seat.

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, a Bill to amend the Dogs Act, 1975, was read a first time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I would like on behalf of the hon. Deputy Prime Minister to ask that he be granted four weeks' leave of absence from this Chamber to carry out official Government duties as from today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave will be granted.
12.25 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, today's Sitting seems likely to be rather lengthy and therefore I am going to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting, subject of course, to the general practice of seeking the approval of the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the Opposition is in agreement with this. If there is no objection those several Standing Orders are suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken and that Order No. 9 be the instant Order of the day.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE BARBADOS REGIMENT (SERVICE PAY) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1978

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, the Government is in the process of embodying a Defence Force. The history of the Defence Force was gone into at great length some months ago when a White Paper was presented to this House for approval. In that White Paper we indicated the general outline that the Defence Force would take.

In the interim period, Mr. Speaker, while the legal framework for the establishment of the Defence Force is being completed, steps are being taken to identify the personnel and go through all the preliminary activities necessary so that we can be ready to pick up with a Defence Force as soon as possible after the enabling legislation is passed. Accordingly, a number of members of the Barbados Regiment are at present on full time or nearly full time duty under the encampment provisions contained in the Barbados Regiment legislation. A number of members of the Coast Guard which has now been disbanded have been sworn in as members of the Barbados Regiment – one or two have reverted to that position since they were already members of the Regiment. A number of persons have been sent on training abroad, and it is necessary to bring into operation the rates of pay which will serve as rates of pay for the Defence Force when it is fully embodied. There are therefore three Resolutions on the Order Paper today – Items 9, 10 and 11 – and there will also be a Resolution which will be dealt with in Committee, relating to severance payment for the Coast Guard. I gave notice of this Resolution a few moments ago and the Opposition have kindly indicated there would be no objection to dealing with it in all its stages today.

To deal with the instant Order of the day, this should read not "Barbados Government Service Pay Amendment Regulation" as printed in the Order Paper but the "Barbados Regiment Service Pay Amendment Regulation." Your Honour will see in the Schedule that we have provided rates of pay for all ranks from private to full Colonel. There is no provision at the moment, or expectations, that the ranks of Brigadier and above will be required for our modest Defence Force. These rates of pay will govern all members of the Defence Force including those members who in due course will be assigned to the Marine Division of the Defence Force; although they may be given the courtesy of naval rank their substantive rank will be as the military rank set out in the Schedule to the Resolution.

These daily paid amounts correspond to annual rates of pay and will in due course form the foundation for the Regiment's pay scale. They go from $16.04 a day for a private up to $74.03 a day for a full Colonel and indeed that will represent the post of Chief of the Defence staff. These rates of pay are not by any means excessive; indeed they are substantially less in many cases that the corresponding rates of pay of a key scale which applies to the Police Force, the Prison Service and the Fire Service, even without taking into consideration the duty allowances which these persons receive. The corresponding pay scale will be $5,858 annually for a recruit private and will go to

$27,024 for a colonel, a fixed scale at the corresponding level B- 1. The second in command who will also be Commander-in-Chief of the Barbados Regiment on a fixed scale B-2 of $24,324. The intermediate ranks are of varying amounts, but for example, the fixed scale for a sergeant is $10.056, which is in fact the same as the pay of a long service private in the Barbados Police Force. So we have by no means pitched the scales at a high level. We know that there have been some disquiet in certain quarters because the scales are pitched below those formerly enjoyed by members of the Coast Guard, but we would like to point out that the Coast Guard Service is of an entirely different nature from the Marine Division in the formation of the Barbados Defence Force. There are different conditions of service and we are not viewing it as the Civil Service Organization which the previous Coast Guard Service was. This will be a military unit under full military discipline, living in barracks and receiving meals and so on, and we cannot accept that the key scale plus 10% could be a basis for the continued remuneration of the new Force.

Now the Defence Force in Phase 1 which is expected to take about the whole of next year will contain 154 regular soldiers. Of this number 62 are to be assigned to the Marine Division and 92 to the land forces; these will be full time officers and men. At the same time it is intended to recruit 302 volunteers as members of the Volunteer Reserve Force. Out of these, 298 will be assigned to the military forces and four to the Coast Guard. I myself am hoping that these four who are intended to be part time air craft pilots will be recruited during the coming year; this may be a bit ambitious, but that is the plan.

During this year also, we hope to carry out extensive work at the Garrison to improve the physical barracks accommodation and the general store accommodation for the new Force. We hope to refurbish the stone barracks which will provide quarters for warrant officers and officers. I myself have inspected these barracks on more than one occasion and do not think that they are in any condition to ask officers of the Defence Force to live in them full time; they undoubtedly need substantial refurbishing.
12.35 p.m.

There is also a need for more storage accommodation. The kitchen has now been completed, but there will be a need to take over some of the premises now used by other departments of Government, including the Central Purchasing Department and the Barbados Development Bank; and in the course of next year we hope that this process will be complete. In Phase 2, which is expected to take another year, there will be 80 more regulars on the regimental side and 166 volunteers. In Phase 3 there will be 49 further regulars and 35 volunteers.

I have given before an idea of the organisation of the Force and I think that I said at that time that there would be approximately 700 people in all when it was full. At that time there was a debate on the White Paper; and I will therefore not detain hon. members much longer with details at that level. I can point out, however, that of the block vote provided during this Financial Year for the establishment of the Regiment, the greater part will probably be unspent because we have been very sparing and frugal in this matter of defence expenditure. I have absolutely no wish to see our country become like one of our CARICOM brothers with a population over three times that of Barbados but with a budget of very little larger, which finds it possible to expend $113 million on military forces in the current Financial Year, and which has refused to consider any reduction in this military budget as a contribution to financial stringency. I make no criticism of any such country. I merely thank the Lord that we are fortunate enough not to have any boundary disputes with powerful neighbours which will dictate the necessity for military spending on this scale.

In addition to this Force, Sir, a scheme is now underway which was not envisaged at the time of the White Paper, for the extension of the activities of a Defence Force into one productive economic area, and that is the area of construction; and the Colonel of the Defence Force, the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Defence, in collaboration with the Permanent Secretary with the Ministry of Communications and Works, are now working out plans which will hopefully lead to the establishment of a pioneer battalion of the Defence Force which can be used in carrying out constructive activities in the country.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. GREAVES entered the House and took their seats.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: We are envisaging an initial force of 150 persons who will be given basic military training, but will then be directed towards construction activities. The company that we are planning will be made up of young people between the ages of 18 and 25. Each intake in this country will have two months basic military training, excluding weapons, and two further months devoted to the learning or improving of basic skills. During the other eight months – we plan recruitment for a year, Sir, a year for each intake – they will be involved in projects providing practical experience in their skills; and in particular we have identified the East Coast Road as an area where the Construction Battalion of a Defence Force can very usefully be employed; and it is this particular project which is under consideration for the scheme. It will give useful training for a year, and will fit them for work in construction areas; and we think that this will be a valuable contribution to the training of youths, not only in fundamental skills, but in a disciplined attitude and approach to life.

Our only regret is that we cannot recruit a larger number of young persons in this exercise which I hope will be very valuable. It is still in the planning stage, and I cannot therefore give any details, but it is expected that by the time of the next Estimates we will be able to request an appropriation for this purpose. As far as the Defence Act is concerned, I expect that that will be ready for debate in the House of Assembly during the first week of December; so that members will no doubt wish to debate these Resolutions today, but will have another opportunity in a month's time to debate the Act itself. I cannot, of course, show the draft on which we are working at the present time; but there may be one or two questions of a general nature on which I may be able to give hon. members some assistance if they make enquiries.

I would wish, if possible, to make one speech on Items 9, 10 and 11 or to make one particular speech on these items. I hope that hon. members will pardon me if I keep my remarks not to deal with the details but to cover the area which relates to training. Perhaps this can more properly be dealt with under Item 11, but it can be covered, I think, at large. We have been seeking training courses in other countries – in the Caribbean and overseas; and at the moment we have two cadets – one on a one year course for subalterms, junior cadet officers, and three members of the Regiment, two former members of the Coast Guard and one Officer of the Regiment whom we hope will assist us with the Coast Guard on a volunteer basis. A few have been sent to Governor's Island, New York. They have now returned from the course. Governor's Island, New York, is the centre of the US Coast Guard. They went on a Search and Rescue Course which I am informed, they have fulfilled satisfactorily and which will relate to Coast Guard duties of protecting the airport in case of tragedies, and carrying out other search and rescue operations more efficiently. The public of Barbados has certainly turned with a will to the Coast Guard for....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that since you are dealing with service pay, you are telling us about what the trained personnel will be earning from service pay.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, Sir. I am now coming down to some of them who are in the Service and getting Service pay. Those who have been recruited into the Regiment. The Coast Guard, Sir. has been asked to carry dead horses out to sea, to serve as floating pavilions at yacht races and to serve as floating pavilions at fish festivals. We have no objections to these things, but I am giving an idea of the extent of its duties, because apparently some of the public regard search and rescue as meaning that when a fishing boat runs out of diesel fuel and the Coast Guard goes out to tow it in, that next day it can run out of fuel again and send out a signal to be towed in by the Coast Guard. That is within the experience of the Coast Guard. Sir, it may not be too unkind to suggest that fishermen who have unduly economised on fuel regard the fuel tanks of the Coast Guard as a substitute for the fuel they should carry themselves. At any rate, I think that most people agree that the search and rescue operations have been popular with the public, and we are glad to have been able to train people who are now back astern and receiving service pay on a daily basis to carry out these duties.

We also have one sergeant in England doing military accounts, and we are very soon sending another on a drill course and there will be more extensive training courses for officers and other ranks. Indeed, Sir, it would be going on now, but due to my view of completing the Resolution now before the House and completing the draft statute for the embodiment of the Force, I have asked that the training course which may have been going on at the present time be postponed to a more suitable occasion.

12.45 p.m.

The only other matter I might just mention on the Coast Guard Service operations relates to the policing of the two hundred mile limit which we very soon hope to bring into force even pending the full marine survey which may be necessary, Sir. This we regard as a vital and important Coast Guard duty and we will very soon be seeking training assistance in this regard and very soon will be instructing the Coast Guard to police our fishing grounds and our limits.

So there it is, Sir, if I may sum it up. A Defence Act is now in the process of preparation and should be ready for the House of Assembly during this month and for debate during the first week in December. Within a month after that, the Defence Force as such should be embodied and Phase One well on the way.

We will be attempting to expand our marine services during the forthcoming year, Sir, and make a rudimentary start at a volunteer air reserve. We will also be attempting during the forthcoming year to establish the pioneering and engineering battalion of which I spoke and assigning it to the East Coast Road as its first contruction effort. Indeed it will do some construction inside the Headquarters of the Regiment itself but this is the first major outside construction ever.

We will be training young people, Sir. We will be giving employment to 154 persons in the initial stages, 92 persons in the Regiment and an additional number in the Coast Guard in the first Phase, for even though many of these persons may be employed at the present by the Regiment full-time, we will make their jobs available to others.

We think we have trodden the path between modesty and economy on the one hand and security on

the other. Sir, with reasonably firm hope, I think that the designated Chief of Staff and his Second-in-command and those personnel under consideration for commissions in the Defence Force, will be persons in whom the Government can have confidence and indeed in whom we as politicians can have confidence, Sir, and I am sure that the House will support the Resolution under Order No. 9 and the other Resolutions relating to this matter which are on the Order Paper and which have been agreed to be done.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I would like to second it and reserve my right to speak on it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we have had in this Chamber many wondrous performances from the Prime Minister and today is no exception. We are dealing with a Resolution relating to the Barbados Regiment (Rates of Pay) (Amendment) Regulation and the Prime Minister has taken the opportunity to refer to other related matters and other Resolutions, but what we would of course have been even interested to hear a lot about would be the dissatisfaction which has reached the columns of the Newspapers. The dissatisfaction that apparently exists among certain members of the Barbados Coast Guard, now defunct I am told, and we would have thought that the Minister for Defence and Security would have explained to this House the nature of the problems within that service, the complaints and concerns of those members of the former Coast Guard Service and to tell us something about the problems involved in the incorporation of the naval arm of the Barbados Defence Force. Instead of that, we have heard a lot about Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III of.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I indicated quite clearly that there is a Resolution coming on the Coast Guard explaining Severance Pay. The hon. member is dealing with what happens to the Coast Guard after they are enlisted in the Regiment. He will have every opportunity of dealing with the matters he is inadvertently referring to, and the reasons why I have not dealt with them is because there are going to come later.

I have to say this because the Press would publish that I refuse to deal with the Coast Guard, and the Reporter may have gone home and may have been too sick in the head and when he comes to deal with it to realise that the person who is out of order is not me but the hon. member for St. Michael South. Out of order for a good cause and out of order in respect of my submission nonetheless, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is taken.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you. If the Press is too thick-headed I hope they will hear they are thick-headed and will take this type of criticism. I believe they can take this type of criticism if they are thick-headed.

Mr. Speaker, I may be genuinely mistaken but I thought I heard the Minister for Defence and Security indicate that he was making one speech, one major speech and indeed he asked your indulgence in order to go outside the bounds of the present Resolution in order to deal with these matters but if the Press is too thick-headed to understand these matters, well maybe they have to be told.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Press is, the Chair is not.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you, thank you. Mr. Speaker, I know that you are not thick-headed. I am merely making a point and I hope the Minister of Defence and Security does not get too hurt because I think quite legitimately I have indicated that we would have expected to hear much more about the problems involved in the Coast Guard Service and the incorporation of that service as a naval arm of the Defence Force and I indicated that instead of that we hear about Phase I. Phase II and Phase III. Projections down to next year and the year beyond in anticipation of the Defence Bill which is to come before this House and that was the first wondrous thing about the performance today.

The second wondrous thing is that quite blandly, as we say in Bajan terms "without batting an eye lid', we hear about this Defence Act or Defence Legislation which is to come next month but no mention at all about the previous promise made sometime ago, I believe as far ago as March, that this House would have been presented with Defence legislation sometime early in April or May. I do not remember which of these months, but I believe it was April. We were told by the Minister of Defence that he was bringing Defence legislation sometime early in the financial year, in April. I believe the month was given as April and in this address today, as I said quite blandly and with very unctious phrases we have heard how it is coming next month.

12.55 p.m.

There has been no reference at all to what has gone before, why it is not here yet, and what are the problems involved. Are there any tensions within the defence establishment? What is the reason? I want to hear. *(Asides)* If it is that, I want to hear what are the reasons why that particular piece of legislation has not come down, and how satisfactory is the present set up within the Regiment, the Defence Force, the Coast Guard or whatever it is in terms of the legislation under which they are supposed to operate, the necessary legal authorities for this service to function and function effectively.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that is impossible for the defence of this country to be properly executed, to be properly administered without the necessary legislation, and I think the Minister of Defence and Security has up to this point in his major introduction failed this House in not explaining the details about that, but by blandly indicating that it is coming next month. We have not been given any details. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what has happened as far as the services performed by the Coast Guard may be concerned. We have heard that that particular agency is expected to prevent people from committing suicide. In other words we are told that the duties include going out on one day to rescue a fishing boat which has run out of fuel, and the next day to go out and rescue the same boat. I refuse to believe that the Minister of Defence could be serious about a matter of life and death and speak of it in those terms. I do not believe that any fisherman would deliberately go out on short fuel and not expect or expecting that if he runs out that the Coast Guard would come to his aid and deliberately court possible death or privation on those grounds. I believe that in defence matters we must be serious, and I do not think that that can be advanced as part of the reasons why the Coast Guard may not now be performing the types of functions that it should be performing.

We heard reference to the question of air/sea rescue. According to the thick-headed journalists, and I am quoting here, Barbados was spared a possible air disaster when an aeroplane had to return to the airport because of some failure in its hydraulic system. I would like to know if under this or similar circumstances the services which were supposed to be performed by the Coast Guard and which now presumably might be performed by the naval arm of the Defence Force include the provision of air/sea rescue services. We have been told, and I thank the Minister of Defence for giving the House the information, that there are persons out on training including in the area of search and rescue....an officer and two ranks. I would like to know whether it is a requirement of the present aviation arrangements that air/sea rescue services should be available particularly to deal in cases where there might be air emergencies or air disasters, and whether those services were available for possible use during the emergency which was experienced at the airport over the week-end when there was that problem at the airport. I wonder if the Minister of Defence could give us some information on that particular matter. Of course, we are all pleased to know that we do not have to spend the amount of our gross national product on defence and police and related matters as other countries in the Caribbean which may be three times as large as Barbados has to spend. Of course the Minister of Defence thanked God that that is not our position. I think the countries of the Caribbean each one has its own peculiar and particular defence problems, and if it may be a continental country with threats imagined or real to its territorial integrity, then it may consider that its national interests demand that it spends a higher proportion of its budget on defence and related matters than other countries which may not be so hemmed in. We will of course have to wait until the defence legislation comes before this Honourable Chamber to hear an elaboration of the potential threats which may face this country and the types of defence capabilities which may have to be developed in order to meet these threats. What we do know at this stage is that there is a phased programme, and w have heard it today, for the development of the defence capabilities of this country. To date what we are particularly interested in is not a long look into the establishment of the defence force as such, but the immediate problems which have led to this rushed legislation coming before us today, how these particular rates and related matters compare with other rates of pay in other parts of the public service, and it is really begging the question a little to say that the naval arm would be considered as part not of the civil service, but as part of the military service.

1.05 p.m.

What we are interested in is not a long look into the establishment of the Defence Force as such but the immediate problem which has led to this rush legislation before us today; how these particular rates and related matters compare with our rates of pay in other parts of the public service. And it is really begging the question a little to say that the Naval would be considered not as part of the Civil Service but as part of the military service. I think it is true to say that they all, whether military or civil, will be serving the same Government and the net result is that persons who over the past years from the inception of the service were accustomed to a certain level of remuneration have suddenly found that remuneration considerably reduced, and quite naturally like all workers faced with reduction in income at a time when the cost of living is increasing, there is dissatisfaction. I think the Minister of Defence owes it to this House to explain the nature of that dissatisfaction and say how these matters are being resolved. I know that he has the defence of this country deeply at heart, as all true and loyal Barbadians have; and we certainly would not wish to see dissatisfaction growing in the Defence and Security Services of this country. We would certainly wish, therefore, that the Minister allay any fears which there may be about this dissatisfaction; that he tells us that it is under control, because I think that it would be better for the psychological well being of this country if such an assurance could be given.

Mr. Speaker, we will await further development in this particular matter, and I will await the promised legislation as I have awaited it in the past, but to date in vain.

We have a number of persons out on training – I think Canada and the United Kingdom. I did not hear any reference to training in the United States. *(Asides)*. I have been told that the Coast Guard has had training in the United States. There is a large military establishment in the countries of some of our Latin American friends, for instance, Brazil. I do not know whether relations between Barbados and that country, as recently evidenced by a shipping agreement between the two, suggest any contemplation of military assistance as far as the training of the military resources of Barbados may be concerned; but again I believe that when we come to the question of elaborating the defence possibilities and the whole parameters relating to the defence of this country we will get a full explanation of this matter.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am therefore asking that further and better particulars be given this Honourable Chamber in respect of the dissatisfaction among former members of the Coast Guard. I have noted that we were promised before a Defence Act which has held up the true and proper development of the defence and security of this country. I do hope that the deadline now given will be kept by the Minister of Defence and Security.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, reports emanating from people in the Regiment indicate quite clearly that there is a lot of dissatisfaction. Some of this dissatisfaction concerns the present scales of pay and I would like to find out from the Minister if these scales of pay are the result of discussions with representatives of the people now forming the Regiment or whether, as has been said, the outcome of a one-man show. This is important because we cannot start up a body as important as the Regiment on grounds of dissatisfaction because it would not function efficiently. The Prime Minister is well aware of this. I do not know if he is aware of the fact that there are reports about dissatisfaction with these pay scales.

What is even more interesting and is arousing more dissatisfaction is the peculiar method of selection of people for the Regiment. People are complaining that they cannot get into the Regiment unless they are of certain political convictions. It has been drawn to my attention that people of the now defunct Coast Guard who have been told to apply to the Regiment were given an examination, have passed and yet have not been selected; and when they enquire why they have not been selected they have been given no explanation. This is something for the Prime Minister to be aware of. I am not accusing him of anything, I am drawing the matter to attention and want him to be aware of it, because you cannot have an organization such as the Regiment, which is so important to the defence and security of the country, saddled with dissatisfaction from the beginning; nor can you have such an organization comprising people of only one political persuasion. And it is in the interest of the Government to deny that this is so.

There is also dissatisfaction among persons of the Regiment concerning people who normally are civil servants but who on certain occasions when the Regiment is having a parade turn up to deliberate on the functions or performance of the Regiment.

I notice, Sir, with a certain amount of satisfaction, the brief attempt made by the Prime Minister to indicate to the people of the country that Barbados will have some form of national service. The Prime Minister has been very careful not to call it so but has indicated that this particular branch or section of the Defence Force will be aimed at people between the ages of 18 and 25, and will be trained not necessarily as soldiers but in the skills necessary for the development of this country and training in discipline. I do not believe that the Prime Minister should be reluctant to elaborate on this matter or to tell the people of this country that the Government is prepared to bring in some form of national service, because he is likely to find that there are many people in this country who are in favour of some form of national service for the young people of Barbados. What they will be concerned about is what form it will actually take, because looking at another country in this area and hearing the report coming out of that country, Barbadians would like to be assured that it is not the intention of this Government to copy from this particular country, and the Prime Minister knows what country I am referring to. I think the people of this country should know in some clear detail whether or not this form of national service is going to embrace a large number of young people, what areas of national service these young people will be trained in and what actual form the training will take, and what it will cost the people of this country, because one of the things we are likely to find is that they will introduce something and tell you it will cost a certain amount, and when you check it out over a period of years you will find that the cost has escalated and keeps escalating.

1.15 p.m.

It is no point trying to assure us that you will only have a small construction section which will be primarily concerned, say with the building of the East Coast Road, and trying to assure the people of this country that you are doing that because you do not want to increase the cost of the maintenance of these people or saddle the people of Barbados with the high cost of their maintenance; but after it has been established one will find after you look at the Estimates that there will be a rather steep increase voted for this particular purpose, and people will find it too late to express themselves as to whether or not they are in favour of such a form of national defence.

I do not believe that the Prime Minister has had to be so careful in his remarks or try to hide this and that; because if this was discussed widely in Barbados he would find that there are large numbers of people in Barbados who are in favour of some form of national service; and he only has to assure them of the cost and the actual form that it will take; and there are some people who are advocating that it is necessary to impart some sense of discipline in the younger people of this country; because one of the problems which a country like Barbados faces in the area of development is that you may not have enough skilled people when there is a boom to draw upon; and a national service may be one way of training a large number of these young people.

What I am concerned with at this particular point in relation to the non-functioning of the Coast Guard which causes problems in Barbados on the West Coast and the South Coast, problems pertaining to smuggling; and I would like to enquire from the Hon. Minister what are the present operations to safeguard our coasts against smuggling and to prevent the Customs or the Government from losing revenue as a result of this smuggling?

For some time now it seems that the Coast Guard ships have been lying down idle. I would like to know how long are they going to remain idle; because while I appreciate his point that we are going to have another opportunity to discuss all the implications, what we are concerned with at this particular point in time is with the non-functioning of this particular department which is causing some problems to the people of this country. I would like to know from him if he is aware of that. I would like to reserve my further remarks for another occasion; I would like to tell the Prime Minister that it is in his interest to put his ears in the right place, and he will get some idea that there is an amount of dissatisfaction both as regards (1) safety, and (2) as regards the method of selection of people going into the Regiment. People have been saying quite clearly that there is political discrimination in that area.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is .....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if no other hon. member wishes to speak, I propose to make my reply. I have listened carefully to the two speeches, Sir, and I had the pleasure of being able to turn to the Acting Leader of the House when the hon. member was praising me during the course of his speech. I appreciate it. Why I mentioned the Press was that we had an experience in this House when the White Paper was debated on January 24, and the Press headlining "Opposition Bears Fears on Force"; and it wrote a story 42 centimeters long; and one little paragraph in that story, 2 centimeters long, said that the Prime Minister introduced a Resolution, and during an hour long speech outlined the Government's position in support of the establishment of a Defence Force. That was all the coverage that was given to the Government.

At least I presented a White Paper which they could read, if they could not take down the shorthand notes necessary to report my speech for the Advocate. They could read the White Paper and see the reasons. The hon. member for St. Michael South received just over half the coverage, 22 centimetres out of 42; and out of that seven paragraphs, a total of 14 centimeters in which the reporter repeated that Mr. Sandiford said that the Government had not given any good reason for having a Defence Force. There were seven paragraphs all of the same speech. So you will see, Mr. Speaker, why I am mistrustful of some of the reporters of the Advocate when they come in here. (Mr. GREAVES: Then they should be destroyed). I never said that they should be destroyed. If the hon. member for St. Lucy thinks that they should be destroyed, he must get up and say that they should be destroyed.

The hon. member for St. Michael South is mistaken in thinking that the Defence Act was promised for April 1978. While listening to his speech, I have read my own speech on that occasion through and through, and a Defence Act was not mentioned in that speech. What was promised on that occasion was that the Defence Force would be brought into operation on the 1st April, 1978. No promise whatsoever was made that this Act would come into operation on the 1st April. So there was no breaking of any promise. The Act was never promised by that time, but the Defence Force was titularly brought into operation on the 1st April because money was voted for it in the Estimates. The Chief of Staff had indeed been designated, and all the preliminary for the establishment of the Defence Force have been going on since April.

There has been no delay or reneging from what was said during the Estimates; and you will see that the reason for the designation of the date for starting the Defence Force is because this is a block vote for the Defence Force which was granted by the House, and the authority to use that vote arises from the Estimates; so that the 1st April is the commencement date. The examinations have been taking place, and I think that there has been quite extensive activity. Several officers and people of other ranks, for example, are teaching at Government Schools; and we have received requests for secondment. We are considering requests for secondment, and we are looking for specialist officers. We have sent people for training, as I have explained, to the U.S. and Canada; and all of this activity relates to the Defence Force. It is therefore wrong to say that we have not brought in the legislation promised. We promised a Defence Force. The other legislation will be coming soon.

I am aware of any tensions within the Defence Establishment such as referred to by the member for St. Michael South. I would welcome his information. I am sure that he would like to give it privately and I promise to investigate all the tensions to which he refers. I am aware that there are certain disgruntled ex members of the Coast Guard who have been seeking out whomever they can find and telling them that the pay is not enough and so on and so forth.
1.25 p.m.

I was not aware that anybody had made an accusation of political favouritism in the selection such as was mentioned by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. What I know has happened is that members of our Party have accused me of giving special favour to a member of the Coast Guard who they say was brought here by the hon. member for St. Michael South West and to make some other allegations which will be investigated, and to say how could I give that man when he was such an outstanding Dem a pick and do not support such and such. So you see it cuts both ways.

When people have a grievance, if they address their grievance to the hon. member for St Michael North Central, the grievance will be "I am with you skipper and they do not want me because I am with you," and if they address their grievance to some hon. members of this Honourable House on this side they will say "I am with you and look the Prime Minister has not given me a pick" and so on.

Well the answer is, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman to whom I am referring I am sure is well known to the hon. member for St. Michael South West if he addresses his mind to the problem. The report on it is that he is a good and reliable member of the Coast Guard and that is all we are concerned with and he got a lot of marks in the examination which he took.

The situation is that the process is not yet complete. Only 15 members of the Coast Guard have been enlisted in the Regiment but further members will be enlisted in due course. I can say now that all cannot expect to be enlisted. There are some who we would welcome but who have not taken the examination. There is one who we would have welcomed but he took the examination and did deliberately bad in it because he said that it was against his dignity to take the examination and indeed I believe he has already been identified by the Regimental officials as a person suitable for re-engagement.

There are some who have taken the examination and are near to passing but they may not be suitable for marine service. I believe there is at least one person who was an artisan in a trade completely unconnected to any sea-going activity. Now to be realistic he is intended to go into the Regiment not back into the Coast Guard. In other words there is a whole series of situations none of which is as simple as the malcontents are indicating to their members of Parliament, members of the Press and their former Trade Unions. None is as quite as straightforward as it seems to occur to these people.

As far as rates of pay is concerned, we obviously are going to have to deal with these at this stage. The point about rates of pay is that the members of the Coast Guard only know, or should only know, or should only know the bottom rate of pay which is $16.04 per day.

The Coast Guard has trade rights but nobody in the Coast Guard is in a position to say what rank he will occupy in the Regiment. It may well be that they are people in the Coast Guard who occupy the position of petty officer but were not found suitable for that position even while they occupied it, but due to the Civil Service nature of the Coast Guard as it then was, could not so to speak be reduced to the ranks, and they may be offered re-engagement as privates in the Regiment. They are members of the Coast Guard who are Privates who were seamen and may very well be offered engagements as Sergeants in the Regiment.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, they are really not in a position to know for sure what emoluments they can expect and will guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that none of the members who have made their dissatisfaction known to the hon. members of the House have indicated that the matter of the cost of living is going to be taken care of by the fact that they are going to be provided with meals in addition to the new pay. Before they were being paid and finding their own except while they were at sea and there was a man who used to refuse to go to sea because he did not like the menu. That is on one man's chart and said he does not eat so and so and he is not going to sea on this ship. That is on one man's personal file.

There are those who, as I said before, did not get meals, and they will get meals now. That is one of the perks of life in barracks. It is true they will have to live in barracks, but some will be glad for the accommodation, I dare say.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there were some very difficult people in the Coast Guard. One man was suspected of sabotaging, of cutting a wire, a vital wire and when the petty officer went to investigate it that man had the nerve to put down that when the Petty Officer came he had a plyers or a knife, something, and it must have fallen down on the wire and that is how it got cut. Now that is the kind of explanation which in itself, I believe that Hon. members of the House who are now galant members will tell you that that explanation by itself would justify removal of the man from the Service.

He is one who has not offered himself for re-engagement, that particular member of the Coast Guard.

There are other members of the Coast Guard who have put the vessel astern when it was supposed to go ahead and crushed up little boats here in the Careenage. There are members of the Coast Guard who I cannot say they are guilty but some serious allegations relating to the Customs Law have been made against them.

All of these things have to be analysed and sifted by the Recruiting Officers who at present are the Colonel assisted by the Second-in-Command. All of these matters have to be assessed. The marks which they got in the examinations will have also to be assessed. I did have the marks at one stage, Sir. I myself at some stage was shown. I do not see them here, but I was told of some of them. For example, a man who got over 90%, came either first or second, I believe, has not yet been enlisted, but I have every expectation that as a man with a clean record and who got over 90% in an examination, he comes from somewhere in Christ Church, I believe, and a technical man, I have every belief that he may be enlisted and perhaps not at the level of private. I really do not know, but I have every belief that this will take place very soon.

Now as far as the accusation – I should not really put it as an accusation, because I think that both speeches by hon. members were reasonable and valuable contributions to the Debate, the comment of reduction of the Coast Guard service and mention of the aircraft. The day with the difficulty of the aircraft, the Barbados Regiment was put on standby, this was last Saturday. It turned out that there was no need for despatch of boats but the Regiment was in constant contact with the Tower of Grantley Adams Airport in connection with the matter. There was never any question of ditching the aircraft in the sea. A careful and intelligent appreciation of the situation was made by the Regimental Authority and all necessary preliminary steps to deal with a disaster, had there been one, were taken.

It happened that the Regiment in fact has a camp in training. There are many more people embodied at present than normally would be the case under the training provisions and for which I hope we will vote for money today, and far more persons were available to deal with the disaster than would have been normally.

1.35 p.m.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enquire of the Hon. Prime Minister....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the hon. member rise?

Dr. CADDLE: On a point of elucidation. The hon. member did mention something in relation to a boat being ready in the case of any disaster. Is he referring to the launch that used to be available to the Government at one time by HARP?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think you had better direct that question to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition rather than to myself. The only boats for which I hold any responsibility, of which I know, are the Coast Guard vessels, the George Fergusson and the three smaller vessels.

One final point which I would make on this question of dissatisfaction of pay. Hon. members should perhaps realise that the present rate of remuneration for the Regiment is $1.00 per parade, and all ranks get $1.00 per parade. If hon. members have been hearing dissatisfaction at a scale of pay which is related to the key scale, that was an omission in the speech of one hon. member. I did indicate which of the key scale corresponds to which rates of pay in some cases. If hon. members consider that people will be getting... it is $1.00 or $1.40 per parade, I beg your pardon, but people will now be getting $16.00 a day as a minimum, they will understand there is unlikely to be any dissatisfaction in the ranks of the Regiment particularly not those who are embodied waiting for this Resolution to be passed. The Colonel perhaps has to call them out for parade three or four times a day to get $3.00 or $4.00 as the case may be. I am not sure altogether how it is being worked, but I do not believe you will find any member of the Regiment complaining about the rates of pay. I do not consider the rates of pay over-generous by any means. This is not going to be an occupation that you will enter for the sake of making a fortune, but at least there is an improvement on present conditions in the Regiment; they are obvious improvements on present conditions in the Regiment, and when the Coast Guard members settle down, I think they will appreciate that they are reasonable rates of pay for the new type and form of duty which they will be engaged in. At the lowest level the rates of pay are not intended to cover a career forever, because the period which we envisage for service will be in the region of five years, and if a man is a private at the end of five years, it is very unlikely that he will be re-enlisted; so it is a relatively short service but not so short a service that eventually you will get Barbados full of everybody who would be given military training, but long enough service to give a man a chance to show what he is worth to see if he is worth promoting. So if you enter you sign on for your basic period and you find you cannot make ends meet, you will have your opportunity at the end of five years, having been trained, to re-enter private life.

There is very little more I believe that I can say on the question of pay and on any dissatisfaction on the part of the Coast Guard, but I do look forward

when we actually come to the debate on the Coast Guard, that will be in Committee, for hon. members if there is anything else they would like to add.

The last point which was made which was relevant to this Resolution relates to national service. As the hon. member for St. Michael North Central clearly appreciates, the difficulty about national service is precisely cost. I have indicated that we will be trying to train a construction and engineering unit, a pioneering and engineering unit on the basis of taking in 150 people a year, giving them four months' training, two months' military and two months' technical, and eight months' work, and we will be glad if instead of 150 it could be 1,500. But we have to pay those people. They have to be paid and work would have to be found for them to do, and the Government's financial resources cannot undertake a major scheme of national service at the present time. It may very well be that the thoughts which are also going on in the Ministry of Community Service relating to a much shorter period of training may well bear fruit. The hon. member and the person for whom he speaks who have indicated their interest and support for national service, I am well aware of the existence of this body of opinion making a sound and reasonable point, but they are really pushing at an open door as far as the Ministry of Defence is concerned, as far as the Ministry of Finance is concerned, and fortunately the door can only be pushed open an inch or two at this time, but the point is being well borne in mind, and I certainly would look forward to seeing the pilot scheme work so that we can estimate how far we can afford on a productive basis, on a basis of returns which in some way corresponds with the outlay so that we can see if we can afford to expand it for the great number of youths coming into our labour force, some very well educated, some well qualified for this type of activity, but unfortunately many of whom the necessary financial resources cannot be found at the present time.

I would like to thank hon. members for their contributions to the debate on this Resoluion.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BARBADOS REGIMENT (RATES OF PAY) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1978

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 10 stands in the name of the hon. Prime Minister, to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Barbados Regiment (Rates of Pay) (Amendment) Regulations, 1978.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, similar consideration apply to this matter, and I beg to move that Resolution do now pass.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, just a question dealing with the Order Paper which I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention. I should have drawn it to the Hon. Prime Minister's attention but he was speaking when I entered, and it is that under Order No. 9, if you look at the Order Paper, it says "Barbados Government", and I did not think when I looked through it that it was correct. I understand it has been corrected. I wish the Printery would exercise a little more care in these matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate the point.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BARBADOS REGIMENT (TRAINING EMOLUMENTS) REGULATIONS, 1978

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 11 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Barbados Regiment (Training Emoluments) Regulations, 1978.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is the one relating to Training Emoluments. There is only one matter which in moving the passing of this Resolution I would add. It relates to the Cadet Forces. I did not deal with that earlier. I know that many hon. members have in the past, in the distant past, regretted that only the grammar schools had cadet forces.
1.45 p.m.

It is probably known to many hon. members, that I think it should be more generally known, that Ellerslie School also now has a cadet corps, and the Regiment will be paying particular attention to the strengthening of the cadet forces and the development of new forces at other schools. The new training regulations will make it possible for the cadet officers at schools interested in the subject to receive some pay. Previously they were not paid and for many it was a sacrifice of valuable time with no reward. I am not suggesting that reward alone will produce a cadet officer at a school, but certainly, as we know, the hope of reward sweetens labour, and we are looking forward to the sort of training that can be given while still at school that can derive from an expansion of the cadet scheme. It is envisaged that at least one officer of the Regiment will have direct responsibility for the development of cadet forces at large. It appears that the Regiment itself will be having the benefit of some persons who are currently officers in charge of cadets at leading schools signing on on a full time basis and we will certainly welcome them with their special knowledge of these matters which also relate to the training of youth.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I speak with a certain amount of knowledge of this subject. I have been a member of two cadet corps out of the three that then existed in Barbados. I did not have the distinction of one of my colleagues of going to all three schools that had cadet corps, so I could only join two of them. I was also a member of the Barbados Regiment when I was at school.

Now, to have a cadet corps attached to schools is as ridiculous as having a regiment of old boys of a particular school – a regiment for Harrison College, one for Lodge School, one for Combermere, and then a sub-regiment for the lesser orders like Ellerslie, Parkinson school and so on. The point I have made before is that you come here and give pay to those masters who refuse to take part in the necessary training of the youth in the three secondary schools in Barbados that have a cadet corps, that is Combermere, Harrison College and Lodge. Now you will get all kinds of people volunteering to be officers in charge of a cadet corps, when for years we could not get a single master interested. I discussed this with the commanding officer of the Regiment and others and I think they agree with me to a large extent that the thing to do is to have a sort of regional cadet corps instead of having a cadet corps attached to schools; a corps in which officers of the Regiment would go on particular afternoons and to which boys would be released from elementary schools. In other words, cadet training should not depend upon attendance at some snob school like Harrison College or Lodge School. If you come from Lodge Hill you should be able to join a cadet corps catering to the young people who live in Lodge Hill. Similarly boys going to Ellerslie should be able to go to the same cadet corps that boys from Black Rock who go to Harrison College belong to; in other words, the training would be vested in the officers of the Barbados Regiment, for when they leave school they have to go and wash the billy cans and sit down and eat at the mess tables with the same boys who have been to the elementary schools or the other schools, so why not start them off that way? Now we are going to give some secondary school masters some extra remuneration for doing things that they previously point blank refused to do. The masters at Harrison College, Lodge and Combermere refused, after people like Mr. Perkins who unfortunately has gone to the grave yard and who used to be at the Foundation School at one time, then he moved to Combermere. Everybody has heard of Gladio Wilson, the man with the sword who taught at Combermere School; Mr. Gardiner who was not a school master at all but used to leave his business and go voluntarily and take charge of the cadets at one of the schools. After these people disappeared from the scene for one reason or another, the younger masters would have nothing to do with cadets at all, and I do not think the solution is now to pay them for what they refused to do all this time, but we should take the officers that we are already paying in the Regiment, regionalize the cadet corps and let boys of the qualified age join the cadet corps for his particular area, so that in St. Andrew you would get boys from the Alleyne School, from the Bawden School and from all over the place joining the cadet corps. In my humble opinion and in the light of the experience we have had, no cadet corps should be attached to a particular school anymore; because if you want the boys to come together and cooperate and work together as men, whether they have been to elementary school or secondary school, let us start them at the age of eleven. But we should certainly not add insult to injury by seeming now to compensate these matters who for all these years could not put in a little extra time but now that the pay looks good they are going to dress up in a uniform with a Sam Browne belt and say they are cadet officers of some cadet corps. Let us use the same officers that we are already paying and let us regionalise; that should be the whole basis of cadet training. I have said so in here already, so this is nothing new with me. I do not know why the Coleridge Parry and all the schools in the North did not have cadet corps before, but nowhere in the north at all could anybody join a cadet corps. But now that the pay is good we will be proliferating the cadet corps because you will find every master will see if he can make an extra $100 a month or so, so that we will have about seventy or eighty different cadet corps all over the Island. This does not make sense to me at all, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, while I subscribe to the view of having a cadet corps at all schools, I am a bit surprised at the hon. member who has just spoken. He seems to have given way to the frustrating period of fifteen years of inability to issue directions as Minister in charge of defence and security, as Minister of Finance and as Minister *primus inter pares* in the Cabinet to get all those things done. No matter how much protest there may have been, he was in the driver's seat and could have implemented it in the fifteen years. Is he admitting that he was unable to get it done? We will put it right for him in the remaining three years.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker. I am happy that the hon. member is not pretending that the Defence Force Act that is being introduced is the creation of him and his officers because if he will go back and search the record he will see I had promised a White Paper on this

matter, which White Paper was ready. But up to now we have not had the presentation of the White Paper. Furthermore, all the real property legislation ...

Mr. SPEAKER: You are making a second speech.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir. But what I am saying is that if we did not introduce a cadet corps on the basis on which I have spoken in our fifteen years, it was that there was so much social legislation to be passed ...

Mr. SPEAKER: I still maintain you are making a second speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is probably getting tired and forgetful. For his information a White Paper on the Defence Force was debated in this House and a Resolution on that White Paper passed not so long ago, setting out the structure of the Defence Force and how it shall function. Insofar as the Defence Act is concerned, the hon. member can be satisfied that instructions for it were only given since this Government took over power and the Act is being drafted. They had fifteen years and are now complaining about things. We are trying to achieve them and will achieve them in a shorter time. I support wholeheartedly the idea of cadet corps at all of the schools without any discrimination, and I want to go a step further.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

1.55 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you rise on a point of order?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of personal explanation. I do not have to urge a Cadet Corps at all the schools. That was the opposite, Sir. You have heard me say it before that it was the wrong policy to have Cadet Corps at all the Schools, but that you should have Cadet Corps in the areas. The hon. member was not listening.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Exactly, Sir. He must if he wants to structure them according to the divisions of areas and districts. There is a strong case for Cadet Corps throughout this island being extended. That is the point that I am making. He cited a boy from Lodge Hill going to the Christ Church Boys' School and being able to join the Cadet Corps at the Christ Church Boys' School – a school that I know, Sir. Let me say that although he spoke in the masculine, I assume that he intended to include women and young girls. I heard a *sotto voce* remark from the law student and I am really not teaching law this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Let me put the position this way. I know that women will be included in that training as well, not only throughout the Defence Force, but also in the Cadet Corps because I consider this extremely important. I also hope that it will be so structured that the statement once made by the hon. member will never come true, and that is about breeding a generation of lawless people. We want to get away from that sort of concept in this country.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have never been a member of any Cadet Corps or of the Regiment or any military establishment. When some of my colleagues have been marching up and down upon the quadrangle of some school or the pastures where they parade, I being a person of peace used to be in the Library reading the political poems of John Dryden or discussing with the member for Christ Church West Shelly's "Prometheus Unbound", or even going outside of his ken, and thinking of those Rennaisance men like Leonardo Da Vinci and Micheal Angelo theorising about marine fossils on the Alps.

Mr. Speaker, even though I did not have that military background, I still have always appreciated the benefits that could come from military trianing for young people, albeit, that appreciation was at a distance. It has certainly been a matter of concern that there has not been additional Cadet Corps established at different institutions throughout the country whether based on schools, or however they might have been organised; and I would like to assure the member for Christ Church West that the question of the establishment of Cadet Corps was not a subject that I had to deal with as such as Minister of Education. It never crossed my desk to the best of my knowledge, although from time to time I would express certain views on that subject; but I certainly have my views and I certainly know and believe that there are problems which develop.

There is the problem of identifying suitable persons who had the interest and who had the knowledge of training young people in the military arts, whether it was the reading of maps or whether it was the training in the use of old-fashioned rifles that they still use in the Cadet Corps and things like that. I believe that the problems still continue as regards suitable persons who can give suitable leadership at the schools. The fact that a school had a teaching staff did

not mean that that staff had on it persons who were competent to give training in the military arts. I believe that the solution then, and the solution now is the provision of a body of persons which can be developed within the Defence Force in order to provide training on a continuing basis at these schools where they are required.

It is a common procedure now in schools whereby specialist services required are not available on the teaching staff of those schools that trained personnel can be recruited on a part time basis for these schools. I believe that in Agriculture and Home Economics and in other subjects that has been the practice. I see no reason why it cannot be developed. The important thing is to provide the schools with trained personnel at the point where they are required.

I know that the Minister of Defence has indicated that persons are now being recruited for the Defence Force who have had experience at schools and who may be coming into the Defence Force. I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether these persons are coming on secondment, and whether there is any common policy in respect of the release of these persons from their present employment; and whether some will be getting secondment and others would not be getting secondment or whether there is a common variation in the various agencies of Government as far as making available to the Defence Force the services where these persons may be concerned; because I think that there should be a common policy. If one is employed by one Government, there should be some common policy of operation whereby those persons who may be required to build up a score of offices should feel that they are all coming in on the same basis.
2.05 p.m.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this indication that other Cadet Corps will be developed at various areas of various schools throughout the country is a good development and I do hope that having identified the persons who will be on full-time with the Defence Force as I understand it and who will therefore be available for training duties with the schools or the central organisations, that they will be able to add a measure of knowledge and discipline as well as skills, an additional level of skill to the young people of this country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is there any other hon. member who wants to speak? The Standing Order has been suspended, Sir, and hon. members have been patient. I will be short Sir. The point about the Cadet Corps is well taken. The point has already been taken. The Cadet Corps in future will be organised on a basis of school companies consisting of pupils of authorised schools enrolled with the approval of the Headmaster and independent companies consisting of persons enrolled with the approval of officers comprising such companies, so we will have both. We will not do away with the existing companies but we will provide for zonal companies in the North.

The age is not 11, it will be 13 in the future. They will be more regulations. The Defence Act and the Defence Regulations dealing with uniforms. Parents and guardians have to make uniforms good and so on. As far as the officers are concerned, the point made by the Leader of the Opposition is also taken. Any officer would have to qualify as a member of the Barbados Defence Force. The legislation will specifically state that the command of the training of the units of the Barbados Cadet Corps should be the responsibility of the officers and non-commissioned officers of the Defence Force, so a man who is not otherwise qualified, a schoolmaster that is, or who is unwilling to accept the Act and the discipline and who merely wants to draw pay for parading on a few afternoons will not be able to command the Cadet Corps. He will have to be a Volunteer Officer in the Regiment or a regular officer in the Regiment, and I think that to a great extent that will take care of some of the issues of motivation which the Leader of the Opposition have identified.

I think that when hon. members next month have the opportunity to examine Part XI of the forthcoming Defence Act, they will see that all the points that have been made about the Cadet Corps will be dealt with in the few sections of the Act that will apply to that Corps.

I must say that I am much obliged to hon. members for the interest they have shown and the ideals they have thrown out which I am sure will not have fallen on stony ground and which have been heard by all those concerned and likely to be concerned in the future with the administration of the Force.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUSPENSION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it is now a quarter after two, Sir, and I beg to move that this House be now suspended for 45 minutes, that would be until 3 o'clock.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.
2.15 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we were still in Committee of Supply. If it pleases Your Hor our, the Resolution of which I gave notice this morning relating to compensation for the Coast Guard will be the next Order of the Day.

I am asking leave to take this Resolution through all its stages. I have already consulted with the appropriate member of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of $104,531 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. 13 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

The Hon. Prime Minister is seeking leave of this Honourable House to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978–79 No. 13

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it has been agreed that on disbandment of the Coast Guard that severance pay be given to all of the members of the Coast Guard who were in service and had properly qualified at the time of disbandment. A careful examination of the Estimates reveals that although there is a good deal of unspent money in the defence vote, there were no head under which this severance could properly be paid, because it is not amongst the salaries and it does not amount in our view to preliminary expenses of establishing a Defence Force. It is therefore necessary, Mr. Chairman, to have a new item specifically relating to this matter – we are calling it "compensation" – and we are asking for a vote of $104,531. The computed amount is actually $104,530.92.

Of the persons in the Coast Guard, there are 42 people who qualify. Their appointments date from June 1974 to December 1976. I hope that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central will notice that even those who were appointed after September 1976 are being terminated under this arrangement. The amount of compensation will vary from $6,243.36 down to $597.30, that is for the persons who had been appointed comparatively recently. Two people will get $597.30, a couple more will get double that and then we go up the scale to $6,243.36.

It is necessary to have this Resolution in order to let the gentlemen get their money. I am very sorry that they did not remain in the Visitor's Gallery to hear that we have paid enough attention to their interests, to ensure that this Head is passed through all its stages today. Some times when you are misled you really do not always act in your best interest and in the best interest of society as a whole.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I think the Prime Minister should be aware of the fact that while this money is being voted to pay severance to these workers or former members of the Coast Guard, it will certainly be no great consolation to many of them to receive this money, because what many of them may be experiencing now is lack of employment, and as I have pointed out earlier today, some of them are concerned about the fact that they are now finding it difficult to move into the Regiment and no satisfactory explanation has been given to them, as I understand, as to why there could not be an easy transfer from the Coast Guard as it now stands into the marine wing of the Reigment, because they are not interested primarily in severance pay. This obviously will come out of the fact that they have been severed.

One has to admit as we examine these things **that** the Government has some legal right to dismiss people who are not established, but at the same time while conceding that right, we have to remind Government that they have a responsibility to ensure that people have employment and to keep those who have employment in employment. I think this is the contention. This is the point that is really moving many of the people in the former or now defunct Coast Guard, not the question of severance pay but the question of employment, because it is not easy for them to move from the now defunct Coast Guard into the Regiment. They have to make fresh applications, they have to undergo examinations, and whether or not they pass these examinations, they still do

not know when they will get into the Regiment. As I have drawn to the hon. member's attention, there is some concern among people especially those who are seeking to get into the Regiment that the method of selection is very difficult and savours of discrimination against those who do not belong to the right group. So it is nice to bring this in here and ask us to pass it. We are going to pass it because we agree that they should get their money but it goes a lot beyond the granting of severance pay, and this is what is bothering people because here is a group of people some of whom have been employed and now as a result of this transition some will not be employed any longer, and certainly the amount of severance which is a certain amount per year and in some cases is not much cannot last very long. By the end of 1978 or before the end of 1978 that money has gone, and what will be steering these people in their faces is unemployment. If their service has been such that you are now saying you do not want them in the marine wing of the Regiment, one would like to know what was the quality of service that you kept them on all the time in the Coast Guard before it became defunct.

I hope the Hon. Prime Minister in his reply not so much to me but to the satisfaction of those people who are now aggrieved by this movement will seek to satisfy them as to the reason why they have been laid off, and also to give them some hope that in the very near future they will either get into the Regiment those who do apply and are eligible, capable and found competent to join the ranks of the movement, and others will find some other form of employment in the very near future.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, earlier in the second reading, the Prime Minister indicated that I brought somebody back here and that person was now a member or an ex member of the Coast Guard, and while I cannot indicate that I know of what he speaks, I nonetheless can say that there are a number of persons living in my constituency who now find themselves in the very peculiar position of having been severed from the Coast Guard by an Act of the Government, not having had an indication as to when they will receive their pay. Of course, Mr. Chairman, to say not having had an indication might not be quite accurate. The information that has been given to me suggests that all of the members of the Coast Guard received letters from an official of the Government in the Ministry of Defence and Security, and in these letters a number of statements were made. Among those statements was an indication of the exact amount of severance pay due to the particular person, and an indication that as soon as that person more or less agreed, the severance pay would be made.
3.10 p.m.

There was also an implied statement in some of the communications that such persons as would be severed from the Coast Guard would become members of a sub-unit, and in the words of one of the gentlemen who spoke to me they would go to sleep one night as members of the Coast Guard, a civil service unit, and wake up next morning as members of a sub-unit with full time pay outside of the civil service etc. They would of course have to indicate that they wanted to join the sub-unit.

Now we have heard in this Chamber of persons who worked in the private sector who long after they have been severed were having difficulty in receiving their severance pay. I believe that hon. members on both sides have deplored this situation, and indeed I recall in the last session, in 1976 I believe, a Resolution was passed, the object of which was to ensure that no one in Barbados would suffer the indignity of having to be on the dole while trying to find another job through no act of his own. It is therefore reprehensible when the Government itself is the agency that should expedite severance pay when persons are in that situation, because such persons have to go around begging and in some cases have their items of hire purchase being taken away and there is disruption of family life. After all, Mr. Chairman, these persons involved are persons who had every reason to feel that they were the heads of stable family units. It is sickening to think that for long periods of time they go from one Government department to another, from one official to another and all they hear is "We do not know what is happening, ask the officer at the Regiment." It is like sending the fool further and further. These people are not fools, they are persons, members of families, and have a right to humane treatment. And indeed when they have been in the employment of Government that right is even more paramount because the Government is sworn or should be sworn to treat all of its citizens in a humane way. Of course, many of us have reasons to doubt that the Government feels very strongly on this point. But what is even more galling to some of the people who find themselves in this position is the fact that one or two of them have had reason, perhaps because of their leadership qualities or because it is in their nature to be that way, to lead a delegation to see officials. In the case of the Regiment I am told they went to see the commanding officer. One particular gentleman who the previous week had remonstrated with the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security indicated to the Permanent Secretary that because he had taken that particular action he fully expected to be victimized. A week had not gone by before this young man went to see an officer of the Regiment and he asked the officer various questions like "I have been unemployed since October 9, today is October 30 and I have not received any money". The reply: "You will be paid in a few days; next question." "I have signed a book and I do not know where I am working and for how much." Reply: "You signed a book; next question". "Can you tell me when I can expect to receive my severance pay?" Reply: "I

cannot tell you that but what I can tell you is that you are fired."

I was not there, Mr. Chairman, but it has been so reported to me and if this is so, I believe that the Minister responsible for defence and security need to examine and tell this Honourable House if in fact those persons who now join the sub-unit can be fired just like that on the basis of questions 1, 2, 3. We have passed the days when persons can be dismissed just like that even in the private sector. It is even more dangerous, wicked and sickening if persons who believe they are working for the Government can be summarily dismissed in that manner. As I said, Mr. Chairman, I was not there; I cannot speak with authority. *(Asides)* But I can tell you, Sir, that no amount of outrage or outcry or hollering from the members of that side can stop me from getting up and speaking for those persons who are not able to speak in here. *(Shouting)* And they can't shout any louder than me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This will not be a shouting match; order please.

Mr. TAITT: The hon. member for St. James has got back his voice again.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I always had a voice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. TAITT: I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if it is normal and natural for persons employed by the Government to be summarily dismissed *(Asides)* Hearsay? You may not know this, Mr. Chairman, but a number of young men in the vicinity of this House today walked out disgusted with what the Prime Minister was saying. That is not hearsay, that is a fact, and they could go outside and ask any of those persons how the shoe is fitting. It is tight.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that much more has to be said; the point has been made. If they are prepared to have persons who were employed by the Government walking up and down day after day, going to the Ministry of Defence and Security, then to the Prime Minister Personal Aide's office, then to his Parliamentary Secretary's office, to the Regiment, to the Deputy Prime Minister and only hearing "I do not know what is going on"; and then coming to me to do something for them; the fact is Mr. Chairman, that if ordinary Barbadians are being induced now to give consideration to joining a service that is supposed to be a national service, if they are to consider the Barbados Regiment or the new Defence Force or whatever it is to be called as something for which they must have national pride, a certain humanitarian attitude must be shown by the Government to help them in this transformation from being civil servants one day and almost nothing the next. It is not easy, Mr. Chairman, unemployment is not something that one can easily take in stride. A man who is in charge of a family unit is not merely losing a job when he is treated in this way, he is being subjected to the loss of his dignity and it will only be a matter of time before he loses his sense of what is right and what is wrong.
3.20 p.m.

A normal human being is entitled to self respect; and I am charging here that by the perambulations of the Government these people are in danger of losing their self respect through no fault of their own. We have heard the Prime Minister announce in the way that he does some short comings.....(Aside).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There must be no cross talk. Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: A person who loses his self respect through no fault of his own in this country is a person who is in danger of being less than a human being. It is unfair, grossly unfair, to ask the ordinary Barbadian, especially at this time when unemployment outside of the Government sector – despite what the Prime Minister says from time to time, and despite the public relations stunts which are performed daily, despite all of these, out there where it counts, where people know that they are not working, and they know that their standard of living is dropping, in fact has dropped, those who are able to maintain themselves because of the employment which they had with the Government were told "well, we done with that."

Some of them heard the Prime Minister here today talking about all of the errors committed by certain officers. These persons are not people who can come here and say a Prime Minister is not telling the truth. I am sure that if any one of them was sitting in here, he would get up and say that the Prime Minister is not telling the truth. So my point is very simple. The Government has a responsibility to find out what is happening in the Barbados Regiment having regard to the transformation of those persons who indicate that they wish to go from the Coast Guard to the Regiment. The Minister has a responsibility to see that any severance payments which are to be paid to these people should be paid as a matter of urgency. I think that if they do not, they may find that in due course it is too late.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Government is finding that the actual details involved in running a Government are not as simple as speaking from the benches of the Opposition as they were wont to do.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if the hon. member is speaking of the last member who has just spoken. Perhaps he can clarify if the member

now finds it easier to speak from the Opposition than as a member of the Government.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Christ Church West has found that the member for St. Michael South West is finding it easy to speak from the Opposition benches; because his remarks are very challenging and are drivinghome and causing some concern over there on the Government benches; but I am certain that the Government is now finding that the problems involved in running a Government are not simple matters. It is not just a matter of issuing fiats or commands, or simply saying do this or do that and it is done. There is a world of difference between having a particular policy or having some type of guidelines and then ensuring that these guidelines are smoothly implemented; and I believe that this question of the establishment of the Defence Force and the dissolution of the Coast Guard service is no exception to that general rule.

From the Opposition benches the Barbados Labour Party was able to speak quite freely, and sometimes quite eloquently on what should be done in Government and what problems there were; but now that the reality of administering a service is upon them, they are finding that there are 1,001 problems that they knew not of, and that they seem incapable of dealing with efficiently.

We have here a Resolution relating to the dissolution of the Coast Guard which is for a sum of $104,535, and we cannot really sweep it under the carpet. We have got to say that there have been some problems in the dissolution of this service and the establishment of the naval arm or sub-unit, or whatever it is called, into the Defence Force. The very act of dissolving the Coast Guard has apparently presented some major problems for the Government. Why should this be so? The great combination had all the expertise. They had the answers to all the problems in Barbados. Why should the citizens of this country find that what was considered to be a simple matter has presented so many grave problems? This is a matter which has been going back and forth. Something seems to be wrong in the State of Denmark.

These matters have to be computed and re-computed. They have to be examined and re-examined, and still the dissatisfaction to which I referred still exists. I believe that somewhere in the military and security establishment there are problems that we know not of which have led to the inelegancies and the inefficiencies in the handling of this whole matter. I believe that this is one that the Minister of Defence and Security would like to forget and sleep out as soon as possible; because little did he believe that this particular matter would perhaps have created so many problems and so much concern. I do not think that he would set this as a model method for handling the integration of a service and the disbandment of another service.

3.30 p.m.

I believe it causes him some concern, but he must face up to the problems. He must not try to gloss them over. He must, in his own words, as he speaks of open Government. He must come and tell this House openly, "look these are the problems we have encountered. These are where the difficulties have been." Let us see an example of open Government in operation and this is what we would expect that those persons who have complaints, those persons who have grievances, and dissatisfaction and who as I understand by my colleague the member for St. Michael South West, there is everything else right in the member speaking if he has had complaints brought to him. That is what representation is about. That is what representation is and one must not get peeved or try to put the speaker down to one's stride simply because he is giving utterances to matters that have been brought to his attention.

When we were in Government we were more thick-skinned than that. We had to take a lot from the Opposition benches then. We used to hear when they were on this side if there were a Ministerial change, you would hear of one member becoming the Minister of Tar Roads, and the irony of that situation is that that member is now responsible, among other things, for Tar Roads. That is the irony of politics. I understand it happened when he was out of the country. I do not know.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, I do not know of any Minister that is responsible for Tar Roads, I know we have barbergreen roads now. I mean I do not know any Tar Roads Minister, Sir. If they had one, I am sure on this side we have none.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please continue?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I certainly will, but the hon. member for St. James can only talk about barber-green holes, not barber-green roads. There are so many holes, there are more holes than roads.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to press the Minister of Defence and Security a little more closely on this matter of the dissolution of the Coast Guard service and the services that they used to perform in the past. I would like to hear a little more about the Air, Sea Rescue Services that that Coast Guard service was supposed to perform in cases particularly in any emergencies which may occur from time to time at the Airport.

I did indicate that there was a problem of an emergency landing at the Airport over the weekend and that certain services had to be put on alert and I would like to know, and to press the Prime Minister a little more closely to say specifically whether the Coast Guard Service or the boats which were bought by the taxpayers money and which were, and are expected to perform in cases of emergency, whether these were on alert, whether in fact they were serviceable to answer any such demands which may be put upon them, whether those boats were actually manned.

I would like to know whether this is a service that is required as far as aviation is concerned, particularly at Airports which may carry a grading of the Grantley Adams International Airport and whether on the occasion of this recent emergency, that service was available and ready for use in case matters had turned out more seriously which we thank God they did not. I will like to press the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence a little more on that particular aspect.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I hear all of the accusations which are being made on that side about the fact that the Coast Guard is finally going to be disbanded in order to make it a more professional service, I get the impression that they were all absent at the time of its initial inception. It is obvious, Sir, if you examine the history of the Coast Guard that they were a number of things which needed to be set straight and in order to have a service that performs the kind of professional service that a modern developing society would demand of its Coast Guard, steps have had to be taken to bring a more professional approach to the selection of personnel, etc.

I can recall, and I do not think I am too far off his exact words, the hon. member for St. John having made one of his off-hand comments to the effect that he did not want any man with varicose veins in his Coast Guard. Indeed, I do not know if that was the only criteria for selection in which case the best that we can say about the service is that nobody with varicose veins got in, but everybody else who had a letter from his favourite DLP politician was inducted into the service without due regard to the normal criteria for selection into the para-military service, that is physical fitness, mental fitness, and by mental I do not only mean you can pass through composure and dealing in an elusive fashion, but I am referring now to the psychological discipline for the people who have to deal with arms.

I heard only a few days ago that one of the duties which some responsible body in Barbados expected from the Coast Guard was hauling dead horses out of the sea. We go and we buy a gun-boat; I do not know how many millions of dollars we paid for it, but some person who is well placed to know better thought that dumping dead horses was a duty that should rationally fall to the Coast Guard Service. Well, under this Government, Sir, we do not regard that as a fit and proper function for the Coast Guard to be engaged in. As a matter of fact, I am sure that there are still a number of ways of disposing of animals far less expensively than with a streamline motor vessel equipped with guns etc., etc.

What we are attempting to do Sir, is to bring the Coast Guard in line with what a modern Defence Force should look like. Para-Defence, Defence, call it whatever you will, but the point is that we have to recognise, Sir, that if improper criteria were implied in the original selection of staff for the Coast Guard, if we are to rationalise it, if we are to make it the kind of body it should be, it will of necessity entail some dislocation of some persons who may not be able to meet the most stringent criteria which I am sure will redound to the benefit of all of us in the final analysis.

3.40 p.m.

I do not think it is too long ago for people to remember that one of the Coast Guard vessels popped up a fishing boat out to sea belonging to a man in St. Philip, and on another occasion, as the Prime Minister indicated, backed astern when it should be going forward. The difference between forward and backward was not immediately clear to the person responsible for propulsion, and another fishing boat got crushed in the Careenage, and the Jamice Aune went down at sea. These are things which we have to be particularly careful of, because when you are talking about hardships which people suffer as a consequence of being told that they cannot reach the criteria for selection, when you tell a man "look, you cannot pass examination therefore you should not reasonably expect to be a member of the service", when you look at these kinds of hardships and put them vis-a-vis the hardship that entails a man losing his life at sea or some sort of national disaster that accrues consequentially upon the bad handling of these motor vessels, etc., when you look at those two things, I think it is really childish, though it might be politically expedient, to come in here and pretend that some dearth of hardship and privation is going to come to people who have been told that they are not going to be detained in the service. (Asides.) I would urge the hon. member for St. Michael South West not to taunt me on certain matters.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member would give way, I was not attempting to taunt him, I was just suggesting that he would be a master of this business of dislocation because of the large number of people who were dislocated from the B.M.C.

Mr. JOHNSON: I do not know how the affairs of the B.M.C. have crept into this debate, but in a more appropriate forum not too long from now we will have a lot to say about the B.M.C., and I am sure the hon. member for St. Michael South West will not want to be here on that occasion.

Now, Sir, he talks about people complaining about how they have been handled by the selection personnel up at the regimental headquarters. I do not believe that it is to be expected that every politician in Barbados must feel it his duty to come into this House and crap constantly about somebody being unfair or unreasonable to somebody else because one man feels to report his side of the story and nobody bothers to investigate the whole affair. I am sure that if a man is badly handled at regimental headquarters, any reasonably intelligent person knows that there is a complaints procedure that should be followed, and I do not believe that in that complaint mechanism the hon. member for St. Michael South West figured; so I do not know why he should be selected as the spokesman for disgruntled persons who are not prepared to tell him what the real reason is that they are not being retained in the service. And there are reasons as the Hon. Minister responsible has indicated already, that there are a number of people who are not fit to be retained in the service, and I believe it is dangerous....

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member would give way....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member give way?

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, I think the hon. member misunderstood what I was saying in regard to that particular point. I was making the point that this is a person who has subsequently joined the sub-Unit, therefore he must have been considered a fit and proper person. I was not discussing the selection personnel at all. The person has subsequently joined the sub-Unit or taken steps required to join the sub-Unit and that person, having asked a senior officer three questions, the answer to the third question ended up with the statement "you are fired". That is the only point I was making.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, if he has subsequently joined the sub-Unit, then he has nothing to be complaining about. He has gone back in the service. Let us say something else. When a man volunteers to go and join a para-military organisation, he does not expect to be treated in normal conventional civilian terms. I spent two years in the United States Army and I know what it is like. The first thing they do with you when you enter the service is to shave your head clean. *(Asides).*

Mr. GREAVES: I was wondering why the hon. member for St. Michael South has not regained all of his hair.

Mr. JOHNSON: That just goes to show the extent of the harshness of the induction treatment. The fact that my hair has not grown back will let you know how rough military life is. They will tell you that the reason they shave your head is to allow you to know when you go into the army you are no longer to consider yourself a person in the same light as you would if you were in civilian life. Military life requires discipline. That is probably the most essential ingredient in military life, and therefore you cannot expect to go into the service and tell the Commander...well, in my day you could not even tell the Second Lieutenant. You had to go in and be extremely quiet, do what you were told and ask no question.

Barbados is a small developing country and I am confident that some of the things that happen in the United States Army which is regarded as a big country, sophisticated in military matters, will never happen in the service in Barbados, so the life will be comparatively easier. I do not see why a man should go and join a service and then come out and complain that somebody spoke to him in a harsh voice, because that is the nature of military life. If you do not like to be spoken to roughly, do not go in. It is that simple because when it comes.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation, the hon. member obviously did not grasp the point I was making. In the United States and other military areas there is a procedure through which a man would be sent before he is cashiered. What I am talking about is if a senior officer is in a position to answer question one and answer question two, and answer question three with the final words "and furthermore you are fired", then it is not a military or para-military organisation. That is the point I am making. I am not quarrelling with the principle.

Mr. JOHNSON: I am making the point that if the man does not like to be spoken to in terms that he regards as harsh, he has no business in there, because in time of crisis when discipline and human life are the two operative ingredients, when we have to have a disciplined force in order to stave off disaster of one variety or another, it is going to be essential that we have proper attitudes prevailing in the service. I served and I survived. I feel, Sir, that I am a better man for having served in a military service, and I am confident that if politicians will stop interfering with the inductees into the national service, going around holding their hands and asking who raised their voice at you and did he give you a set, when you get to that sort of business, if politicians over there, if that crowd over there would leave the people alone, this service will blossom forth into a service of which we can all be justly proud. I feel, Sir, that we should stop fooling around with this playing of politics with the national service, recognise that the effort is being made to

bring the service up to a professional level, and that things like no varicose veins will not be the sole criteria for selection, but that we will do it on a more sophisticated level and people with the relevant competence will be inducted into the service, and in the event that Barbados requires that service above and beyond the duties that were outlined earlier, we will have the necessary discipline to see us through.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. member wish to make a contribution to this debate? I will ask the Hon. Prime Minister to reply.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I regret, Mr. Chairman, that the high standard, the well informed comments and the very reasonable level of debate which we have enjoyed with the contributions of the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Michael South and the hon. member for St. Michael North Central has been let down by the recent contribution.
3.50 p.m.

To deal with one of the decent ones, I would advise the hon. member for St. Michael South that the George Fergusson boat was available on the Saturday of the crisis. It needed certain repairs to its superstructure and they were carried out. The Port engine was tuned, and we got assistance from the HMS "Herimone" in doing some engine tuning. It was ready on the 25th October, it was on the sea on Saturday and is in the sea now. I can arrange sea trials for any hon. member if he won't get sea sick, like some of the members in the Coast Guard who couldn't go to sea because they were sick every day on the ship. We are taking them into the Regiment, but not into the Coast Guard, at the same pay, same uniform but no sailing. Some care has to be exercised in the use of the main tank. It may need repair, but when we get all the boats in the water we will repair that. Boat 403 is in the water and some repair is being done. On boat 404 all work was completed on 27th October, and the boat is now in the sea. The Harbour Police boat "Hawk". – work was started on minor repairs, and it was ready for launching last week but in fact we have not yet launched it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker, I only wanted some indication as to whether the boat was available. I did not want the Minister of Defence to give all that information now, lest any enemy of this country should note our naval unpreparedness and attack now.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sure the hon. member is not warning me against any of his colleagues, but you have a complete run down on our naval vessels. I am reminded of a cartoon many years ago in the London Daily Express by Cummings. Cummings said: "If only the Russians carried on their business the way the Americans carry on Congressional hearings." The cartoon was of a Russian General unfolding his papers and saying: "Now here is our exact number of atomic bombs." But let me say that the exact state of naval readiness in Barbados is 75%.

Now I listened to the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South West with some distress. First, I was distressed at his naievete. Second, I was distressed at the ignorance of the requirements of military discipline, and thirdly, at lack of a sense of responsibility which he showed in the main tenor of his speech. I appreciate the hon. member complaining about unemployment is by way of a *crie de coeur,* and I accept fully what he says about the demoralization a man can go through when he is unemployed. But the fact is that service in a military unit, as the hon. member for St. Michael West has so ably said, is not ordinary straightforward employment. There are things that you have to take from an employee in Government or in the private enterprise that you cannot afford to take from a member of a Defence Force. Now I know the principal source of the hon. member's information. It is a recalcitrant member of the Coast Guard who has also approached hon. members on this side to indicate political support for us and complaining of political discrimination against him on the part of some person. This is a person who was dismissed from the Barbados Regiment for insubordination. This is a person whom I am formally advised that had a Defence Act been in force could have been charged with inciting a mutiny. It may seen like a joke to the hon. member, but he could perhaps take the advice of the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. and galant member for St. John. You cannot have a man in a Defence Force who looks in the commanding officer's face and says: "Nobody is giving me any orders, I am not taking any orders from you." Are we madmen in here that we are going to put forward the case of such a man? He was fortunate that the conditions which existed at the time did not permit of a court martial being called and his being put in the cells under guard for trial in due course.

In any case all former members of the Coast Guard were employed on a temporary basis, one month's notice on either side. The Coast Guard was given a month's notice and they are being given severance pay. They are being offered re-employment but they will have to qualify, not only in terms of examination capacity but in terms of character and the capacity to submit to military discipline. That is the entire point of the exercise and we have to understand it, and we cannot get in here and try to skip this. We cannot get in here and try to make people believe that shouting in a commanding officer's face is something which can be ameliorated by an approach to the hon. member for St. Michael South West or to members of the back bench on the Government side or trying to approach the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security. To the best of my

knowledge a letter was written by the National Union of Public Workers to the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security, and I believe that the Permanent Secretary saw a number of people. I also believe the Parliamentary Secretary in my office saw a number of people. None can say that they have seen me, and my Personal Aide informs me that none can say they have seen him either. A letter was written by a responsible body and it was responded to in a responsible way. We do nobody any service by suggesting that employment in Government service carries a permanent right to such employment no matter what your behaviour. Not even in the Civil Service can a man expect to behave as he likes and remain employed; and less so in military service. I am acting in the interest of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, the hon. member for St. Lucy and all hon. members on that side when I uphold such decisions.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Prime Minister constantly refers to the hon. member for St. Michael South West. It is not outside the pale of my responsibility to raise a question with the Prime Minister whether it is as he says of a military service, whether a man can be fired just like that, summarily. That is the only point I raised.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Does the hon. member think that I am afraid to say that a soldier can be fired summarily? I am saying that as far as my knowledge of military matters goes and my responsibility....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way. What is the hon. member talking about? What does he know about a soldier? The hon. member can hardly ride a bicycle.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member had better suppress his nonsense and behave himself in here. Do you have to be able to ride a bicycle to know right from wrong? If the knowledge of right from wrong qualified one to ride a bicycle or drive a motor car the hon. member could not have a driving licence.
4.00 p.m.

I am not afraid to say that we are not dealing with a civil service situation. We are dealing with a situation of military service; and I am not afraid to say that insubordination can call for instant dismissal from the military service and perhaps a charge under the Defence Act. When the Defence Act comes in, you will see Court Martial procedures. The hon. member perhaps does not know very much about military discipline. Ask the hon. member for St. John. Perhaps in the last war nobody in the British Army was shot for conventional cowardice; but anybody who is aware of military history will know that in the First World War something like 600 private soldiers were shot for refusing to go into the line. He would know that.

There are different circumstances applying to military service from civil servants; and the hon. member does this country no service when he suggests anything that will give comfort to insubordination, or give encouragement to mutiny. That is what I mean when I say I am acting in the interest of all of us when I make this speech in here. I have full confidence in Colonel Banfield, the designated Chief of Staff of the Barbados Defence Force and his Second in Command. I have full confidence in their integrity and their judgment in military matters; and I have not the slightest intention of giving any encouragement to any hon. member who comes in and puts a case for a man who could look the Colonel in the face and tell him that he is not taking any orders.

That is exactly what causes soldiers in the end to be insubordinate, to be their own masters, and to decide that we should not be their masters, but should be their servants. That is exactly what it leads to -- the encouragement of insubordination in military forces. I am not encouraging it. As far as I am concerned, this matter has been elaborated. Members of the Coast Guard have expressed surprise that they were being given severance pay because of the fact that they were told that they would be sent home without the notice that the law required. We could have sent them home without any notice; but we are giving them amounts varying from $597 to over $6,000. We could have just told them that their temporary posts had come to an end, and that would have been the end of the matter. They would all have been out in the street.

I never heard this talk in here about how the Coast Guard members were originally selected. I only had to tell you that I have certain impressions of some of the criteria that were used to select coast guards. People who have been dismissed from the Regiment, but who had good friends at court were able to obtain selection in the Coast Guard. People who had been dismissed from military service could yet find themselves in the Coast Guard at the command of a retired police officer in the initial stages. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this matter has been handled admirably by the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security, by the Colonel and by his Second in Command, Major Lewis; and I am fully satisfied that they have done their best, and are doing their best to bring into existence a Defence Force of which all Barbadians can be proud.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to say anything on the Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you aware that I asked if any other member wished to speak?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken yet in Committee on this matter. I think that if the Minister wishes to speak after me he will be able to do so; but in view of the fact that some of the comments made by the Hon. Minister were entirely new, I think that I could be allowed to speak. It is as simple as that. The position is that I had a lot to do with the initial stages of the proposals for the establishment of a Defence Force. It was during my term as Minister of Defence and Security that the Coast Guard was actually established.

No Minister of Government had anything to do with the recruitment of personnel for the Coast Guard. If any Minister had anything to do with the recruitment of the Coast Guard personnel – and I invite the Prime Minister to bring any evidence that he has – he certainly did in a highly conspiratorial manner behind my back when I was out of the Island, and with a highly organised conspiracy with members of the Public Service.

The recommendation for the recruitment or secondment of a retired Assistant Commissioner of Police to the post of Temporary Commanding Officer of the Coast Guard was my recommendation. I do not myself know a single member of the Coast Guard although I visited them usually early on mornings, and on one or two occasions when the slipway was under construction, the mechanical device for lifting boats, was being introduced up there. I just want to get the position clear in that particular sphere.

Now, the Hon. Prime Minister has a wonderful propensity which, of course, he was not allowed to exercise in the Law Courts to its fullest because the people who sit on the Bench of the Law Courts, and that of course is an advantage which even Your Honour did not choose to avail yourself of, being more of a scientific bent -- to restrain the Prime Minister when he goes off on these flights of fancy.

What I am saying is that nobody over there was criticising the Commanding Officer. The member for St. Michael South West was bringing to the attention of the Prime Minister not that a particular person who was insubordinate was dismissed for insubordination, but that a whole group of men had had their gainful employment curtailed in a very summary manner when they had commitments; and that it has taken the Government a very long period of time to make adequate compensation or redress to these people. Whether they were subordinate or insubordinate is not really the question. There is no need for the whole thing to be built up just because the Colonel is present as he is supposed to be during the debate; and the whole Civil Service should be very grateful to the Prime Minister for knowing that people who have been servants of the Crown and the Government of this country for fifteen years before the hon. member, unfortunately, became entrusted with the affairs of Barbados, do not have their jobs in jeopardy; and I am sure that the Colonel is glad with that reassurance because we all know that he is an efficient man; so that was not the point of the debate at all. The point of the debate was where you have people who are working at C.B.C., like Mr. Jerry Richards who had gone and bought a house and has a mortgage on it, or where you are a Corporal or a Sergeant or an able-bodied seaman or a coast guard member, and you have commitments and your employment is curtailed on the grounds that you are a temporary person.

A job has to be done, and yet you take six, eight or ten months before you say how are you going to make those monthly payments to meet the demands for their children's school fees, for instalments on the T.V. set, for monthly payments to the garage and for gasolene which has gone up inordinately during the past year and a half, and all the other payments that are being met by the unfortunate people of this unfortunate country at this unfortunate time. This is the whole question of this debate.

The debate has nothing to do with whether one person was subordinate or insubordinate. I just want to say this, Mr. Chairman, and I know that you will be very indulgent although my time has not expired. I do not want to prolong this debate any longer. I just want to say that as a constitutional issue, now that we have a Defence Force, do not tell me that when Raffique Shah went down to Tetron Bridge with his mutineers that he did not have any right as a soldier; that he had a right to be summarily put against the wall. I say this because when people mutiny in the British Army you do not invite anybody from Russia, and Canada, and Alsaka and Outer Mongolia to come and have a big harangue and court martial proceedings and a cocktail party and that kind of thing.

4.10 p.m.

You have a Court Marshal to put them up against a wall, shoot them, send their clothes home and say they died of active service. That is the end of the matter. No newspaper intervening or anything. Mr. Chandler is a member of the House but he has constitutional rights. Do not tell me that a soldier does not have constitutional rights, and if a soldier is dismissed he still has a right.

As a matter of fact during the war in the House of Commons at the height of the war; members of Parliament were raising matters about the rights of soldiers

in the House of Commons in England and I was there. Not that anybody was raising things for me, I was raising them for myself with members of the House of Commons with Mr. James Griffith, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I wanted to know how it was that black people were dying and according to King's Regulations you had to be of European descent to have Royal Commissions, but that was for the mentor.

So do not tell me about M.P's because I used to go in and talk to M.P's all the time so do not tell me that a soldier does not have any rights. Furthermore, if a member of the Regiment has a representative, I am not saying that every time he does not like the way the rice was cooked that he should write or run to his M.P. and say I want you to raise this in the House of Commons. Only the Jamaicans do that. As a matter of fact, Sir, the Jamaicans not only went to the M.P's, but they went on strike until they got they own cooks, at the height of the war. But I thought that was only done then and I said they did not know what was going on in the world. Then again I may be old-fashioned.

The point is that even soldiers have rights and I do not want to hear the hon. Prime Minister or anybody come in here and twist the whole debate into the question that somebody over here is defending somebody who is insubordinate. That is not germaine to this issue at all. What has happened is that the Government has been callous and indifferent by the length of time they have taken to deal with the terms of benefits for those people who now find themselves without any further sustenance.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Prime Minister is just out of the Chamber for a while and I should like to reply to a few of the points which the hon. member who has just sat down have made. In the first place I think the Prime Minister made it quite clear in his speech that under the Defence Act there will be a system set up where persons who may be on disciplinary charges in the Defence Force will have the right of course to make representations and indeed to legal defence. Sir, I am only drawing to your attention that the rules do not allow people to speak...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. TAITT: The hon. member may be inadvertently misleading this House. The Prime Minister in his debate said if the Defence Act had been passed such and such would have happened. Now the hon. member is getting up to tell us that when the Act comes something else will happen. What is he trying to tell us Mr. Chairman.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member probably believes that his so-called righteous indignation can provoke anyone from listening to him and answering him, Sir. He has got to keep a little cool, Sir. He will be provoked many times, Sir, between now and 1981.

The position is, Sir, that under the proposed Act, as happen in any Military Establishment, there are systems by which people who are on disciplinary charges have a right in order to be heard in their defence if they have a defence at all. That is nothing to do with the fact that in the instant case, the persons were employed on a temporary basis and it is a well known constitutional rule that in such cases they can be terminated on short notice and there is no argument about this.

Let us put the legal position clear. All sorts of accusations have been made against the Government. In this case despite the legal position, the Government has seen fit to come down to this House and ask for provisions to be provided in order to give compensation in cases such as this. Let us get the position clear. The Government is not terminating people's services and not giving them under any circumstances compensation even though by law they have no right to compensation, and the hon. member for St. John should be the last to talk. He and I had this out during the last session between 1971 and 1976 when I drew to his attention that there were several persons employed in the Service of the Crown who did not have the benefit of Severance Pay at this time and he tried to get out of my argument at the time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is very clever. He said he drew to may attention that there were several members of the Government who did not have the benefit of the severance payment. I can ask the hon. member if he knows of any one person who did not get severance payment, or the equilavent, or compensation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have never known of any instance where the hon. member brought down a measure for Severance Pay in this House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The question I asked, Mr. Chairman, was this. Does the hon. member know of any person who did not get Severance Pay or compensation pay, not whether I brought down a measure. What is the point of bringing down a measure when.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have some order. I think you are trying to explain it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Police are not under Workmen's Compensation but we pay them Workmen's Compensation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will give him an instance. Teachers who were severed by the Hon. Frederick Smith and did not get any compensation – although they had years of service and 597 persons of the Ministry of Communications and Works who were severed and have never got any form of compensation.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member should know that the negotiations for the Teachers are still going on. They were started and are still going on.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member well knows that when he went out of power they had never even started negotiations and compensated Teachers and that we....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is misleading this House. When Mr. Frederick Smith was Minister you could have read it in the newspapers. There were negotiations between the Ministry and these Teachers. Negotiations started then and to say that negotiations had not started before they came in....

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

Mr. TAITT: How you mean this is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you addressing the Chair? Please take your seat: The Hon. Attorney General, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Out of their own mouths, they are contending that there is a long time since people from the Coast Guard were severed and no compensation paid. The Teachers fate occurred more than a year before the DLP left Government and they never got a cent of compensation. You did not hear them talking about these poor people and their rights, whose children were suffering. The hon. member was a Cabinet Minister then. Did he have the guts and the dignity to get up and fight then in relation to their rights?
4.20 p.m.

You did not hear then about these poor people who had their rights, whose children were suffering. You did not hear about that then. The hon. member was a Cabinet Minister. Where was he then? Did he have the guts and decency to get up and fight the big McGuffy at the time in relation to their rights? You did not hear it then. The hon. member was in the Senate, he was in the Cabinet. What did he do during that year? The problem is that politics is becoming the politics of hypocrisy; that is what it is becoming when you hear it coming from the Opposition benches. That is what it is becoming. You have all sorts of rules that you brought and because you believe you are on some wave of popularity you keep playing to the Gallery.

Furthermore let me deal with these provisions. I am not finished with them yet. The employment of the Coast Guard members ended on 30th September, last month, and they were paid right up to the end of September. Now let us look at it. It is not that they were severed in March or for a year, but on 30th September, and today we are debating on the 31st October in order to get the money so that on the time they would have been paid in October they have severance payment in their hands. The criticism of the Government is unwarranted, unfounded trifling and a waste of people's time when you come in here with that sort of thing. It is the type of politics that one can do without in Barbados today, trying to create an assumed sympathy that does not exist without looking at the basic facts that are concerned in the Resolution before the House. Those are the facts. Hon. members should be made to research facts before they come in here and talk like the hon. member for St. Michael South West on hearsay and rumours. That is what you get on platforms these days, rumours about people, characterising people in all sorts of manner without any proper justification and not based on the facts before the people in the House. That is what the hon. member should look at. It is not a question of trying to get out of any debate. If the Opposition had any points to make, all of their points are unfounded and nobody can take you seriously in coming in here trying to mislead the House on facts that are completely beyond the point. That is the point.

Anyhow, Sir, I hope the hon. member will have better luck up at the University and that he will learn in future to do proper research founded on fact and advance logical cases, not like the case he has advanced here today.

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

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Resolution was agreed to.

THE DOGS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1978

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I intimated at an earlier stage in the day's proceedings that I would be requesting leave for this matter to be dealt with today in all its stages, the Dogs Amendment Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave of this Honourable House to proceed with an amendment to the Dogs Act, 1975. I understand that copies have been circulated and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being on objection, leave is granted.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: This is a very simple amendment, Mr. Speaker. On the occasion of the last amendment an anomaly arose which had the effect of depriving the Minister of the power to make certain regulations under the Act, and this is an amendment to section 23 of the Dogs Act, 1975, where it is proposed that we delete the words "on the sale or other disposal of dogs" appearing in the last three lines of paragraph (h) thereof and substituting therefor the words "and the sale and other disposal of dogs seized under Part III". What happened in the Other Place, Mr. Speaker, was that it was thought that there had been a typographical error and the word "on" was substituted quite mistakenly for the word "and" which made a complete nonsense of this particular clause.

It might be said that the particular clause was a little dubious, but it so happens that members in the Other Place had not read the regulations with the Act. If they had done so they would have recognised that the sale and/or other disposal of dogs could only have referred to dogs seized under Part III of the Act, and it was thought that in an effort to dispel any possible misunderstanding or misconstruing that this amendment as I have read would make the position quite clear to everyone. It was thought that the Minister would have power to regulate the sale of dogs. That was never intended to be so, not generally speaking. It refers to dogs seized under the Act which may be disposed of by sale, by auction, by humane disposal or other means.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we were circulated the proposed amendment a short time ago. It may be inconsequential. The difficulty is that the Dogs Act as printed in the Laws of Barbados has itself been amended on more than one occasion, and I think that we should do a little tidier drafting of legislation because section 23 which is in this volume of the Laws of Barbados is not the section 23 which is referred to in this amendment.
4.30 p.m.

That places us in a difficulty. Now if we were in our own offices or Chambers we would be able to have the amendment up-to-date and we do not really know what the hon. member is speaking about today. This is one of the things which probably is not political as far as I can see, and I do not know what the hurry is to have this legislation. The Act has not been proclaimed yet as far as I know, and it has been on the Statute Books since 1975 and up to now it has not been proclaimed and yet we hear that we must deal with this in all its stages today. But as I said, I do not have very strong feelings on it. Procedurally it is untidy because it places us in a difficulty to know what Section 23 is about since the Section 23 is not in this volume of the laws of Barbados.

But I would wish to speak on another matter relating to dogs. And that is that I think that if the Act is imperfect let us repeal it; let us go back to the drawing board and bring down a proper Act. If the Act is in order let us proclaim it and let us get some of these stray dogs off the streets. I have a proliferation of them by my office; I have to spray my office for dog fleas all the time. A problem I once had is that I rang up the S.P.C.A. that I had a dead dog on my premises the other day. They advised me to take it to the top of the street and the people at the Sanitation Department will take it away. But that would have been creating a nuisance for other people. They wanted me to take the dog and deposit it on the premises of the hon. member for Christ Church South Central who lives at the top of the street; then he would be able to get me for creating a public nuisance. What we need is a number of paddy wagons for these stray dogs. Up to this morning I saw two dogs stretched out in the gutter between the place where I live and Bridgetown. I must apologise for saying this, Sir, but too often in Barbados we say: "I wonder how people who come to Barbados feel?" But we should wonder how Barbadians feel. We do not have to talk about visitors although we are a tourist Island; but let us have standards for ourselves and not worry so much about what visitors think. If we have proper standards for ourselves then people will accept us as a clean Island.

But we have no way of disposing of live dogs or dead dogs, because if you ring the S.P.C.A. they are not going to help you even if you offer to pay money; and if you get in touch with the Sanitation Department they want you to go and be offensive to other people. So what can you do in these circumstances? I must really ask the hon. Minister if the Act is satisfactory let us get proper dog vans; if the Act is not satisfactory, let us repeal it and start afresh and get something. We have all kinds of diseases caused by these animals, apart from the fleas that do not know any national or other boundaries, for if the dog next door has fleas, the fleas can fly over to your premises; the dogs need not necessarily have to visit you.

A lot of people are keeping dogs who do not look after them properly. Now this may sound as if you do not want poor people to keeep dogs. That is nonsense. I find there are a lot of people keeping dogs in this country who are not able to look after them. This is a fact and I make no apology for saying this. And there are a lot of people who keep dogs who are financially able to look after them but are not capable psychologically or mentally of looking after them, just in the same way as you have people who are financially incapable of looking after children. And the ridiculous thing in Barbados is that we have more people with dogs and can't look after

them than people who can afford to keep dogs. It is the same thing with children. The people who have money don't have a large lot of children; the people who don't have money have a riffle of children and can't really give them the kind of education and comfort that children should have.

So I am inviting the hon. Minister to try and do something about the Dogs Act. Let us get the whole thing tidied up and implement it. But I do not know what the hurry is, if she can explain to me what the hurry is and what Section 23 says as it has been amended since this book was printed in 1975. It is to come into force on a date that is to be proclaimed; it has not yet been proclaimed. I would be very much indebted to the hon. Minister for this information. It has been a long time, almost time for the Statute of Limitations to come into effect.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear the speech on the amendment to the Dogs Act coming from the Leader of the Opposition. I myself have always been very concerned about the number of stray dogs about Barbados. I have been the victim of stray dogs on more than one occasion – when I was sixteen years old and again when I was about thirty. Since assuming the office some time ago of Minister of Labour and Community Services and had to visit the John Beckles Day Nursery I was alarmed at the problems you have with the dogs hanging around that Day Nursery, and I am glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition speak in that vein. I would have to support Government's policy on this occasion, but I was a bit sceptical about when we go on the political platform at the hustings, for I know what is likely to be said, if not by hon. members on that side at least by their paid supporters; and we will soon be hearing that this Government is so bad that they don't even want the poor old lady or old gentleman to have a dog. I am therefore very glad this afternoon to hear the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and I hope to be able to read Hansard to such people when the occasion arises. I think I hear them saying "even the little dog..."

Mr. SPEAKER: Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, but to be forewarned is to be forearmed. I have no doubt that the way they would put would be as though the whole economy of the country was about to collapse. They would say: "This wicked and bad Government took away the poor old lady's or old gentleman's dog and now they don't even have that." So I am very happy at the vein in which the Leader of the Opposition spoke. I am not qualified to talk about the law, so I cannot determine what aspect of the law to be changed, whether there needs to be one Dogs Act, and Alsatian Act or a German Shepherd Act. The hon. Attorney General would be able to tell us about that but I have been the victim of being bitten by a dog on more than one accasion, and those people at the John Beckles Day Nursery have my sympathy. They have to be doing a lot of spraying out there and people are afraid to go for their kids at the nursery. It is an awful situation down there.

4.40 p.m.

I am happy to hear that the Minister of Health is now prepared to bring down to Parliament an Act that will get the stray dogs off the streets. They are not only biting up people, but destroying people's goats, sheep and cows and all of those things. Garbage is another problem which you have to face. I am happy to see that the Opposition is going to support it; but I must warn the Opposition not to go out there talking about poor old people's dogs, because I am going to read the speech of the Leader of the Opposition morning, noon and night. He said that he supported it. I hope that they do not play tricks when the occasion arises, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Just a point of elucidation, Sir. The Dogs Act was introduced in 1975. The hon. member should know his dates. If it was introduced in 1975, I do not see how I could have spoken against it. It was 1975, not 1066 which is a period of British History, and not Barbados Legislation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I apologise for not knowing that it was passed in 1975. I do not profess to know everything. I know that the Leader of the Opposition pretends sometimes that he does not remember some things. He did not remember how much the North Point cost, also, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, a point was raised about the drafting of the Act. Perhaps for the benefit of the hon. member I can explain that the version of 1975 Act which he has does not reflect the amendments made. The Act was amended once, and this was a couple of weeks ago in Parliament so that the amendments have not yet been incorporated. I will assure hon. members that within a couple of days they will be available to this House. There will be a supplement bringing these laws up to the 31st December, 1976; and we hope that by March next year or maybe June next year to have supplements bringing the laws up to the 31st December, 1978; and thereafter we will try in the first three months of every year to have the laws incorporated up to January 31 of the preceeding year. Members will then only have to look at the Acts that we are going through to find any amendments to particular laws.

We have managed to complete the five years law revision. It is now available, and will be on sale shortly to the public; and hon. members will be entitled to free copies, being members of this House. In so far as this particular amendment is concerned, what happened is that

we passed the Bill and it came down to the House and it went to the Senate where apparently two amendments were made. An amendment was made to Section 21 which was obviously accepted by the Ministry, in order to limit the power of a member of the Police Force or an authorised person to request a person where a dog is kept, or the owner, to produce for examination a licence.

The substantive Bill which was passed by this House authorised them to enter. Some objection was taken to wide powers given; and the Minister indicated her clear and complete acceptance of that one. We drafted in accordance with the policy which was brought to us and I think that it was a very good draft. Section 23 is a regulating section and it gives the Minister power to make regulations for the issue, renewal and transfer of licences of dogs, and the sale or other disposal of dogs. Senators took the point that that meant that she would have wide powers over saying for how much a person should sell a dog without recognising that it was related to the provision of the Act which only related to the sale and disposal of dogs which had been seized and which people had taken no objection to or had not got back out of the kennel. They said that this was a typographical error, and I think that they were complimented for this by the Press; and the word "and" was changed to the word "are".

Let me say that we have a very lax system at present obtaining in legislation. When a Bill leaves this House **and** goes to the Upper House and is amended, Parliamentary Counsel is not brought in. It is not returned to us to look at. In this instance it was the very day that it came back to the House that it was passed again by this House, and certainly although I looked at the Bill here my attention was directed to Section 21 and not to Section 23.

When the Bill went Back to the Minister, her advisers recognised that the regulations which she had to make under this section would have been of no effect at all, because the powers she should have had were taken away from her, and it would have been a waste of time probably to make regulations in those circumstances. It would have meant sending it back to us, sending it back to the Cabinet by the Minister and being brought back to us; and we redrafted it in such a way to make assurance doubly sure that this is only limited to Part III.

I believe that the draft came through Dr. Wells who is an outstanding draftsman in his own right as the hon. member for St. Michael South would know; but the position has been clarified. Mr. Speaker, let me say in all fairness that the system which obtains in Parliament and with Parliamentary Counsel in my office has obtained in here for years. It is not a new system. We have an expert, Mr. Duval, who is now looking into this and will be making recommendations by which Parliamentary Counsel will be available during the sittings of Parliament to help members in drafts and to explain any points that members want explained and where we will have some time to see when amendments are brought before the House, whether or not they are in proper style or whether mistakes have been made. The present position is that the amendment just comes back from the Senate to the House, and it is dealt with on that level. Perhaps if the Senate had just waited and had consulted us during the day – I do think that they tried to get hold of me and I was not available during the night – we would not have had these problems that have occurred. That is the total explanation of that matter, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief with what I have to say. I do not believe that we cannot agree with the amendment in the light of what has been said; but I would merely like to point out to the Hon. Attorney General that very soon after I came in here the Hon. Attorney General made a long statement about his predecessors in office and how they had been inefficient.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member had better read my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us deal with the dogs now.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: All right, Sir. The hon. member is trying to quote a speech that I have made and he has not quoted it accurately. I have never in this House accused any predecessor of mine of inefficiency. I made a speech in which I adverted to the fact that Acts were changed by way of custom after they had received the assent of Mr. Speaker of this House and Mr. President of the Senate, and that it was a practice to be discontinued; and I did so advise. I have never said that anybody was inefficient.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to develop the point about inefficiency. The point which I wish to make is that this constant having to go back and forth practically every Tuesday that we are here on little, tiny amendments, some of which have been occasioned by little more than typographical errors, is costing us large sums of money. Here is what has happened to the Dogs Act, Sir. It went up to the Senate and they saw what they thought was a typographical error. They changed it. They sent it back down here along with another amendment. We then passed it, and having passed it, we found that it was changed in error. So, we are now in the process of passing an amendment to that amendment which will now have to go back to the Senate.
4.50 p.m.

Now, Sir, if you take the case involved in all of that activity, you will find, Sir, that it is not an inconsiderable amount of money and especially if you take in the accumulative basis.

I am not standing on my feet to criticise, I am only drawing to the attention of the Attorney General that he might want to revise his concept on this question of typographical errors. There was always some contention as to whether it was substantive law that was being changed or whether there were typographical errors.

The previous Attorneys General are satisfied that under certain circumstances the same draughtsmen which we will now have coming down here to consort with members, many of whom will feel that they are better draughtsmen than the draughtsmen who come down here, the same point which he is about to introduce as sophistication of the system may in fact be superseded by the simple fact of adhering to the practices of old where when errors have been made, errors of a certain kind that are fairly obvious, they can be corrected, even if not corrected in a sophisticated way like they would be in Canada or Britain, but at a significant saving to the country as a whole.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will reply to that in particular. I will not delay, I will reply.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the hon. member for St. John did not hear when the first amendment to the Dogs Act was debated, he would not today be asking me the question, what is the hurry. The hurry is very simple, Mr. Speaker, to explain. For his benefit, and the benefit of all hon. members of this House, and for the benefit of the people I will explain it again.

Section 23 is a section which covers the making of various Regulations under the Act. I cannot just employ people in the Ministry of Health to go out, and I do not know what people imagine, and hit dogs over the head or kick them into the Careenage. That is not the official way in which it is done. The whole business of dog catching is to be done in a humane manner. All of that has got to be covered by Regulations.

The licencing of dogs is a matter which has got to be covered by Regulations. Unless I have the power to make these Regulations I cannot get the whole exercise on the way. The error which was made in Section 23 deprived me of the right to make Regulations, particularly the Regulations regarding the issuing of licences for dogs, and that is why I have come here and asked that the matter be dealt with in all its stages today. The sooner it gets through this House and goes to the Senate tomorrow or as quickly as I can get it to the Senate, I can get it proclaimed, then people may license their dogs, and after what I consider to be a generous and reasonable interval for so licensing, I will begin to pick up dogs.

I have said it before, and I will say it again, I am giving people until the 31st December, to license their dogs. The licensing will go into effect under this Act at the time of this proclamation. It does not mean that people may not license under the old legislation. They can do that and they have done that. There are dogs who are licensed even now, but under this new legislation. I am giving people until the end of this year to licence their dog and early in the New Year we will begin the business of picking up strays. If licensed dogs are among those strays, people will be able to go to the Dog Pound, identify their dogs by virtue of a licence which is in the form of a tag, and take them away, again having paid the fine.

The Government will not be feeding and keeping pedigree dogs for people who will not keep them properly tethered at nights or in the day time and let them out to ravish and roam and destroy other people's property, livestock, crops and persons, and when people have paid the relevant funds they can take their dogs away again. The dogs who have no owners, those who are roaming in packs at nights, destroying livestock, destroying crops, those are going to be picked up and dealt with and destroyed, all in a humane fashion.

Some of those dogs, Mr. Speaker, as I said before and I shall take the opportunity to say it again, are not really stray dogs without owners. Some of them are pedigree dogs with owners who let them out at nights, their owners not caring whether they destroy property or not. All of that requires some kind of organisation. Regulations have to be made, people have to know what they have to do, what they must not do and when they must do it, and that is the reason for the speed, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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 on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise just briefly to say that the amendment being asked for in Clause 2 is not a typographical error, and they would not have been any need at all for any further action to be taken on the Bill if the Senate had not changed the Bill and this House had not passed that change without giving it proper consideration.

I am saying this, Mr . Speaker, because the hon. member for St. Michael South West raised the question about the correction about the typographical errors. Under the Law Revision Act, every time I do a law revision exercise, which should be done at the end of the year, I have the power at that time to correct typographical errors which may appear in the law, and I would not therefore normally take up the correction of a typographical error until the end of the year so that we do it globally and save the expense to the public and the time of Parliament.
5.00 p.m.

In the United Kingdom they have brought forth a special Bill giving to the legal draughtsmen the power to change typographical errors the moment it is passed by Parliament. That Bill was seriously criticised because its terms were too wide. I really do not want to adopt it. It is supposed not to be very good in relation to the exercise of Parliamentary scrutiny and power over legislation, and therefore I would not want to adopt it. But outside of the Law Revision Commissioner's Act which was passed under the last Government, I think back in 1971, I have no powers to correct typographical errors, and I think so it should be because sometimes you can change a simple word and change the whole sense of what Parliament itself intended, and it is not a power that should be lightly given to any Attorney General no matter how well intentioned he may be. So I wanted to make that straight to the hon. member.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think the Government will have to accept responsibility for these matters, and it is a plain simple one. I think the Attorney General and hon. member for Christ Church West understands this. If an amendment comes down from the Senate or even if the amendment is made from the floor of this House, it is a matter of judgement whether the Government accepts that amendment and is prepared to proceed on it. I would not like the discussion to be put at the level of a system and giving the impression that this is some particular procedure because an amendment is sent back down, then there is some system that it must be dealt with here in the House without reference to the legal advisers of the Government. It is a matter of judgement on each occasion and if the legal officers of the Government who sit in this Chamber as legal advisers to the Government, or if the Minister or person in charge of the Bill or if the legal liminaries as they call themselves who sit on the backbench as well as the other legal personnel on the front bench and the Minister for Housing, if they all decide to accept the particular amendment, then yes I will say that because we go on the advice of the front bench on these matters that appear to be a minor matter, and the Government is prepared to go along with it, that is a matter for them. It is a matter of judgement. I do hope that we can dispose of this simply. It was a mistake, it was an error to have accepted it and that is that. It was an error of judgement, an oversight on our part. It is not hard to accept these things when they go wrong, but I must express my concern that in recent times there have been a too frequent repetition...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, I heard the hon. member always using the superlative. If the hon. members would look through the legislation and tell us the too frequent occasion that they are referring to in this House, I shall be glad. On a point of explanation, I was making the point that there is a system that in my view should be improved, that it has operated in a particular way and we will improve the system. Everybody in this House including the hon. member sat down and passed the amendment because it was a thing brought from the Other Place straight to us in a Message from the Speaker and passed the same day. That is the position. I have advised against that system. I believe it is absolutely right that in such instances where the Senate has passed that enough time should be allowed for the legislation to go back to Parliamentary counsel, and I said so. It is quite clear; it is not a matter of ducking out of positions, but we all passed it because we all looked at the only substantive point that was raised and forgot that they had amended what looked like a typographical error. The draughtsmen never saw it. What am I to do if I did not see it? The system is wrong and we are going to improve that system, and I give my firm undertaking to the hon. member that we will set up a system which we will tell to the House because it is about the procedure of the House. There are lots of things in the procedure of the House that are not satisfactory.

Mr. SANDIFORD: The hon. member must not get too finnicky on this point. I was simply making the point that you have the majority and you decided to proceed on the matter. It was a failure of judgement and that is that. I do not think we should really make a big thing over it, and if you now after this particular unfortunate procedure other procedures are introduced, I think it would be better for the whole House, but I am part of that because to the best of my knowledge I was in the House at the time as well, and of course who would be me if you have the legal people out there and you have some of them out here....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Is the hon. member saying that the Hon. member is not a competent Attorney General? Is that what he is trying to imply?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am not implying that and I think the hon. member for St. James knows that he is competent. That is my view. I would say on this particular occasion that he was not and the Government was not competent.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I really cannot remember the occasion of this amendment, but I just want to get the procedure on this clear. The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown liked to come in, not being a lawyer, and propose amendments and say let us put in this and let us put in that, and we have always resisted the idea of doing the work of the Parliamentary Draughtsmen on the floor of the House. I have always warned against it. The procedure that was followed on this particular occasion does not appear to me to be the right procedure for this kind of amendment. There are amendments sometimes in which there has been a misprint and the Other Place has sent back down and drawn it to our attention by a Message from the Speaker that there has been a misprint, and very quickly we would agree to it; but this is an enabling amendment, as far as I can see; it is an amendment of substance. What bothers me is this: an amendment of this kind appears to have been an afterthought and must have been initiated by a Government member in the Other Place, otherwise if it was not initiated at that level, it should have gone back to the Parliamentary Counsel who would have advised the Cabinet whether to accept the amendment or not, and then it should have been brought back down here.

I want to say this, Mr. Chairman. I do not think that every time there is a typographical error, apart from the powers of the Attorney General once a year to correct these defects, that we ought to indicate to the Other Place that we are not going to accept amendments to typographical errors sent back down on the same day, because that tidies up the legislation; but when they get up there playing draughtsmen and draughts – it looks more like draughts than draughtsmanship to me -- I think we have to be very careful. So we are now inserting new principles into the Bill, and as a matter of fact it seems that the section 23 as originally went up is not section 23 at all; it is something completely different. I cannot even remember if I was here. I do not think I was. I am not saying that if I was here that I would have noticed it or paid attention at that particular juncture, because when amendments come from the other place usually they are of a verbal nature where there is a correction in punctuation or a matter of that kind.

5.10 p.m.

I think that in any event I would like to say this to my colleagues, that whether they are lawyers or not, all of us are to blame; you cannot blame the Attorney General alone; we are all Parliamentarians and when we come in here we profess to have a certain amount of expertise in the passing of legislation. I know that this would not have escaped the notice of one of the greater Parliamentarians we have had, the late T. T. Lewis, the once junior member for The City. So I don't think we can say we are not lawyers and have to depend on the Attorney General to lead kindly light amid the encircling gloom. There is no gloom over this side as far as I am concerned; the gloom may be on the other side. And all I am asking is that if we sit down in here and make a mistake, it is the mistake of all of us and we are all equally culpable in allowing it to pass. So let us hope it does not happen again. And I would like to tell the hon. Attorney General we don't always see eye to eye – but if I was absent I am to blame, and if I was present I am doubly to blame.

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

On the motion of Hon. B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, 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. MILLIER, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND HOTELS AND RESTAURANTS (SALES TAX) ACT, 1974

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Budgetary measure that has taken some time to come before the House because there was some difficulty as to definitions, particularly the definition of guest house, and therefore there are two Acts that have to be amended to effect the purpose of the Budget which was to apply the existing hotel and Restaurant sales tax to guest houses and not restrict its application only to major hotels. Some of these places catalogued and characterized as guest houses have a large number of rooms. There are a number of places that call themselves guest houses and according to my information are treated as guest houses. One place in Bay Street has twenty two beds; another has twenty; one has eighteen; there are several with sixteen beds. The one I am thinking of in Bay Street if it has 22 beds I don't think these beds are contained in more than four or five rooms. I do not know if the hon. member for St. James who has some familiarity with the premises can enlighten me further.

The apartment hotels of course, Sir, have enormous numbers of rooms but I think most of them are already categorized as hotels. Sunset Crest, for example, is listed as an apartment hotel and has no less then 1,453 beds.

This has created some difficulty in conceptualizing the necessary amendments and this is the reason that it has taken so long to prepare this legislation. We have not therefore sought to back date the tax to Budget day -- an obvious impossibility anyhow since the guests have long gone. But the public must be given notice that the effective date is tomorrow November 1, 1978. As from tomorrow guest houses will have to collect from their guests the hotel and restaurant sales tax. The Hotel Association has been duly informed and I hope and trust that all those responsible will take note.

Just to mention the next item -- we had to define guest houses now and we therefore have to include a saving clause in the next Bill to come up, the Landlord and Tenants Registration Bill. In case anybody asks if they will have to pay both taxes, the answer is no.
5.20 p.m.

There is one slight addition in the Act now before the House. We have also taken general power to collect the Hotel and Restaurant Sales Tax at large from everybody; because the Commissioner of Inland Revenue has been having some trouble; and we are including a provision for the unpaid tax certificate system. In other words, when the inspectors of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue go around to the hotels and find that they have not been paying their taxes, we do not have to rely on the relatively cumbersome procedure of suing. We will be able to file an unpaid tax certificate in the same way as we can in cases of income tax. After the expiry of seven days it has the same effect as the judgment of the court in which it is registered, plus interest and plus reasonable costs. It is a valuable power, Sir, and one that has been found necessary in the matter of income tax; and I see no reason why if Barbadians have to suffer under the unpaid tax certificate system that the individuals who own the hotels should also not have to put up with it.

At the same time we are also taking power to remit a penalty under the new section 14A(1) in cases where there is a genuine excuse for failure to pay the Hotel or Restaurant Sales Tax. We will now be taking the power to remit that in the same way the Minister has power to remit penalties under the Income Tax Act -- penalties for late collection of PAYE and so on, and penalties at large. I do not think that this matter should be controversial, Mr. Speaker, but of course if there are any questions on which I can assist hon. members I will be glad to do so.

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

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful to see at last a definition of "guest house". There is a problem which we experience in the area of Health which is not unconnected with this business of the taxing of hotels and restaurants -- in particular guest houses and hotels. You would be surprised to know, Mr. Speaker, that some of these would do anything in their power, notwithstanding the 50 or 60 beds within their walls, to deny that they are in fact guest houses or hotels. This has a bearing upon Health, Sir, because more often than not the conditions, the insanitary conditions which obtain in these so-called hotels or guest houses bring our tourist industry into serious disrepute.

I have now had since this year, Mr. Speaker, certain powers of closure of eating houses, businesses and guest houses; and I am disgusted to discover that there has been a long practice in this country for hotels and guest houses to go unlicenced. It is not uncommon for certain guest houses, and particularly on the South Coast of this Island for people to put ordinary mattresses down on the floor, sometime eight or 10 in a row, and take money from tourists for this kind of accommodation. It is not uncommon to find one bathroom serving 20 or 25 people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not all at the same time?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is not unknown, Sir. All that and other natural and unnatural practices take place. One of these houses is before the court now, Mr. Speaker, I will not comment on it. I intend to crack down on them before the official winter season opens this year. The Ministry of Health through its public health inspectors intends to do something to clean up this situation; and I am happy to see this because now we are going to identify certain houses.

It is not unknown for a public health inspector to go into a house where there are 20 rooms and maybe 40 beds, and for a gentleman or lady to say that this is not a guest house. All of these people here are friends -- my friend, my friend's friend and friends of friends. So, as I have said I am happy to see this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because some of the hidden guest houses and hidden hotels which I cannot now properly identify will have to identify themselves. The definition of a "guest house" will be useful to me because I have had a situation where we were dealing with a lodging house which is an old and archaic concept; but the modern guest house is very well defined here, and I am happy to see it.

I want to give a warning to these guest houses and hotels that I will not hesitate to invoke the closure legislation and other avenues which are open to me to force them to put their houses in order as far as public health is concerned. There are not only sanitary conditions obtained in these guest houses and hotels but there is sewage going into the sea and all of that. This has to be cleaned up. We cannot have a situation where magazines and newspapers will draw attention to the fact that this kind of situation obtains in the Barbados Tourist Industry.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any member of this House would not agree with this legislation for the extension of the Hotel Tax to the smaller properties, because I believe that the Prime Minister had them in mind when he brought this legislation before Parliament last year; but it was defined clearly. It is in order also to say that most of the visitors coming to Barbados never understand the fact that this is a very small place and they pay the 8% tax without question; and therefore I am sure that members will support this tax.

As regards what the Minister of Health has just mentioned, I do not think that she would mind me mentioning that it was a letter that came from the administration of the Board of Tourism to the Ministry of Health drawing to their attention that these bad conditions exist in certain places. I have to say this, because since nobody will blow our trumpet, I think that we will have to blow it ourselves. We see that they have taken action on these lines. In a number of properties on the Silver Sands Coast, it is not very nice to see people using tents when the hotel is full and this kind of thing. This is most undesirable.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that this is the sea-egg problem.

Mr. WARD: I would also like to say to the Ministry of Health that they should look seriously into what is becoming a common practice with visitors from Europe who come here believing that we will permit them to use tents on the beach and what have you. Not only does it create the possibility of crime, but it also has sanitary problems. This island of Barbados could well do without this type of tourist. As a matter of fact what we want to do is to sell our industry up and not down.
5.30 p.m.

It is not easy. It is not an easy problem to face up to but if you eliminate these habitations that they like they will go elsewhere so the Ministry of Health should get full marks for their move in this direction.

I would like to draw one more thing to the attention of the Ministry of Health which we have to look into and that is the laundry of Hotels. Mr. Speaker, we are getting about 300,000 visitors a year now and we know for sure that X amount, I do not know what the X represents, of people that are going to have one disease or another and therefore Hotels should be forced by law to send their laundry to be laundered at places which have the equipment to do it in a sanitary condition. Many Hotels want to get away by sending it up the road to the Laundromat or the wife doing it home, or somebody doing it in a tub.

This is something that Government has to look into. Just as they look into the kitchens, they will have to look into the laundry. Every place that accepts guests will have to send their laundry to a place that has the proper equipment and the laundry itself is only too happy to show people around.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me, I want to mention one more thing in regard to laundry that really does not come up right now, but I mention it because the opportunity is here. A multi-national organisation who owns a very large laundry in Barbados is going around this country signing up contracts with large Hotels at almost ridiculous rates and pushing small laundries out of business. I have spoken to a few of the Hoteliers but I can understand their position because they are concerned with dollars and cents, but we the Government are concerned with more than dollars and cents, although we are concerned with that as well. We are concerned that the small Barbadian owned laundries are getting their fair share of the business, so I will just leave that with the appropriate authorities.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 5 were called and passed.

Clause 6 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In moving that Clause 6 stand part, I again, Sir, would draw to the attention of all concerned that this Act comes into force tomorrow. In due course when it is passed and assented to it will have been in force as from the 1st November. This is the effect of Clause 6, Sir. As from tomorrow the Guest Houses can start collecting the Hotel and Restaurant Sales Tax.

I beg to move that this Clause stand part.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the Hotels and Restaurant (Sales Tax) (Amendment) Act, 1978.

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

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

THE LANDLORD AND TENANT (REGISTRATION OF TENANCIES) ACT, 1977

Mr. SPEAKER: Iten No. 15 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant (Registration of Tenancies) Act, 1977.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is a very simple Act, Sir. It redefines premises to exclude Guest Houses as defined by the Act we have just passed, so that persons who just have a house and wish to rent it out they can decide either to rent it out on a landlord and tenants basis in which case they register it under this Act or if they are taking in lodgers they register it as a Guest House. They would not be able to get away by saying it is not one or the other.

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

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

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.
5.40 p.m.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO ACQUIRE LAND AT CHALKY MOUNT, ST. ANDREW

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 12 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing and Lands to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Chalky Mount, St. Andrew, for soil conservation purposes.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of Parliament to acquire a parcel of land in the amount of 2.18 acres in the parish of St. Andrew for the construction of a soil conservation unit. The land was owned by...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the document that was circulated said 2.018, but I know it has to be a mistake for the hon. member I think has also been misled by the printers because it is not 2.18 acres, it is 2.018. I hope the hon. member does not mind the interruption. Even the newspapers had it as 2,000 acres. That is practically the whole of St. Andrew.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I was coming to that because I saw the report in the newspaper and myself had a look at the file again. When I saw this 2,000 acres of land I was a bit surprised. However it is 2.018 acres of land to be acquired at Chalky Mount in St. Andrew. The purpose of this is for a soil conservation unit in the light of a problem which the Chalky Mount Mixed School was having, and the Ministry of Agriculture

recommended that the land be acquired so as to avoid additional slippage.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution should be in any way controversial. I think the Addendum is quite clear, the necessary notices have been sent out, it has been gazetted on 18th September and from the office of the Attorney General we have had his input.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Resolution, I should like to make one or two brief points not only in my capacity as Minister of Agriculture but as representative of the constituency of St. Andrew.

The acquisition of this land has become necessary as a result of a number of problems which were being experienced at the Chalky Mount School, and the Government at some stage had to pay compensation to the owner of the land, Mr. Frederick Boyce, as a result of damage done to this banana crops there. I want to say that this was a matter which was long drawn out and pre-dated our time in Government. We have however been able to meet the satisfaction of Mr. Boyce in respect of compensation for the damage to his crop, and the Government was advised that in the area of land adjoining the school should be acquired from Mr. Boyce in order to stabilise the area surrounding the Chalky Mount School and at the same time to assist in carrying out massive plans of stabilisation within the area of Chalky Mount.

I am happy to report to this Honourable House and to the nation that as a result of acquisition and stabilisation work in the area at the mouth of the Chalky Mount slope leading on to Corbin's Village or Lakes as it is well known and down into Belleplaine that the soil conservation has started to carry out a massive reclamation scheme, and very shortly the soil conservation will be utilising large areas of land that were once the object of sloppage and to grow fruit trees in that area. I certainly would welcome an opportunity to have members of this Parliament and members of the country largely to come into St. Andrew and to observe what is being done there by the Soil Conservation Unit. *(Asides).* The Barbados Labour Party started the action within the St. Andrew area. Nobody would seek to deny that. As a matter of fact, we have brought benefits to that area; we have done things in that area that the former Government had failed to do by way of making the workers permanent down there when in truth and in fact the last Government failed to do this, and it is very surprising and very disheartening when one can hear unkind remarks made about the hon. member for St. Joseph who in his capacity as Minister of Agriculture did a very great service to this country by focusing attention on the problems in the St. Andrew area, and it is only when you go down there to recognise what has been done within the past two years that you realise the massive amount of work which was done by my hon. colleague and friend, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works. This conservation scheme which will go a long way to stabilising the area of Chalky Mount... the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is gargling something, Sir. I do not know what it is.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said it is two acres of land and we have no objection. The hon. member who introduced it made...

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two hon. members on their feet.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rose on a point of order. The hon. Minister introduced the Resolution quite properly, he accepted it and it is only two acres of land. It does not call for this big long-winded speech. That is all I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is still the Minister's privilege.
5.50 p.m.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I do not think the fact that I am here will be a joy to the hon. member who has just sat down; and since I am here it is my right to speak, the attitude of the hon. member notwithstanding. And since we are dealing with two acres of land in Barbados and land in my constituency, that gives me the right to speak. It is my duty to point out the problems within the area and give this House the background as to why these two acres – in fact it is more than two acres, it is 2.018 acres – and it is a precious piece of the soil of St. Andrew that the Government has acquired for stabilization of the area.

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

BILL TO AMEND CERTAIN ENACTMENTS RELATING TO PENSIONS

The thirteenth Order was called – To move the second Reading of the Bill to amend certain enactments relating to pensions.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, earlier today – although I must not refer to Gazetted debates in the same session – but earlier today I think I heard about how long it was taking to give people severance pay. That was refuted when it was pointed out that the people got their wages last month and will be in a position to get their severance pay within five weeks of leaving work. I do not believe that West Indies Hospital Sweepstakes has yet paid its workers severance pay, and that is a couple of

years ago. Perhaps hon. members instead of reproving the hon. member for St. Thomas should be reproving the unsuccessful candidate for St. Thomas in respect of severance pay. Now that we have severed teachers and given those who have in fact left the service – for even since the House was last briefed on this matter I have been advised that some of them have qualified – one told me last Saturday that she has just got her last subject and is now a qualified teacher – which means incidentally that as far as I know the figures quoted by the Barbados Union of Teachers in an advertisement in the Press in which they distributed their bucks evenly between the Barbados Workers Union, the National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Secondary School Teachers Association and then behind them gave the Government a small stick. The figures they quoted of $319 a month are untrue because there is no teacher left in the service who will receive other than pay suitably augmented by qualification.

But it has been necessary to amend the General Pensions Act – more than one Pensions Act – we have had to amend by schedule on this occasion the Casual Employees Pensions Act, the Pension Regulation, Public Employees Pension Regulation Act, the Secondary School Teachers Pensions Act, the Statutory Board Casual Employees Pensions Act, etc., and all these Acts had to be amended to provide that where severance is paid in respect of a period of service that if the employee is again employed under conditions that would give rise to pensionable emoluments the earlier years for which he has received severance pay cannot be taken into account. This is necessary because the Severance Pay Act does not generally apply to Government and the safety provision of the Severance Payment Act itself cannot apply to these special *ad hoc* cases. Honourable members can read the Schedule and see that each Act is being amended in a different way; compensation is paid out of money voted by Parliament, but the Pension Act itself – we are taking the new Section 8(a) saying that "where temporary employment is terminated for no less than two years of service the Minister in any case where he considers it appropriate authorize the payment of compensation to that person." This should not be taken to mean that we are now generally giving an opportunity of severance under conditions more favourable than those provided by the Severance Payments Act, nor indeed is there any general expenditure of the Severance Payment Act by the Government.

One of the chief reasons for that would be what I hope the hon. member for St. Lucy would applaud, which is that the Severance Payment Act is so complicated that in the end the wheels of the Civil Service may turn a little faster than the wheels of the courts or tribunal and the counsel and trade union advisers who have to make their way through the maze of regulations which the last Government left for us in the Severance Payment Act.

I commend this Act to hon. members. It is both an enabling and restricting piece of legislation and I think it will make much easier the task of dealing equitably with persons who have found themselves in Government service who under the previous regime could expect nothing if they were laid off after temporary service but who will now be given an opportunity to get something. But at the same time we are protecting the revenue by ensuring that they do not get it both ways – severance pay for a couple of years of service and then pension for those same years at some future date.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

6.00 p.m.

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

The question that the Schedule stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that the CHAIRMAN report the passing of one Bill in Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day.

BILL TO GRANT AN ADDITIONAL SUM OF MONEY OUT OF THE CONSOLIDATED FUND

The Second Order of the Day was called – Second Reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the financial year ended 31st March, 1978.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very straightforward Bill. It is a supplementary appropriation consolidating supplements during the last financial year, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went inro Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

On separate motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive of the Bill were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble to the Bill was called and passed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the instant Order of Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 is the instant Order of the Day.

BILL TO MAKE PROVISION RESPECTING PROPERTY

The third Order of the Day was called – A Bill to make provisions respecting property.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, when we last discussed Order No. 3, my time had not expired when I was speaking. I understand that the Other Place has proposed that these bits of real property and ancillary legislation numbers 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 should be referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses; and in the circumstances I would like to recommend to the Hon. Attorney General that if this is the wish of the Other Place, perhaps this would be the most advantageous manner to deal with the legislation.

He has already made a very good introduction, and I do not think that there is anything controversial; but I think that a Joint Committee of both Houses would probably be able to deal with the technical aspects of the Bills more adequately than we would by just standing on our feet here and trying to discuss the merits or demerits. I make that recommendation. I have nothing that I could usefully add on my feet, but I think I would be able to celebrate better if I was made a member of the Joint Committee. In that case I would be willing to serve.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, basically the Government has no objection to a Joint Committee with the Other Place; and indeed would welcome an all-party representation on the Committee with some independent members. I hope that those members who serve on the Committee will realise that there will be a time limit in which the Bills should be returned. In fact, all the Legal Draftsmen will be available, particularly as I said, Mr. Thomas who did most of the Bills with Professor Marshall and who will be available to hon. members.
6.10 p.m.

Professor Marshall is going to be here, Sir, about the first or second week in December. He will be available for consultations on any part of the Bill. I had hoped that he could have been here earlier but he has certain commitments so he cannot get here before. I have personally no objections, Sir.

We would like to bring into effect three of the Bills in January, those except the compulsory legislation until we get the legislation ready. I do not know if hon. members want a full second reading on all of the Bills but if the hon. member wants to move it I would move that this House would constitute a Select Committee together with the Senate on this Bill and that the following persons be named as members of the Committee. I would like to begin with the Leader of the House who is very knowledgeable on land Law.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think the form of motion is that this House do apoint members of the House to sit with members of the Other Place as a Joint Select Committee on this Bill and I respectfully suggest that if hon. members do not disagree with the principle of this property and related matters legislation that we give all the Bills a second reading so that they can all be referred to one Select Committee.

I myself feel, for example, that the Charities Bill could be passed whether we had a new Property Act or not, but the Attorney General would prefer that all be dealt with seriatim. I think they should all go to one Select Committee otherwise we will take an age one after another referring these Bills to Select Committees; then we have to give each one a second reading.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: With all due respect, Sir, I do not think this is correct procedure subject to Your Honour's ruling because I think after they come from the Select Committee they are given a third reading. They are not given a second reading. This a peculiar arrangement that they have. The Select Committee I think is regarded as the second reading, but I do not think that we give it a second reading. Do you mean we give them a second reading here? I am a bit uncertain as to that procedure, but I will be guided by the Chair, not by you.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said he will not be guided by me.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will be guided by the Chair and not by you, that is correct procedure.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: That is correct procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet, please sit down.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I would never want to lead the Hon. Leader of the Opposition because ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. Minister please take his seat.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On what grounds, Sir? Am I not entitled to talk now, Sir? I am very serious about this. If Mr. Speaker, you tell me I cannot talk and I must sit down ...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is to be led by the Chair. Nobody is trying to prevent the Minister from speaking, but the Chair must rule eventually on the matter and I intend to do so now.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: But, Mr. Speaker, are you saying you intend to rule when an issue has been raised about the procedure which will be adopted if the Bill goes to a Select Committee? That is all I want to find out.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister rose and started to address the Chair as to who should lead who and who he would not lead and things of that sort, totally irrelevant to what is before this Honourable House. These Items under reference must be first given their second reading and then the reference to a Select Committee can be made, but they must first have their second reading.

I would like to draw the attention of all hon. members. In the case of Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, the Hon. Attorney General must first move his motion for second reading. On doing so, any hon. member who wishes to make a contribution in the second reading is entitled to do so, but after all of those Bill have had a second reading, then the reference can be made to a Select Committee.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Are you inviting members to speak on a second reading, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not invite, I just remind members of their rights.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In speaking very briefly, there is just one thing. The Government is anxious to have as wide a range of opinion of handling these matters as possible. I can remember sitting on a ...

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it, Mr. Prime Minister, you are now making you second reading.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is correct. I can remember sitting on a Select Committee with the Leader of the Opposition and I can testify to the interest which he brought to the matter and I am sure that for example with him on a Select Committee, that the matter will be properly ventilated with the other hon. members who I see whose names the Attorney General have down here, but we have a timetable and I will appeal to hon. members to come out to the Select Committee, as we have had difficulties with attendances at Select Committees in the past.

I remember that ten or eleven years ago, Sir, when the Income Tax Bill Select Committee was on, Sir, that

the hon. member for St. John was a faithful attendant and punctual and I hope that all hon. members on both sides will obey the same precinct and report back within a reasonable time because the Government has to get some of these Bills through this year and we really want them all on the Statute Book at an early stage.

This is the first major attempt to deal with the law of the land since the settlement of Barbados. I mean there are pieces of land in Barbados which, believe it or not, have never changed hands. There were granted and have never been advanced since and the law has advanced very little since those days. The history is known very well, Sir.
6.20 p.m.

We want to wipe it all out and make a new start next year. If this Parliament does nothing else, members can at least say they modernised the law of land, something that is very important to Barbados and will be a monument to all of us in here within the year 2100 far less the year 2000. So let us really apply ourselves to these jobs. A Select Committee is an excellent vehicle to deal with it, but it must work, and I think that the public as a whole will applaud us all if we can really get these Bills through and get them into operation and modernise the way Barbadians can hold their principal resource.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think I have a right to speak on the second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not seek to deny you, but it seems as if you are lending your ear to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SANDIFORD: No, I will be guided by you, Mr. Speaker.

On this particular measure, we have heard speeches and we have heard from the Prime Minister indicating the very important nature of this piece of legislation. It is with a certain temerity that I speak on this particular measure which seems to be one cut out specially for Attorneys-at-Law, but I would like to make a point, and it is a general point that I wish to make in view of the very far-reaching effect which I believe this piece of legislation will have on the economic and social life of this country, and it is that this legislation will affect each piece of land in this country.

I believe there must be 106,000 acres in Barbados, 48,000 hectares I am told, but whatever it is these sets of bills that we are going to deal with will affect each particular holding in this country, and as such it is of deep concern to those who own land as well as to those who hope to own land, and I am merely throwing out a suggestion here in terms of dealing with this type of fundamental legislation which will affect people, and the people themselves may not be aware or fully aware of the implications of what we may be doing. This is not meant to be any criticism of the Government, but I am making a general point as far as the introduction of fundamental legislation of this type is concerned. I do hope that in future some device or mechanism might be worked out whereby in cases where the people as a whole are to be fundamentally affected that there could be some wide measure or consultation before such legislation or before Parliament decides on such legislation.

Note what we are doing here. We are changing or about to change, if Parliament agrees, the method of land ownership in this country. We are about to get different methods whereby ownership of land will be ascertained, a new system of registration. Mr. Speaker, it will affect you as a substantial property holder in this country; it will affect, Mr. Speaker, those persons in your constituency who may own 200 acres of land as well as those persons who may own only an eighth of an acre of land; it will affect those persons who are hoping through some will or bequest to own land. So when I say it is fundamental I mean it is going to touch a whole range of people and a whole range of interest, and I do hope that in future if we are dealing with legislation of this type in order to improve our democratic processes that we could devise some means before any definitive decisions are taken of informing the people of what may be involved.

As I indicated, this is not meant to be a measure of criticism of the Government. I am looking at our fundamental democratic processes whereby some form of consultation on these matters might take place.

In introducing this measure the Attorney General did indicate that he believes it will take about ten to fifteen years to get the new system fully operational. I do hope that his forecast proves to be correct. I have my doubts about that. I believe in the United Kingdom, the first attempt to bring in this type of legislation started somewhere back in 1862 and by 1925 the matter had not reached a very far stage and new legislation had to be brought in, and I believe the major legislation dealing with land registration is the 1925 legislation. I speak of course subject to correction from the land lawyers or however they call themselves on the other side. I believe that substantially the measure that is before us owes a lot in generalogy to the 1925 legislation in Britain, and I am not quite certain whether in Britain itself they have a complete system of registration of this type or whether even after those 50, 52 or 53 years there is still the dual system going on this matter.

The main point I wish to make is whether some procedure for consultation in future can be made. I know that attempts are being made in terms of the revision of the constitution and in terms of other matters. A number of commissions have been set up, but I think that this

particular measure perhaps has a more direct bearing on people's pockets than even those areas in which the commissions have been established. Mr. Speaker, that is the point I wished to make on the second reading.
6.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, that is the point I want to make during the second reading. There were other points I wanted to make, but inasmuch as the procedure will be for the establishment of a joint Select Committee to deal iwth these matters, I will reserve my comments for the Select Committee stage.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. speaker, I wish to make a few comments on this particular Item and will reserve whatever else I have to contribute for the Select Committee, and I offer myself as a person willing to serve on that Committee.

I think that in the whole area of land law there has been this prying need for revision and updating; but none of these laws will fulfil the social objectives unless some account is taken of the purchasers of land, and in that respect we have to improvise ways and means of reducing the cost of conveyancing to members of the public.

Speaking as Chairman of the National Housing Corporation – which is a substantial landlord – on the television programme Issues and Answers in August, 1977, I made a comment for which I incurred the wrath of my fellow colleagues in the legal profession when I said that it was my considered view that the expenses which persons purchasing houses from the National Housing Corporation are expected to bear are excessive and burdensome. I am not saying that the private attorneys are doing anything in the line of extortion or over-charging; they are charging according to scales in current practice. But the current scales are themselves in need of revision because of their inflated character, and I think we have to give serious consideration to devising mechanisms for the reduction in costs to purchasers. There are ideas which I have discussed to the substantive Leader of the House, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central, in terms of providing within the National Housing Corporation a method which would reduce some of the searching necessary and thereby reduce the incidence of costs. If we could get some specialist assistance in this area, I think we would have done a substantial service to the poor, bearing in mind that the majority of houses built for sale to Barbadians are built to satisfy persons less well off in the society and it is to them we should look to give an ease to the financial pressures to which they are subjected in their day to day activities.

I was slightly concerned at the beginning and during the buildingup of this speech by the hon. member for St. Michael South when he said that in legislation of such far-reaching consequences and of such a fundamental character Government in future should contemplate a spreading of the consultative process to involve as many people as possible who could make their inputs into the nature and quality of the legislation ultimately produced; and I think that the hon. Attorney General is only too willing to give an assurance that these Bills before the House today have been circulated to interested groups for their opinions and that there has been some feedback. One unfortunate thing is that in many cases you send out these requests and do not get any reply. But in this case it seems that there has been quite substantial consultation.

Over and above that, I believe that the hon. member was in fact not sufficiently courageous to call for a Commission into the law of land, because his side has constantly accused this Government of having – Government by Commission. But I recall making the point in here on at least two occasions about sums that had to be voted for Commissions; and I said that Commissions in my view – I am not saying it applies to all – It would not apply to the Duffus Commission, for instance – but certainly the Commission on the Status of Women – that such Commissions carry out the democratic process and give the citizens of the country the fullest opportunity to participate and make a meaningful contribution to the community. Such as the case, for instance, with the Constitution Commission and the Gambling Commission. They are going around the country sampling opinion, having public meetings. This is not a novel thing in Barbados – we have had Commissions before – and I see no harm in the continuation of this system of Government where we involve the people directly with the agents of Government in the sense of the Commissioners and give them an opportunity to air their views on various issues which confront us from time to time. By this means we get a cross-fertilization of views, and in my opinion the final product would do more to reflect a consensus than something handed down as dictated by Cabinet.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill which has been rightly referred to a Select Committee is indeed very important, and we must realise that we are dealing with a very important item. The Bill will seek to amend a system relating to land which is some 800 years old, and we must realize that any attempt to update a system which has prevailed for over 800 years must indeed be important; and since it is dealing with the question of land we must examine it all the more because we are looking at a system which we have inherited, known as the feudal system. This system was employed in England in the eleventh century and you

must bear in mind the reason for this system which we inherited in Barbados to this present day.
6.40 p.m.

That is why it is important that we in Barbados in 1978 examine the relevance of this particular system and see how best we can amend it and adjust it to our social and economic needs. Times have changed. In Britain where this feudal system operated, as I said before, it operated with particular benefits; and attempts were made over the years to look at it and bring it into a more modern aspect as a result of the social and economic changes. What will happen, Sir, is that now we will see the system changed under which before some of the corporations, Crown lands and religious lands were exempted from paying tax. We had a system which still prevails where land is passed from heir to heir in such a way that the heir could not dispose of that land.

Mr. Speaker, those statutes to which I am referring became known as the statutes of mortmain which came into being in 1279; and we had another statute of 1285 called *de donis constitutionalibus.* Both of these statutes remained operative until present day, and it is time that we need to look at these statutes because they have long outlived their usefulness, and they need to be amended or re-examined so that they could fit into our present social conditions. These statutes were passed to suit a particular need for a particular reason; and no doubt when the legal brains said that Edward I was the great law-giver, it was he who really passed these laws – he had a purpose and a reason for bringing each of these laws; and as a result many lands which would have paid taxes were exempted, and hence the Crown or the State was denied income by way of taxes.

It is time we look at it, Mr. Speaker, because there was a practice whereby people, in order to avoid paying taxes, would pass their lands before they died into the hands of the Church; and since the Church paid no taxes, it was a way of evading taxation and the State was denied of that revenue. Today in Barbados we have to look at a system where people pay their dues and this kind of fraudulent behaviour does not prevail. I think that.....

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have had a look at this Act and I do not see anything about taxes in it. I do not know what the hon. member is talking about. I think that he should better be asked to stick to what we are talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker what I am saying is that in looking at this particular Act the Government is aware of some of these mal-practices and the social aspects of this Bill in an attempt to bring it up so as to see that there is proper registration, that there are proper titles and that everyone will regard land which is so important as an important piece of possession. It is not a matter of political concern. It has more far-reaching consequences because other groups in the country will be affected; because land was always regarded as the most important thing in a man's life.

That is why I said that we must examine this bit of legislation with the sense that one would normally pay to very important business before this Chamber. We cannot dismiss this Bill in a very light manner. I think that all groups of people in Barbados ought to be aware that this is a piece of legislation which is far-reaching, or which has far-reaching social consequences; and as the Attorney General has said, in ten or fifteen year's time we will see a completely different social structure because this particular Bill will bring about an entirely different social structure in our country. This is not only a matter for lawyers. This is an important Bill to those who have got connections with land and property, to those who have got children and grandchildren to inherit these lands and properties. That is why we must look at this piece of legislation in that light because we must make sure that we are examining this particular piece of legislation, because what we do is what future generations will have to live with. And what we are doing will probably not be changed for hundreds of years; so in looking at this land legislation, we must bear in mind that it is going to affect future generations, and therefore it will mean that all of us in this Honourable Chamber should examine it in the light of what it will mean.

Mr. Speaker, that is my contribution; and as I have said before, realising the seriousness of it, I would welcome the opportunity to serve on the Select Committee of this Honourable House which this House may care to select when the time comes.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Lands, I should claim the right to sit on the Committee: but I have no desire to sit on the Committee because it is a technical Committee.
6.50 p.m.

I have no interest in sitting on the Committee because it is a technical Committee. It is going to have a lot of legal language in it that I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit on any Committee unless I say something. I am not prepared for any lawyer to laugh at me; I am to laugh at the lawyers. Sir, can you imagine me sitting on a Committee with the Leader of the Opposition? Now in the first place I know that would not work out period because he would not be coming to the meetings and I believe that with his

experience, Mr. Speaker, which is his former legal, if not present legal experience now, he will be able to assist the Committee.

Sir, there is one point I would like to draw to the attention of the proposed Committee and that is simplifying the language. I hear my colleagues speaking about Statutes, Sir, the Statute of Liberty and this type of thing, but I, Mr. Speaker, would like to make reference to the Statute of simplifying the language so that the more unfortunate people like me would be able to sit down and read the Will good when I make it for my family. The whereas, and the concurring, and forthwith, and before and afterwards, and all this type of thing. This is all I am asking the Committee to do. I have no doubt in my mind, Sir, that the legislation which we are now dealing with that, as the Prime Minister indicated, is supposed to be a masterpiece of legislation, although my colleague and one whose judgment and contributions have been very sound in the past indicated that since 1861 or 1811 until 1925 that what they referred to as the Mother Country, the Mother Country could not get it put together. Well, they may have had their problems but I believe in this technological age, we may be able to get it put together in a much quicker manner, Sir.

I am told, Mr. Speaker, it will take between 12 and 15 years to have the land legislation well organised. I am told that all preparatory work has been done and it is felt that they should have this before Parliament before 1979 and it is a sincere wish, Sir, as Minister responsible for Lands, that when they report, then I should be in a position to understand the legal jargon as well as the man in the streets.

I am told, Sir, that you are a very sizeable land owner in my constituency and which is also, Sir, on the coastal line and you would be very interested in knowing what they are planning to do with that type of land, but, Mr. Speaker, I live in the South. I have the interest of those in St. James at heart and also I have a lot of constituents in here, George Moe used to be around, and the member for St. Michael South and you, Sir. The very prestigious post which you hold, you can rest assured, Sir, that I will do everything to make sure that whenever this Bill is presented in Parliament, that it will be presented in a manner that the man in the street can understand. That is of paramount importance to me.

I have no other contribution to make. I have indicated to the Attorney General that I have no interest in sitting on the Committee but when the Committee reports back, the Minister of Lands would then be in a position to understand it as well as I can understand it, Sir.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, just a few short remarks on this matter. I think, Sir, one of the primary concerns of the public will be whether or not these laws pertaining to the land will make it quicker and easier for them to get their conveyances and titles and also cheaper. Already on this matter some words have been expressed about the high cost of conveyancing of lands or properties in this country, and what concerns the public is whether or not the passing of these new laws will entail they having to go and consult the Attorneys-at-Law barely on the basis of the change of the law and therefore having to pay a different fee for that type of service, and more important, whether now we are going to see a spiralling in the cost when you go to the Attorneys-at-Law in the buying and selling of land.

When you look at conveyances in this country you see that there are more or less similar, if not identical, in all respects. They vary in minor details and one of the things which comes to my mind, quite unlike what the hon. member for St. Philip has stated, I thing that somewhere in one of these Bills there should be a schedule outlining or embracing the important points of conveyancing and which you would expect Attorneys-at-Law to honour because what you observe in this country, people tend to tell you of the problems which they have when they set out to press titles, when they have to draw up conveyances and things of that nature. In other words, to justify the cost, but whenever you analyse the final product you do not see much of a difference and I know what I am talking about, although my representative may be a bit peeved about what I am saying.

You take the conveyances and you go there and you see there are substantially similar in what they purport to do, so I would want to know what justifies the high costs in some of these cases and the concern I am repeating for the benefit of the Hon. Attorney General, the concern of the public as to whether or not they are going to see an increase in the cost of conveyancing of land.

It is a bit sad to hear from the Hon. Attorney General that some of the people to whom he has sent these Bills for their comments have not responded because the duty and selling of land in Barbados is not a matter entirely for Attorneys-at-Law. There are realtors, real estate people, there are people that are property owners and then they are people who expect to own land, and I would like to believe that in a matter as far reaching as this, that these people in addition to the Attorneys-at-Law, would be of some assistance or guidance to the Hon. Attorney General in

deciding or coming to some conclusion as to what is best for Barbados because, as he has stated, it is based on the North Ireland Act which is now based on the British Act, 1925, and it is not unlikely that there are peculiar social circumstances in Barbados which will call for an entirely different approach to what obtains in Ireland or Great Britain.

Furthermore when one bears in mind that this goes back to 1925, it is suggested that we are something like 53 years and we would like to know what is the up-to-date position of land regarding the conveyancing of land, the buying and selling of land, the operating of land in general according to other developing countries and particularly Britain from which we are seeking to draw some examples.

Another area of some concern to the public and I hope that when we study these laws in the Select Committee I will see some enlightenment there. There is a very easy way in this country of people coming into ownership of land. You take land and you pass it on, very often unknown to the owner, because of the way it is done. You put a small notice on one of the pages of the *Advocate* asking people who have claims against the particular land to come in and register these claims in the Supreme Court, very often missing the notice of the owner and the owner very often does not suspect that any person will try to cheat him out of his land until one day he comes looking for his land and finds that there is a house on it.

That has occurred in Barbados in recent times and that is one of the things which we expect to be cleared up when you bring in new laws and there are other problems which I believe will come out of the Select Committee which affect people in Barbados having land or people in Barbados who have gone overseas and other people have gone occupying their lands, paying their taxes and then they find there are some problems when they return in recovering their lands and I hope that the Select Committee would be able to examine some of the problems of Barbadian people in this country and then address the law to these problems rather than relying solely on adaptation of laws which have been drawn out in entirely different circumstances and conditions because you will very well find that as happened in previous acts, that when you sit down and try to adopt laws of other countries which have been evolved to suit their peculiar social and economic conditions, that when you apply them to Barbados there are not as forceful in practice as they appear on paper.

7.00 p.m.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I did not altogether agree, in fact I did not agree at all that this matter under consideration is a matter to be left exclusively to the consideration of lawyers, because lawyers by the very nature of their training look at the technical aspects of the problem relating to the law and often do not pay sufficient consideration to the far-reaching implications of any action they might take.

Mr. Speaker, I took note of something that was said by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central when he talked about this practice of passing land through the Court. Technically the law states that if a notice is posted in the organ for a period of time – I do not know the details of it; three months I am told by the Attorney General – if the technical owner of the land does not respond, he loses claim or can lose legitimate claim subject to the judgment of the Court.

Now the reason why I picked on this particular point, Mr. Speaker, is that in my constituency an old gentleman of 74 years came to my home one Sunday morning with a stack of legal documents, conveyances etc. in a Purity Bread wrapper. There were eleven pieces of paper altogether, old conveyances showing the history of the land. Among those documents he had one granting him power of attorney over the land in question by his brother who was resident in Panama, and he thought by having that document that he was legitimate owner of approximately two acres of land at Dears Land in Black Rock. Well, Sir, when he brought those papers to me and asked me to read them and tell him what I thought, I told him I was not a lawyer, but I could take a peep. I did not presume to advise him on the points of law, but to the extent that the papers were intelligible to me I was able to determine that the land in question had been awarded to what we might call a squatter who had been living on the land for some period of time.

The reason why I mention this point is because it was particularly hard for that gentleman to understand the mechanism which had in his view robbed him of his land. He wrote letters and I will probably let the Attorney General take a look at the stack, because I still have the papers. But when a man sits down and tries to understand at 74 years, a man in poverty who lives solely on pension and what he can get from selling milk from an old cow that he drags around, that two acres of land at Dears Land at Black Rock is no longer his, it is not an easy matter to get over, and I am saying that the social implications of these technicalities in law ought to be sufficiently gone into to preserve and protect poor people who are for the most part innocent of these matters.

I believe that these kinds of provisions could be changed and to some extent modified so that people will not have to come up against that kind of situation. I heard the hon. member for St. Philip North comment on the cost of conveyancing, and I was startled by his

forthrightness inasmuch as he represents the legal profession, and those are the strong points of the members on this side, and I too would like to voice what I am sure is a universal concern in Barbados about the high cost of passing conveyances. I managed recently to acquire a small holding, a little bailiwick, and I had difficulty myself, Mr. Speaker, having bought land on a previous occasion in another place, at the quantum of charges. I had to pay my own Attorney, then I had to pay the Attorney for the mortgagee...

Mr. SPEAKER: You will take the opportunity now to tell all this to the Select Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir. I am saying all this in the hearing of those hon. members who have been selected to serve on this Committee so that they will bring some consideration to bear upon these matters. I know the hon. member for St. John will pay careful attention to these matters and inasmuch as he represents a country parish up in St. John, I am sure he will want to see that his constituents are well served in this respect. I do not think that the services that are rendered with respect to conveyancing in all cases can justify the quantum of charges that are attached to them. I say this without any malice or anything of the sort with respect to the legal profession. So I say that one has to look beyond the technicalities of the law to see once the law is enacted how it is going to impinge upon people, because ultimately the law is there to serve people and you have to put that foremost in your mind whenever you go to write something. I will urge the Attorney General and those persons concerned to look very diligently at those aspects to make sure that those hardships are well taken care of.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am much indebted to hon. members who have spoken and indeed for the suggestion of the Rt. Hon. member for St. John that we should refer this Bill and the others which follow to a Select Committee as I believe that it will give hon. members an opportunity to hear from members of the public, and I will be proposing in due course to the Select Committee that we advertise our hearings and that members of the public including the hon. member for St. Michael West who has just spoken on instances of over-charging for conveyancing and high fees get an opportunity to come before that body.

Let me say, Sir, that we did take the opportunity to circulate these Bills to the various professions, the Surveyors' profession, the people at the University, the Law Society, the Bar Association, and I think some of the Real Estate agents had an opportunity to see it as well. But the point is well taken that it is necessary if we are to bring about such a substantial change to have members of the public more aware of the changes and that is why in my introductory statements I said I was going to invite Professor Marshall together with my legal officers to write brochures for the benefit of the public and memoranda which would simplify the matter for the public.

Sir, so far as the cost of conveyancing is concerned, I thought that both the Rt. Hon. member for St. John and myself spoke on this matter and said that with this system it is hoped that we can reduce effectively the cost of conveyancing, conveyances would be smaller, they would be more straightforward, there would be less searches, and there is no reason why Attorneys-at-Law should expect to charge the same high fees that at present exist.
7.10 p.m.

I want to say this, however, the public does not recognise that real estate agents who do less work in a transaction involving the sale of land get higher fees in that same transaction than many attorney-at-law, and I have not heard any complaints against the fees charged by real estate agents, many of whom have never had the benefit of qualifying; and it may be that members of the public and of the Select Committee of this House should also give some evidence before the Select Committee on the desirability for legislation dealing with real estate agents as well. Likewise for mortgage companies. They too pose a very serious problem. They have a commitment fee, then they have different interests and this all adds up. And when it comes to the Housing Authority, I see no reason for such searches in Housing Authority titles when Parliament can give a Statutory title. Indeed, talking to the hon. member for St. John last week and exchanging ideas with him he brought out the point that nearly all areas now owned by the Housing Authority are titles by statutory acquisition and there is no reason why you have to continue to search back that same title and charge the same amount.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be much longer except to say I have taken into account the points made by all hon. members including the hon. member for St. Michael South, and I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time. I have to do this formally with all the Bills before moving the Select Committee.

I beg to move that this Bill, the Law of Property Act, be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Condominium Act be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Land Registration Act be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that the Land Adjudication of Rights and Interests Act be read a second time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Trustee Act be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that the Charities Act be read a second time.

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now constitute a Select Committee and that the following Message be sent to the Honourable Senate:

MESSAGE

FROM

THE HON'BLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

TO

THE HONOURABLE THE SENATE

On the 31st day of October, 1978, the Honourable the House of Assembly agreed to invite the Honourable the Senate to nominate Senators to constitute a joint committee with the following Members of the House of Assembly:–

His Honour the Speaker,
Hon. member for Christ Church South Central,
Hon. member for St. Joseph,
Hon. member for St. Philip North,
Hon. member for St. Michael South East,
Hon. member for St. John,
Hon. member for St. Michael South West,
Hon. member for St. Michael North Central,
Hon. member for Christ Church West to consider and report on the following Bills which have been read the second time in this Honourable House:–

1. A bill to make provision respecting property.

2. A Bill to amend the Condominium Act, Cap. 224A.

3. A Bill to make provision for the registration to title to land and for dealings in land so registered and for purposes connected therewith.

4. A Bill to make provisions respecting the adjudication of titles to land.

5. A Bill entitled an Act relating to trustees.

6. A Bill to make provisions respecting charities and for related matters.

Wherefore the Honourable the House of Assembly invites the concurrence in the Honourable the Senate in the constitution of the Committee. If the Senate does so concur, the Honourable the House of Assembly requests the agreement of the Senate that the Joint Committee so constituted should proceed to meet at the early convenience of members without further reference to the House of Assembly before meeting and that the Joint Committee be authorised to hear evidence and receive memoranda from any person and be instructed to report to Parliament two months after it is constituted.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Message stand as a Resolution.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that the Message as read by the hon. Attorney General be sent to the Other Place *(A Pause)*

Both sides have agreed with the Message.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it is now 7.20 p.m. and I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended for one hour.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the acting Leader of the House that there is only one Item left on the Order Paper, so I wonder whether it is worthwhile suspending the Sitting for an hour or whether we should try to dispose of the Item or adjourn until next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry that a matter like this has to come before the House because it shows a lack of consultation between the two sides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: There was a degree of consultation, but I was at a loss as to who was acting as the Leader of the Opposition, was not in his place. I thought the matter would have been conveyed to the Leader of the Opposition. However, Sir, there is a Resolution which I believe could be done this evening and I think it advisable we have dinner and return.

I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 8.15 p.m.

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

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

On Resumption:–

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the instant Order of the Day and this House do now go into Committee to discuss this matter.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978–79, PART II – CAPITAL

Order No. 1 was called – a Resolution to grant the sum of $1,139,461 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978–79, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978–79 No. 12, which form the Schedule to the Resolution, Head 109 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple matter. Last year we voted $1½ million, but this year only $405,000. These funds are needed to supplement certain fees which have to be paid for the study which is currently going on, examining sites for the Barbados Marketing Corporation and so on, Sir. The Schedule shows the consultancy fees which have to be paid. The Ministry of Finance and Planning has certified that the study is continuing and this money needs to be voted. We are putting in a small contingency amount of 5%.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Sir, while it is good to hear that the studies are going on as regards the siting and so on of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, I wonder if it is not time to have a study as to whether we should continue with the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I am not being facetious. When one looks over the years at the large amount of money spent on this organisation, it is high time to ask that we start to assess whether or not this money has produced the effect in the society which has been expected of it all along.

One really has to ask if there was no BMC, would the Barbadian society, and especially the farmers and their associates would be at any great disadvantage in not having this institution. Certainly the institution has not given the satisfaction that was originally contemplated, either to the people who put it up or to the people who are expected to benefit by it, that is the consumer or the farming community in this country; and while it may not be easy at this particular stage to pinpoint the reason for its inability to deliver the goods, it goes without saying that a large amount of money has been spent on the BMC over the years. It has been refinanced by the previous Government, and since this Government has come into power they have had financially to resuscitate it in one way or the other.

People have complained about the way in which goods are distributed. People are wondering why some people can get chicken legs, potatoes etc. and other people cannot get them. Last year the previous Minister of Agriculture said that they made a profit of $400,000 and yet it has been unable to establish any profitable operation; and if you compare this with private organisations one must admit that institutions with a less turnover do make a profit. Let us forget the political harangue and enquire whether or not the absence of this institution will mean a loss to the farmers and consumers.

Maybe the money that is being pumped into that institution would be better spent providing employment in other avenues. While we come here and talk about

surveys being done, there is no guarantee that the type of stalemate which seems now to be effecting the Barbados Marketing Corporation will not continue. I think that it will take a lot more than that. I ask whether it is worth the effort to be expending this time and money and other resources on that institution to make it viable, not only in this sense that it will be able to satisfy the farmers, the public and the Government, but to make it a viable operation without every now and then this House has to be saddled with Resolutions asking for money for the Barbados Marketing Corporation. That is something we have to look at rather than getting in here and looking at this from a purely political point of view. One has to ask what use the BMC really has been to the community, and if there was no BMC would there be any great loss? Would the farmers of this country be unable to sell their produce if there was no BMC? Would the consumers be unable to get certain things if there was no BMC? Those are the important questions to be answered.

Do not let us get away with the question of whether this happened over the years, or whether it was under the DLP or the BLP. I do not think that that is relevant now. What is relevant is what is the benefit to the people, the real benefit to the community; and if that institution was not there would the community be at any disadvantage great or small? I am of the opinion that if it was not there the community would not be at any disadvantage because there is dissatisfaction in the country about its operations right now. We should not just sit down seeking to criticise one another on political grounds when one of our problems is unemployment, and we go on spending money in this area without asking ourselves whether or not that money could be diverted to produce some more tangible benefits, benefits more long lasting which the public of this country would be better able to evaluate. That is something we need to look at.
8.25 p.m.

This is something that we need to look at. I am not voting against the Resolution, Sir, but I think we have to take stock of a lot of things we have been doing and not the question of pursuing them on the basis of whether or not it is a Party line or whether or not we are going to get one from another Party but we have to look in the long run at what is best for the country and in the final analysis, it is the way these things affect the public that matters, not how Party officals or party members see these things.

If you go through the years from the time this institution had been set up and you look at the amount of money and you add it up, you run into huge sums of money that this organisation had handled over the years and this is something to be look at and in the matter of the BMC when we looked at the prices of the commodities we have to be concerned about this because we find that in the area of marketing for farmers or buying produce from farmers, there is a lot of dissatisfaction. Farmers are dissatisfied. I do not have to rehearse this.

Sometime ago we had the pig growers complaining and if you go back over the years, and recent times, you will find that over and over again there have been complaints about relations with the BMC and how the BMC functions. When you look from the point of view of the community, you find that members of the community who come to the BMC find that it is difficult to get produce because you find certain individuals go there and are able to buy large quantities of produce from the BMC before the individual consumer when he goes there to buy. These are things which irritate the public.

When you look at the question of maybe even a simple thing such as salt fish, you find in this country there is a lot of concern over the price of salt fish. I am not saying that the BMC is responsible but I do hope that the BMC can do something about that because here in this country we have salt fish being sold at $3.51 above the scheduled price wholesale and no action is being taken against the people responsible for so doing. Although when people question some of the merchants who sell at this price they are being told that this includes the price for delivery and when they question if I come for my own quantity of salt fish will this extra money come off, "no is the answer", so when, these things are happening in the community and you have a Marketing Corporation which is supposed to assist people, especially where these unfavourable things are occurring, you have to ask what is the BMC doing when this matter is going on and they are taking no action in this matter. So to me, I think the time has come when we have to take a realistic stock of the BMC and its impact upon the community, the farming community and the consumer community.

We have other areas in this country that need money. I do not have to tell the Government that, the Government knows that better than I do. As they have said during their campaign, we have to start looking at areas of wastage seriously and eliminate them to make money available for other areas of endeavour which are also essential to development in this country. I have no doubt whatsoever in my mind that the BMC is one of those areas of wastage which needs to be looked into. I am not joking, and I would like the Hon. Prime Minister to take a serious look at the operation. Not purely to come in here and let us hear some political haranguing or political battle or something on the BMC or who started it or something like that. Let us have a real look at it and see if it is something that is really necessary to the development of this country at this stage, and we are not just carrying on something that you will like to say that you inherited it so you have to carry it on.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would not have entered into this debate but as Acting Minister of Labour, and hearing the member for St. Michael North Central advocating the dismissal of over 250 workers at the BMC must bring me, Sir, to my feet.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member goes any further I want to make it quite clear. I have not stood here and advocated the dismissal of anybody. I have advocated an analysis of the BMC to see whether it is worthy in respect of its operations to the community. It should be analysed in regard to its benefits to the farming community, the population, the Government as a whole, and if out of that analysis you have to make decisions and these decisions have to be made on the basis of facts which can be proved, I will have to get up and support you on that because there is an area of unemployment in this country which needs attention and maybe some of the savings of money may be directed towards generating other areas of employment.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I do not mind the long gallon of order from the member. In his opening remarks, he made it abundantly clear that we should forget BMC, done with BMC, close down BMC, shut down BMC, demolish B.M.C. that is what I understand. In conclusion, he said we should have a look at it, but in his initial remarks he said the time has come when we have to forget the BMC. Now if we forget the BMC, Sir, as I understand it from the hon. member, we close it down, it serves no useful purpose. We will have to close it down and therefore dislocate some 250 workers.

I have always taken the hon. member to the task or objective of his inconsistencies. Only a couple of nights ago in Carrington's Village I heard the hon. member on a platform, he and the most secondly, deposed, powerful man telling the residents of Carrington's Village and its surrounding areas about unemployment in Barbados and this Government will not find work for people, but now we are hearing in here, this evening, to close the Marketing Corporation that employs some 250 persons. I would believe, Sir, that if the BMC is closed now, as the member is advocating, the Union would refuse to meet with me as Minister of Labour as they have refused to meet with me on the Port dispute. Now this is very clear cut.

In my capacity, Sir, as Acting Minister of Labour, through my Permanent Secretary, I invited the Union to meet with me to avoid any possible dislocation of work in the Harbour and my Permanent Secretary conveyed to me that the Union Secretary said that he cannot meet with the Minister of Labour because the Conference took a stand that as long as Lionel Craig is Minister of Labour they cannot sit around a table with me. Well, I am still ready and willing at anytime, at any place, to meet with anybody appointed by the Union to meet with the Minister of Labour in my acting capacity. I am quite sure the Union cannot tell the Prime Minister who he should make a Minister of Labour in his Cabinet, neither can we say to the Union who is to be Secretary. That is the position.

Mr. Chairman, we have a very good case. I am dealing with the dislocation of workers. I am dealing with the BMC. This is my Resolution, Mr. Chairman, and I can talk about Sandy Lane, the BMC, the Hospital, as long as it is my Resolution and it involves the taxpayers money.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out to the Hon. Minister, important as the matters raised by him may be, I would wish that he not stray too far from the question of the BMC. Continue please.
8.35 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I was in here for twelve years. I am close to the BMC and I am near to St. George North. I know my way around in here. Thanks for drawing to my attention not to stray too far from the BMC. I will deal with the resiting of the BMC and the dislocation of the workers at the BMC as advocated by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central. How can we come in here and talk about the dislocation of workers. Here it is you are advocating to Government to have 250 persons redundant, simply because of your shoddy planning over the past fifteen years. When you controlled the BMC you never had the courage of your convictions to get up in here and tell the then Prime Minister of Barbados and Minister of Finance that he should not put the millions of dollars he put into the BMC, but you got up in here just now, it was empty and you were like the boy on the burning deck until the hon. member for St. Lucy came in; you had nobody in here just now so you were letting go a little easy work, close it down, but as soon as the hon. member for St. Lucy came in and you are afraid he goes and tells the Secretary General, you start saying to have a critical look at it. There is no critical look at it. The BMC has been badly operated by you for fifteen years, we have taken it over and I am quite sure the BMC is in a better position, and not only in a better position, but it even looks better. You only have to go down the road; it has a face lift it has never had in its whole history. You are not in a position to say how well it is doing. The facts and figures will soon come out.

All we are doing right here this evening, Mr. Chairman, is dealing with CDB funds for a study of the BMC. But the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, a person who talked about high unemployment all today, now all of a sudden we are hearing from him this evening at 8.30 to chase away 250 workers. What am I hearing at all? How can you be so inconsistent? Earlier in the day you talked about people who cannot get work

and now with limited resources, bad planning by you all over fifteen years, we are putting it back into shape. This is the thing that would not allow certain Government profits to get off. He has his work cut out because every time we settle down to do something, you see the ugly head of the DLP coming up in the air. Your bad planning over the years with millions of dollars in the Transport Board, the BMC, the Housing Authority is the result. I am awaiting on you all in here on the Ministry of Housing; we will have a real show-down in here. Millions you have thrown away of the taxpayers' money because of bad planning and the hon. member for St. Michael North Central never had the guts to get on the floor of the House and say what he said in here this evening, to close down the BMC. I will tell the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Barbados this: if I were the Minister in any Government with him and an operation was not successful, I would tell him straight I do not agree with him on the floor of the House and that I am not holding myself accountable to the public and I am advocating the closure of it, unlike you when you said you wanted an enquiry into the Hospital and the skipper said you could not have it. You are too inconsistent. Earlier you wanted people to work, but now at 8.30 you say close it down. What do we do? Close it down and dislocate 250 persons at Christmas time. You are a heartless politician. In December around Christmas time he is going to talk about closing the doors and sending home 250 persons, so they can get no ham, no wine, no 7-Ups, no sorrel, no peas. What sort of heartless M.P. can he be, Mr. Chairman? It is not fair; and talking about being a socialist. You are making fun. We are not going to close it; it is in good hands; it is there to help dictate the prices in the country. It is there to make sure that the prices are kept down by some of the supermarkets in Bridgetown, and as a matter of fact in Barbados that would have the cost of living at a spiralling level. That is what you call the price barometer of the country, and I dare say the Minister as well as the Chairman would be in a better position to answer any charges about the present operation of the BMC.

I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South West, the President General now, talk about how many people they chased away from the BMC out of his constituency. Now you are going to chase away all from all the constituencies. We are not going to do that. We are going to make a viable operation, it is going to have a new face, under new management, new directions, and I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that rather than dismissing 250 persons, as the hon. member advocated, to increase it by an additional 250 persons.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I have been pretty quiet all day and I really did not intend to speak on this Resolution, but the hon. member for St. James has, as it were, by the reply which he has made to the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, in a way provoked me into getting up to get into this debate. Now we are looking at this Resolution which has to do with the provision of a sum of money for the Barbados Marketing Corporation presumably to try to ensure that the finances relating to the relocation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation are well taken care of. As I understand it, I was not here, but I was in consultation with the hon. member for St. Michael North Central and in his presentation he was referring to having a critical look at the operation of the BMC and certainly was not advocating the dismissal of workers who are employed at the BMC. I do not believe that anybody in his right senses would advocate such a situation, but I believe that the record of the debate on what the hon. member said would indicate very clearly that this was not said.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman on a point of order, I am quite sure the hon. member for St. Lucy was not in the Chamber when the hon. member for St. Michael North Central started his speech. He was not even in the precinct of the House. He is only going by hearsay. It is really not fair.

Mr. GREAVES: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, in looking at this matter relating to the BMC and at the sums of money which we see here, it is a very interesting matter, as a matter of fact, because if you examine the way in which the fees are set out, you will see that there is a considerable amount of money, the greater proportion of which is going towards consultancy fees. It is true I was not here when this matter was introduced, but I would hope that some explanation has been given about the high proportion of consultancy fees which are set out here in this Resolution, because it seems to be fairly large in comparison with the other expenses which are involved in relocating the services of the BMC. We have well over $\frac{1}{2}$ million which has been allocated out of this $787,000 for consultancy fees. I think this needs some explanation if it has not yet been given.

8.45 p.m.

But the hon. member for St. James, now Minister of Housing and of late Minister of Labour, now acting, as I understand it, as Minister of Labour, was making the point earlier that if the hon. member for St. Michael North Central was advocating the closing down of the Barbados Marketing Corporation he in his capacity as acting Minister of Labour will have to have some discussion with the union concerned – presumably he is talking about the Barbados Workers Union – and he recited the fact that only recently on Saturday an attempt was made by him through his Permanent Secretary to have a meeting with the Barbados Workers Union on a matter which is exercising our attention at the present moment and this was refused, and he seemed a bit peeved at this.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am not peeved; it is the workers who are

going to be peeved. The workers are likely to be peeved because you and your union will not come and discuss the matter at Ministerial level. But I am still willing and waiting, so I am not peeved.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, what I want to tell the hon. member for St. James is that as far as the Barbados Workers Union is concerned we will not be sitting down around a table with him as Minister of Labour. We have passed a Resolution condemning him for the insulting remarks he made about the people of this country and we have stated quite clearly that we will not be sitting down with him discussing any matter relating to labour.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I am only carrying out my Ministerial duties, and my duty is that when it reaches domestic level and breaks down and then at the Labour Department level and breaks down, it falls into the lap of the Minister and I am acting Minister of Labour. If they don't want to discuss the workers business, that is a matter for them; I have carried out my Ministerial duties; I am not worried about that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I think it is an insult to the country for the Prime Minister to be so insensitive to have the hon. member for St. James appointed to act as Minister of Labour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind the hon. member for St. Lucy that earlier I spoke to the hon. member for St. James in relation to this matter coming into the debate and the fact that it was irrelevant, and I must advise again that the matter being mentioned has already been the subject of debate in this Chamber. I will therefore ask the hon. member for St. Lucy to continue his speech but to desist from the matter which he has presently brought into focus.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to your ruling, I am dealing with a matter which is germane to what we are talking about, because the hon. member for St. James is charging that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central is advocating closure of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and that consequentially that he as acting Minister of Labour would have to sit down with the Union to deal with the dislocation of workers. What I am telling the acting Minister of Labour – he says he is acting Minister of Labour, but it has not been gazetted – what I am saying is that the acting Minister of Labour must understand....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for St. Lucy is the only member in here who is always speaking with his head down. I do not have to be gazetted; I am appointed by the Prime Minister in the exercise of his discretion. This is not the Union; this is big business.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. GREAVES: I do not understand how the manner in which I hold my head – he should look at how he holds his head. But I won't bother about that. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that as far as the Barbados Workers Union is concerned we have said very clearly that we have no intention of sitting down with the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are repeating yourself; please carry on with the debate.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, to revert to the matter relating to the Marketing Corporation. I said that what we have to look at in this matter of relocation of the facilities of the BMC; one has to be concerned with the large amount of fees stated here for consultancy services, and this should be explained. I have no doubt that the Barbados Marketing Corporation, if properly managed and its objectives properly defined, can play an important and a meaningful role in the development of agriculture and the allied services which would fall under the scope of the operation of the Marketing Corporation; and certainly the Corporation was set up to be of important assistance to small farmers in ensuring that the produce from their land is properly brought together and marketed and that this service would be available to people throughout the country in as cheap a manner as possible. So we have the making of a useful corporation in this country. But what I understand the hon. member for St. Michael North Central to be asking is whether or not the Barbados Marketing Corporation is fulfilling the role which it was designed to play, and we have to look at it and ensure that in any attempts to relocate the facilities of the Marketing Corporation we look at the matter in its totality; we have to ensure, for example, that the relocation would not bring about any particular dislocation or any particular difficulties to the people who have to rely on the BMC for the sale of their produce. So that I think we have to look at the matter with a critical view and re-examine its role and try to ensure that its functions are properly defined and its role properly set out.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing I am very happy about it is that only two members of the Opposition are in their places tonight, because we are able to see very clearly the Opposition speaking with two different voices. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central went out on a limb, and the hon. member for St. Lucy in recognizing this sought to rescue him, but with great difficulty.

The hon. member for St. Lucy said that the BMC can play a very useful role in the community. It is unfortunate, that he, with his time in this Parliament did not seek to help his Government structure the BMC in the manner it should have been.

The Barbados Marketing Corporation as originally conceived by the Barbados Labour Party was to serve a positive and useful purpose in the community, and the BMC under this administration is going to serve that purpose.

The hon. member for St. Michael North Central spoke about who gets benefit from the BMC, about the prices of the commodities, and other things to do with the BMC. The problem with the BMC as we saw it was inefficiency, ineptitude and corruption.
8.55 p.m.

As a matter of fact it was known where the staffing structure was concerned that of course you could not get a job down there unless you were the carrier of a passport of the Democratic Labour Party. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central took refuge very quickly in the statement that we should not allow our party feelings to creep into this matter. It was a very early appeal for light; but we cannot help but say that the Democratic Labour Party placed the BMC in the chronic financial position that it finds itself in. As the hon. member said, we cannot afford to put people out of work; but we must get rid of inefficiency. The Barbados Government will make sure that it plays that role.

A person going into the Baymart or any of the other centres of the BMC will see that the prices are much less that in the supermarkets. Quite recently we have seen the supermarkets slashing their prices. They did not do it because they want to give cheaper food to the consumers. They have had to slash the prices on their items because the BMC has forced them to do so. I have seen recently where the BMC had a box of Kleenex tissues for men at $3.10, while the price at other supermarkets was $3.75. I am satisfied that the BMC has a very useful role to play.

The question that only certain people can get chicken backs and so on from the BMC and others cannot is unknown to me. There is no way in which I will allow anyone in this country to be in any unfair position where the BMC is concerned. The BMC must serve Barbados as it was intended to do. I want to go on record as saying that the role of the BMC is to satisfy the people in all walks of life.

There are producers who will bring their goods to the BMC in times of glut and sell them elesewhere when there is no glut. It is then when they want to market at the BMC. These are people who want to get the best of both words and who will find themselves in difficulty from time to time.

This study that we are dealing with now is one by which the marketing system of the BMC will be taken into account. The hon. member for St. Lucy said that the consultant fees will be high. I am sure that as a member of a trade union he knows that these consultant charges go according to the quantum involved. The marketing of all sorts of goods are involved, and while it may seem to be somewhat expensive, it is not really so in the circumstances.

The Government took a very conscious decision in December, 1977 to have the BMC relocated. There was the question of cold storage and all of those things. While consultant fees on the surface might seem to be large I do not think that according to the fees that people charge today they are very large. I believe that the BMC, properly run, can do a very good job in this country. I want to compliment the Chairman of that corporation and the present Board for the very good job which they have done up to now. I believe that with the correct public co-operation they will continue to do so. As long as they continue to do things that are right, they will enjoy my support; and I will not hesitate to take the necessary steps to correct any situation that is not working correctly. With the support of the Government, the BMC will continue to play the role which it had been playing within the past two years.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, just two weeks ago this Chamber saw an exercise which was instituted by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central when he brought a Resolution seeking to condemn the hon. member for St. James for making certain remarks and then saying that the member's remarks were distasteful. We are told that politicians are not supposed to make such statements, and therefore I would never have thought that the hon. member would have made the statement that he made in relation to the closing of the Barbados Marketing Corporation; because throughout the many years that we have been associated with each other, the hon. member has always talked about the need for improving the position of the small man in this country and he always appeared to be interested in the small farmers of this country.
9.05 p.m.

But the statement tonight that the Government should seek to close the BMC and use the money in other avenues certainly discloses the hidden realities in the member's mind, and in truth and in fact, he does not care anything about small people in this community.

The BMC was established by an Act of Parliament sometime in 1960 or very early in 1961 and if one looks at the functioning of that Corporation, one would see that it is to facilitate the marketing of agricultural produce. One of the weakest sectors in Barbados and in the Caribbean is the marketing of agricultural produce, and if we in Barbados at anytime henceforth seek to close the BMC you might as well pass the appropriate laws at the same time to eliminate some 12,000 small farmers in this country.

When I was Minister responsible for Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, I appreciated that there are many Technical officers who would tell you that it is impossible to cater to small farmers, but when you look at the situation that exists in Barbados where you have large farmers and small farmers, when you look at the Hotel Industry, they basically utilise quite a large percentage of the agricultural produce produced in Barbados. You ask yourself, what other avenues would there be for the small farmer with his few square meters of land who still indulge in the planting of agricultural products.

When you take into account that under the last administration several plantations were sub-divided into areas of 1 hectare or less, and those areas have been lying idle and if you take into account that this administration pledged to the people of this country that we will bring back the idle land into production, if you also take into account that it is the policy not only of this administration but of the last administration that there should be a diversification programme so that we are not totally dependant on sugar, and if you take into account that this administration believes in the export of vegetables that can be profitably grown in Barbados, you ask yourself what other institution are you going to bring about to handle the marketing from the plantations and other sectors down to the small farmer to a few square meters of land.

In every country there is some agricultural marketing institution that looks after all farmers and if at the time of the DLP the BMC was losing money, it was losing money because the present Minister of Agriculture now saw the recalcitrant nature of some of the workers down there who were sent down there as party hacks, and walking about doing nothing. They said the Minister sent me down here and you cannot tell me what to do.

Mr. Chairman, we are looking at the BMC. In Barbados there is still no effective consumer association. We have devised a policy whereby the BMC can produce products in this country which would set a pattern for the other supermarkets in this country. You have a number of people employed at the BMC. In the Caricom Agreement, only Government Institutions can participate in the exercise of the Agricultural Marketing Protocol.

If you today, Mr. Chairman, seek to get oranges from St. Lucia, oranges that are dropping under the trees morning, noon and night, you will find that the Marketing Corporation of St. Lucia will only send to the Marketing Corporation of Barbados.

When we grow onions in this country to export to other Caribbean territories, you will find that the BMC is the sole exporter of onions in the Agricultural Marketing Protocol of Caricom and it can only send to a similar Government Institution in another Caricom territory, and the hon. member tells you that this Government must close it down, shut it down. What is he seeking to do? Destroy the very foundation of which the BLP has pledged to bring this country out of the financial difficulties that political party left it in. Then they will walk about and tell the people that the BLP shut down the BMC, sent home 250 people, and then peace would reign. Then you cannot call that a slip. I do not know if you can call it political mileage, but I do not understand if the hon. member really understood what it meant.

The hon. member from St. Lucy came in like a Defence Counsel. The client having committed a murder, the witnesses have seen, the police have arrested him, but the Defence Counsel must still try his best to say something. I mean this is Parliament. The people in the gallery alone would have heard the statement. The newspapers if they are honest, will headline tomorrow "Caddle says shut down BMC" and why does he want to shut it down? You know why he wants to shut it down, Mr. Chairman, if you really think, this year is the first year, within the last 11 years, that Barbados has had so much rainfall. That is the first year that Barbados would be producing more vegetables than would be the lifetime of the DLP but you see what they want? Shut it down now. Every farmer in Barbados out there growing something.

We have produced between last year and this year more yams than have ever been produced in the 15 years the DLP has been in power. We have exported more vegetables from this country than ever the DLP has been in power and all went through the BMC.

Mr. Chairman, we lowered the price of chicken backs and imported more than they had ever imported at a lower and better price to the consumers than they had ever done. They want to close it down now. Everything you look at agriculturally has gone up, and defeated the figures of import and export that they have ever done and the hon. member wants to close down the BMC. You know why? When the new structure is completed, when we have put in the various categories of cold storage that is needed in an institution like the BMC, we shall show to the last administration that it can function profitably and not as they had it going.

If you really start to think of what was going on down there, at this point of time, I thought the hon. member would have said close it down in early 1976 when it was throwing away $2 million a year despite the fact that it was re-financed. Mr. Chairman, when I went into office, if you want to hear the final weight of being in office, Mr. Cyril Walker, the then Acting Manager, a member of the DLP, came up to me saying he wanted $1.2 million by the Friday evening otherwise everybody at the BMC would have to go home. They never had $1.2 million under me. The most they have ever got is $500.00

in an overdraft and that has nothing to do with when I asked for the Accounts and they showed me the accounts, and if you look down the list of accounts you will see members of the DLP who owed the BMC money and did not pay it and you will understand why it was losing money.
9.15 p.m.

This has nothing to do, Mr. Chairman, with my walking into the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce where the manager called me and said "let me show you something", and he showed me two documents signed by one Branford Taitt, Minister responsible for Trade for $400,000 for onions on a short term loan that was never paid back, and the BMC was losing money. In 1976 the hon. member, a member of the Cabinet, had the chance to tell the then Minister of Finance to shut down the BMC and save the country money, but he did not do it then. (A VOICE: How do you know?) I have heard of the hon. member talking with the Minister of Finance. But you see, Mr. Chairman, now the BMC is out of the way of darkness and out of debt, now it has been managed effectively, now that the Government has made plans to put agriculture and the BMC on a proper footing, what you hear on 31st October is to chase home the workers of the BMC, close it down and save money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this evening there was a Resolution in this Chamber to pay the Coast Guard, and although the Coast Guard got paid up to the end of last month, you heard them in here saying the poor hungry people do not know where they are going to get anything from to cause them to go down to the ground because of no this and no that, but at the same time, less than eight hours thereafter you hear close down the BMC, send home the workers and starve the people. Now that is the very Resolution they wanted to choke the hon. member for St. James with and he never said that. Mr. Chairman, I would be the first to say to the Prime Minister "goodbye" if I heard him say he was going to close the BMC as the hon. member would want to close it. *(Asides.)* That does not worry me. That is like your drawing up under Frank.

Mr. Chairman, all I am saying is that we have a responsibility to the farmers of this country. The farmers were frustrated when the Barbados Labour Party came into power. Small farmers about the country said it was not worth their while to get involved in agriculture. I went into office and before I did the newspapers were saying that the pig farmers were waiting for the Minister to solve the problem created under their government. Who saved them? The Barbados Marketing Corporation came to their rescue. Today you have a viable pig farming industry in this country. The poultry farmers had their problems and the BMC came to their rescue, and the very people will go outside and tell you that the Government must do something to help small entrepreneurs, the small black workers, the small this and the small the next, but then you hear to shut down the BMC and put them out in the dark. How can you ever operate? Everyone of their members will tell this Government they must do this for small businessmen, it must do that for small businessmen, but when the politicians come in here they say shut it down and leave the small businessmen out there in the streets. I really and truly do not understand the hon. member tonight. He said that the millions of dollars that went into the BMC could be used in some other profitable exercise. But how much money has the Barbados Labour Party put into the BMC so far? You know what has happened to us. We are saddled with a debt of nearly $1½ million that the Chamber of Commerce said under the DLP they could not hear a word from as to whether they would get paid or not. *(Asides.)* The Canadian Bank of Commerce was $400,000 for overdraft, Barclays Bank was $1.5 million, the Chamber of Commerce and another $1.5 million, and they wrote to me when I was Minister and they came and saw me and said "Mr. Minister, I know it is not your debt, the debt was not incurred during your regime, it was incurred during the regime of the DLP but the members would not even speak to us about it. We beg you, give us a little bit; we will go along with you. Tell us how you are going to pay us. Even if you pay us over the next ten years, we know it is something coming in". But you know what the hon. member wants? Liquidate the BMC and so the debt has gone through the eddoes and the Government would have no credibility in Bridgetown, and they will then walk about and say "You see the DLP, you see whom you voted into power, people that killed your debt. That is what they would like us to do, but responsible Government operates in a far different way. I do not think anybody in Government could shut down the BMC. They have put money into it. What we are trying to do is to rescue the situation like we have had to rescue every situation that the DLP got involved in. The Housing Authority, as the Hon. Minister has reminded me, under the DLP is riddled in debt, but you do not do it that way.

Mr. Chairman, it would appear as if the hon. members over there have a strange way of operating. I do not know if the hon. member for St. Lucy agrees with the hon. member for St. Michael North Central or not, but he seems to be backing him up. I do not really think that he understood the hon. member's statement, because the workers down there tomorrow morning, when they understand what the hon. member for St. Michael North Central has said and the hon. member for St. Lucy.....do you know something? He went so far as to say that as far as the union is concerned they will not meet with the hon. member for St. James even despite the fact that the hon. member is trying to keep the workers at work for the Union to get its dues, because when the workers go home no Union dues will be paid. *(Asides)* Oh, no, they get their money from the Union even although the workers have gone home.

Mr. Chairman, today is a black day for this country. It is a black day for the farmers of this country; it is a black day for anybody who believes in low prices when the members of the Opposition who, as they say, look out for the people out there and all this talk about this 48%, and can now say to shut down the BMC. I hope they fully understand the implication and the true socialists in this particular country.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I have here in my hand some figures which suggest that the accumulated deficit of the Barbados Marketing Corporation is of the order of $10 million, all accumulated under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party from 1963 until 1977. We inherited that situation, and don't forget that the Government of Barbados has ploughed millions of dollars trying to recover a bad situation that existed at that Corporation for all these years. Tonight in Barbados 230 odd mothers and fathers are going about their daily routine oblivious of the fact that a senior member of the Democratic Labour Party at this moment is standing up in the House of Assembly and saying that they should starve and that they should be dismissed from their work in order to save money.
9.25 p.m.

Now $10 million, of accumulated deficit. When they were in power nobody said that something ought to be done to save money. But for the first time the Barbados Marketing Corporation has shown that it is a useful organization in this society, and yet the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, a man who has clinics by the wayside, who is supposed to have sprung from the grass roots in Carrington Village and who was nurtured by Mr. Mottley...

Dr. CADDLE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made a statement about being nurtured by Mr. Mottley. I would like to know where he got that from, for it is not true; so don't start with that.

Mr. JOHNSON: A man supposed to be a product of the grass roots, who has constituents working at the Barbados Marketing Corporation, comes in here calling for their dismissal on the eve of Christmas, a time when everybody looks forward to being able to pay accumulated debts for things acquired during the year – refrigerators, stoves, etc., and you are telling us we should shut down the BMC. And the hon. member who is the union representative, a representative of the workers, sat by your side and heard you say that and made not a word of protest. You indicated that you were absolutely certain...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I am talking to the Chair. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central indicated that he did not believe any disadvantage would result if the BMC was closed. In his mind 250 jobless people is no disadvantage in this country.

Dr. CADDLE: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman, I do not mind the hon. member carrying on this harangue, but I said I did not believe there would be any disadvantage to the farmers, consumers or the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I have it written down: "We do not believe there would be any disadvantage if the BMC is shut down'" He said one outstanding problem in this country is unemployment; he made that remark. And right after that he suggests creating 250 more jobless situations. And that is not all. The Barbados Marketing Corporation does not only employ people who are directly involved there. With a tune of $1.5 million in salaries and wages which we pay out every year you are asking us to wipe that out, not to mention the fact that we are responsible for making certain that people who have to depend on a quarter acre of land have a place to market their produce. The Barbados Marketing Corporation is there to make sure that those people who depend on the land are able to find a safe market for their produce, and those include the peasant farmers in this country, some of whom come from St. Michael North Central. But if the papers do not report it I will tell the people of St. Michael North Central that their representative said they should be fired. I will also tell the farmers of St. Michael North Central – and there are poultry farmers and vegetable farmers – that their representative said that the BMC should be shut down.

Sir, I would like you to understand the magnitude of the task the BMC is called upon to perform. When we went to that Corporation in November, 1976, the Corporation was at a point where it was not able to purchase any commodities for the Christmas trade; it was virtually unable to pay salaries and wages and we had to ask the Government for money for temporary bailing out. That was because under the previous administration a system of constructive lawlessness went on time and time again. As a matter of fact it was the norm for people to be employed at the BMC and checking in full time on other jobs; and when we pointed out these things members on that side talked about the Barbadoos Labour Party victimizing people; those people over there, heartless and aparently godless people taking advantage of a situation and then saying that we were callous in seeking to correct these ills; and yet two years later a leading member of that party, a former Cabinet Minister and an avowed socialist, is going to come in here and suggest bringing further degration on the people who have to depend on the Barbados Marketing Corporation for their livelihood.

Mr. Chairman, the Barbados Marketing Corporation has two fundamental responsibilities. In the first instance it is supposed to run a commercially viable organization and it must at the same time provide an avenue for the profitable marketing of produce from farmers. We have turned the Corporation around where we will shortly be able to demonstrate when audited financial statements are available that we have saved the taxpayers in this financial year $1.6 million. That is money which would have gone down the drain if the corporate mismanagers were still at the helm – and I am refering to the former Government.

We for the first time in the history of the Corporation, to the best of my recollection, exported yams and okras into North America – experimental exports, yes, but we had to do the experimental work – proper certification by the Food and Drug administration; adequate safeguards against the carrying of pests into that country; and we have been able to send yams and okras to North America and we have a viable thriving trade in yams with the United States, all through the efforts of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. We have successfully shipped sweet potatoes to the United Kingdom and we have every reason to believe that in future sweet potatoes will form one of our export crops because we have demonstrated that we can package potatoes to arrive at their destination in good condition.

So the Barbados Marketing Corporation is not a candidate for closure. I believe that if anyone is at all honest it will be recognized that we are clearly on the road to recovery, thanks to the efforts of the Barbados Labour Party Government, and calling for the closure of the Barbados Marketing Corporation now is not going to stop us because we have only now begun, and as they say in common parlance, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central "ain't see nothing yet."
9.35 p.m.

Now, Sir, he talked about the Baymart. When we went to the Barbados Marketing Corporation in November, all areas of commercial activity at the BMC were at a gross loss position. There was a whole lot of pilfering going on. I heard people boasting openly that they had built bungalows out of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I know the names, and I could call them now. That was aided and abetted by the Democratic Labour Party. The BMC Baymart had a system whereby the cashiers would write on the bill "cancelled" and the goods went through the door in any case. That was something for which a man was ultimately charged. Even today when the Barbados Labour Party is in power, a former employee of the BMC is still going down there trying to engage in malpractices. We had to turn the man over.

They now have the audacity to come here and say close it down. Why did they not make that decision then? I am glad to be able to report that since we opened the BMC supermarket under new conditions there has been a gross profit of 16.9%. Other supermarkets in Barbados used to have sales of $40,000.00 a week, whereas we have sales of $85,000.00 a week. I saw the wife of the former Leader of the Opposition shopping easily at the Baymart. We have put in piped in music for the shoppers, and we notice that other supermarkets are putting in piped music too. We have arrangements so that if there are any shoplifters about we will spot them.

We have had sales of $85,000 a week and they will soon top $100,000 a week. The Barbados Marketing Corporation has money for brand new equipment. We did not have to go begging for it. The money that used to be stolen by people to buy bungalows is now being properly invested. We have added to our assets in the last two years. As I have said, new equipment throughout. We have a new Board room and new furniture. All of these are items that are there providing new assets for the corporation. That is some of the money that people used to carry away before. That type of lawlessness is ended forever.

This legislation is to provide facilities for the BMC. I am sorry that I have to disappoint or disconcert the hon. member for St. Michael North Central when I say that the BMC is not closing down. We have new plans for relocating the BMC, and we are committed to paying for it. Mr. Chairman, I believe that our approach to the management of the BMC will yield results that the people of this country are seeking. Only last month I was in the USA and I concluded an agreement with a company who will be agents in Barbados for the first time. We do not have to go and beg anybody to sell the BMC anything. We can sell to them.
9.45 p.m.

And whereas people used to be under the mistaken impression that if they are agents for product A, they were the only persons who had the right to distribute it. I have news for them because the reason why the supermarket prices have been tumbling and coming down all over Barbados is precisely because of the direct importation programme of down-grading at the BMC.

We went to Miami to import some products which are distributed by merchants here in this country. We imported them through independent brokers, paid the freight, paid the duty, put it at the BMC and were able to charge substantially cheaper than the merchants who were agents for the product. I am talking about a 1 lb. tin of peanut butter. We were able to sell the 4 lb. tin of butter for the same price they were selling the 1 lb. butter for in this country, and that is how significant the Corporation is working.

We have a situation and we are rectifying it. Right now in the BMC there are two containers of products

directly imported. You see people messing around with soap powder saying they cannot get it here and they cannot get it there. Come to the BMC next week. We are not going to be held hostage by merchants any longer. The BMC is a free enterprise and a free enterprise just like any other Corporation in town. We are Government owned but we operate on a free system. We are competitive. We import wherever we can buy the goods cheaper and we pass it on to the consumer.

You have never seen in this country before two whole pages saying Kellogs CornFlakes formerly $4.50 now $3.85. Chicken legs formerly $2.80 now $1.85. You will never see that in the history of Barbados. I am not asking you I am telling you and the reason why you are seing it now is because of the BMC's policy of direct importation. It is beginning to break through and the beneficiaries are the consumers of Barbados and instead of going out and telling your constituencies that they can go to the BMC and save money you walk about talking about shutting it down. Instead of telling them you have a deal for them, that the $60.00 a week they are getting as domestic servants or whatever can stretch a little further at the BMC, shut it down, and let prices go back up in the air.

Chicken legs were $2.80 per pound only a year ago and I heard Goddards advertising them last week at $1.95. You know why, because they were paying less to bring chicken legs into this country so precisely they had to force the prices down. We do not have to listen to merchants or anybody like that telling us that we are not to do this and we are not to do that. I have never known the old house...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Some order please.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say that the new facilities at the Marketing Corporation that we are talking about here tonight will make us more effective in our programme and distribution. This is the first order of the business. Distribution. We have a supermarket, not because we like supermarkets necessarily, but because it is a monetary point. The United States Government works precisely the same programme. It holds prices in check because whenever they go too high they just have to advertise it and force prices back in line. This is precisely what the BMC is doing. It is holding prices in line. All we have to do is to advertise when the prices are too high and get them back in line.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the hon. member for St. Lucy scoff at chicken backs. You know something, Sir, these are middle-class snobs that we have over there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute, before you speak on your point of order I will like the hon. member to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON: I did not call anybody's name, Sir. I just mentioned middle-class snobs. I did not say Greaves.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will withdraw his words.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, with all grave respect....

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

Mr. JOHNSON: If the hon. member for St. Michael South West thought that I was referring to him as a half-baked, middle-class snob, I will withdraw.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask you to withdraw.

Mr. JOHNSON: I have withdrawn, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That will be taken from the records. Let it be recorded that the hon. member withdrew his comments.

Mr. JOHNSON: The hon. member for St. Lucy scoffed at chicken backs. I want him to know that the people in Barbados consume in the order of 3 to 4 million chicken backs a year and that same man who scoffed, if you sneak up in his kitchen one night you will find that he has some in there. The only difference is that he is going to go in and say he has bought it for his dog, but the poor people of Barbados have to buy them because they are a fine source of cheap proteins for them.

I want the people of Barbados to take note that these people on that side, the hon. members on that side, feel that people who eat chicken backs do not count in this society, but I want the member for St. Michael South West to know that he could not sit in this House tonight if the people who eat chicken backs in his constituency sat at home. He could not get in here. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central could not get in here either and you all come in here and scoff?

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want you to know that the chicken backs we are now talking about used to sell in this country for 67c in 1965 and 1966, in 1975 and 1976, and the hon. member for St. Joseph and the then Minister of Agriculture and his Government know that they were structured in here at 5c here for this fellow and 5c there for that fellow. I want you to hear this. Chicken backs were selling in 1975 on the International market for 14.5c per lb. U.S. It was 15c per pound U.S., 30c landed at Barbados, but the DLP still sold it to the poor people of Barbados for 67c. Now listen to this. We have been in power for two years.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is misleading the House. You cannot say that they were 15c U.S., landing here at 30c. If they were 15c U.S. per lb. they cannot possibly land here at the same 15c U.S. per lb.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the reason why the BMC was in such a mess was because the Minister then did not have the slightest iota or concern of what running a Corporation was all about. He knows nothing. 15c per lb. U.S. landed means 15c per lb. landed.
9.55 p.m.

Fifteen cents a pound US landed means 15 cents a pound landed, so how much simpler can I make it? That is what I said. Stick to law; two weeks. Leave out the big business work. Mr. Chairman, at that time landed at 30 cents he controlled the price at 67 cents. The Minister here controlled it at 48 cents a pound for two years and the price has gone up to 20 cents odd and we have had to relax that for the first time in two years, and it is still cheaper than it was in 1975.

I am going to wind up now, but this whole Resolution is about providing facilities for the BMC to carry on its enlightened programme, a programme which the consumers of Barbados have come to appreciate because if they did not sense that something was going on down there, they would not increase their sales by twice. The only member for St. Michael South West might not understand it, but his constituents understand it because I see them in their shopping, and he should go on the platform next time around and tell them that if they eat chicken backs he does not require their vote. He should have the courage to go out there and tell them that.

On that note, Sir, I would like to recommend that we all support this Resolution so that we can provide the facilities that we have been talking about so that the programme of the Barbados Marketing Corporation can continue.

Mr. TAITT rose.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member speaks, it is now 10 o'clock. We know the staff of Parliament are supposed to work up to 10 o'clock. I am not quite sure of the time factor, but I have just been informed by one of the Deputy Clerks. The hon. member for St. Michael South West, as usual, starts like the elephant on the carpet, floating back. Sam Brown has now come. All that the hon. member had to do was to come back in here at 8.30 p.m. He should have been in here at 8.15 p.m. It is his bounden duty to come in here. If he expects us to have any problems.....

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just let the hon. member make his point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: There is no point of order. I am just trying to straighten out the path. We will come back tomorrow. Tell Sidney Poitier to sit down for a moment. I am just trying to straighten out something. Tell the actor to sit down for a moment. He can act downstairs.

The position is that I believe that my colleagues would have to come back tomorrow. We will have to stop now and we will come back tomorrow at 9.30 a.m. or 10 o'clock. This Government is a business-like Government. You have not got to come to prayers or to form a quorum; we will form one. The position is that I believe we would have to report progress unless they would allow us to go through with the Resolution for another ten minutes. I have seen an indication from the Reporter at the table and we would have to be in a position to have this go right through for another ten minutes. If James Brown is prepared to put on an act now, he would know we would have to finish by another five minutes.

The question that Head 109 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND NOTE TO ITEM 5 UNDER HEAD 110 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Attorney General to move the passing of a Resolution to amend the note to Head 110 – Ministry of the Attorney General – Item 5 – Vehicles – of the Estimates 1978–79.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple matter. The Police want to buy motor cycles. The item "Motor Cycles" was omitted from the note in the Estimates. They are very particular and pernickety in these days. They do not want any more Commissions of Enquiry and therefore we are asking that the note be amended to add motor cycles.

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 AMEND THE NUMBER OF AN ITEM CONTAINED IN RESOLUTION 42/1978: SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79 No. 5

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of a Resolution to amend the number of an Item contained in

Resolution 42/1978: Supplementary Estimates 1978–79, No. 5.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment. An amendment of a different character. Apparently two new Items were being prepared in the Ministry of Education at the same time and both of them were given the Item number "21", 20 being the last Item under the Capital Vote. These were the "Hotel School", and the "Project Implementation Unit". We have already passed the Project Implementation Unit, indeed we passed both of them, so you have two Items 21, and they want an amendment to that. I understand that all these things are necessary but they would wish the Hotel School Item amended to read "22.".

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.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
10.05 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a long and interesting day and I want to move that the House stand adjourn until Tuesday 7th November, 1978, at 12 Noon. But before doing so, I feel I would be failing in my duty if I did not say thanks to the Reporters and Staff of Parliament for what I consider a hard day. They may not have been in a position to enjoy the blows that we put on the Opposition in the last moment, with the two boys who "stood on the burning deck when all but they had fled."

I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 7th November, 1978 at 12 Noon.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 7th November, 1978 at 12 Noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
10.10 p.m.