

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th January, 1979.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P. (Speaker); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Dr. R. B. CADDLE M.D., Ch.B.; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry) (Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker) and Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., M.R.C.P. (Edin.)

Prayers were read.

Mr. SIMMONS, Dr. HAYNES and Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Friday, 15th December, 1978 – hon. members will have received them.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated, and I beg to move that they be confirmed subject to any observations or any errors in the Minutes.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection these Minutes are now confirmed. The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 19th December, 1978.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Minutes be confirmed subject to any observations or corrections.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations or corrections, these Minutes which have been circulated are now confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received copies of the Accounts and Statements for the month of March, 1978 as prepared by the Accountant General.

I have also received the report of the Auditor General as a result of the examination of the finances of the Government for the year ended 31st March, 1978. It should be of interest to note that these accounts are up to date to the 31st March, 1978.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the 9th Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank for the year 1977–78.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Attorney General I beg to lay the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year 1976.

Also on behalf of the Minister of Communications and Works I beg to lay statements showing Money Order Transactions through the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments and Administrations for the period August–October 1978.

Also on behalf of the same Minister, statements showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money orders for the months August–October 1978.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$69,324 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978–79, Part II – Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978–79, No. 23, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$40,000 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. 24, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael North Central – his question re a National Park along the eastern coast.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: To enquire of the appropriate Minister –

- (a) Is the Minister aware that Government's intention to set up a National Park along the eastern coast between Archer's Bay, St. Lucy and Bath, St. John is an inhibition in the development of land in that area and specifically at Archer's Bay and Morgan Lewis?
- (b) What is Government's policy on the development of land in the area proposed for the National Park?
- (c) What assistance will Government give towards development in that area?
- (d) What directions have been given to the Chief Town Planner in relation to applications for development of land in the area proposed for the National Park?

12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Hon. member his question re Motor Vehicles.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I ask of the appropriate Minister:

- (a) How many motor vehicles and in what categories were imported into Barbados during 1978?
- (b) What is the total value of all such imported motor vehicles?
- (c) How much customs duty was paid on such vehicles?
- (d) What are the countries of origin with the amount of such imported vehicles?
- (e) To what extent did importation of vehicles contribute to an adverse trade balance with any country?
- (d) What steps is Government taking to reverse this adverse trade balance?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Hon. member his question re bottled gas.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I ask of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that there has been an increase in the price of a commodity known as bottled gas this month and a further increase is expected?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative will the Minister state:

- (a) What is the Government's policy on nationalisation of importation and subsidisation of bottled gas?
- (b) Will Government bring this commodity under price control?
- (c) Will Government seek to make available to consumers any alternate product to bottled gas?
- (d) What steps has Government taken to ensure that the quantity and quality of bottled gas as supplied to consumers are adequate?

Mr. SPEAKER:- The same Hon. member his question re International Seafoods Limited.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I ask of the appropriate Minister:

In view of Government's decision to wind up International Seafoods Limited, will the Minister state –

- (a) What is the accumulated debt to date of International Seafoods Limited?

- (b) Who are the creditors and how much is due each creditor?
- (c) How much is Government's liability?
- (d) How many workers, permanent and temporary or seasonal, will be affected by cessation of operations of International Seafoods Limited?
- (e) What compensation is due such workers and when will it be made available to them?
- (f) How does Government intend to dispose of assets of International Seafoods Limited — trawlers, machinery, etc?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Hon. member his question re Government's policy on South Africa.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I ask of the appropriate Minister — Does Government's policy on South Africa support a ban on all trade with South Africa?

If the answer to the above is in the affirmative will the Minister further state:

- (a) Does this ban on trade extend to Barbados?
- (b) Are there penalties for contravening this ban?
- (c) Is the Minister aware that local business places are contravening this ban by importing goods from South Africa via New York and London?
- (d) What steps does the Minister intend to take to ensure that this ban on such trade is upheld by Barbadians?

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to move that this be deferred, Sir, as I understand there is a Report from the Joint Select Committee which was set up by this Honourable House in relation to consideration of the Land Law Bills on the Order Paper. An interim report is now being processed and is not quite ready yet.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

RESOLUTION RE DEATH OF THE LATE MR. CLIFFORD BELFIELD SEARLES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, while we were in recess, we received news of the death of the late Clifford Belfield Searles. He was a member of this House between the period 1956–1961 as a Junior

Member for the Parish of St. James, and he had reached the ripe age of 91 years when he died.

I, myself, had the good fortune of knowing the late Clifford Belfield Searles in his last years as a politician. He obviously had a remarkable career in politics in Barbados, for those of us who know Barbados would recognise the courage it took for a person like the late Clifford Belfield Searles to have associated himself with the Barbados Labour Party from an early date.

He claimed that he suffered for his conviction in that his employers at some period of time in his employment disagreed so greatly with his association that they terminated his services.

He was, in addition, a Vestryman of the Parish of St. James for a number of years and during the course of his service in public life in Barbados he was a vigorous proponent of the view that all Barbadians, irrespective of their class, colour and creed were entitled to equal opportunity in Barbados and that the resources of Barbados should be used for the betterment of all.

As is usual, Sir, on behalf of the Government, Sir, I would like to extend to his surviving relatives the deepest sympathy and I hope, Sir, that they are comforted by the knowledge that Mr. Searles made an outstanding contribution in the public life of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before the hon. member for St. Philip South speaks the Opposition would like to join with the sentiments expressed by the Leader of the House. I served in here and I think I am the only surviving member of that era. I served in here with Mr. Searles and I was not as closely associated with his work in Local Government and the hon. member for St. Philip South who was much better acquainted with him than I was in this particular field has asked for permission to express his personal condolence on this matter, but I should like to join with the Leader of the House in expressing our regrets to Mr. Searles' passing.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, on such an occasion as this, it is indeed a privilege and an honour for me to associate myself from the depth of my heart with the passing of this Resolution on the death of a former member of Parliament, James Clifford Belfield Searles who, Sir, did reach longevity and has now gone to a better and peaceful place.
12.35 p.m.

The late Mr. Searles not only served as a member of the House of Assembly from 1956 to 1961, he also rendered invaluable honorary service as a Vestryman for many years. You, Sir, will forgive me if I appear for

one moment to be insular or parochial on this occasion when I state today that of all the members in this Hon. House I am in the unique position here today to appreciate the invaluable service he has rendered to the community.

Now, Sir, I would also state that having served as a Vestryman for a long time, subsequently a Councillor, and later in Local Government from its inception to its abolition, I have no doubt you will agree with me that I have had similar experience to the late Mr. Searles. Those were the days when the plantocracy and the arch conservations dominated and controlled not only Local Government but Central Government. I regret to state that in those days I was considered as a young, rude, pugnacious and vicious person but with my determination to serve my people I never looked back, and today I too am a member of this Parliament and have almost the rare honour of serving for four consecutive terms. Others, I have no doubt, should try to emulate that. It is therefore a consolation to me to be here today as the only member of the old brigade who have travelled through the rough and narrow path and the Vestry system, and subsequently the Local Government system.

Now, I am a member of this House to express my deep and sincere gratitude to the family of the late Mr. Searles for the yeoman service he has given this country in Local and Central Government. This can only be attributed to his tenacity of spirit. It took men in those days with the courage, tenacity of spirit and love for their people to pave the way for others who can now carry on where they left off with less discomfort and faster speed than their predecessors.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Searles can be placed in this category of the old school. On these occasions it is noticeable that we are non-partisan and always call a spade a spade, and we always render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's regardless of party affiliation, colour, class, race or creed. It is therefore a tonic to my mind to hear kudos showered on the late Belfield Searles, and therefore I will say that all is not lost in this country. My only regret, since I was a member of this House of Assembly, is to witness the trend of thoughts by a few youngsters, or young people, who through their academic achievement take false and ignorant pride in attempting to belittle, humiliate and relegate in public those who belong to the old brigade and who stand up for their right and are alive and have made a tangible contribution to the improvement of the masses so that they could now have the opportunity to serve in this country. This, Mr. Speaker, is an abominable sin, and I pray that the practice will discontinue as soon as possible. We must learn to display our commonsense and appreciation for those people who had a long way to travel before their

assessment from the contribution they have made to this country, can be fully accepted.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore fitting for me to express my deepest and sincerest sympathy to the relatives of the late Mr. Searles and to state that his leaving this world makes it almost impossible for a replacement in his category. May his soul rest in peace and may we who are left behind instil in our minds that what a man sows he reaps, even if it takes his entire life time and he may have to reminisce on the past whether it be good or bad, and if it is bad to pay the extreme penalty of remorse. May God bless the late Mr. Searles in his grave.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I must rise so quickly after the last speaker. At one stage I was wondering if his remarks were in tribute to the dead or if he was concerned with the living. I am told, knowing the late Mr. Searles well, that he would not have wanted anyone here to rise to say anything in his behalf unless the person so doing was free from anger, hatred or animosity, and therefore the speech which was just made was in poor taste and not a speech Mr. Searles would have wanted to hear. It seems to be becoming fashionable in this House for hon. members to take the occasion to pronounce on matters which should not be pronounced upon, and I want to see the day when members can rise above petty politics and speak in terms as men who occupy hon. places in the community in which they live.

Mr. Searles was well known to me and I have the honour to represent part of the constituency he had the honour to represent and incidentally the area in which he lived up to the time of his death is the area that I have the honour to represent in this Hon. House. Mr. Searles and the distinction of being one of the few people with the courage of the times in which he lived to challenge the vested interests of the mercantile community and the plantocracy. In his day it took a man of tremendous courage to have challenged no less a person than the wealthy businessman and planter, the late J. H. Wilkinson, and the late Keith Walcott, the then Attorney General. It took tremendous courage to come out along with the progressive forces of the day, with the vanguard of the Barbados Labour Party, and align himself on the side of the poor and give strength and encouragement to the forces of progress under the leadership of the late Sir Grantley Adams.

Mr. Searles did a wonderful job in his time and I think we who are here should feel honoured to come along in his footsteps and occupy the place that it was his fortune to occupy. I would like to know that this honourable House, free from anger, free from hatred and malice, has this day paid humble and respectful tribute to the service which the late Mr. Searles rendered to this

community. In that day it took a man of great courage, and when you consider the reputation of Mr. Searles, one must agree that it called for a great deal of strength and courage for a man to come out against people like himself. In this regard I would also mention the name of the late A.E.S. Lewis who also aligned himself with the progressive movement of the day.

I would just like to put the record straight and pay my humble tribute to a simple, honest, straightforward and down-to-earth man whom it was our good fortune to know and who lived among us and made a contribution to the progress of this country. I sincerely hope that what we say today will serve as a tonic to his family and tend to lift the load of his death from off their shoulders.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I would be failing in my duty if I did not associate myself with the remarks made by hon. members on both sides of this House in expressing sympathy to the family of the late Mr. C. B. Searles, and in a very small way pay a simple and humble tribute to the work of the man.

I have been fortunate up to now to be the representative for the parish of St. James, the parish which Mr. Belfield Searles represented for five years. I recall that when I went to St. James in 1966, completely unknown politically — I hardly knew the roads in St. James at the time — I found myself in Orange Hill and Mr. Searles was one of the people I was introduced to as a man who would give me a helping hand. And in occupying a seat in this Chamber, part of my success was due to the course which the late Mr. C. B. Searles helped charter for me.

I am unable to speak in any glowing terms of his work as a Vestryman or Parliamentarian, but from what I have heard, historians would have a good field for research and those who are interested in the history of political development of Barbados would find it interesting reading when they learn what Mr. C. B. Searles had to face and how he faced it. It took a man of great courage and nerves of steel for one with that pigmentation to have fought for the people against the masters of that day. I am therefore particularly happy not only to have associated myself with Mr. Searles in the evening of his days but also to be still associated with the party which he recognized as the one to lead the struggle to relieve the masses of the problems they had to face in this country. I am happy also for the fact that Mr. Searles was able to see his party in victory. He stood by them when they tasted defeat and live long enough to see them recapture the reins of Government. Like my colleagues on both sides of the House I want to extend to Mr. Searles's family and those closely associated with him my deepest sympathy and to say that his life's work has been recognised and that in me as the representative for St.

James there is still some of the courage which he has left behind.

12.55 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this motion, personally as an old friend of the family of Mr. Belfield Searles. I did not have the honour of sitting in the House with Mr. Searles, but as you would know, Sir, he remained a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party and an active member; and his voice was lent determinedly in the decade of 80 and 90 which I believe he reached. Mr. Searles even formed the subject, I believe, a couple of years ago of a controversial debate here in Parliament; and I had to smile at the fact that even at the age of 90 slanders were still pursuing a person of so devoted a friend of the working classes of this country in his 90th year.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, the incident when Mr. Searles had to ask me on the telephone to deny certain statements made about him by someone who is still a member of the House in relation to events that had happened in 1960. Nonetheless, let us leave those things; and no doubt the remorse to which the hon. member for St. Philip South referred has come to pass in these speeches here today.

Belfield Searles belonged to a generation of Barbadians that was heavily political in its outlook and when political issues were the foremost issues. The parish of St. James was then the bastion of rural conservatism in this country. Election after election it had returned the leader of the then Conservative Party and his deputy, who became Leader of the Opposition in 1951. Those who fought against conservative interests invariably found themselves penalised. Those who made no threats to "The Rock" found themselves receiving boons and benefits which they would little have expected when they were members of the Barbados Labour Party or if they supported the Barbados Labour Party.

Belfield Searles was not one such. Despite his colour, and his position as a small land owner and his apparent community of interest with the Conservatives of the day, he fought for what he thought was right. He supported the Barbados Labour Party fruitlessly in 1944, 1946 and 1948 when Mr. Talma, Mr. Crick and others ran. He supported Mr. Ellsworth Holder under the famous slogan of "one gone" in 1951, and he himself saw to the political demise of the other when he defeated the then leader of the Opposition and obtained his seat in 1956.

He fell before the political scythe in 1961; but his work lives on, and his friendship lives on in the hearts of those who knew him. God rest his memory, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that all members of the House

of Assembly will certainly say so in supporting the Resolution of Condolence to his sorrowing relatives.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to be associated with the sentiments expressed by hon. members of both sides of the House. There can be no doubt that Mr. Searles in his own right was a champion. It can be said as well that he saw the light of day at a pretty early hour. He was a gentleman who could have been taken at his word; and I am sure that he lived to see and to know that his many friends have had much to say and much value to place on the contribution that he has made to the political wilderness which existed at the time in Barbados.

I can give hon. members the assurance that instructions will be given that the remaining members of his family will learn at first hand of the interest shown in Mr. Searles' work here today and with as speedy a hand as possible. I will ask hon. members to pay their last respects to Mr. Searles by standing with me for a minute in silence.

Members stood in their places for one minute in silence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

APOLOGY BY MR. GREAVES

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we proceed to the Orders of the Day, I recall that on the last occasion during the month of November — I think it was the 21st day of November — that the hon. member for St. Lucy took part in a debate in this Hon. House, the occasion arose when the Chair had to call on that hon. member to withdraw certain remarks which he had used. The hon. member on that occasion disobeyed the authority of the Chair, and I ruled that the hon. member, before taking his place in this Hon. House, would have to apologise and withdraw those remarks and apologise for his ill behaviour. The occasion has now arisen when I observe that the hon. member is present again. He must withdraw those remarks now and apologise to this Hon. House.

1.05 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must now apologise to the House for his mis-behaviour.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I would want to apologise for the occasion to which you refer but I am sure that you will appreciate.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You can only apologise full stop.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 1.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of the sum of money for the service of the Island.

Mr. SISNETT: 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. 22

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$58,526 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. 22, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the first Head is 3(2) — Other Personal Allowances in the amount of \$20,270. This particular item is used to pay the housing and entertainment allowance for the Chief Establishments Officer and at the moment for the Permanent Secretary — Special Assignments, who is attached to the Ministry of Agriculture.

The amount was under-estimated, far from the additional burden as proposed by the appointment of a Permanent Secretary Special Assignments; and it is necessary to ask for this sum also to permit the supplementary of the housing and entertainment allowance following the increase of emoluments to public officers.

I beg to move that Head 3(2) now stand part.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am just seeking some information. I wonder if the Minister could inform us as to the special assignments which are being carried out by the Permanent Secretary to whom he referred and the relationship of those assignments towards the overall improvement and development of agriculture in this country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member must temporarily be taking over the role of Public

Relations Officer for the Government if he asks the Government to outline the duties of Special Assignments Officer.

As is known, Sir, the Government places a great deal of importance on proper expansion in the area covered by the Ministry of Agriculture and we have conceptualized a number of schemes over and above the previous plans existing in the Ministry. These include the Development Plan of the Scotland District, the plan known as the rural Integrated Development Scheme. It also includes the Oistin's Development and new Development at Spring Hall. I think there is one other. The total amount is in the area of \$60 million, and the Barbados Marketing Corporation project which is an old project, and the Scotland District, the Minister of Agriculture will be able, if necessary, to debate at length. I do not know if that is what the hon. member wants or if he only wants to know the names of the schemes but it is felt that the Scotland District needs a recycling surge forward.

The Government owns estates there. It would not do very well to lose money on the fruit planting schemes. Hon. members of the House would recall when we were taken on a tour during the last Parliament to the Scotland District area and when we got down to Haggatts would recall that all the fruit planting schemes that had been counted up in the debate had not in fact been carried out and many of us bore witness to a very angry exchange between the then Minister, Mr. DaCosta Edwards, and the official as to why the fruit trees had not been planted and as a result of the visit of the House that day, the acreage of trees along the banks of the Belleplaine River were planted and are already producing, but this is only a piece-meal approach to what is needed.

In company with the present Minister of Agriculture and other officials, I took the President of the Inter-American Development Bank for a tour of the District. We looked at the Joes River muds of the Scotland Formation itself. We looked at the areas where erosion was most obvious and we also looked at some of the work which the Government was doing and as a result of our ideas and the views which the Bank had at the time we were able to formulate a very long-term development plan of the area involving the injection of a really large amount of capital.

The rural integration scheme is drawn out of the Barbados Labour Party's pledge to permit plantation tenants to buy spots of land which they own on very favourable terms.

1.15 p.m.

At an early stage during the new administration representatives of the plantation owners came to my

office and met with various Ministers concerned, and broad agreement to permit plantation tenants to buy under a Government scheme that will be set up by legislation the spots which they own was reached. For this reason, and an incidental part of this reason, indeed it will be observed that we are more or less freezing sales at what were not commercial but very high prices of plantation tenantry lands to the tenants, because the Government aims when we create the legal framework for the transfer of title to make it extremely easy financially for the tenants to get the house spots, but different considerations arose in connection with the small holdings which plantation tenants at present rent from the plantations. In many cases these small pieces of land are adjacent to a tenantry, or comprise parcels which it is not feasible economically for the plantation to farm and it therefore encourages workers on the plantation to take up the half acre of land or quarter acre of land as the case may be, sometimes one acre or more, and put it generally into canes so that it contributes to the general output of the plantation.

It was considered that some scheme of development should be applied to the agricultural small-holdings at present farmed by the tenants. It is possible to give the tenants parcels or spots for amounts of money to be measured in hundreds rather than thousands of dollars. That is possible, mechanical means have to be devised, decisions have to be taken on surveying problems and so on, but that was easy to see. The position, however, with selling off agricultural land to the tenants without some development scheme created further difficulties, and I wish to pay tribute to a Minister, who is not a representative of an agricultural constituency, and has a Ministry which has nothing to do with agriculture — I refer to the Attorney General — for the initiative which he has taken in this matter, because a great deal of the preliminary work was done by his Ministry and by him.

What we are devising is an integrated rural development scheme to allow these plantation small holders to have access to irrigation, to farming advice and to market facilities, to encourage the putting of the small holdings into vegetables under terms at least as favourable as those which the plantation itself is allowed, or enjoys at the present time, and the Inter-American Development Bank has also shown an interest in this project, and, as you may have read in the newspaper, Mr. Chairman, an appraisal team is coming within the next couple of months to analyse the possibilities for this. We believe that it can mean a great upsurge in vegetable production in this country, because we are dealing with people who are already interested and knowledgeable about land, of agricultural matters. We are dealing with land which they are accustomed to working. What we are doing is giving them an interest in land irrigation and a marketing framework, and we

believe that with the transfer of title will come the general development of the tenancies — very recently Cabinet has taken a decision, for example, to make enquiries of the Barbados Light and Power Company as to all remaining areas in the country of Barbados that do not have electricity and see their proposals for bringing electricity to every last house in the country, where this is possible. The Ministry of Communications and Works is also, in conjunction with the Town Planner, looking at all the plantation tenancies, all country areas in fact, with a view to finalising the road programme and to make sure that they can all get roads, and this is what we are describing as the integrated rural development scheme.

We are also, Sir, not confining the facilities to facilities for plantation tenants only. In suitable areas where there is a large peasantry arising out of a previously cut up plantation, the schemes are going to be extended. I have forgotten the names of tenancies which have already been examined by the survey teams, I think Halton Tenancy in St. Philip, Drax Hall in St. George, Bushy Park in St. Philip South. It does seem that notwithstanding the aridity of St. Philip where rainfall is concerned that there are abundant water resources available for irrigation. These are the areas which have been looked at, a census has been carried out by the Statistical Department of all the plantation tenancies in Barbados, the needs of the tenants and the wishes of the tenants to take part in the agricultural part of the scheme are being investigated, and we are very much hoping to get off the ground with the scheme. The preliminary work we hope to complete this year and we very much hope to get off the ground with the scheme during next year.

I have spent some time on this, Sir, because so far as I am aware the details have not been given to the House before. The other schemes are perhaps better known, the BMC is one which we have inherited and which we have had to shuffle about. Springhall, Sir, I think I can say at this stage that the Government has rejected the previous concept of creating what seemed to us to be a bungalow development at Springhall in which the greater part of the money would go into building bungalows and which perhaps might have encouraged some danger of attracting people there for the residential facilities rather than the agricultural facilities, and with the aid of the Caribbean Development Bank we have almost brought the new plan to the stage where it can be published. It will be similar in so far as it will be a settlement plan, but part of the expense will be removed to make it easier for people who are interested in agriculture but really need to enjoy the settlement facilities.

The Oistins development scheme I think is also well known, Sir, this is to be carried out with funds

supplied by the European Development Facility. A better fishing port will be built at Oistins and there will be some landing and processing facilities, there will also be physical developments within the town of Oistins itself, the Police Station will be altered, a new Magistrates' Court will be built there. The Leader of the House is very anxious that the Post Office be improved and that other facilities be brought to the district, but I think the outlines are well known to hon. members. That is the work being done by the Permanent Secretary — Special Assignments, because we feel that it is impossible to ask the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture who carries a heavy load already in dealing with the day to day misfortunes of the Agricultural Development Corporation — no matter how well we are pulling the BMC up at present, Sir, we still have to bear with critics even in this House who say that it should be closed down and the 200 workers sent home, we still have to bear with that and try to justify its continued existence — and we think that with that and the ordinary work of the Ministry of Agriculture it would have been impossible for a Permanent Secretary to bring to bear on these new duties all the attention which they deserve. I think that the appointment when viewed in that light will not be regarded by the hon. member for St. Michael South as an unnecessary or redundant or purely bureaucratic one.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I raised this question because to the best of my knowledge it had nothing to do with any public relations of the Government. I believe the Government has a Press Aide, it has all the resources of the Prime Minister's Office, it has the Government Information Service, and it has its own party organs through which it can put forward its public relations programme.

1.25 p.m.

What I am concerned about is the place of Parliament in the national affairs of this country, and I think towards the end of his contribution — and I am grateful to the Prime Minister for explaining the programme to be followed even though he conceived it as only a public relations job — I am interested in the information concerning the Special Assignments Officer and I am grateful to him for giving the information. He did say towards the end of his address that it was the first time as far as he could recall that that type of information was being given to this Chamber in respect of the duties of the Special Assignments Officer, and it is precisely because of this that I have risen. I believe that when we have important developments Parliament should be one of the first places where such developments should be aired. I read in the Press some time ago that there was some major policy statement made by the new Minister of Agriculture, and he has kindly promised to let me have a copy of that new policy statement and I am looking forward to receiving it.

What is interesting, Mr. Chairman, — and I know that as a representative of an agricultural constituency you have a deep interest in these matters — what is interesting to note is that the Minister of Agriculture, to the best of my knowledge, outside of the Prime Ministerial domain is the only other Minister — I am speaking subject to correction — and the possible exception also of the Minister for Caribbean Affairs and Trade and his other appurtenances — are perhaps the only two Ministers who have a second Permanent Secretary, and I would like to believe that this has nothing to do with the administrative problems of placing Permanent Secretaries and finding places for outstanding public officers in any shuffle of Permanent Secretaries. I would like to believe that it had to do with a Governmental thrust into the field of agriculture, although that particular point has not been made and we have not been told that, because we have not seen this new agricultural plan laid before Parliament. But with the provision of a second Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture and with the translation of a former Minister of Communications and Works into the Agriculture Ministry, and with the removal of the expert *par excellence* from that particular Ministry, we are certainly looking forward for this agricultural development thrust to get off the ground. We have had some efforts and they have come to nought. I would like to say that there is a very great problem and a great challenge facing this Minister. With two Permanent Secretaries, with a rural development scheme, the Scotland district, Oistins, Spring Hall, the BMC and all these special assignments — as the Prime Minister did indicate we do know these things very well, which suggests that they have a history maybe a little longer than the present administration — but with all of these schemes I will ask him to ensure that there is a coordinated approach to the development of agriculture in this country and that these two Permanent Secretaries consider their assignments not as separate entities but as part of a totality to raise the level of agricultural production in this country and to ensure that those who are farming, large and small alike, may be able to produce the agricultural commodities required in this country and for export and that their incomes may appreciate considerably. I would like to say that however much the talk and how ever much the public relations, there has been a grave breakdown in certain of the agricultural purposes of this country. The whole motor tractor cultivation scheme seems to be in disarray and a whole planting season has passed and the food which small farmers in this country would have planted they have not been able to do so because of the breakdown in that motor tractor cultivation scheme. I see the hon. member for St. James is smiling. I know he has some constituents, as well as other hon. members who represent agricultural constituencies, and including small farmers in particular have been unable, in spite of the brave talk that has been said about agriculture, to

get their land cultivated. I believe that any hon. member on that side would be able to confirm this if they take an interest in the agricultural development of this country, and I hope that the Minister when he gets up will be able to say something on this matter because we are not going to get agricultural production unless lands can be cultivated, and if the tractors and the services are not available then this is a major problem. I would like him to tell us the arrangement in terms of the repair of these tractors and whether he has a specific programme either under the special assignment or under ordinary assignment to rectify what are obvious deficiencies in the agricultural services of this country.

I do not wish to go any further into this matter but I am bringing it to the attention of the Minister. I know he will try to put his particular stamp on the Ministry of Agriculture and I certainly hope that he can without rancour address himself to the problems of agriculture and do a reasonable job during the year.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWIATE: Mr. Chairman, the last hon. member has made a number of requests and certainly I am wondering if in a short session I can give him the type of comprehensive replies that he would wish for. However, in very brief manner I would like to answer a few of the points made by him, but let me preface my remarks by saying that the Ministry of Agriculture is certainly today in a far healthier position by way of projecting problems and getting to grips with problems than it was two and a half years or three years or up to fifteen years ago.
1.35 p.m.

I can tell you that for sure. We know exactly where we are going, we know what we want and we are prepared to get what we want. There is a question which the hon. member asked me which I want to deal with first. I understand that the question was about the tractor service. The service which the Government offers is a very cheap type of service; and I am a firm believer in giving subsidies to farmers in some respects; but one must ask oneself the question whether we should give the subsidy at the cultivation level or whether we should give it at the product finished end. Now, we have been seeing developing in Barbados a situation where because the tractor service is cheap, many people employed the tractors to have their lands ploughed up, and then in a matter of weeks we see the lands again in grass.

Now, who suffers as a result of this? The Government itself suffers, also the people who own the land — I imagine that with goodwill they want to work that land — but for some reason or another the land is ploughed up and put in good shape and again goes back into grass. A second application is made for the land to

be put into preparation and when the Government is unable to satisfy these demands you get a hue and cry that the tractor service is not available.

There is something further I can tell you, Sir. That service is costing the Government a tremendous amount of money. I want to be very blunt in saying what I have to say this afternoon. I am regarded as a blunt speaker and I will continue to be blunt in saying what I feel on these matters. I had these problems in the workshop of the Ministry of Communications and Works, and again I am equally having these problems within the Ministry of Agriculture. You have the people who look after the tractors and who are permanently paid; and the tractors for some reason or other are invariably in the workshop. Sometimes you hardly know what is wrong with them. You just know that they are there, and what you do not know is whether the people you pay weekly for looking after the tractors are performing their various functions. It would seem to me that the whole system of the tractor service needs revamping, and I am looking at that area. The Government subsidy for the tractor service is very high; and the Government is not getting returns from the people for the type of expenditure which is put into the cultivation section of the Ministry of Agriculture.

As a matter of fact, I get many complaints from people as far as the extension services in the Ministry of Agriculture are concerned. This is an area which I am looking at. We have got a large staff in the Ministry of Agriculture, but one has to ask oneself if it is really performing and if we are really getting the maximum out of the staff which is provided by the Ministry. We get cases where there are genuine breakdowns in the mechanical units, but there are cases in which to my belief the breakdowns are not so genuine. These are matters which we have to look at.

On the question of the two Permanent Secretaries, I had better make the position clear on that. The Permanent Secretary's special assignment is looking after the developmental side of the Ministry of Agriculture. There are a number of projects that have recently come under the wings of the Ministry of Agriculture. There is no way that one Permanent Secretary could ever handle the number of projects which have to be handled. There is the matter of co-ordination. There would be no case otherwise. The co-ordinating person is the Minister of Agriculture. He is the person who has to co-ordinate, and therefore it is a fact that if they are working with me, and responsible to me for what they are doing, you cannot expect a Permanent Secretary who has got the whole Ministry to look after, Consumer Affairs, Food, and what have you to look after all these things. I am told every day that I have additional work to do in the Ministry of Agriculture. One man cannot do all the work. Therefore, if you have the Oistin Development,

and you have the Spring Hall Development and the Rural Integrated Development and the Scotland Development Programme, there is no way how one man can handle all those projects. Therefore an additional man is needed.

There is no question of panning somebody off somewhere. If you do not have a Permanent Secretary to send, you will have to create an office of specialist officer to handle the projects which we are now carrying out. The hon. member for St. Michael South asked questions about the agricultural plan. The agricultural plan, I suppose, should be known. I note that in the past the members opposite always referred to the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. I want to assure them that that is still the gospel as such of the Barbados Labour Party, and whatever you see in there having to do with agriculture continues to be the gospel of the Barbados Labour Party as far as agriculture is concerned.

The Prime Minister did not mention it just now, but I am prepared to mention it to you, Sir. As a result of the type of developments carried on in the Scotland area by way of developing fruit trees etc., we have got something like five acres of cherry trees down there; and in the first picking of cherries they were able to get a profit of something like \$10,000; and we should look very carefully at the Scotland area from the point of view not of producing vegetables, not to any extent, but fruit on a large scale.

In the areas which are not so good for the production of fruit, there are certain areas in which you can continue to grow canes. In the Sedgepond area something like 50 acres of land has been leased to a co-operative group there; and they are asking for an additional 50 acres of land; and they are doing a very good system. I would hope that in the fullness of time, actually all of the land which is under the Agricultural Development Corporation and in areas that are not producing as well as they should will do so because if the Agricultural Development Corporation does not perform, this Government would not allow itself to be strangled and the taxpayers' money to be frittered away by any corporation that is operating under the Government. We must make sure that those which are operating as a business in fact operate in a proper way, and if we feel that the lands in the Scotland area can be leased to farmers who can handle them better than the Government, let the farmers handle them.

As a matter of fact, when the Scotland area was taken over by the past Government they were just relieving the owners of the Scotland estates of the great headaches which they had over the years; but I would have thought that the best thing that they should have done long ago was to let the people who can handle

these lands handle them. I am glad to know that there are people within the Sedgepond area who are willing to work 100 acres; and I would hope that more people would come forward to work if they are so inclined.

There is one thing which I am happy to say this afternoon, and it is that despite the down-grading of agriculture by the previous regime, that people today are again moving very determinedly into the area of agriculture. My prediction, the ridicule, by a journalist in the Nation notwithstanding, will certainly be accomplished with goodwill on all sides as a result of the thrust which is being made in agriculture. I have no doubt that the steps which the Government has taken and is taking will go very far in bringing out a complete revolution in the area of agriculture.

1.45 p.m.

I do not know if I have answered sufficiently the questions asked by the hon. member. I promise him that the programme of action enunciated by me in the area of agriculture will be posted to him very shortly. I have given instructions that this should be done, I am surprised that they were not sent to him but I assure him that in a matter of days he will be receiving a copy of the promised policies which I have enunciated.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, over the past seven years or so we have been hearing a lot about the interest of the Barbados Labour Party in the development of agriculture in this country. I will not choose to respond to remarks about the down-grading of agriculture by the Democratic Labour Party. I would prefer, Sir, to express the view before this Hon. House that as I see it, looking down the next 10, 20 years in the development of this country, that Agriculture and Tourism would probably represent the two major areas that would be giving the best economic returns and most likely to bring the best benefits to the people of this country.

It is noted that over the past year significant incentives have been given in the hotel industry and in relation to the manufacturing sector and it is my firm belief that the time has come, when in consideration of the overall development of agriculture, its linkage with tourism should be considered, and that due consideration should be given not only to its potential in terms of feeding the local population, serving the needs of the additional population that we anticipate from the projected increases in the number of tourists coming to Barbados from year to year and also that we should be getting very heavily into serious agro-industrial development with a view to taking more of the glut situation that occurs from time to time with many of our major products.

It would seem to me that the same level of tax incentives which have been accorded to these other areas might be seriously considered in relation to agriculture apart from other methods suggesting the fostering the growth of co-operatives, making land available to people who are *bona fides* farmers and also that our housing programmes should somehow take into consideration the possibilities of setting up groups of houses or housing areas where a man can not only have a home but also have additional means of making a living by having some land attached to it.

I say this because, Mr. Chairman, if you look back historically down the years in Barbados, they are many of us who have been brought up and who have been able to live satisfactory lives largely because our parents may have had access to half an acre or an acre of land that provided substantially in terms of the monies that came into that household and in terms of what we ate from day to day, and this would contribute to a saving in foreign exchange and also help to feed this community. So I would make a plea, Mr. Chairman, that we should look very carefully into the question of taxation in relation to agriculture and see what tax incentives of a serious nature can be introduced in the area to stimulate the further growth of agriculture in this country.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not think that one should leave this Debate without attempting to clarify some of the real misconceptions which obviously exist in the minds of hon. members of the other side as to the purpose and indeed of the policies which this Government has been carrying out in the course of the last two years and which this Government has been advocating over the last 20 years of its existence.

I am very glad to see that the hon. members on that side have now recognized that there should be a linkage between Tourism and Agriculture. That has always been the policy of this Government from as long ago as the 1950's when it started off by saying that we recognise that to satisfy demand for employment and economic opportunities in Barbados we will have to pursue a policy not only in agriculture but also of diversification in the form of tourism and industrial Development.

Now what I want to get over is that Barbados is no different from any other country in the world. There is a limit to the amount of employment that can be generated in agriculture. There is a limit to the amount. Luckily for us, we have practically gone through the revolution in respect of loss of agricultural employment. As a matter of fact, today permanent employees in agriculture are probably about 5% or 6% of the labour force which is the sort of percentage of

employment in agriculture that you get in developed countries.

What we need here now is to ensure that we have a system of tenure that permits people who want to be genuine farmers to have access to land. I am not talking about people who want to be part-time farmers and things like that. We need to have a system of tenure which permits people who want to be full-time professional farmers to have access to land. It is for that reason that the Government is pursuing the policy of the rural integrated development scheme and also pursuing the policy of being a model landowner and trying to devise a fashion of an agricultural lease which would permit people without the need for large capital sums to buy land so as to have access to the land.

We are not a tenants — farmers society. In this country, what was permitted under the Democratic Labour Party was that speculators were allowed to cut up agricultural land in order to make great capital gains and sell it at such a price that the genuine people who wanted to engage in fulltime agriculture could not afford to pay the capital cost of the land and buy equipment and the other agricultural machinery which was necessary.
1.55 p.m.

That is why we reviewed that. As a matter of fact, it can be statistically proven now, not according to the statistics of the Government as politicians, but according to the same Civil Service that operated under the Democratic Labour Party, that since this Government has assumed power in this country a considerable amount in acreage which was out of agriculture has come back into agriculture. That is a proven fact. The Chief Agricultural Officer has repeatedly certified that that is in fact so.

Thirdly, the Government recognises that marketing is of great importance. The Government has been giving great encouragement to the development of industrial activity which is complementary to agricultural production in the sense that processing takes place with raw material which is produced. We were the ones who had to solve the question of the lack of planning on the part of the Democratic Labour Party in respect of BARPAC, and while this Government is trying its best to preserve a balance between the local pig producers and satisfying the interest of consumers who have specialist tastes and consumers whom we have to ensure are not exploited, we are receiving not the support of the Opposition, not the support of the Leader of the Opposition and others, we receive abuse from the other side when we are trying to do the delicate act of balancing. Obviously, if you want

to ensure that there is a measure of protection for your local producer, at the same time in the interest of the consumers you have to ensure that a few monopolists in your country do not exploit a situation and not take into account your consumers' interest. That is a difficult job to do and we have done it successfully in relation to pig production, and we are moving further.

There is a cannery in Barbados now, and there is a row over raw material costs. There is a cannery which is capable of canning some of our vegetables, and there is a row over raw material costs. The farmers feel they want one thing, the cannery says if it buys it at that it will have to sell it at that. This is not an unusual experience, that the interest of the producers, those who sell for ready market, is not the same as for the people who produce for processors. If you had made a study of what took place in Europe in agriculture and in other countries of the world, you would know that there is this constant battle going along between the producer, and that battle. . . .

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, what point of elucidation. I am not giving way, he has no point of elucidation. Give way what, man. What foolishness are you talking. Learn the rules of the House.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, it being 2 o'clock, I will come back and deal with them.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 today.
2.05 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, earlier today I asked that the Item "Reports of Select Committees" be deferred until an appropriate occasion. It is now the appropriate occasion, and I beg to move that this Item be now taken.

REPORT FROM SELECT COMMITTEE

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that the Joint Select Committee appointed by this Honourable House has submitted a Report. It is an interim report and deals with the Committee's consideration of three Bills, namely a Bill to make provision in respect of property, a Bill dealing with Trustees, and a Bill relating to Charities. The Committee has completed consideration of these Bills and has made a recommendation to this House that these Bills are in the opinion of the Committee fit to be passed with the amendments suggested, and the Committee is asking leave to sit again and report further within eight weeks. The Committee is asking that the House accept the interim report and are asking for a further eight weeks in order to complete consideration of the three remaining Bills. Accordingly, Sir, I beg to lay this interim report.

The question that the Joint Select Committee be granted an extension of eight weeks was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. There are no replies to Questions so we move on to Private Members Business.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I am of the view that the Resolution standing in my name dealing with the apprenticeship system is time barred, and in the circumstances I do not think that I can proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 2. of Private Members Business — I do not see the hon. member for St. Michael South West in his place. This therefore brings us to the end of Private Members Business. Government Business is the instant order of the day.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee to resume consideration of a money Resolution which was being discussed earlier.

The question that the House go into Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. ODLE took the Chair in Committee.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to point out the misconception as to the real thrust of the government plan in the minds of the other side and I had reached the stage where I was explaining the delicate balance that the Government had to face between giving a reasonable measure of protection to local production and the interests of the consumers so

that they could be satisfied that prices were reasonable. In this respect we were not receiving the help one would have expected from the other side, especially from the Leader of the Opposition. Not so long ago he is reported to have told the Hotel Association that as far as he is concerned they should be given unlimited opportunity to import what they like. I hope that I will never again read such an irresponsible statement. I hope the hon. member for St. Michael South Central recognises the irresponsibility of that statement, because it runs directly counter to what the hon. member has been saying in here today, namely, that one must try to preserve a linkage between tourism and the demand generated by tourism and see as far as possible that the demand can be satisfied from local production.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Sir, I think that the hon. member for St. John was simply trying to point out that there would always be special need in relation to the hotel industry.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot elucidate another hon. member's remarks.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member is on the horns of a dilemma. He does not want to point out the obviously stupid statement allegedly made by the hon. member for St. John. The basic position is that we have to try to reconcile these two conflicting interests, and this Government has done better than any other Government, not only in Barbados but in the Caribbean, because we have created a Committee which would review the decisions of the Chief Licensing Officer and we permit both the Hotel Association and the farmers and other interested parties to put their respective positions, and after that a rational decision is arrived at. No longer in this country is any decision given on such an important matter on the basis of favouritism, and I challenge any hon. member on the other side to point out where this Government in its price control administration has not given a fair hearing to any member on the public, importer or consumer.

I go further. On the question of tax incentives — and this is a difficult area — under the CARICOM arrangement there is a scheme for the harmonization of fiscal incentives. At the time that the Common External Tariff and the scheme were devised unfortunately insufficient attention was paid, in my opinion, to the question of agricultural development. As a matter of fact, if one analyses the duty on the import of inputs into agricultural production in any of the territories, you will find that there were a number of items which were not capable of being produced within the area, but notwithstanding the importance of the need for greater agricultural production there was duty on these items; and we in Barbados as soon as we assumed power in this country requested a waiver of duty on a number of these items. I myself took the matter before

the CARICOM Trade Council in Guyana and we were successful in getting the duties waived. You have to renew the waiver annually and the matter has to be monitored and at the end of every year you have to apply again. There is no difficulty in getting it, but it is the responsibility of the executive agencies in Government. As far as we are concerned there should be no duty on things like fertilizers, tractors and other agricultural inputs. We are trying to get recognition of the fact that it is the habit now of most of the territories in the CARICOM area not to impose duty on these things because there is not sufficient local production and variety in the CARICOM area. I am not talking about fertilizers that can be produced in Trinidad. Originally when the scheme was devised, the object was to make sure that there was a measure of duty protection for indigenous production within the Caribbean. But it must be remembered that because of differences in soils throughout the area a particular fertilizer which may be produced in a particular area may not necessarily be suitable in another, so one must have a flexible approach to this matter.

We go further. What other advantages does the grant of fiscal incentives give? It gives duty free raw materials. It gives the ability to have freedom from taxation in respect of profits. One of the things you will find in agriculture is that it is only in very good years that a majority of the agricultural enterprises pay income tax as such. This is because of the fact that they can take advantage of the very generous depreciation allowances. 2.55 p.m.

Generous taxation concessions are granted on initial investments and annual appreciation to the extent that there is built into the existing system of taxation; generous taxation relief concessions, as I have just said. I notice the fact that over the course of the last four or five years, with the exception of the year 1975, when we have not had good rainfall in this country, the revenue from sugar has been dropping. But I can assure hon. members that this Government has taken into consideration the need for credit in particular to the agricultural industry. It is for this reason that we have rationalised the whole of the credit agencies in relation to agriculture. We have combined them within a week under the Barbados National Bank. Only a couple of days ago hon. members would have seen where the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance signed an agreement with the Caribbean Development Bank to ensure that greater resources are made available to the Barbados National Bank for lending to farmers.

We are pursuing many other areas with a view to getting greater inflow of capital into our own lending agencies, by reforming, refashioning and redirecting by this Government so as to ensure that there is a channel of credit in the field of agriculture. We have also as a

matter of policy decided that funds should be made available to encourage greater production of food crops in this country by way of taking advantage of the water resources that have been identified in Barbados. Credit facilities will be available for the expansion of that.

The other area is the question of marketing. I have already pointed out that while one section of BARPAC is in St. Thomas, the second section is now commissioned. The Minister will obviously have to try to settle the problem about the cost of raw materials, but we have gone further. The former Minister of Agriculture felt very strongly that in this country we should try to get more of our protein locally by utilising the black belly sheep in this country. I think that the first trials must be finished by now with the mutiple crossed at the breeding unit at Sedge Pond, in St. Andrew.

Further than this, licences and the method of export of agricultural produce have been rationalised. As I understand it, today there is no question that any co-operative institution or individual or company who feel that they have a market abroad for the export of agricultural produce can get a licence from the Barbados Marketing Corporation upon the payment of a small fee and without ensuring that a certificate of origin and documentation are certified by the authority.

We have removed the so-called shackles under which the industry was operating, or said they were operating, when we came into power, mainly the fact that there was a monopoly situation in regard to export. In addition to that, at the Industrial Development Corporation we have processed an industry for the making of packaging materials in Barbados. Hon. members may not have heard of that, but that machinery is now being installed at Applewaites in St. Thomas; and we expect that the packaging material for boxing agricultural produce will be made here in Barbados, and that we will not be suffering from the difficulty which we had in the course of the last two years, namely that when we had potatoes and other produce to export, we had to rely upon the packing machinery from Trinidad or St. Lucia and because of the uncertainty of supply and the fact that those companies only catered to their domestic markets before exporting, we were often unable to match the demand for the boxes with a demand from overseas.

We wanted to remove that constraint, and we granted fiscal incentives. As I said in the Other Place in 1975, processing in this country cannot be separated from growing, and no processing can be successful unless there is a harmonious relationship between the growers and the processors. They must regard the whole thing as an integrated operation between both. That has been the history of sugar and it has acted in the mind

of every producer in Barbados that he must be part of the processing. The unfortunate thing in Barbados is that what has been embedded in the minds of producers is that they do not want to put forward the risk capital to go into the processing industry. They want other people to put forward the risk money, and, as soon as those who have taken the risk begin to make a little profit, they want to push up the price of their raw materials and squeeze the processor; but it cannot work that way. I think that they will have to make up their minds that they will go forward and be an integral part of the effort in processing, and take some of the risk at the beginning, or they will have to understand that those who have taken the risk in setting up processing machinery are entitled just as much as they are to a reasonable rate of return. That goes for the Government itself. The Government itself is committed to being part and parcel of any initiative to ensure that the processing facilities are upgraded and brought up to date.

Not only has the Minister of Agriculture been working along these lines, but I myself in my capacity as Minister for Industry, have been trying my best to gain the experience of other small countries like Ireland who went through the same difficulties as we have, of trying to convert people from growing a traditional small number of crops into more diversified agriculture. They went through the same difficulties of this conflict between the producers and the processors; and in the end what happened was that the Irish Government itself had to play the role, the leading role, in bringing together the producers and the processors, and now they have a tripartite arrangement in Ireland in which their sugar refinery which produces sugar from Barbados is also a leading shareholder in an international company, and it is a tripartite. Barbados will operate on the same lines as that.

Of course we also have the question of the Barbados Marketing Corporation and its processing facilities. Since that scheme was conceived years ago, a number of things have taken place. Let us take the poultry industry as an example. A number of these people in the poultry industry have established their own processing plants. Obviously, before one can go ahead, one has to re-evaluate the whole of these schemes and see whether in these projects as originally conceived, the *de facto* conditions are still the same.

I just want to give hon. members the assurance that far from being an unco-ordinated approach, there is a co-ordinated approach; and if hon. members will take time to put together — of course they will not have to do that in the future, because the Government's Development Plan is nearly due for publication, and hon. members will be able to read it — If hon. members will read the bible of 1976, let them look at the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party and they

will see that all we are doing is executing what we set out then.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there are just a few points that I want to make on this Resolution, particularly because the debate has taken the form to some extent of a full scale debate on agriculture, or on the agricultural policy of the Government. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Government, on this occasion when they are attempting to outline their policies on agriculture, owe it to the country to provide the answers to a number of questions which are niggling people who certainly have some concern and some appreciation of the agricultural arrangements in this community.

3.05 p.m.

The member for St. Michael South Central when he spoke related the association between production and marketing and I think that anybody who has had any kind of understanding of agriculture must recognise that these are two fruitful areas. We cannot be in a situation where we are going to be talking in terms of providing without increasing our agricultural output with a view to exporting some of the products which are produced without knowing where or attempting to establish some very close co-ordination between production and the whole question of marketing. This therefore brings me, Mr. Chairman, to two areas of concern and particularly since we are in a situation where this Resolution seeks to provide money and to provide assistance for an additional Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture.

I am wondering if the Minister or any person who will be applying on behalf of the Government will be in a position to let us know something definitely about the present existing glut in Yam production in this country. It should be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that some years ago there was a market which Barbados used to fulfil in England and my understanding is now that this market has been lost to Ghana and it has been lost through the inefficiency of the Barbados Marketing Corporation under the direction of the present administration. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the Government needs to provide us with some answers to this, whether or not yams are still being exported to England or indeed whether yams are exported anywhere at all because at present if you check at almost any plantation and a number of small farmers in Barbados you will find that yams are in abundant supply. I believe that if you have a situation where people are encouraged to plant food stuffs with a view to the export market and then be saddled with a situation of gross inefficiency on the part of the Government Department or a Government Statutory Corporation then I think that Government and the people who are responsible for that stand should be condemned. At the sametimé, Mr. Chairman, while we are at it, I think that the present Minister ought to let us know something

about the progress and the plans for the production of these exotic products — the kind of products which the former Minister of Agriculture used to talk so much about and which, of course, never got off the ground because we have not heard very much more about these exotic products such that he was able to catch the market in Miami and Timbuktu and Japan and all over the place. I think we need to have some explanation of that.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that towards the end of last year, probably November — October or November, 1978 — there was a release from the Trinidad Government which indicated that it was refusing to accept some large amount of pig-products, I believe, which were supposed to have come from Barbados. My understanding of the situation is that it has created a very serious amount of embarrassment to the Barbados Government in terms of the fact that the Trinidad Government did not trust the word which was given and my understanding is that the Agency which allegedly was to sell the pork products to a Trinidadian Government was the Barbados Marketing Corporation and not BARPAC.

I think this needs some explanation and I understand the amount is somewhere like 400,000 pounds. Indeed, it was discovered by the Trinidadian Government that these parts were not from pigs which were grown in Barbados but were imported from Canada or some other place like this and there were attempts to pass them off as products of Barbados. I think that one needs to get a very clear explanation of these things because if the Government knows nothing about it I think that, because of the kind of embarrassment which Barbadians and the Government of Barbados were subject to the Government ought to set a very clear position on this since I think it is something which is of extreme importance.

What was very interesting, Mr. Chairman, was to hear the situation from the Deputy Prime Minister because if I recall correctly, I think it was either the former Minister of Agriculture or the present Minister of Agriculture who sometime ago indicated that there were a lot of opportunities in Agriculture for people to be employed and that agriculture was not employing a large number of people in this country. The Deputy Prime Minister took the point today that with the mechanisation and with the general development of agriculture and kind of processing which countries pass through in economic life that more and more you will find that the number of people who will be required to be employed and can be absorbed in agriculture will fall.

This is a natural thing and there is economic and historical evidence to support this. But yet you hear on one occasion the Barbados Labour Party indicating very clearly that there were large numbers of jobs going

a-begging in the area of agriculture, but we have a situation now that it would seem that, with the development of experience, the irrational approach which was adopted by the Barbados Labour Party in this particular matter has changed and I think that this kind of Resolution would definitely be an indication that they are beginning to understand what is involved.

I was particularly glad, Mr. Chairman, sitting here and listening to the Deputy Prime Minister referring to the effect which the rainfall has on agriculture and particularly on sugar production. I think this is a fact which has been known for a number of years and indeed if you look at any of the publications from the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association you will see very clearly that they have been constantly making the point that indeed the relationship has been established between the high yield of sugar and rainfall, or indeed the yield of sugar represented has been directly related to rainfall.

This does not mean that the results of experimentation with the different kinds of varieties and what have you would not have an effect on the production of sugar, but certainly one of the key factors is the question of rainfall and the Deputy Prime Minister admitted today that rainfall has been the prime factor in the rising production of sugar. So I do not want to hear or, indeed, see later the Barbados Labour Party claiming that they were responsible for the rise in sugar production unless, of course, they would want to take the credit for the rise in rainfall. But we will watch the argument as it will undoubtedly develop when we come into the home stretch on the eve of a General Election.

3.15 p.m.

I think we have therefore to take these points and recognise that a lot of the things which were said by the present administration seem somewhat to have gone a little off key, and we would like to get the answers to a number of questions which have been raised. Whilst I am on my feet I think I would be failing in my duty, Mr. Chairman, if I did not in some small way allude to the Springhall Development Project. Now, the Prime Minister in his introduction — and indeed the Deputy Prime Minister — made a lot of references to and censure of the whole question of rural development and integrated rural development — notice the new kind of twist they are talking about now — an integrated rural development scheme which will be completely different. By the mere insertion of the word "integrated" it is going to be something new. But I think that the Prime Minister did say that the Springhall project is ready, it has been approved now by the Caribbean Development Bank, according to him — I was under the impression that it was approved before — but it is something new they are coming with and I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture is in a position today to give us some indication about what the plans of the Government are,

because as you will appreciate and indeed recognise, this project was conceived by the Democratic Labour Party and was, as I understand it, all ready for implementation. I would think that in as much as the Prime Minister has indicated that this plan is all ready, I feel that the House should be given the honour of knowing what these plans are.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I have sat here and listened rather attentively to a long debate which would have been more fitting if we were discussing agricultural matters, but what I see here before me is an Establishments matter and I would like to confine my remarks to that aspect.

I do recall when I was a Minister that a lot of argument used to be put up by civil servants then against having two Permanent Secretaries in a Ministry, and one of the things that I started to formulate was what has happened to the arguments they used to put up in the past when I hear that we are now going to have two Permanent Secretaries in the Ministry of Agriculture. In fact, I am now corrected that we already have them.

As I recall it, they used to put forward the argument that under the Financial and Audit Rules there is only one Accounting Officer, and if you have two Permanent Secretaries you have this problem of who will be the Accounting Officer, and also, if you have two Permanent Secretaries then there will be a question of who will be responsible for the deployment of the staff and the work as given to the staff functioning in the particular Ministry. I would like to hear from the Minister responsible for Establishments in what way has this particular matter been resolved, or if it still exists, because to my way of thinking, I would believe that in a Ministry with two Permanent Secretaries accepting the old contentions, there must be some friction between them as to who will have the control over the deployment of staff and the allocation of work for the staff in that particular Ministry. At the same time I would like to know if the setting up of another Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture will entail further staff in that Ministry to be put solely at the disposal of this new Permanent Secretary who has been given certain responsibility.

It is nice to hear the Minister of Agriculture saying that the correlation will come through him, but from the way in which the civil servants have worked in the past, one would prefer to envisage that at some time there is bound to be a lot of friction lower down, and while he may be seeking to correlate this he will find a lot of difficulty in so doing unless there is perfect harmony and understanding right down the line, especially beginning with the two Permanent Secretaries, and I thought it would be more interesting to hear the

type of arrangements to be made in the Ministry of Agriculture, and for that matter in any Ministry, where now you are introducing this concept that you can have two Permanent Secretaries, and I would believe that there are other Ministries which would be looking forward to having two Permanent Secretaries, because if you look at the question of work load in any Ministry, there are always the routine matters which we feel should be treated separately and distinctly from the matters pertaining to development, and one may very well be willing to buy the argument that if you want to speed up the development programmes of a Ministry you should have a Permanent Secretary responsible solely for that aspect of the Ministry's affairs, but at the same time one has to look at how the Civil Service has been functioning in the past and how it continues to function and ponder if the mere establishment of an additional post of Permanent Secretary will in reality facilitate the speed and efficiency with which a Ministry goes about its work, or rather introduce new problems of contention within the Ministry.

I would like to hear any one of the Ministers, particularly the Minister responsible for Establishments, responding to this aspect. I would like to repeat, Sir, while it has been very refreshing to hear all these arguments about agriculture, that I thought that the matter before us was an Establishments matter and should have been so treated.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the last hon. member who spoke, the member for St. Michael North Central, is certainly the province of the Prime Minister, but I believe as a person who has operated for a very long time as a Minister he would be acquainted with the functions of Ministries and how Ministries operate. I have spelt out in my answer to the hon. member for St. Michael South that the question of the Special Assignment Permanent Secretary is to deal with developmental functions within the Ministry of Agriculture as distinct from the day to day routine running of the Ministry of Agriculture as such. Of course, during his time as Minister of Communications and Works he certainly was not assigned the functions of the Port and therefore he would not be aware of that aspect of the functions of a Special Assignments Permanent Secretary, but within the Ministry of Communications and Works when the Port was being extended a Permanent Secretary was made available specially for that function. The totality of the vote for the Special Assignments post would certainly be far larger than that of the total Ministry as such of Agriculture, it would exceed the Current Estimates by far, and therefore this is a special assignment. I spelt out the functions, the Prime Minister spelt out the functions. There is no question of accountability, the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture will account for the matters under him and the Permanent

Secretary, Special Assignments will account for matters under him. The assignment is clear.
3.25 p.m.

As a matter of fact, I can well understand the hon. member for St. Michael South Central or the hon. member for St. Lucy asking a question such as that, but for a person who has been in Ministries for a long time and certainly understands the complexities of a Ministry and the nature of the operations of such Ministry it is surprising to me that a question like this should arise, because he knows full well that a Permanent Secretary is accountable for matters for which he is responsible, and that is how this separation goes.

As far as coordinating the functions are concerned I will repeat with emphasis that the Minister responsible will be the coordinator. I hope that I am clear as far as that is concerned and I do not think it is necessary for the Minister responsible for Establishments to reply on that section.

Now to deal with the last point made by the hon. member for St. Lucy. He said that the Spring Hall project was conceived by the Democratic Labour Party. He could have added ill-conceived by them. The conception of the Spring Hall project, as we found it, was not suitable, in our opinion, for what the project should serve. As the Prime Minister correctly pointed out, it was a bungalow type project for Spring Hall. What we want is an agricultural type project for Spring Hall and this is the area we are looking at.

The hon. member for St. Lucy also talked about a glut in yams and potatoes. I don't know if because the price of yams and potatoes has not come down to the level they should have been at years ago he is calling this a glut. I do not think that in a place like Barbados that has been growing yams and potatoes for all the years they should be selling at seventy five cents and eighty cents per pound. It is disgraceful to think that we could import white potatoes from Cyprus sell them at thirty five cents or forty cents per pound but sell our own local potatoes at seventy five cents per pound; to me this is ridiculous.

It is the aim of the present Government to make agricultural production reasonable in this country and the produce from such agricultural activity reasonable to the consumer. We are now in the process of reaping yams. We have no problems about the export of yams. I do not know where the hon. member for St. Lucy gets his information from but I have seldom heard him coming forth with any idea that I can give credence to. There is no such thing as any glut in yams and potatoes. There is nothing wrong with the price of potatoes at twenty-four cents a pound or yams at twenty-two cents a pound. As a matter of fact, I dream

of the day when the price will be ten or twelve cents again. Let us produce potatoes; let us grow sufficient food that people can have things at a reasonable price.

The hon. member also said that the question of the type of glut arrangement is probably due to the gross inefficiency of the authorities, the BMC and ultimately myself. The BMC is not responsible for any problems, because there are no problems. As a matter of fact, if there are problems they are within the fertile mind of the hon. member for St. Lucy. But, as far as I know, there are no problems. The plantations will continue to have their yams exported and the BMC will continue to provide a service — by continue I mean what they have been doing within the last two and a half years, because they never did it before. As a matter of fact, the BMC can now consider itself to be a worthy agent of the Government of Barbados. In the past it was a discredited agent. Indeed, so ashamed was the other side of the BMC that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central once said that we should examine the possibility of closing down the BMC entirely. But we now regard the BMC as a vital, energetic and farseeing operation that will go very far in assisting the producers, the consumers and the public at large by satisfying them that money is no longer being thrown away.

As far as BARPAC is concerned, I want to make the Government's position clear. Government's duties involve policing as much as possible the problems within the country; and by policing I do not mean nosing behind people to see every step they take. We are prepared to give BARPAC and other local companies an opportunity to do business and to make a profit; but we are not going to allow them to fleece the consumers of this Island and we will take every step to see that is not done, be it BARPAC, or Lionel Hill's factory in Applewhaite or whatever. Whenever they come to the Government they must come with facts and figures and when they fail to do so we will take the necessary steps to correct that. I was glad to hear the hon. member for St. Michael North Central posing a question with respect to bottled gas and am glad to see he is such a good learner that he can learn from the points which we develop in our Ministries. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central is learning very well because he was able to extract from the newspapers that Government is at the moment investigating problems involved with liquid propane gas.

I assure hon. members that the Government is very aware of the problems within agriculture and is doing everything to redress the wrongs that have been built up over the years; and as the hon. member for St. Michael South Central said earlier on, the question of agriculture is not a matter that we should see in a limited way but should look at from a broad point of

view. We are looking at it broadly, but we cannot help seeing that the disintegration of agriculture came about as a result of a famous speech made by the previous Prime Minister that he would like to see the day when there was not a cane blade in Barbados.

The last hon. member who spoke referred to the fact that the Deputy Prime Minister made mention of the question of sugar being the product of rain. Every Barbadian would know that; that unless we get rain we cannot get yams or potatoes or sugar or anything else from the ground. But the production we are getting in terms of sugar is not based on rainfall alone but it is based also on the fact that people have been taking to the land again and are cultivating it to produce crops which are now coming forth. So when the Deputy Prime Minister talks about rainfall he does not mean rainfall by itself. He means rainfall in addition to the cultivation of the land. So I do not want the hon. member for St. Lucy to believe that when we talk about rainfall and the production of sugar it can come about by rain just falling and no cultivation of the land. We have to look very carefully at these matters.

3.35 p.m.

I hope that I have answered many of the points raised, Sir. If there is anything more that I can add, I will be willing to do that.

The question that Head 3(2) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 4(1) was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this Head relates to the Constitution Commission. The Commission has not been able to complete its work by the end of 1978 as was intended; and I have applied to the Governor General for an extension. This extension has been granted, and it will necessitate the provision of further funds to meet its expenses during the ensuing three months. It is intended that the Commission will complete its work by the end of March, 1979. The additional amount needed is \$9,000 and I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Prime Minister has stated that the Constitutional Review Committee has been unable to complete its work at the end of the year, and has asked for an extension. Would he like to tell this Hon. Chamber how long that extension will be?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I thought that I had made it quite clear when I said: "March 31, 1979" that I meant three months. We are changing from feet to metres, but we are not changing

March to July or any of the French revolutionary concepts.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, we are here voting an amount of \$9,000. I am wondering if the Prime Minister would give us some indication or some breakdown of the expenditure of the Constitution Commission so far.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if I tell the hon. member what the fees are, I hope that that will assist him. Out of the money at 22nd November, 1978 just under \$29,500 has been spent. There was \$1,800 a month for the Chairman, \$1,600 a month for each of the other members, \$1,400 a month for the Executive Secretary and I think that the amount of rent for telephones is about \$18 or \$19 a month or some amount like that. We are putting in contingencies of \$2,000 for the printing of the report and for any witnesses called to give evidence to the Constitutional Commission. We also intend — because we have not made any provision — and because the gentleman himself has not been made aware of it — but since the hon. member has asked the question, we intend to give an honorarium to the consultant because no provision has been made for the gentleman who is the consultant to the Commission. Since hon. members have asked for this, I will give them; but in fact I do not believe that any discussion has been held with him about an honorarium as yet.

The question that Head 8(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 8(1) — Item 15 — Expenses of Commissions was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, it has taken us a long time to get to this item. It deals with the expenses of Commissions. I have received a good deal of advice about this. Some persons have advised me to say nothing about the Duffus Commission and leave it to the Opposition to say what they have to say. Other persons have suggested that I should bring T.V. cameras in here to show what was in the Duffus Report and read it out for the benefit of all Barbadians so that they could hear the truth, and not just be content with what they read in the Advocate-News; but, Sir, this is by no means the last occasion on which I shall speak or say something about the Duffus Report; but I think I will have to say — although not all can be said — a few words about it while asking for a supplementary vote for its Secretary.

Sir, history abounds with tales of great relief. When the citizens of Vienna stood tending their walls in 1685 before the hosts of the Turk, the citizens

expressed their relief to King Jan Sovetsky of Poland who marched to their rescue from a distant country and drove away the Turk. When the British Garrison at Lucknow heard the bag pipes skirling across the Indian plain as Sir Collin Campbell and the Argyll Highlanders arrived to their rescue, they were very relieved. In 1879 at the Siege of Mafeking, Lord Baden Powell — he was Colonel Baden Powell at that time — was relieved when he saw the Red Coats march across Botswana to relieve Mafeking; but all this relief is nothing compared with the relief found by hon. members on the Opposite side when they read the Duffus Report.

I am really amused at the level of expectation that existed in this country about what Sir Herbert Duffus would have to say about the Democratic Labour Party. Perhaps if hon. members on both sides of the House would really take note of themselves, they would realise what is involved; for universally members of the Democratic Labour Party were looking forward to revelations of something of a character that nothing in the setting up of the Duffus Commission could possibly give rise to expectations of. The very hon. members who sit down over there — not for one moment did they have enough trust in the integrity of the hon. member for St. John not to be relieved when the Duffus Report appeared. There was not one hon. member over there who would not have been surprised at a different form of words being chosen by Sir Herbert Duffus.

I saw relief on everybody's face, Sir, at the time that the Duffus Report came out. I saw disappointment in some people's faces. I saw in the Duffus Report no more in the way of findings than what I had said in my introductory remarks here in the House of Assembly; but a point which seems to have been omitted by everybody is that in the speech in which I announced to the House that the Duffus Commission was going to be set up, I made certain allegations, and every single allegation has been proved true. There has been no suggestion that one word I said — you can read it, Sir — there is no suggestion, any single suggestion which was made on that occasion which has not been fully justified.

Now, I am not proposing to go into such things as what constitutes a malpractice, what constitutes an infelicity, or what constitutes corruption, or what constitutes stealing. I saw Senator Connell — I do not want to reflect on it — but I will try to be relevant. He said that the Oxford Concise Dictionary defines "malpractice" as such and such.

3.45 p.m.

I saw Senator Connell pick up or he said that the Oxford Concise Dictionary defines "malpractice" as such

and such. It has three meanings. He read out the second. The third meaning would have cast an entirely different complexion on his arguments. The third meaning which is described as the general meaning would have cast an entirely different complexion on everything he said. I went and looked it up, not even in the Concise. As it was on the T.V. I took my magnifying glass and looked it up in my edition of the complete Oxford Dictionary and I read something there.

I heard Senator Connell foaming at the mouth on T.V. and I read something entirely different in sense from what he was putting forward. I heard Senator Connell saying how the Government sold the North Point at a stupendous loss. I challenge him to prove the two remarks which he made about the North Point. I challenge him at any occasion to bring conclusive proof as to the ultimate resale value and destination of the North Point, but again I am not going into all of that. I am not interested in all of that.

What I want to ask hon. members is to consider deep down whether there can be any possible argument about the Duffus Commission as to its utility in exposing one or two, three or four, at least four, maybe five facts that were touched on when its appointment was announced. Now the hon. member for St. Michael South was in fact the first member to speak in this Debate on the subject of Duffus. He did not call the name Duffus. He was speaking under a different Head but he spent a few minutes driving some shrewd blows on the necessity for coming into the House of Assembly and saying before-hand what you are going to do with the people's money, some shrewd and important blows about the decision making process.

We have already heard some of this from the hon. member for St. Michael South and they did not fall from his lips by accident either. They did not fall from his lips unconsciously or accidentally in the debate on the agricultural matter. Now, as I said, Mr. Chairman, great has been the relief. The Vietnamese could not have welcomed Jan Kovetsky more than the members of the Opposition welcomed Duffus. The Beseiged at Lucknow could not have thrown their arms around Sir Collin Campbell's neck with greater fervour than the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has figuratively thrown his arms on Sir Herbert Duffus. But there is a warning.

I hope all hon. members have their copy of this book here. There is a warning in the good book, in the Authorised Version in Chapter 10 in Revelations where St. John reports a vision, at verse 9. Of course those who are familiar with Chapter 10 will remember how the angel appeared with a book in his hands and he set his right foot upon the seat and his left foot in the air and he cried with a loud voice as when a lion roareth and so on.

Speaking of that Book that the angel had:

"And I went unto the angel, and said unto him, Give me the little book, And he said unto me, Take it, and eat it up; And it shall make thy belly bitter, but it shall be in thy mouth sweet as honey.

"And I took the little book out of the angel's hand and ate it up; and it was in my mouth sweet as honey and; as soon as I had eaten it my belly was bitter."

Now I am suggesting to hon. members of the Opposition that Duffus is as sweet as honey when you first pick it up but you will find over the years that it will make your bellies bitter indeed, and some of it has started already inside of the Democratic Labour Party, if Senator Connell is to be any witness.

I know that I would not like to read in any commentary on the way the Barbados Labour Party conducts the Government that a Barbados Labour Party Minister told someone in charge of property that the Government had bought, that a particular piece of that property was to be his and that it was to be carried down by his house. Even if the Minister consequently denied this I would not then further like to read in a Report that a person from abroad found it impossible to say whether the Minister's denial represented the truth or if the original allegation represented the truth.

Let us look at page 13 of the Duffus Report, in my edition anyhow, paragraph 28 dealing with the North Point.

"Capt. Fergusson, when giving his evidence, denied emphatically that he had told Capt. Clarke that the boat was his or that he had requested him to have the boat removed to 'Fergie's Moorings'. It seems that a number of most unpleasant rumours about Capt. Fergusson and the boat were circulated around Barbados and I would have liked very much to have been able to arrive at a clear and positive conclusion as to what the true facts were but this was not to be and I am unable to decide whether Capt. Fergusson was speaking the truth."

Then you get the point, Sir. Listen to this:

"There seemed to be no reason why Capt. Clarke should have maliciously concocted the story he told and there was no reason why Capt. Fergusson should have said that Capt. Clarke was untruthful, even if Capt. Clarke was, in fact, speaking the truth."

That is something apparently which the Democratic Labour Party likes to read about itself. That one of its Ministers cannot be relied on as a witness of truth in an argument with a Civil Servant over whether the Minister had attempted to steal a boat belonging to the Government. That is exactly what that passage means and evidently this is honey to the Democratic Labour Party. This is something which the Democratic Labour Party feels throws credit on them, something which they feel reflects well on their conduct of affairs and integrity of their Minister.

I would also not like to read, Sir, that I nor any other of my Ministers treated the purchase of a ship for getting on to \$3 million in all — I think that is probably the total amount as that was the entire cost to the Government — as being of no more importance than the purchase of a lorry. I hope I will never live to tell anybody to buy a truck, to buy a ship, in that way — all the same thing because again that is what the hon. member for St. John told Sir Herbert Duffus.

I hope it will never be asked whether I carried out a policy to spend \$3 million legitimately in conjunction with another Government, but without consulting the other Government or reaching any agreement. I hope it will never be asked of me whether I should have bought a ship or anything else before final plans, estimates and costings had been prepared for the use to which the ship would have been put. I hope it will never be asked if I did well to re-condition a ship at great expense, and bring it to Barbados without any firm plans for its remunerative use until such time as it was required. In the context of that, Sir, when we consider the interest that Space Research had in the entire matter we did consider something which arose after the Government had changed and which I am quite prepared to reveal to the House, that Space Research spoke in terms of getting the North Point to bring the same thing from Nova Scotia to Antigua that they were subsequently revealed to have been bringing on a South African ship.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. I do not want to interrupt the Prime Minister, but I have been asking for a copy of the Duffus Report which is in the House, and the Clerks at the Table have refused to let me see the copy. I would like to get a copy which is the House copy, please. I have asked each one of the Clerks for a copy and they have bluntly refused to give it to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I understand that all members have been circulated with copies. There was one copy in the office which they are having a problem to find, and the Clerk is looking for it. We are trying to solve the problem.

Mr. GREAVES: I do not want to appear to be giving trouble, but the message which the Clerk who is now searching brought back indicated that he had difficulty in getting permission to go and get the report. I would like to get a copy of the report.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can assure you that we are working on your problem, he is still looking. (ASIDES). Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I cannot even help the hon. member, I have not got a copy either, Sir, but I have the original here reading from. Anyway, Sir, North Point arrived in this island, as I say relief was perhaps the dominant emotion when the report was read, but I do not believe that there is any hon. member on the other side who can be satisfied that unknown to Parliament, unknown in all probability to the members of the party, with correspondence that did not even appear on the Government's files in one case, that the former Prime Minister bought a ship, had it reconditioned and it suddenly turned up, in the middle of an election campaign, Sir — they were bold — right here in Barbados; a ship for which there was no immediate use, no agent, no crew, no funds, nothing except, I believe, a promise of Space Research that the ship could be put to some useful purpose.

Evidently members of the Democratic Labour Party think that that is a good policy to follow, that there is nothing wrong whatsoever when you have no use for a ship to spend \$1.8 million (U.S.) ultimately on buying it, some of it in great secrecy. Some of the bills we had to settle, some I refused to settle. One particular bill I refused to settle because there was no authorisation on the Government's files, and an Accountant brought in an authorisation signed by the hon. member for St. John to spend \$122,000 U.S. of which there was no copy in the Government's files. All of that is in Duffus' record and we accept it. In fact, we signed it and therefore we had to pay Space Research the money, and since there seems to have been some confusion about North Point and the price that was paid for it, let me just tell the House, Sir — this is nothing to do with the Duffus Report, this is just a follow up — the sort of price that North Point was worth on the open market, depending on if you could find a buyer, was between \$120,000 and \$200,000 U.S. I was very indebted to the hon. member for St. Michael North East, the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, who spent several weeks of the period searching through current shipping magazines which were offering to buy and to sell ships, and picking out ships in North Point's class, assuming it was a sea-going vessel, about which I am not really going to pronounce one way or the other, but at the best it was a sea-going vessel of limited tonnage, could make ten knots, and was built a long time ago, and the best price that I think we saw was

in the region of \$200,000 U.S., and when we advertised it for sale the best price that was offered was \$120,000. All the other offers would have involved the Government in having to continue to spend money on it.

Space Research — it seems to have escaped most people — made a price which corresponded to the last cent with what the Government had spend to get North Point and bring it here. That was exactly the price they made. It bore no relation to the commercial value of the vessel, it was what the Government had paid the American Government and what it had paid Space Research, and indeed what they said we owed them, because they offered to pay us even what they said we owed but we did not agree, they offered to pay us that, and I am not even sure it is finished paying for yet. I must say, eventually it will be settled by the final exchange of cheques. I do not know if they have come up with all the money yet because of the form of payment which was agreed, so the price for North Point bore no relation to its commercial value.

I go into this because some evidence of this apparently crept into the Duffus matter and I observe that it has been touched upon in a television programme in which Senator Connell quite untruthfully spoke of a high resale value. What the resale value of North Point was, who Space Research transferred it to, another of their companies, whether it carries arms to Guatemala, to South Africa, to wherever, I do not know, all that I know is that the Government was paid a price several times in excess of what any similar vessel had sold for years and years and years. Its subsequent history I cannot follow, I was only concerned in salvaging some of the taxpayers' money.

I speak of North Point; I can look also to Seafoods. Evidently the Democratic Labour Party is proud of the fact that in the light of evidence given by Mr. Harcourt Lewis, who was then the Permanent Secretary of Finance, that the shares in International Seafoods, the whole 125,000 were not worth altogether \$1.00, yet they paid the shareholders the full par value of their shares. Look at what in fact is in Duffus, do not mind what Duffus says at the end, mind the facts he found. Paragraph 49 on Seafoods, page 33:

"Looking at the company's balance sheets and accounts, it seems clear that in the year 1976 the shares were worth practically nothing. Mr. Harcourt Lewis who was then Permanent Secretary, Finance and is now the President of the Barbados National Bank, stated on oath that he would have paid a dollar for all 125,000 shares. Mr. R. St. Clair Stuart, formerly the Chief Accountant in the Ministry of Finance, and who is now the Managing Director of ISL, stated that on a strictly commercial

basis 'I don't think they would find anybody to buy those shares.' At the time the Government agreed to buy the shares the Auditors' report on the current financial position of the company had not been completed, nor had Captain Sayers valuation of the boats been completed. Not a single witness who appeared before the Commission admitted taking any part in the valuation of the shares; not Mr. Barrow, not Mr. Taitt, not Mr. Emtage, not Mr. Lewis, not Mr. Stuart."

I do not even see the hon. members for St. John and St. Michael South West.
4.05 p.m.

How then were Mr. Simpson and Mr. Fergusson so fortunate as to be able to get their asking price of par value of \$1 per share without a voice raised in protest? Evidently this is something the Democratic Labour Party is proud about, proud about reading these words about the conduct of the Ministry of Finance when they were in power. The Government now has a functional responsibility to pay debts which have not been guaranteed. I do not know how anybody who has achieved the level of a Cabinet post or election to the House of Assembly can read page after page of Duffus and say that the Democratic Labour Party Government comes out with credit. I will make a quotation from what Mr. Agard, my Press Secretary, had to say in the Advocate-News some time ago which may give some idea of the basis of the relief.

Golden Mile? When I think of the conduct of the Inquiry into Golden Mile, when I think there were suggestions to the extent where Mr. Howard Roberts, my Personal Assistant, sought legal advice as to whether he could sue Mr. Asquith Phillips for slander because Mr. Phillips made remarks to the effect that Mr. Roberts had forged the "Dear Cecil" letter, which was produced before the Commission, when I think of that I wonder again if hon. members are satisfied at the conduct of the Enquiry. Hon. members would recall the letter supposedly written by the hon. member for St. John to Dr. Cecil Kirton in New York offering Sir Lionel Luckhoo's shares in Golden Mile. It was suggested that members of the Barbados Labour Party had forged that letter, but when it came to the point the hon. member for St. John admitted it because he knew that we had discovered that the letter had been written from Singapore, and it is then that he acknowledged that he had written it and said that he was acting as trustee and agent for people in New York. I wonder what some hon. members would make of it if I was acting as trustee or agent for a group of my friends overseas who had a piece of property in Barbados and the property was being bought by the Government without my telling the House of Assembly or the Cabinet about it?

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of information I would like the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to

state if he can substantiate that Mr. Barrow admitted writing the letter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Has the hon. member read the Duffus Report? Paragraph 30 dealing with Golden Miles says: "Mr. Barrow made a statement of some length and with many details as to his connection with Dr. Cecil Kirton and Golden Mile. This statement may be seen in Volume 10 of the Transcript of Evidence, which accompanies this Report. The sum total of his evidence is that several years ago he acted as a trustee or agent for Dr. Cecil Kirton and a group of his friends, all of whom were resident in New York, in connection with the investment in Barbados of the sum of Bds. \$300,000." And the paragraph before, paragraph 29, is the paragraph where the Commissioner says that on the 25th July, 1978 he questioned Mr. Barrow and questioned him about the "Cecil" letter and asked him what he wanted to say about Golden Mile; and he told Mr. Duffus that on the 23rd January, 1971, the date of the letter, he was in Singapore attending a Commonwealth Prime Minister's conference and the Prime Minister of Singapore had made one of his Chinese stenographers available to him.

How do you mean if he really admitted it? Do you want me to read more? Mr. Barrow said that he could have well have written the letter and did not deny having done so, even in the House of Assembly. After Asquith Phillips accused members of the Barbados Labour Party of forging the letter, the hon. member for St. John admitted that he wrote it. And the Democratic Labour Party is proud about this? You know in court when a lawyer gets up and ask a witness questions, the Judge may ask him "Are those your instructions?" And when he cannot substantiate it you hear a great deal at the end about the conduct of counsel and of a client who misleads counsel in respect of matters put to a witness to show that witness in a bad light.

Perhaps I have got a bit hot. The hon. member for St. James has suggested that I do not pursue the matter, but I would like to assure the hon. member for St. Philip South that as between Howard Roberts who was accused of forgery and Asquith Phillips who accused him of it, the liar is not Howard Roberts. It has been admitted that the letter was written from Singapore by the Hon. member for St. John. Again hon. members will judge whether they think it is above board and there is nothing to question about the Minister of Finance dealing with Sir Lionel Luckhoo, Dr. Kirton in New York and others on whose behalf he was working in connection with property to be bought by the Government, without any revelation of this fact to the House of Assembly or the Cabinet. Maybe we want to have a Government that conducts business like that; maybe we should have a Government like that in this country, but it won't be my Government, maybe the government of the hon. member for St. John. If hon. members want that kind of thing they would have to wait

five, ten fifteen or twenty years; they will not get it from this side.

Now again, Carib West. What I can say? (ASIDES) Honourable members are asking me not to talk about Carib West, to leave it to them; but I have actually given a pledge to Mr. Harold Went to say something about it. He wrote me a letter about this matter and I have indicated that I was going to say something about it in the House of Assembly.

You can start with Carib West at the beginning; you can read through, and the more you read Carib West the more you wonder how the Government got into it. Is there anything in Carib West that reflects any better on the hon. member for St. John than Watergate reflected on President Nixon? There was no cover up after it was all known, but you have all this evidence. What are the words which Mr. Duffus used on the Cabinet decision to acquire Carib West: "There are several remarkable and very strange and unusual circumstances surrounding this Cabinet Minute on which comment must not be made." And he goes on to say what they were — there was no Cabinet paper or written submission; he deals with some of the amnesia, etc., and spends several pages analysing the whole Carib West matter. When I think of the evidence these people gave, that when Trevor Mayers was asked if he knew the former Prime Minister well, he hesitated and started to say no, and then was asked if Mr. Barrow was not bestman at his brother's wedding — it eventually came out that there was a close friendship over a period of years.
4.15 p.m.

It is known to all that the hon. member stayed with the directors of Carib West in 1973 when he took his sabbatical leave from the House; and that there is a close relationship. Mr. Harold Went at least is more honest and candid. Mr. Harold Went said that he used to go into his office and set out all the facts. He did not hide anything; but the answer of the hon. member was that a lot of Civil Servants have got political amnesia. Imagine the hon. member for St. John telling a lie on Steve Emtage. I do not believe that you can say in here "telling a lie". Do hon. members think that it reflects credit on the previous Government that a positive statement made by the former Prime Minister about Civil Servants has been found to be a lie? No matter how it is wrapped up?

A positive statement was made by the hon. member that he consulted Mr. Emtage and Mr. Emtage took notes and discussed the matter; and Sir Herbert Duffus has to find that not a word of it was true; and hon. members over there are proud about that? Do hon. members think that this is something of which to go and tell the public that the Duffus Commission has exonerated them? They are proud to know that Duffus found the former Prime

Minister to be a witness unworthy of belief on oath? Do you know what that is called? It is called perjury? No matter how kind the language actually used is, in judicial proceedings it is called perjury — telling lies on people; and that is something which hon. members opposite appeared to be proud of?

I will deal with the guarantee because I have not seen any comment publicly on the question of the guarantee now, Sir, I did mention in here when I was introducing the Duffus matter, that two documents had been signed by the hon. member for St. John without the authority of Parliament. Indeed, it did not have the authority of Cabinet; and I must just read precisely the words set out in paragraph 39 — it is my page 63 dealing with the Carib West matter. It says: "The hungry maw of this airline in which the Government of Barbados was now a majority shareholder soon exhausted its credit, and again the Government were asked to help it obtain further credit from the bank;" and once again Mr. Barrow obliged. I am sorry, Sir, but I am referring back to the first overdraft.

On the 22nd June, 1976, he signed a second so called "letter of comfort" for the amount of \$500,000 which the Commission was told included the earlier amount of \$350,000, it would seem that in giving these letters of comfort to the bank, Mr. Barrow acted on his own initiative. He did not seek the prior approval of his Cabinet as he had done when seeking the expenditure of \$520,000 to purchase the shares, nor did he report back to Cabinet what had been done.

It is to be noted that one venture which came under the scrutiny of the bank — namely the International Seafoods Limited, that a guarantee to the bank was sought by First National City Bank; and the Crown Law Officers advised that the authority of Parliament itself was required before the guarantee could be made; and this was in fact done. In the case of Carib West Airways, not only was legislative authority not sought or obtained, but the fellow Ministers of the Ministry of Finance were never informed that he had jeopardised the Government's fund to the tune of \$½million. These are Duffus' comments.

Hon. members will recall that this was one of the principal matters to which I drew the attention of the House when announcing the setting up of the Commission, that without the authority of Parliament, or without telling his Ministers, the Prime Minister pledged the Government's credit, and more than pledged the Government's credit because this was cash that was paid out to the tune of \$½ million for Carib West.

Again, if hon. members read paragraph 46 on the explanation of the hon. member about the letters of comfort of guarantee, all of us being sophisticated

persons, Sir, when you read the final words of that paragraph, one is bound to ask the question: Was Mr. Barrow deceived? I say that because Duffus has proved that the manager of the bank of Nova Scotia was not telling the truth. He proved it, and he said it seems difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile this written statement with his oral explanation. There is no doubt that Mr. Gallagher was not straightforward and was not being entirely true in his explanation.

When you read these words, was Mr. Barrow deceived? That was Sir Herbert Duffus' way of telling you that the hon. member for St. John was not truthful, I think, in pretending that the Government's credit was not pledged but that he signed a document without intending to enter into a legal obligation. I will go further, Mr. Chairman, because the answer given by the former Minister of Finance is that when he signed those documents he did not intend those documents to be of any legal effect. Do you really want in this country a Minister of Finance who puts his signature on behalf of the Government that he does not intend to have any legal effect? Is that what you want from me? You cannot get it from Tom Adams. Let me tell you that. Ask for it from the former Minister of Finance. He has reached the stage where his explanation is that when he signed something he was only throwing away his signature. As far as I am concerned my document dealing with finance that I have to put my signature to can stand up to the test of any law court, and I would mean it to have legal effect.

Then we come to the conclusion as to Carib West. There have been drummed in the Press and therefore, I will deal with them. The words are that there was no corruption found, and it is therefore quite clear that the Government of Barbados on a sudden change of mind of its Minister of Finance and with the knowledge of Parliament saddled the taxpayers with a liability of over \$1 million for which there was no quid pro quo save and expect the piece of paper signed by the former President Nixon, that is the CAB permit to fly in and out of the USA which Mr. Barrow thought was very valuable, not because of President Nixon's signature but because it is difficult and time consuming to obtain such a permit.

Is this something of which the Democratic Labour Party is so proud? Do these words indicate that under the previous regime they did everything that was good and nothing that was bad? In the case of ISL it was a policy decision to help the fishing and shrimping industry, and in the case of Carib West there were less than half dozen employees who, with the exception of Mr. Went and Mr. Mayers, were not working when there was no aircraft.

The 1971 Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party which was produced said: "The Party will ensure that Government invest directly in enterprises where the

national interest requires it, and where there may be a scarcity of private capital. Investment in Carib West would qualify for a scarcity of private capital. Investment in Carib West would qualify for a scarcity of private capital, but did the national interests require it?

Certainly the personal and private interest of Mr. Went and Mr. Mayers required it — particularly in the case of Mr. Went whose home was mortgage and who was personally liable to First National City Bank under a guarantee to secure a debt owing by the company of \$310,000 for which on the 28th January 1976 he had offered the Bank a payment of \$200,000 in full settlement and satisfaction of the company's indebtedness and release from his personal guarantee."

4.25 p.m.

" In fact, Mr. Went paid First National \$200,000 on the 8th March, 1976 with the first cheque drawn on the new account with the Bank of Nova Scotia out of the \$510,000 paid by the Crown Solicitor for the shares. It seems that Mr. Went was so sure of his position that he was able to offer the Bank the payment of \$200,000 on the day preceding the date of Cabinet's decision to purchase the shares which was the 29th January."

The Report refers to the letters concerned. The next paragraph goes on.

" Fortune was eventually kind to Mr. Went, and his friendship with the former Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, his frequent visits to his office and his persistent badgering to get him to aid his ailing Air-line were rewarded. The Edghills and the American shareholders were also extremely fortunate in being able to get back their money from the Airline and they too ought to be most grateful to Mr. Barrow and the Barbadian tax-payers."

This is what the Democratic Labour Party is proud of. That is what they are glad to hear. What can one say about you to make you ashamed. What can be said of hon. members of the other side to make you ashamed. Nothing, nothing. For ye which is present have the symbols clashing before the walls of Jericho. But no walls fell down and you have to blow some trumpets as well and to blow trumpets you have to have a tune and this is the tune to remember.

Now Mr. Went had written to me as a result of what appeared in the *Advocate* on December, 15th 1978. Apparently the *Advocate* said that I said that Mr. Barrow took taxpayers funds to clear a mortgage on the house of a member of the staff of Carib West. Mr. Went said that this is undoubtedly the consideration that one could draw from the Report submitted by Sir Herbert Duffus on

Carib West and he went on to say that it caused him severe embarrassment. He gave some of the history of the matter. He says he cleared up the mortgage on his house held by another company and offered to the Bank an equitable charge to secure Carib West debt and he agreed to pay it off at so much and so much a month.

In this paragraph he mentioned it again and I told him that I will deal with it on the next occasion of making a public statement. He said that "when the Government through the then Prime Minister was approached and asked to take active participation in the Company I pointed out to Mr. Barrow these facts and asked as payment to negotiate a settlement with the Bank since I felt that if the Bank knew that the Government was the prospective investor then settlement for less than the total amount owed by Carib West which was in the region of \$350,000 would never be achieved."

I do not know if Mr. Went was telling the truth when he said that, but I will tell you this, if he says so and the hon. member for St. John denies it, I believe Mr. Went for there is virtually nobody on earth against whom if there is a conflict of evidence about a serious matter like this with the hon. member for St. John I would believe the hon. member for St. John although I see the hon. member for St. Michael South Central putting up his arm as a candidate. Alright, you are a bigger liar than he is, if that is what you want me to say. I see the hon. member for St. Michael South Central raising his hand. If you are raising your hand as a candidate, I will give you. When you and he start contradicting each other why then I will believe him. If you wish to have the cap fit you, push your head under it.

Now it has been commented openly on that the reason why there was no Cabinet paper is that it had to be kept secret even from the Cabinet so as to enable Mr. Went to complete his deal. I do not blame Mr. Went. Mr. Went was entitled as a businessman to negotiate whatever he could with City Bank. The fact that City Bank unknowingly gave up \$150,000 they would not have given up had they known it was not up to Mr. Went. If they did it, they did it. The fact is that it is the taxpayers' money which ultimately made it possible.

The Democratic Labour Party and its adherents are proud of these facts. They are glad to hear that without telling the Government, Parliament or indeed City Bank, the creditors, without telling anybody, a private arrangement was made between the then Minister of Finance and Mr. Went, Mr. Mayers and others.

I have already talked about the amnesia. I heard hon. members ask why should one person be accused of being deliberately uncontrollable where another is merely described as being guilty of amnesia. Hon. members have asked the question, they will have to find their own

answers. I am not making any comments on any of these things. All that I know is that if Steve Emtage tells me something, I believe it and if it is between Steve Emtage and the hon. member for St. John, I cannot think of any circumstances on earth under which I could believe the hon. member for St. John before I believe Mr. Emtage, the Director of Finance and Planning and I am glad to see that Sir Herbert Duffus agrees with me in that particular regard. But all of these facts are the facts that hon. members on the other side are so proud of.

You would never have found these facts out without a Commission of Enquiry. We would never have been able to discover that Mr. Went was able to pay off his indebtedness to the Bank using the taxpayers' money so provided by his friend under these circumstances. If we had not held a Commission of Enquiry which was able to go into the dates, places, times and particulars we would not have found out these things.

Finally, Sir, we come to Bath. Bath, of course, is the great unknown because with the best will in the world I do not think that Sir Herbert Duffus himself feels that he has got to the bottom of Bath. He has spoken very heavily about there being no evidence on certain matters. Page 87 has that note, Sir. He has also pointed out that he has not had the benefit of evidence from Sir Lionel Luckhoo, Mr. Bruce Baxter, Mr. Donald Havens, Mr. Leon Bernstein or Mr. Edward Pilgrim.

Now I just want to say something about that, that if anything, if it is a criticism of anybody apart from the people concerned of those who were in Barbados, if there is a criticism of anybody, it is a criticism of the presentation of the Government's case. Just let me set this picture exactly right. We did not approach Sir Lionel Luckhoo. I personally felt that with Sir Lionel Luckhoo being involved in Golden Mile, and I must say that the hon. Member for St. John offering all these shares for sale being trustee for a group of people in New York has not explained how he came to be offered Luckhoo's shares for sale. Luckhoo is not one of the New York people.
4.35 p.m.

That looks like an explanation, but Luckhoo is not one of the New York Syndicate, and the "Dear Cecil" letter was offering the New York Syndicate shares from Luckhoo, but anyhow, let that pass. The Luckhoo shares were involved in Golden Mile, he was Chairman of Bath and he was under some criticism. It is up to him if he wishes to give evidence to clear his name. As it is, he will now have to accept what is said.

The same thing about Mr. Leon Bernstein. It is obvious that Mr. Bernstein was not going to get an entirely clean bill of health, and he has been very severely criticised indeed by the Duffus Report. It has spoken of as incompetence of the members of the

Bank, spoken of in worse expression, but all that has been dealt with already. If Mr. Bernstein wishes to come and give evidence to show that he was not incompetent he is free to do so. If he wishes to give evidence on the allegations of the telephone calls stating that the Bank had agreed to things when in fact it had not, that he wrote letters which contained lots of lies, all that is in the report. If he wishes to answer that, he is free to come and answer it, but the Government did not approach Mr. Bernstein to give evidence. We did, however, approach Mr. Baxter, Mr. Edward Pilgrim and Mr. Havens. Mr. Moseley went to see Mr. Baxter in Puerto Rico but I have no intention of giving any evidence of what Mr. Baxter said to him about what the hon. member for St. John said before Mr. Duffus. Mr. Baxter volunteered a tape recorded statement casting a lot of light on how he met Sir Lionel Luckhoo, who introduced him to Luckhoo, where it was done, and so on. He gave a long tape recorded statement. This was offered in evidence, but Sir Herbert indicated that since it had been given after the announcement of the Commission that he would not receive it in evidence, that Mr. Baxter's duty was to come and give evidence, but the Government did the best it could. We tried to get Mr. Baxter to come back here and he refused to come back.

Mr. Moseley and the Government did their best to obtain the evidence, certainly, from Mr. Pilgrim. We did our best in this matter, but the gentlemen were not within our jurisdiction, they did not come to Barbados, they did not give evidence, we have done our best. It is not a court of law where we could have asked for extradition, they did not choose to come and give the evidence. Those who read the report on Bath with an open mind will feel that the enquiry on Bath is incomplete. I do not mean that there will be a new enquiry, but they will have to feel that there are many areas where things could have been said which were not indeed said. Again, there is a point here in connection with Bath which is something that the Press does not seem to have picked up. One of the essentials in the whole Bath deal was that some of the Directors of Bath refused to give the guarantee even after they had been instructed to do so by the former Prime Minister. Mr. Kirby was one, the same Richard Leslie was another. He comes in for a lot of strictures, but he refused and voted on the committee against giving any guarantee to Bath, against wasting the taxpayers' money, and it was carried against their votes by the casting vote of Mr. Bernstein, and the point made by Mr. Kirby who subsequently resigned because he said he was having no more of it with the Barbados Development Bank was that the former Minister of Finance had acted illegally in giving a direction.

Sir Herbert Duffus has said on that matter that the question as to whether the Minister was *ultra vires*

or *intra vires* when he gave directions for the doubtful acquisition relating to \$1.5 million is really one that ought to be decided in a court of law, that it is not a proper question for a Commission of Enquiry. I will tell hon. members this just to set their minds at ease. I am not carrying the matter to any court of law, as far as I am concerned the enquiry has made it clear that there were infelicities abounding at Bath. Sir Herbert has not found it possible himself to decide whether what the former Prime Minister did was legal or illegal, and he said it would have to go to a court of law. I am going to let it die at that point, Sir. I can set his mind at rest, he is not in here to take the licks, but he can rest assured that there is no danger of it being taken to any court.

Evidently again, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Labour Party thinks that it has something to be proud about in that it can be said of its former Prime Minister that one of his actions may be legal or may not be legal. He gives an indication in fact as to the legality, but you will have to take him to court to find out about it. Perhaps this is the way to run a Government and nobody has anything to be ashamed of, that when these things are said about you that nobody has to worry if it is said that you took the taxpayers' money to help your friend for a mortgage. Well, if that is all right I can understand hon members on the other side.

Last year in December a letter was written to the Advocate newspaper by my Press Secretary, Mr. Denzil Agard, and today I see Mr. Desmond Bourne has replied — apparently the Desmond Bourne who acted as my Press Secretary once.
4.45 p.m.

Apparently a Mr. Desmond Bourne who once acted as my Press Secretary cannot understand a quotation from the historian Gibbon in connection with the Duffus Report. If I remember correctly the quotation in question was referring to a then Pope John XXI or XXII — he was struck out of the order so he does not appear in the list of Popes — and the quotation is "The most scandalous charges against the Pope were suppressed; the Vicar of Christ was charged only with piracy, murder, rape, sodomy and incest." Now Mr. Desmond Bourne evidently cannot understand what is wrong with sodomy or those other offences cited in the quotation. I take the point of that quotation to be that the Pope was acquitted of some unknown, unspecified, scandalous charges but he was still acquitted of a number of other things which included piracy, rape, murder, sodomy and incest. And the analogy which I assume Mr. Agard is drawing is that the hon. member for St. John was acquitted of what Barbadians call stealing — nobody charged him with it — but that he is guilty of financial malpractices while in office as revealed by the same Duffus Report which

would amount to financial rape, piracy, sodomy, murder and incest. The relief of the hon. members of being acquitted of the capital charges cannot conceal the fact that though they have got off from the felony they may still be guilty of the misdemeanour; and certainly as a lawyer I would say that even if you are not charged with a felony but you are charged with five misdemeanours and you are found guilty of four, does that count for nothing? But they honestly must not believe that when the first flush of honey in the mouth has gone down they won't get a bitter taste from taking up the taxpayers' money to give to Mr. Went to pay off the mortgage on his house; because that is how the man in the street will see the Carib West matter. The Bath transaction also contains the same substance that I believe will prove bitter in the end.

We have been able to repair some of this — we cannot repair Seafoods — we have already paid out almost \$10 million for Sea Foods. We cannot repair that but we can at least put a halt to it. Bath — we have had to pay off the debts — another \$3 million, but I am told that a cane plot has been replanted and may make a profit this year. But to pay \$3 million for some acres of land in St. John to sell a few thousand dollars in sugar is not a good deal in anybody's judgment.

Carib West — the Government can never get back the million dollars thrown down the drain with Carib West, but under the enlightened direction of the hon. Leader of the House, the Minister for Civil Aviation, I have no doubt that Carib West can at least keep itself afloat and not make a loss in the future. You just have to write off the losses in this matter.

Golden Mile has had certain difficulties. We paid a lot for the land but the Government is carrying on the transaction. In any case the allegations about Golden Mile were on a slightly different character.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, this is not the last you will be hearing from me about Commissions of Enquiry or even about the Duffus Commission, but perhaps the House will not have to endure any more long speeches from me in the future.

I would like to give general counsel to all who address their thoughts to this matter. Read and consider carefully what the objectives are of anybody in any enterprise he is embarking upon. The Duffus Enquiry was carefully limited to five enterprises in Government within the context of an introduction made by me in the House of Assembly, every word of which, in my opinion, had been substantiated by the event. Let us not get too excited. Honourable members of the other side should have been ashamed of themselves at the thought that corruption might have been proved; that

they had to be so worried about what might have come out of Duffus. They should be ashamed of themselves at showing the relief so openly, as though the only thing that mattered was something that was not even within the terms of reference of the Duffus Commission.

Let us all take a lesson from Duffus as to what can go wrong if you stay in Government in one particular position for fifteen years and think that you know the beginning and end of everything and you are surrounded by sycophants who cannot stand up to you and tell you that you are making a mistake about a matter or that you are going in the wrong way.

I cannot convict the hon. member for St. Michael South or the hon. member for St. Michael North Central for anything for Carib West. I believe they just sat down in Cabinet and believed what was said to them and agreed to it. I do not believe they knew about the guarantees till they heard me speak about them. I do not think they knew that Harold Went took the money to pay his own debts. I think it came as a surprise to them and they should be glad of the Government's report because it has given them information about who they were dealing with over the last five years. I have to acquit the hon. member for St. Michael South Central too. Maybe he has aspirations to be a sycophant but he was not around at that time. He was not in any position of responsibility where he would be consulted about anything serious, perhaps not even by Mr. Bernstein. I have to acquit hon. members like the member for St. Philip South. Obviously he has nothing to do with this. I lost my temper a bit with the hon. member, but it is obvious that the hon. member did not even know that the hon. member for St. John had written the "Dear Cecil" letter, even after Duffus and after all the water has passed under the bridge. But I sincerely hope that hon. members on this side and the public at large will never allow this Minister of Finance to rise so far above proper procedure as to produce a catalogue of three volumes of what can go wrong with the financial procedures of Government even in a small place under the immediate eyes of colleagues and others who have not been accustomed to dealing with it over a period of years.

Mr. Chairman, the supplement which we seek is small. The amount is \$23,526, which means that the Duffus Commission and the Gambling Commission together will cost just under \$150,000. I am not one who says that buying a ship is the same as buying a truck, so I will not say that \$150,000 is nothing, but it represents in my respectful submission a sum of money by no means excessive when we consider what must have been going through people's minds about the previous Government, and when we consider the nature of the enterprises — \$20 million in all. And I hope in the fulness of time to be able to tell the House that what Duffus has brought out

has been of positive financial advantage to the Government. I do not think the amount unreasonable and I move that Head 8(1) stand part.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there are many lessons to be learned from the report of the Duffus Commission. I believe that the first lesson to be learned is that I will never find myself in this Honourable House making the kind of speech, the kind of harangue to which we have been subjected for more than an hour. I believe that if there was any virtue in the establishment of the Commission, then that virtue must lie in the search for the truth.

4.55 p.m.

Consequently, I will not get involved in the reopening of the multiple allegations that have been made against someone who has contributed so much to this country, and who has changed the face of Barbados; but I would like to say that one of the very first fundamental things that we have to look at in relation to the Duffus Commission is the fact that a situation existed in this country where there was a possibility that one man, Mr. Duffus, was put in a position where he could have destroyed the reputation of the hon. member for St. John. This is a very important statement, and it is something that needs to be very carefully considered.

Now, as a consequence of this Commission, many people in the Civil Service, many people on Statutory Boards find it extremely difficult to function unless they have obtained authorisation from this source or that source as the Government expands its activities more and more into the commercial sector, and become involved in the investment area directly or indirectly where speed of action is very important in financial matters, and where delays can cause considerable losses and frustration. In these circumstances, Civil Servants will find themselves in a situation of fear because Civil Servants will never again want to go through the kind of experience that they were dragged through during the hearing of the Duffus Commission, and the preparation for this hearing.

I want first of all to make a public statement that the Democratic Labour Party will not in any circumstances ever set up any such Commission to investigate any Government, if, in time, the DLP should become the Government of this country again. I say that because we feel very strongly that there are forces which perform law enforcement in this country; and if corruption is suspected, then I think that the existing law enforcement authorities of this country should be the people who should investigate charges of corruption; and that the money would have been much better spent in setting up a special department within the Royal

Barbados Police Force for the investigation of allegations of corruption in Government.

Now, the question has been raised as to whether or not there were any charges of corruption levelled against the Democratic Labour Party Government. There is not a single person who has lived in Barbados over the past nine years, going back to 1971, who can come and say honestly that there were not charges and persistent charges of corruption made against the Democratic Labour Party regime, both in respect of those matters that came under the scrutiny of Sir Herbert Duffus and a whole range of other matters. The fact is that these charges were made up and down this country. There can be no question about it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read from the House of Assembly debate on Tuesday, 2nd November, 1976 at Page 200. The hon. member for St. Thomas is the speaker. It goes like this: "When that double dealing man gave two votes to create the Bath Plantation deal, and as a result deprived Barbados of development funds for a period of some years, it is only now that I am able to tell the House that the IADB is again prepared to make money available to the Barbados Development Bank, now we have got a corrupt Bath Plantation deal off our backs."

So when anyone comes into this House now and tries to pretend that charges of corruption were not made against the DLP regime, it nauseates me both physically and intellectually. I have picked this one out because this is one statement that was made after September 2, 1976 — a direct charge of corruption in respect of Bath Plantation; and there can be no question about that; but indeed, Mr. Chairman, as I started off by saying, one of the lessons that you must learn from Mr. Duffus is not to walk around this country accusing our political colleagues whether they are on this side or on the other side of corruption unless you have evidence enough that you can make available to the Police of this country, the Director of Public Prosecutions or to whomsoever it can be made available under the Constitution of Barbados.

I feel very strongly that one of the major contributions of this type of report to the political life of this country is preventing us from coming into the House of Assembly and making the kind of speech which we heard earlier. There is one other point that I wish to make. Up and down people of this country know that it is being said that the Democratic Labour Party bribed Mr. Duffus because Mr. Duffus did not come up with the kind of report that certain people wanted. I am not charging that any members of this Hon. House are responsible for these rumours; but is is most important that if members of the Democratic Labour Party happened to be going around the country making a charge of this kind against Mr. Duffus, that certain steps should be taken to stop it, because it is not fair. When

Mr. Duffus came here we welcomed him. An open letter was sent by the hon. member for St. John to Mr. Duffus.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not want to disturb the hon. member. This is a point of elucidation. I want the hon. member to help me since a moment ago he said that you must not come into the House of Assembly and say things which cannot be justified. Will he tell me who told him that the Democratic Labour Party bribed Sir Herbert Duffus? He can write it on a piece of paper and sent it to me.

Dr. HAYNES: If you have not heard that, you are not living in Barbados. All around the streets of Barbados this can be heard. I think that Sir Herbert Duffus has enforced a very important point; and that important point is that questions of policy decisions taken by a sovereign Government can only be questioned in Parliament or before the electorate of the country; and many of the questions that were presented in a distorted manner were questions which Mr. Duffus raised in respect of each of these ventures because they touched on policy matters; and he made it quite clear that it was not for him to pass judgment on these matters.
5.05 p.m.

It is for the members of this Honourable House and for the electorate of this country to pass judgment on those matters. So I want to make it absolutely clear that when in certain areas instead of coming to a firm conclusion questions were posed because it was a policy matter and because Sir Herbert Duffus quite rightly and correctly took the position that he cannot and would not find himself in a position where he is passing judgment on policies made by the Sovereign Government of Barbados. He made it clear that that is a matter for the Parliament of Barbados and the electorate of Barbados and the public must not be fooled into thinking that because the questions were asked that those questions necessarily meant that he disagreed with the way in which a particular thing was done.

He posed the question, It is a matter of policy. It is a matter of priority. No matter what job you do anyone who comes into that job after you, if he wishes to make you look like the worst person on God's earth, he can do it. If he wants you to look like the best person on God's earth he can do it. It is a question of the attitude of people when they succeed others and I think it is almost a fundamental attitude of decency that when you get into a situation that you do not set out to destroy your predecessor.

Another very important point is this, Mr. Chairman. I am going to get to the specifics later but I think there are some basic points that have to be raised. If you look at paragraph 3, page 102 of the Duffus Report there is a

clear statement that the reasons for setting up this Commission of Enquiry were purely political. The reasons for setting up the Commission of Enquiry were purely political. That is a clear statement made in the Duffus Commission. Sir Herbert Duffus was smart enough to see that and I am questioning whether it is not a condemnation of the present Government that Sir Herbert Duffus could say that all he was called to Barbados to do is to perform a political function and the taxpayers in this country are to pay for him to perform some political function.

The masses of the people of Barbados did not accuse the Democratic Labour Party of corruption. It was the Barbados Labour Party that did it and it is the Barbados Labour Party that should be paying Duffus and there are many instances and many things I want to deal with here.

The hon. member for St. Thomas knew why Sir Lionel Luckhoo was not summoned here. He knew why three people went up to Puerto Rico and had that tape recording with Mr. Baxter. Why did he not come and tell you how much they were paid in Puerto Rico? Why does he not come and tell whether expenses were paid by Mr. Baxter and whether or not they refunded the money that was paid to them by the Government? Let him come and tell this House who prevented Mr. Baxter from coming here. Let him come and tell this House why Sir Lionel Luckhoo was not summoned. Let him come and tell this House why Mr. Baxter was not summoned. Let him come and tell this House whether it was cheaper to bring Mr. Baxter here or to send three people to Puerto Rico. But Mr. Baxter could not be brought here for the simple reason the he refused to say that Sir Lionel Luckhoo owned shares or had shares in Bath Plantation Limited on behalf of Mr. Barrow. He refused to say it. The information that he has on the tape I have access to. Very often when you try to play tricks they often backfire.

There is another matter in my general introduction, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to mention and it is this. Having discovered that they did not have enough evidence to substantiate any charge of corruption against the Government, when it came to the crunch of setting up a Commission, then we heard the ridiculous word of "infelicitities" being introduced and you are setting up a Commission to investigate infelicitities, unhappiness. Now for heavens sake, Mr. Chairman, *felicitas* means happiness and *infelicitas* means unhappiness. I am a Barbadian Scholar in Classics, you know, with three distinctions, Latin, Greek and Ancient History and Literature.

Anyhow the point I am trying to make is that all that word means is unhappiness and if it can cover corruption it can cover anything. Each hon. member here, each Barbadian, has had some unhappiness in his life.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order. It must not go down on the records that the Commission was established because of 'infelicities'. The Commission was established, Mr. Chairman:

"(a) to enquire into and report on the circumstances surrounding the acquisition of lands, assets or other property of, the expenditure of public moneys on, the guaranteeing or indemnification of liabilities or obligations of, and the procuring of goods and services from enterprises of a public or private nature and in particular the enterprises set out in the Schedule hereto, by Government or any public statutory body during the years 1961 to 1976;

"(b) to enquire into and report on the circumstances in which Government entered into the said enterprises set out in the Schedule hereto;"

Nowhere in this Report, Mr. Chairman is there mention in the terms of reference of infelicities. It is misleading the House. It is the member misleading himself far less the general public that the Commission was set up to enquire into infelicities.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I suspect that the hon. member for St. Philip North is addressing his remarks to a Mr. John Connell and/or a Mr. Weekes. Now, sir, I would like to say this. If you look at page 106 of the Duffus Commission Report starts off first of all, at paragraph 9:

"There was no evidence of anything corrupt or fraudulent on the part of any Minister or any official of Government or by any of the persons or companies concerned with the matters which I enquired into."

5.15 p.m.

It then goes on: "It must be pointed out that at the first sitting of the Commission Mr. Moseley had made it clear that there were no allegations of corruption or fraud; and that what the present Administration had said was that there were *infelicities*." That is in the report, I cannot rewrite the report, it is here, page 106, paragraph 9. Read it, it is there, the word "infelicities" is there, and my contention, Mr. Chairman, is that if you set up a Commission and that Commission sets out to investigate infelicities, that no person in Barbados can escape. It means "unhappiness". You may be unhappy with your wife, you may be unhappy with your child, you may be unhappy with a Department or Ministry. As a matter of fact, I would say that the vast majority of Barbadians

now would consider the hon. member for St. Thomas a mere infelicity as far as Barbados is concerned. That would be my judgment of the situation, if I were to use a term like that. Do you think that we would set up a Commission of Enquiry because the hon. member for St. Thomas is thought to be an infelicity? There can be no justification for that, the electorate will decide that, and I believe that they have already decided that.

Another important fundamental principle that I want to establish here is this. The role of Government, Mr. Chairman, is determined by the political complexion of those who form a particular Government at any given time. There are persons who would feel that the only role a Government should play in a free enterprise system is a regulatory function, and very often such persons who are committed to that kind of philosophy and that kind of belief will inevitably escape certain charges of incompetence, charges of mismanagement and even slanderous charges of corruption.

There is another approach to Government and that approach to Government is where a Government may feel that on behalf of its citizens, for them to enjoy the full benefits of that society, that Government has to get directly involved in many financial projects. Governments are often very scarce in terms of middle management and even upper management in terms of commercial projects. No matter what kind of business enterprise you get involved in, if it is worthwhile there is going to be some risk involved, and so long as Government gets into the exercise of putting Government money either directly or indirectly, either say by guarantees of loans or by direct investments in the projects of any enterprise that will make money, they might lose money, but it is what is for the common good, and what is very important and what can be very misleading, that very often Government has a fundamental responsibility to put money in projects, but there are risks involved, and when you come to consider such risks, and when you come to a consideration of the overall benefit to the community, it is most important that you take into consideration all these factors.

Now, I heard a lot of talk about the par value of shares in this enterprise, and the book value of shares, and people buying shares that are worth nothing. This is perfectly possible. A company may have shares for which the book value might be \$110 and the par value might be \$1, and yet you try to sell those shares on the market and cannot get a penny for them. You might sell those shares at \$30 just to keep the company from going out of business. Government on the other hand has to recognise the contribution that people have made, their commitment to those people in terms of what they have done for the employment of people over the years, 15, 20, 30 or 40 years, and when we hear in this Hon. House people talking about the development of fisheries and at the same time talking about closing down ISL, when I

happen to know that in the last seven months alone they have lost \$700,000 as a result of having those boats tied up in Belem, where they have been for almost five months.....(ASIDES). Those are not facts? I think the hon. member for St. Andrew should try to know the difference between facts and information, but my information is that the debt is now somewhere in the region of \$17 million.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have not heard very clearly what the hon. member said. Am I to understand that between the time of the Duffus Report and today that additional debt has been incurred by Seafoods to the tune of \$17 million?

Dr. HAYNES: No, I did not say so. I said when you look at the present debt, my information is that it is about \$17 million compared to what it was at the time that Duffus terminated his investigations into International Seafoods, but that is not important, because I think the appropriate questions will be asked of the appropriate Minister in due course and at the appropriate time. So I just want to get this question of the value of shares clarified in relation to Government policies as far as public investment is concerned and I think it is quite erroneous to say that because the par value of a share is \$X that that particular enterprise as far as the public is concerned might not be worth considering, and more than that, particularly when you consider the job generation and future development of a particular company — for example, drawing down the \$20 million from Trinidad for the purpose of further developing the shrimp industry rather than paying civil servants, and also having proper agreements with Brazil for fishing in Brazilian waters.
5.25 p.m.

I think that if an appropriate policy had been taken, that just as International Seafoods with six boats made something like over \$270,000 in the first year of operation — and shrimping is known to be a very profitable industry, if International Seafoods could do that with six boats, it is my view that with proper capitalisation and proper agreements, and recognising with the failure of International Seafoods Limited that what happened to the company could be corrected by getting cheap fuel from Venezuela or Trinidad, I think we would have been in a very different position today. But there was too much anxiety to prove that the Democratic Labour Party Government was corrupt. I believe that when the Duffus Report is seen against the background of a government trying to make sure that the wealth of this country was being spread as widely as possible throughout the community and that ownership in major enterprises even of a commercial nature was new to Government as an exercise distinct from what took place over the last 100 years in Barbados, we believe that people will begin to understand that the questions asked by Duffus were not intended to be a condemnation of

Government but merely a matter of saying "I am not getting involved in these policy matters."

Take the North Point; I am not sure I heard correctly, but I think I heard a statement while I was in the dining room that the best offer the Government had for the North Point was US \$250,000 or something like that. I can tell you this, that a shipping firm in New Jersey was prepared to pay US \$2 million for the North Point and were in contact with a local agent here, and when he phoned the office of the Crown Solicitor he was told that the boat was already sold. And I wonder if the hon. member for St. Thomas told this House how much money he got for the North Point.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member knows the name of the shipping firm and the local shipping agent he must name them. He has just made an accusation of a most serious nature. I know of no such offer. If he does not wish to be branded as a liar he must tell the House the names.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, to continue.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must not be allowed to get up and say what he has in the House, because it is a reflection on what I have said. I have said that the highest offer that the Government got was X dollars. He has invented an offer from a New Jersey Company or a shipping agent; he must tell the House if he has these facts.

Dr. HAYNES: I did not say that the Government had any such offer. What I said was that an offer came from a New Jersey firm and that offer was passed on to a local Barbadian agent who assured me he had phoned the office of the Crown Solicitor. I do not know to whom he spoke, but I got the information that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Dr. HAYNES: I will give you another example, Mr. Chairman.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member give us the name of the shipping agent in Barbados or the shipping firm in New Jersey? I have never been on the same side as the hon. member in my whole life, but if he can give me that information, I would get up and support him for the first time in my life.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Caribbean Airways shows an interesting example of what can happen in a country like ours. Caribbean Airways was not made one of the subjects for enquiry by Duffus. The people of Barbados will remember the same charges made against the previous regime of Caribbean Airways, and also.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have said that Government did not receive any offer higher than a certain amount. The hon. member has said that a shipping firm in New Jersey communicated with a firm in Barbados and made a higher offer to some officer of the Government. Must that reflection on my speech be allowed to remain? Can a man get up in here and say anything, true or false and it must stand?

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to carry on? The hon. member for St. Thomas got up and carried on as he liked. We sat down and listened to all kinds of remarks being made about the hon. member for St. John but we refused to interrupt because we knew he was fighting a losing battle.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to draw to the attention of the Committee that there is a time limit set for debate on supplementary votes of this sort, and if members are going to continue this talk and cross talk, the time will be used up and some hon. member who wishes to speak will not be able to do so.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am willing to continue to speak but I am not being allowed to do so.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I am putting it to you if hon. members can get in this House and call another hon. member of the Opposition a liar — I do not know if you did not hear and so did not call on the hon. member to withdraw the remark — and I am saying let justice be done though the Heavens may fall.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must comment on the remarks of the last hon. member, the member for St. Philip South, and certainly if any hon. member of this House used that word and it escaped the notice of the Chairman I would have expected that some hon. member would have drawn it to my attention.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I am the only hon. member to whom he could be referring. But it is Sir Herbert Duffus who called him a liar, not I, and Sir Herbert Duffus is not a member in here.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, I would like to keep before me the general spirit of the Duffus Report and continue with the facts as I see them. Caribbean Airways was subjected to serious charges of corruption for many years in this country, but with the knighting of Mr. Laker everything is all right.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what Caribbean Airways has to do with the Duffus Report. The hon. member has been going on for a long time. Perhaps he should keep within the limits of the debate.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am specifically referring to Caribbean Airways to demonstrate how important it is for a Government to get involved either directly or indirectly with certain projects, because even if sometimes you have up-front losses, the gains further down the line can be tremendous. The opening of Europe to mass tourism that we are experiencing today is a consequence of putting a non-IATA Carrier on that European route. Of Carib West, if it has lost \$1 million, all I will say is this, that when BWIA stopped flying overnight it was an invaluable asset to the industrial and commercial sector of this country, and heaven only knows how many million dollars it may have saved this country during that period. So in these instances you cannot just look at up-front losses, and if a Barbados-based cargo carrier is properly capitalized and managed, I believe it can be of tremendous value to Barbados, that it can help our commercial, industrial and agricultural development, and if we have to subsidize such an airline by \$1 million and it brought in \$10 million a year, then it would be a worthwhile expenditure.

5.35 p.m.

So these projects cannot be judged in the kind of way that the hon. member for St. Thomas says and he knows that. He knows that they cannot be judged in that way. He knows that you cannot take a cut off point like that in terms of assessing these projects. The Leader of the House would know better because he has experience in commercial matters. He has experience in business, and he knows perfectly well that often it will be ten or fifteen years before projects of this kind come into their own in terms of fulfilling what was perceived ten years earlier to be desirable.

I have already dealt with the North Point; but it is also of interest when we hear that Duffus needed all kinds of professional assistance, that Duffus could not get to the bottom of Bath. Duffus could not do this and could not do that, but Duffus could come to a clear conclusion. On Page 104 Duffus says: "The only enterprise on which it has been established that there was a loss was that of the North Point, the loss on which was \$87,684." The hon. member for St. Thomas, an expert economist, a financier and an expert businessman can come to all sorts of other conclusions.

We are here to debate the Duffus Report, and I hope that not only the facts of this Report will be written in the Duffus Report, but also in the records of this House. I know that I am speaking in the kind of spirit which Duffus hopes will continue to be seen transpired in this House in our debates. You will note, Sir, very clearly that I have not sought to make any personal assaults. I will leave that kind of behaviour to the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. Thomas. Humble persons and ordinary members of this House like me will know how to conduct ourselves and would not want to

use remarks about him, the kind of remarks that I heard him make about the member for St. John today. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is too much cross talk.
(Hon. L. R. TULL: You talked about the Prime Minister and other Ministers in Welchman Hall).

Order Please. The hon. member has a minute to wind up his remarks. (*Asides*). Order Please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I heard the hon. member talked about your father too. (*Asides*).

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it is quite interesting to note that in his summary on International Seafoods Limited he was very careful not to say whether the Government should have proceeded with the private arrangements within the terms of reference. What I perceive here is what Duffus is suggesting, although he did not wish to say so, since he never wished to interfere with the policies of the past Government or pass judgment on them, on the question of whether or not it was a wise decision not to have gone ahead with the private arrangement.

On the Golden Mile enterprise there was no evidence of corruption, no evidence that the land was bought at other than a fair price. I have already spoken about Carib West and Bath Plantation and I can say that the price of \$3.5 million is excessive for Bath Plantation for agricultural use. I have no quarrel with that; but the hon. member for St. Thomas must know that the cost generated was for a substantial proportion of that land for a different purpose; and when we stand up in this Hon. House today, Mr. Chairman, and we talk of linking agriculture with agro-industries and with tourist development, can you think of a more wonderful site to carry on that type of development than in places like Bath or Bathsheba which can be susceptible to that kind of development for the further generation of employment and bringing hard currency into this country?

So you have put this land back into agriculture and you have devalued it. You have made it a useless investment. If they do continue it as an agro-industrial development, it would be a different situation altogether. The energy situation and the investment climate are changing throughout the world. What blue prints are there already; and there is every possibility that that \$3.5 million could be the basis of a different use of that particular area, and the value of the land in relation to its potential use would have been improved.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to put across some of the very serious points raised by the Duffus Commission. I have tried to put across what he said and the kind of conclusions and questions that were

misrepresented, particularly because Mr. Duffus sought to avoid any intention of going into what are essentially matters of policy.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, after listening to and watching the performance of the last speaker, I would say that the hon. member needs to take control of himself. As a physician, the hon. member may well know that unless he takes control of himself, other people from his behaviour may well believe that he should perhaps seek the advice of a physician from the Black Rock area.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, this has been a very nice debate; but I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention Standing Order 70(2)(a) which says: "Three hours shall be allotted for a debate on a Supplementary Estimate of Expenditure containing up to 12 items and an additional 15 minutes debate shall be allowed for every item over twelve items". I am submitting that you should close the debate on this item.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have exceeded the time, but sometimes members are allowed to go beyond the time. I will ask the Prime Minister to sum up. (*Aside*)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I will move for an extension of time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If that is the wish of hon. members.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Is it correct for an hon. member to flout the ruling of the Chair? You have made a ruling, and he is saying "No, no, Sir."
5.45 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No hon. member will flout this Chair blatantly or other wise.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am very sorry, Sir, it was quite inadvertent and I apologise to Your Honour, Sir. I do apologise but I did rise to ask that the time limit be extended.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to have the feeling of the Committee on an extension of time for 15 minutes.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. Order please.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, for information I would like to know from you if the time is extended for approximately half an hour how many people would be able to speak because all of us would like to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a general agreement that the time be extended and it is so extended.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the views of the member for St. Michael North. The Prime Minister indicated half an hour. I am going to have half an hour. No, sorry, I am going to have 15 minutes. I am sure that other members from this side will be in this so I would need the whole 15 minutes and I am appealing to my colleagues to extend it beyond half past six or I will speak now and the Deputy Prime Minister would not be able to speak. I am going to speak on this.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Despite what the hon. member says, he is not entitled to speak now. He will be speaking after I speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, with all due respect to you, no member can tell you who will catch your eyes. Where are we going. I am the senior member in here and we must set forth a good example, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And let me assure the hon. member for St. Philip South that he will always catch my eye. Now what I want to get clear is the duration of this extension. I think it is very necessary that a limit be set and we should agree on some specific time. It is my opinion that hon. members agree to an extension of time and there is no specific limit set.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I disagree.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You disagree with what?

Dr. CADDLE: We have Standing Orders, let us abide by them. We should have suspended the Standing Orders at the beginning of the Debate which you did not do. I do not see any point in suspending them for 45 minutes or whatever because the time limit has gone. At the same time people are permitted to speak only 15 minutes and you have allowed some members....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was speaking time actually ran out but I took the silence of the House and the fact that neither the hon. member for St. Michael North Central nor any other hon. member got from their seat to draw it to the attention of the Chair to mean that silence meant consent.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we should fix a specific time and I would suggest 8 o'clock as a reasonable time, but everybody should only speak for 15 minutes. I think that should be rigidly imposed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that there is a general agreement that the debate should continue until 8 o'clock.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up any long period of time because I have my own views as to the full importance of the Report of the Duffus Enquiry and I think, unlike some hon. members who have spoken in here, that the Report and its consequences will be of lasting benefit to Government in this country.

I think it is important that we all remember that we practise a system of Government which is an elected democratic system and all countries in the world who practise such a system have to make use of the device of an independent enquiry into the conduct of particular public officers including officers who hold such high office as the office of Chief Executive in the country.

In this particular case there can be no doubt as to failure of the then Government of the day to be free and frank with its own executive and with the legislature in Barbados. I think that one thing is very clear. I am surprised that the other members on the other side have not taken the point yet because certainly in the course of the speech of the Prime Minister he adverted to the point that one of the most significant things in the Report was that for whatever historical reason or otherwise we did have a situation in Barbados in which the former Prime Minister and Minister of Finance felt that it was his exclusive prerogative to deal with Government monies in a manner as he sought without reference to his colleagues and without reference to the legislature in this country.

Now I regard that as a very serious thing. I do not believe that it is in the interest of good Government, and indeed of a Democratic Government for us to come to white-wash these very serious findings because that is a very serious thing. No executive is entitled to treat the taxpayers' money in the manner in which it was treated in respect of the investments as set out in the Duffus Report and this is one of the most iniquitous things.

What we should be doing is trying to discover what ways and means we can come up with to ensure that the Regulations, the Rules, and the Laws of this country are so reformed and established as to prevent a repetition of that sort of thing.

5.55 p.m.

I would hope that in the course of the next three or four years we will be able to devise such a system. Reading right through the report perhaps this is an area where the report is particularly defective, because despite the clear evidence of one of the functionaries in the Ministry of Finance, an important functionary, namely, the former Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of

Finance, as to the unsuitability and inadequacy of the existing rules relating to financial administration, no positive remedial suggestions other than the suggestion that each Ministry should have a Financial Controller came forth from the report. It is fairly clear that inadequate examination was given and inadequate thought was brought to bear upon the connection between the adequacy of the laws and the findings in relation to the specific enterprises. So I do hope that rather than approaching this in a manner of point scoring by either side that we will bend our minds to this particularly important area.

There is another important point arising out of the report. There is no question or doubt about it, that some \$20 million of the taxpayers' money was involved in these transactions. In respect of some of the transactions there are residual assets, there may be differences of opinion as to the valuation of these assets on both sides, there may be differences of opinion in respect of the utility in purchasing the assets at the particular time, but there is one distinct fact that remains and one distinct question that was posed. Were the procedures adopted reasonable, ordinary business procedures which were adopted? If Government is going to indulge in commercial activity, it is my humble opinion that Government having decided that it is going to indulge in commercial activity must decide that it must have regard to what is recognised as prudent and proper commercial practice. And this has nothing to do with "isms", and this is something that hon. members seem to be losing sight of.

One of the significant things of this part of the 20th century is the close coalition of viewpoint between people who profess various political views and Governments who profess various political philosophies and that in relation to economic activity, it has become recognised, whether you are communist, socialist, conservative or otherwise, there are certain ordinary rules of commerce and business practices which if not followed will lead to losses which no community is prepared to tolerate. It is no point the hon. member for St. Michael South Central getting in here and saying that the Democratic Labour Party indulged in these business activities, these undertakings, because they wanted to share out the cake among a wider section of the community. That does not bear examination, because I would like to ask the hon. member when the Democratic Labour Party was paying off the private shareholders of International Seafoods, who were they paying off? They were paying off Mr. Simpson. Is the hon. member over there going to say that Mr. Simpson belongs to that class of Barbadians that it is the Government's wish to make sure that the greater part of the cake is divided up amongst? Who were the other shareholders? One of the former shareholders was Mr. Challie Jones, the other one was Mr. George Fergusson Jnr., and who were the others? There were four or five individuals in relation to Carib

West who were the shareholders, Harold Went and a couple of other shareholders, the Guilto Corporation and a couple of other shareholders.

Let us go to Bath. When we talk about Bath, who were the shareholders? Mr. Baxter,....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman. The point was that Government had invested in these matters and any shareholding would have to relate to Government's perspective of what these companies were capable of doing for the community as a whole and that the actual share value cannot only be based either on the par value or the book value, but you have to have the wider perspective of the entire operation, and I think the hon. member is probably not saying exactly what I said. I am not saying that Government had any particular duty to particular shareholders. Government has a duty to look at the overall factors related to any company and may well come to the conclusion that neither the par value nor the book value of a particular company would necessarily be the price which you would pay for a share. That is all I said, nothing more than that.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I distinctly heard the hon. member say in addition to that that in evaluation of these enterprises the Government found itself in a position in which it partook in these enterprises with a view to ensuring that a greater percentage of the cake of this country was shared among people who did not have any share in the cake of ownership. I distinctly heard the hon. member say that, and I say that a critical examination of the enterprises does not support that view, because I have pointed out that the people who were partaking in the sharing of the cake were people who could not by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as people who never partook in any share of the cake of this country. 6.05 p.m.

And I pointed out in relation to Bath Plantation that the real beneficiaries of any cake were people who had little or no connection with this country; the only connection was that they were members of the Democratic Labour Party. But even if one assumes that it is necessary for Government to participate in certain circumstances in order to rescue an operation, it does not relieve the Government of the responsibility of ensuring that it is participating in the rescue operation in a business-like manner. One of the cardinal points of failure brought out in the Duffus Report is that the former Minister of Finance ignored any kind of financial prudence in dealing with these enterprises. In particular the evidence was positively clear that he was advised by his financial advisers — Mr. Neville Osbourne in relation to International Sea Foods — this is the important point, and I am sorry to say that the message of Duffus has not yet got home to the hon. members of the other side, that

is, that you cannot in relation to taxpayers money spend it as though it were your own. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central is entitled to do what he likes with his own money, but once you assume responsibility in relation to the taxpayers money, it is my humble opinion, and the opinion of this Government, that you are under a duty to act prudently and in accordance with proper business practices. And I go further — and this is the point the hon. member up to now, in spite of this report, has not grasped and that is that the legislature and the Cabinet must be in a position to make a contribution in respect of the wisdom or unwisdom of decisions. It is no use saying that it is for the electorate to settle. How can the electorate make an intelligent decision on any matter unless the true facts are brought out, so that they know all the facts surrounding a matter? That is something that hon. members on the other side up to now..

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation, at page 106 of the Duffus Report there is a clear statement which reads: "The evidence discloses that in every one of the five enterprises the Cabinet was consulted and a decision obtained before executive action was taken." This is a clear statement at page 106 of the Duffus Report.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member has only illustrated one of remarkable things about the Duffus Report, that is, that it says different things at different points, because in respect of Carib West the Government was bitterly criticised for non-disclosure to the Cabinet of a number of material facts.

Dr. HAYNES: You appointed Duffus, not us.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. There is a great danger in picking out one thing and not reading the whole Report. I read out something in which the hon. member for St. John was criticised for not consulting the Cabinet; it is to be found at paragraph 40 of the Carib West section of the Report, and it said that "It would seem in giving these letters of comfort to the bank Mr. Barrow acted on his own initiative. He did not seek the prior approval of his Cabinet as he had done when seeking to expend \$520,000 nor did he report to the Cabinet what he had done." So the hon. member has no right to get up and say that Duffus said the former Prime Minister consulted the Cabinet at all times. Duffus has perhaps said different things at different places.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The basic position is this, Sir: We know now as a fact that in some instances all the relevant facts surrounding the decisions were not put to the Cabinet; that his known. Secondly we know that in respect of many of the instances the Legislature of this country was not consulted. So I just want to emphasise that these are very important and significant findings in relation to our scheme of Government, and I think that

what we should be directing our time and energy to now is the lessons that are to be learned in respect of our structure of government, having regard to the fact that we know that it can be manipulated to suit the particular purposes of particular people if they are so inclined. And so we have to see what checks and balances are necessary in the interest of ensuring a proper accountability. Our views are very clear on this. It is clear to me that the real description we can draw in relation to public finance in this country between this Government and the last Government is that we over here feel that accountability is important and those over there, particularly the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, feel that there is no concept of accountability worthy of mention in his scheme of things. He goes even further and is inviting the Government to do what it likes because he wants to give us the assurance that they will never appoint a Commission of Enquiry into the activities of a Government.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I think the hon. member is stretching the situation. When I made the statement that the Democratic Labour Party would never seek to appoint this kind of Commission I said this because this was a political Commission and will have consequential problems, and you yourself are going to find problems in functioning as a consequence of the establishment of this Commission. Talk to some of your Board Chairmen and see.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You know the Lord in heaven has a way of giving a forewarning. When a serious contender for so-called political leadership of this country can get up on the floor of this House after being in here only four or five months and say that as far as the Democratic Labour Party is concerned they will never appoint a Commission of Enquiry of the Duffus type into any activity of any Government, and then in the course of his speech the hon. member does not advert to the points raised in the Enquiry as to the adequacy of accounting procedures, when he does not advert to that the only reasonable conclusion to be drawn is: "Boys, do what you like now, because when we get back in we will do what we like." The hon. member wants to establish a brand new standard. He wants to say that as politicians we should understand "Today for me, tomorrow for you." I cannot subscribe to that kind of philosophy. It would be irresponsible for any political party to commit itself to the viewpoint that it will not use the process of a Commission of Enquiry to enquire into the failure of any Government to conform to what is regarded as proper conduct in Government.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I think I made it perfectly clear that we did not believe in political Commissions of Enquiry but that the Royal Barbados

Police Force should be strengthened and the monies being spent on enquiries should be spent to set up a special department.....

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Anyway, Sir, I think I have made the position clear and I am glad that we extended the time and that the hon. member made the contribution that he did, because we are beginning to see very clearly the differences in the political attitude of members of the other side, especially the difference between the former Minister of Finance and this Government and we are beginning to see the hon. member's own attitude towards Government in this country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been sitting here now for quite a long time and would like to retire for a short while. I would therefore like to ask that I report progress and ask for leave to sit again. I would like at this stage to suspend for about five minutes.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
6.15 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LANDS DESCRIBED IN THE SCHEDULES TO THE RESOLUTION

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

Order No. 2 was called — A Resolution that the House of Assembly approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of the parcels of land described in the Schedules hereto for the following purpose, namely; for the establishment of a pipeline system for the Bridgetown Sewerage Project and that the Senate be invited to concur herein.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution for the acquisition of a parcel of land at Roebuck Street for the Bridgetown Sewerage Project. The Government is setting out to acquire land of Hasley Pollard, the National Housing Corporation, Ismay Kendal, and Mr. Harold Evelyn.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: 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 leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is with a heavy heart that I speak on this particular matter which is before the House. It is of considerable surprise to me that a matter dealing with a major commission set up by the administration should be dealt with by way of a minor supplementary Resolution. I would have thought myself that the way to have dealt with this matter would have been by a substantive Resolution because it was the Government's decision to set up that Commission; and to me that would have been the proper way to deal with this matter. On a previous occasion I noted that the member for St. Philip North moved a Resolution dealing with the status of women; but on this occasion that particular procedure has not been followed so that we have run into the time limit problem and other areas of difficulty precisely because I believe that the Government is failing to give proper direction and leadership to this Hon. Chamber in this matter.

There is no reason why we should be debating this on a minor Resolution. The second point is specifically in relation to the supplementary and that I would like some information of the total expenditure on that Commission, and in particular whether counsel for the previous administration who have been appearing before the Duffus Commission have been paid out of public funds for their appearance or whether it is the Government's intention so to pay the Attorneys-at-law who appeared for the previous administration. I have heard no reference made to that from the other side; and I would like some clarification from that side. Make no bones about it, this Commission was set up to make certain enquiries. Could the hon. member clarify the terms of reference and give the necessary information on what I have asked about? It was highly necessary for counsel to appear on both sides.

I think that that is fundamental where Commissions are set up; and I think that in the literature on Commissions there are clear guidelines; and I quote from a particular book on these matters where it states in relation to the Royal Commission to review the workings of the tribunals of inquiry under the Act of 1921, and to make recommendations, "Included in the six

recommendations made on that matter was that any person involved in an inquiry should have adequate opportunity of preparing his case and of being assisted by legal officers. Secondly, these legal officers' expenses should normally be made out of public funds."

6.25 p.m.

I believe in as much as this was not a court of law, it was not such an enquiry as we have known, I think it is only right that if the main purpose was to gather information and to clarify that information and to make recommendations, Counsel on both sides should have been paid for the work they did in this regard and I would like some information in this regard as to whether the Counsel appearing for the previous administration have been paid or whether it is the intention of the Government to pay the Attorneys who appeared for the previous administration.

I think myself that it was an ill day and I speak quite frankly on this matter. I think it was an ill day when for Barbadian public affairs such a Commission was established. This is my view, I believe that when an administration makes decisions of a policy nature which either do not turn out as was expected or which are misinterpreted and the public is made to feel that those decisions were wrong in consideration and implementation, I believe that it is the electorate who decide on these matters. Sir Herbert Duffus in his Report made precisely that point when he stated that the decisions taken by the previous administration, the policies of the previous administration according to him were judged by the electorate and that the electorate made its decision and the previous administration is no longer the Government of this country.

I believe that that is how it should be and I believe that amidst all of the talk about dividing the country, of calling a moratorium on political divisions, there has been nothing that has created more division in this country than the appointment of his Commission because however much we might try to white-wash it, however much we might try to say it was not set up in order to prove corruption, there is no doubt at all in the minds of the people of this country that the Barbados Labour Party administration was hoping and expecting to find some serious charge against the previous administration in the hope that the previous Democratic Labour Party administration could be politically sent into the wilderness for all time. That is my feeling on this matter.

I believe that in the first flush of flaunting victory in 1976 at the polls the new Government of this country was listening more to the hot heads in the Party rather than to the balanced views of others, and decided that they would go down this road and set up this Commission hoping that when the outcomes were before the public and the Government that great political capital

could have been made out of the findings. I think the Report in my own judgment has been a great disappointment to the Barbados Labour Party which now finds itself having to come and argue that it was not talking about corruption but was merely talking about infelicities, and I think that is the measure of the miscalculation, the political miscalculation of the Barbados Labour Party administration in the establishment of such a Commission.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that having said that I do not think I am taking any comfort from the Report or that anyone — or rather, to put it this way, I for one do not take any comfort from this Report because I do not think that the Commission should have been established in the first place — I think myself it tells us something about our political institutions in this country and I believe in the role and the influence of Parliament. I believe, further, that the main thrust of the Report has been missed by a lot of people in this country. I believe it must have been somewhere in the mid 1860's in a classic on the British Constitution Walter Bagehot indicated that power had slipped from Parliament into the hands of the Cabinet.

There is a clear indication not only in Barbados but elsewhere that what we have now is not a Cabinet Government but Prime Ministerial Government in which the power of the Prime Minister is increasing and we have seen it occurring over the years and we have seen it even increasing since 1976 because the personal staff of the Prime Minister has been on the increase. There is the growth of Prime Ministerial Government and I am asking all parliamentarians to search their hearts and realise what is happening.

When Duffus refers to the fact that all roads led to Barrow, I do not think that he was referring to the previous Prime Minister as such, but he was merely drawing attention to a trend in modern Government, both in the United States and even moreso in Britain where the growth of the power of the Prime Minister, the executive in the country, has advanced while at the same time the power of Parliament has contracted and that is a sign which all of us as parliamentarians must take into account, the type of lesson which I hope this Parliament would take account of and do something to try to reverse that particular trend and replace Parliament back at the centre of political development in this country. That type of development spells some dangers for political freedom and democracy for this country.

6.35 p.m.

I do not think it has anything at all to do with the personality as such of the person temporarily holding the office of Prime Minister, but it is a particular drift in modern Government which we must be all aware of, and if we miss this particular lesson in the Duffus

Commission Report we will tend to be catching at straws and missing the real substance of the real lesson from this particular report.

Mr. Chairman, I would really need a little longer than the time that is allowed to me to speak on this matter, so I am not getting involved at this stage because of the constraints of time to go into the particular matters that have been raised in the report. I merely wish to state that this Commission was set up for political purposes and there is no point trying to deny that, this fact has been established in a recent book called "The Role of Commissions in Policy Making" in which it is stated, and I quote: "A Commission may be defined as a body set up by a Government to consider a specific problem or problems; it works within fairly clearly indicated constraints of time, resources and in particular the political environment. It may have a part political role" — and this is the important thing — "it may have a party political role which when present is concealed as far as possible behind a neutral facade."

I am saying that the appointment of this Commission was definitely one with a high political content and the stakes were very high, and the fact that the Counsel for the Government — at least, some of them, I cannot speak of all of them — are known to be members or supporters of the Barbados Labour Party, the members who were chosen by the previous administration were members or supporters of the Democratic Labour Party merely underlines that. It was set up by the Government with a high political content and we cannot escape the consequences of that particular situation. So when on this side we say that no charges of corruption have been found in the matters that were placed before the Duffus Commission we are saying in the words of the report itself that one of the main purposes, the political purposes, for which that particular Commission has been set up did not turn out as the Government was hoping they would turn out.

Now we have to see where we go from here. It may be that you can say the matter should die at that particular point, but I am making the point that as a Parliament and as persons charged with a role in the political system of this country we have got to think beyond those narrow party political gains and see the drift, and the type of threat that is approaching our democracy, and I refer again to the fact of the extension of prime ministerial power and the place of Parliament in public affairs in this country. For me that is a very serious development and one that holds no good for democracy and development in this country.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, there is a Resolution before this Committee for the sum of \$23,256 which is supposed to assist in the payment of sums of money incurred out of a Commission set up of which the sole Commissioner was, the eminent Sir Herbert Duffus.

In any report there is always an element of argument for and against. A secretary's report from his party at conference, the treasurer's report, the chairman's report, any report at all, Sir, there is always going to be some argument for and some against, a degree of controversy. Reading the Advocate, I think it was yesterday or Sunday, it carried the headline: "Duffus Report to be debated." I saw no such item on the Order Paper, and I was one who hoped that this Resolution would never have brought in any submissions from either side on the report as handed in by Sir Herbert Duffus. I was one who tried to persuade my colleagues not to join in any debate relating to the report of Sir Herbert Duffus, but we are all caught up in the act.

Let me make my position clear. I am not one or part of any person in this country who is going to deny that I have accused them, the Democratic Labour Party, of wholesale corruption on public platforms. I have done it and will continue to do it. I will make this also clear. You jumped for joy with the Duffus report, so you accept everything in it; everything in the Duffus Report is favourable to the Opposition because Sir Herbert did not come out and say there was wholesale corruption as I personally hoped I would have seen, but I do not care about all the Sir Herberts, or the Adamases, or the Barrows, all the law schools they went to. My simple commonsense tells me that there is corruption and was corruption in the Democratic Labour Party and we challenged you openly. There is wholesale stealing, and we are not finished yet, this is only the beginning of reports. Remember, you have accepted this and you jumped for joy. It said all roads led to Barrow. So if you get the John Wickham report, the Lindsay Bolden report, or the Hanschell report, remember, whatever comes out of them jump for joy, because all roads led to Barrow. You accept that aspect of the report because you are jumping for joy on the report, but I only want to deal with one aspect of the report.

I have a simple letter. Now, I happen to know this, that out of common courtesy if you are writing a Prime Minister, a Minister of Government, if you are writing your boss, you start off with "Dear Sir," "Dear Mr. Barrow," "Dear Mr. Prime Minister," or "Dear Mr. President." He is your boss.
6.45 p.m.

When you are writing a friend you can write "Dear Mark" — even if it is Mark Young — or Dear Shipper and you can sign it Tom or Buddy — not Buddy Brathwaite — or El Tora — the bull. Therefore I am going to deal with the Carib West business.

Sir Herbert Duffus has left me with no doubt that I must form my own conclusions just as with any other report, be it political, church or else, and in Sir Herbert's Report on the Carib West intervention he asked: "What

caused Mr. Barrow to change his mind? What caused Mr. Barrow after being lodged for so many years by Mr. Went and Mr. Mayers?" Now Mr. Mayers writes the Prime Minister of a country and begins "Dear Skipper."

Now bear with me, since I have not got distinctions in Greek or Latin, or Spanish or French. But he starts off "Dear Skipper" and goes on — this is January 29, 1974 — and in paragraph 3.....(Asides) This is a photocopy — I have plenty of them, like the cheques from Sydney Alleyne. And he goes on: "I do not know if Harold and Trevor explained the serious position the company is in at the moment, but it looks as though we are hanging on to the last straw and your buddy will be out on the streets looking for a job. I definitely do not have negative ideas about this cargo business, but Carib West as it is at the moment is really bursting. I think it is at the moment the type of business from which a fortune can be made but there must be operating capital. Harold, Trevor and I myself have extended ourselves financially and we are in a position that if we cease now everything we have is gone, if we go on as we are without further financing. We are operating in a very rinky dink fashion without progressing; we are in one hell of a position. Skipper, there must be a solution. We need Carib West in Barbados. There is no limit to its potential as you well know, and I think that only God or yourself can take us out of this by having Government participation."

Now I think the legal luminaries will guide me that you do not have to see a man kill another but there is a thing called circumstantial evidence. Here is a friend writing the Prime Minister of a country asking him to take up taxpayers money to help him out of a situation and Sir Herbert wonders what caused Mr. Barrow to have a change of mind. I am charging the hon. member for St. John with wholesale corruption; I am charging him with corruption and I am saying it publicly that I will do my best to keep him out of Parliament as long as he is alive. I challenge the integrity of the Leader of the Opposition, because he bypassed Cabinet and Parliament and gave to a citizen of Barbados \$510,000 of taxpayers money and did not tell his colleagues. That is the question; that was the reason.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think the hon. member is misleading the House when he says that money was given to a citizen of Barbados. To the best of my knowledge the money was paid to a company and subsequently disbursed by that company.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order. You are giving an explanation.

Dr. HAYNES: It is a point of order. It is a serious accusation to say money was given to a man to pay off for his house. It is a different matter if money is given to a company and the Board of Directors of that Company

disburse certain of the moneys to a bank and part of it is used.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is very clear, Sir, that a cheque was handed to Mr. Went. Mr. Went may have deposited the cheque to a company, but the same Mr. Went took the \$510,000 and paid \$200,000 of the money into his personal account to offset a mortgage. 6.55 p.m.

Now I want to say here today that the Prime Minister's colleagues did not know. They were not told. The Cabinet met on a Thursday. On Tuesday Mr. Went made an arrangement with the Bank. The Cabinet met on Thursday, and on the Friday Mr. Went went with a cheque for \$200,000 and paid it into his account to offset a mortgage to free himself, and not to free the indebtedness of Carib West to the Bank. Duffus does not have to read and spell for me. The letter alone, written by Mr. Mayers to Mr. Barrow, the then Prime Minister was addressed in the words "Dear Skipper", telling him that only he or God can save me; and the member for St. John, the then Prime Minister of Barbados, gave Mr. Went a cheque which Mr. Went carried to the bank and paid towards his mortgage, and not to offset the indebtedness of Carib West.

How did Mr. Went know to go to the bank two days before the Cabinet sat to make arrangements with the bank where he had an indebtedness of \$310,000 and tell the bank manager hold on to this \$200,000 because you may not get anymore. The former Prime Minister by-passed his Cabinet colleagues. He treated them with scant respect. Now I charge them with corruption and I will continue; because there must have been some very close association. Mr. Barrow must have been sold the idea that his buddy was going to make a fortune, and he wanted to be in that fortune.

That is the only reason why he would have taken up the taxpayers' money and put it at the disposal of Mr. Went and Mr. Mayers; but Mr. Went fooled him. He did not pay the money to keep the airplanes going. He went and freed himself of his indebtedness to the bank out of the taxpayers' money. I considered that dishonest — by-passing his colleagues and by-passing Parliament by taking up what was theirs and giving it to somebody to use, knowing that you cannot get it back.

Mr. Duffus asked why did Mr. Barrow have second thoughts? This is in evidence. There is evidence that an association existed between two people, and Mr. Duffus said in his report that Mr. Went and Mr. Barrow knew more about the facts than Mr. Mayers himself; so there must have been some close mix up with them.

I must form my own conclusion, and therefore I conclude that it was an act of dishonesty. So there

must be some close thing, some close mix up with them. I am here to form my own conclusions and I conclude that it was an act of dishonesty. If they are not to be charged for corruption then I do not know what is corruption. This is an act of corruption and I am not hiding behind any door. His Cabinet colleagues did not know, the taxpayers did not know. It was only his buddy who knew very well. As the Report says, Mr. Went was not a Cabinet Minister. Mr. Went was just a shareholder; and Sir Herbert Duffus pointed out that it could not have been in the interest of the public because he only employed a half dozen people, of which only two were working when the airplane was flying; and their own manifesto of 1971 said that they would only have double participation if the interest of the country was at stake by way of employing people as they did at International Seafoods Limited.

This, to my mind, is corruption, and, as I have said, I am not going to hide behind any cloud of smoke saying that I do not charge them. I charge them. You will see a new ball coming out, and you will scream when it comes out. It deals with the land where the Labour College is at Mangrove. I will deal with that also. It was all a money set up and a money deal with the former Prime Minister holding shares for some people in the USA. The same money that Mr. Simpson put in, Simpson got back although the company was losing money. We charge them with mismanagement, with corruption and malpractice. When you talk about infelicitous, it is just high class parliamentary words for stealing. That is what it is that bare thieving.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 7.10 p.m. and I wish to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, can you ask us to report progress and ask for leave to sit again?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking for a motion.

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: 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.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, when we were in Committee I noticed that 7 o'clock was the moment of interruption; but it was pointed out that this debate could be extended until 8 o'clock. I would like to draw

this to Your Honour's attention. There is no objection on any side. Both sides agreed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would appreciate the feeling of the House as to the extending of the debating time until 8 o'clock; but I must let you know that the Committee should have apprised itself of the relevant Standing Order. It is now after 7.10 p.m., and I must suspend this sitting until 8 o'clock p.m. I must let both sides of the House know that this is a requirement of the Standing Orders; but if in a matter of seconds I get the feeling of the House that we should do otherwise, I am prepared to hear.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on this side we are quite prepared to go along with the extension; and I am quite sure that members on the other side would like to be involved with what they initiated in this debate. We on this side are quite willing.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I get an indication from members on the other side, I am quite willing to entertain it. *(Pause)*. This sitting now stands suspended until 8 o'clock p.m.
7.05 p.m.

On Resumption —

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

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

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 of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79 No. 22

The question that Head 15 and Head 15(2) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN Mr. Chairman reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business and I beg that this House now stand adjourned until the 23rd day of January, 1979 at 12 noon.

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

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

8.10 p.m.