

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 - 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30th 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); Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, LL.D., (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Hon. C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. H. deB. Forde, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. Ward; 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. Bradshaw; Mr. L. L. Sisnett; Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, M.Sc. (Econ.) and His Honour E. E. Alleyne, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 23rd January, 1979.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes were circulated a little late and I beg to move that consideration be postponed so as to enable members to have an opportunity to check them. They were late from the Printery, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking that confirmation be deferred owing to the fact that the Minutes, though circulated, were received late from the Government Printers. Consideration is therefore deferred.

Dr. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On behalf of the Minister of Finance I beg to give notice of a Resolution to amend the note to Item 2 - Loans to Agencies under Head 22 - Loans and Advances of the 1978-79 Current Estimates.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Order No. 1, Sir.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT DALKEITH AND PADDOCK ROADS, ST. MICHAEL FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Government is seeking parliamentary approval for the acquisition of a parcel of land at the junction of Dalkeith and Paddock Roads for road improvement. I think if you travel that

road often, Sir, you will recognise that coming into Paddock Road off Dalkeith Road it is one-way and it is really a blind corner and a very bad corner, and vehicular traffic always finds problems with pedestrians. The Government has examined this, MCW has recommended that improvement to the road be done, and as Minister responsible for Housing under which the acquisition of land falls I am therefore commanded to seek parliamentary approval of this matter.

Mr. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

There are, Mr. Speaker, four pieces of land — 177 square feet owned by a Miss Bascombe, 50 square feet owned by a Mrs. Redman, which both of them have kindly consented through public spiritedness to donate to Government, and there is 6,693 square feet of land owned by a Mr. K. Harding and 4,710 square feet owned by a Miss Clements. On that 4,710 square feet there is an old house which Government will also have to compensate Miss Clements for.

All the necessary arrangements have been made, the parties have agreed to this quite amicably, section 3 has been issued, and all the legal ramifications have satisfied the owners of this land. Therefore, Sir, I am commending this to the House hopefully that it will have parliamentary approval.

I imagine the Minister himself may be even looking at what appears to be what I am told by residents is a drainage problem. There is a well in the area which for many, many years has caused great concern to residents and which is very close to the hard courts of the Garrison Secondary School, and I am sure there will be no problems for this to receive parliamentary approval, but I would also like to say how pleased I am to see Barbadians when they can do something for their country in whatever little way they can donating to Government small parcels of land for road improvement. We know there are times when some persons feel that as long as Government has to acquire something they should get a tidy sum for it, and I would be failing in my duty as Minister of Lands if I did not say how happy I am to say from the floor of the House that I salute both Miss Bascombe and Mrs. Redman for their public spiritedness.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a minor contribution. I know the particular area, and if my knowledge of this area is correct, I would think that the Ministry concerned, MCW, should look at the

possibility of suggesting and recommending more improvements to that particular road. The road that runs east-west leading into Deighton narrows about 150 metres from the western end, and there are a couple of houses along that road that need to be moved if that road is supposed to be used for proper advantage.

Mr. TAITT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

12.25 p.m.

There is the Garrison School there, and up this morning I had to pass that road and I found that there were some impediment caused by the narrowness of the road there, and I would suggest that the Ministry of Communications and Works take another look and recommend that further acquisition of land along that road be considered. To the eastern end which goes to Deighton Road there are two houses on either side of that junction and this has been causing lots of concern and I feel that in dealing with this road MCW should look at that corner and that junction and make recommendations so that we can acquire the property at the eastern end so as to widen the road. It is a very dangerous situation indeed, and whereas there has been some move to rectify the western end, there seems to be little suggestion that the end at the eastern section will be rectified, so I am suggesting that the entire road be looked at with a view to widening it and at the same time making the very dangerous junction, and the Deighton and Paddock roads better for all vehicular traffic. There are lots of school children using this road, and I think that when we consider the danger posed to these children it is imperative that the Ministry of Communications and Works have a look at this area and make a recommendation in the not too distant future.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FREE HILL, ST. GEORGE

The Second Order was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Free Hill, St. George, for the establishment of a Pulverisation Plant.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, again this is another matter on which I seek Parliamentary approval for the compulsory acquisition of land at Free Hill, in St. George. I cannot speak with authority on the long talked about Pulverisation Plant — that comes under the Portfolio of the Minister of Health — but looking at the whole aspect of the pulverisation plant, it has been hanging fire for approximately four years, and I was a bit surprised when I examined the files to see that the plant was to be delivered in Barbados in April, 1975. It

is now 1979 and we are still struggling to have some of these lands acquired. I know there has been quite a number of problems with the surveying of these lands and that the whole matter of acquisition is tied up with the land surveyors but I am a bit disappointed to see that up to today we are still trying to acquire these lands compulsorily when the delivery date for the equipment connected with this project was supposed to be since 1975. I do not know how much money the Ministry of Health will have to spend to put the pulverisation plant in order or whether it has been protected against rust or other deterioration, but in my duty as Minister of Housing I can only move that this Resolution pass so that we will be able to get on with the actual acquisition of the land and allow the Minister of Health to have the pulverisation plant established. I am sure the Minister of Health is anxious to get on with this aspect of it and I hope there will be no more serious problems, although I envisage a small problem with one or two people, and we have been going gingerly with that. I have been liaising with the hon. member for St. George North and the Minister of Education about carrying out a public relations job in connection with one or two properties which may be in the access road and I hope we will be able to get the tenants there to come to some agreement. But this will come in another Resolution for the actual acquisition.

I want to say that I hope I will not be a Minister of Housing ever to push down anybody's property for the purpose of carrying out a Government development. I remember the famous Singh case some years ago, in 1961 I think, and it was political dynamite that the Government had pushed down the poor man's house. I hope that in this case we will not have to do anything of this nature. I hope instead that we can reach some amicable agreement on this matter, and I hope that the hon. member for St. George North and the Minister of Education will do everything in their power to make sure that there is no problem. I can imagine the mouthings from the other side about how we pushed down some poor old lady's house; but I would hope to be alive to be able to say how such a thing came about if it did. I can imagine hearing how this wicked Government pushed down the old lady's house, but you will never hear them say anything about a productive government. I would only warn them that since 1974 they had agreed to buy Workmans for the pulverisation plant, but we now have the problem of acquiring the property and putting the pulverisation plant into operation.

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

Mr. WARD: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion I would like to make a few comments on this matter of the pulverisation plant. Let me say at the outset that I

regard the establishment of a pulverisation plant in Barbados as a great error.

12.35 p.m.

The former Government — all right I am seconding the Resolution, and I will vote for the money; I am just suggesting that we are to put down a pulverisation plant in spite of the fact that it is not what is needed in Barbados at the present time. There are hon. members in here who are fully aware of the catastrophe which would occur in Barbados if we had an epidemic. Garbage is something that should be disposed of instantly, and not taken from one part of the island to another to be pulverised and virtually played up with. That is what a pulverisation plant does. It takes garbage and plays up with it and pulverises it.

Members must give serious consideration to this question, to the question of what garbage really means. You get dead animals. There are houses in this island that have sick people in them; and what comes out from the houses is often dumped in the garbage. You have what is known today as disposable nappies. All of these go out in garbage. I want this to go on record because the pulverisation plant is going to fail.

I believe that what Barbados needs at this time is to look to the 20th century and have a modern, up-to-date incineration plant to dispose of garbage in 24 hours. I do not want to play up with it or store it for two weeks or three weeks or store it anywhere; because the pulverisation plant will mean a colossal expenditure in the next 15 years. There will be the maintenance of the plant, the insecticides and deodorants plus the long distance of transporting it into St. George. When you pulverise anything you have to look for somewhere to put it. If you say that you are going to turn it into fertiliser, you have got to experiment as to what you have to do about the additives to make this a feasible proposition to turn it into a fertiliser.

Mr. Speaker, it is said by people who play cards — and there is no lie in it — spending money to buy a fertilisation plant is like throwing good money behind bad one. The money that has been already spent for the pulverisation plant was wasted. When I sit down I will hear the gentlemen on the other side get up and say that when they were in Cabinet it was only a temporary measure and all kinds of things.

A pulverisation plant is not a progressive step. We should be looking for an instant disposal of garbage by way of an incineration plant. Garbage should not be around longer than 24 hours, and not to have to carry it up in St. George and then beat it up and then take it up to St. Philip or St. Lucy to make fertiliser out of it. Mr. Speaker, I know that I am committing heresy today because two Cabinets decided on a pulverisation

plant; but if 44 Cabinets had decided on a pulverisation, I believe that a pulverisation plant is a wrong thing for Barbados in this year. It was all right 15 years ago or 20 years ago; but what we need now is an instant disposal of garbage by way of fire. Burn it. Dispose of it instantly. So, I want that to go on record because when it flops people will say that I agreed with it. I agreed because my Government says that they want money to go in for it; but as I have said already, it is good money going after bad money, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Resolution principally from the environmental point of view. Early in 1976 when this proposal was put forward to site the pulverisation plant at Free Hill, St. George — when this was brought to my attention, I personally expressed the view that there were serious environmental problems that should be looked into. At that time the member for St. George North — I repeat.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Did he say in 1976?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member address his questions to the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: I took the view, Mr. Speaker, that although the then Government, the Democratic Labour Party Government had undertaken that particular project, that there were certain environmental aspects of it that caused concern to me. I would make the point that the member for St. George North apparently shared that view when he associated himself with certain objections from residents in the area in 1976 prior to the election. It seems to me that the views expressed now are views which I have expressed to the Democratic Labour Party in a private capacity and which I now express in this Hon. House in the capacity of a person holding a seat in this Hon. House.

There are two serious environmental problems, Mr. Speaker. The first one is less serious, but I will deal with it first. That site at Free Hill, St. George, overlooks an area that is pretty heavily populated, namely the Workmans, Jordans and Rock Hall area, and so on. There is no way that you cannot continue to cause great psychological damage to the residents of that area, apart from a potential physiological damage; and for physical damage, I see that the access to that particular area is by way of winding steep and narrow hills; and which ever way you bring the garbage in, whether you bring it in from the Taitt Hill area, it is a question that the trucks will be going up very narrow and winding hills; and if you bring it in from the other area, St. Judes, there are houses which line that road. There are shops there and at least one supermarket and a primary school in the area where children pass and play every school day.

Mr. Speaker, the service range from that area is directly through the areas of the homes of people living in the lower lying districts. The second point, Mr. Speaker, is much more serious. It is the environmental problem. It is predicted that some 80 to 90% of the total garbage in Barbados will come from the St. Michael, St. Thomas and Christ Church area and dumping of that garbage, Mr. Speaker, will be in an area that has been quarried for many years; and indeed it is known that that area has fissures in the coral structure. I want to make the point that where there is surface drainage or subterranean drainage in that area, that the drainage will eventually go right down into the Bulkeley, the Constant, the Valley and the Belle areas which according to Tullstron, constitutes one of our major water sources in this country.

Although it is not a Zone 1 area, the fact is that this is the only possible direction of drainage; the only alternative may be some lateral drainage. If you look at either place, there are areas that go up like a kind of gully between this coral formation and you can actually see the cracks in the coral. Now, when I speak about fissures, I want to make it clear that the principle behind pure water in Barbados is in itself a self filtering. If at any time there is a fissure in the coral, then you are likely to have contamination.
12.45 p.m.

Now there is no expert on this earth who can tell you that between Free Hill and that water reserve that there are not fissures in that area. I know there has been a conflict of a opinion on fissures in the coral. These conflicts of opinion, I understand, have even led to the suggestion that the bottom of the quarry should be sealed, and even if, Mr. Speaker, at any given point in time there were no fissures in that coral structure where the subterranean drainage would take place, all it would take is for a significant earth tremor or a small earthquake to open up the fissure and then have direct contamination to your water in the particular area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that there are differences of opinion. My view, Mr. Speaker, would be why take the risk. That is the question that should be evaluated by this Honourable House. Now, Mr. Speaker, some years ago I had the honour when this country was faced with a possible involvement in the pandemic of cholera that was sweeping the world and as you know Barbadians still have very ruthless memories of a previous cholera epidemic. The fact, Sir, Mr. Speaker, that our water resources were so protected that we were able to come to the conclusion that by simply increasing our surveillance at the Airport and at the Port, then we would be able to deal with any problem, or if anyone slipped through say from Portugal, or from the Far East, that this should be rapidly controlled by

increased chlorination of the water and limited provision of emergency facilities.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, as I said before the engineers, water engineers, hydrologists, geologists, might give the opinion that there is no danger of contamination. I cannot see how they can tell you that between Free Hill up here and a valley down there at that level that there are no fissures and even if there are no fissures now, that they will not be fissures in the future.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether any epidemiologist or anyone who has had experience in water-borne diseases in Barbados, and we have people in this country who would have a lot of experience in this area, whether a single one of them would give a positive opinion that this does not constitute a hazard, that there is not the possibility of contamination of our water resources. Now the epidemiologist and physicians in a sense are the persons who have to evaluate the balance of evidence in one direction or another and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that they will certainly come out and decide that the positive risk must exist in relation to the major hazards second to the contamination of our resources and to a certain extent the first risk to the local population which I am trying to point out.

I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, since it is certainly not a party or political matter on which I am speaking, I would certainly urge the present Government to have a much more careful look at the environmental problems that can be generated by placing this plant at that particular site and I urge the member for St. George North to be consistent, as I am being consistent in my position then and my position now in relation to placing that plant at that site.

I made a commitment to the people of Workmans and the adjacent areas that I could not possibly support it if the Democratic Labour Party Government was returned to power. I cannot support it now that there is an alternative Government in power. Whichever Government is in power I certainly would have to bring to bear on any comments made on this matter which are honest. I would not like to say professionally, because I am not an epidemiologist but I certainly have been involved in this country ten years ago in the control of waterborne typhoid.

I have certainly provided the consultant services to the Pan-American Health Organisation in order to advise on the question of cholera spread in the Caribbean and Barbados was outstanding as distinct from Trinidad, Dominica or other areas in that its water resources were so tightly controlled that we could even face up to the threat of a cholera epidemic without the kind of precautions that would have to be done in other areas.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would again call for a review of this situation, particularly from these two environmental angles which I have spoken about. These remarks are made on a non-political basis. It is purely an environmental problem and if any of you do not believe me, there is a crack in that same coral structure that was big enough on the western side of that coral structure that was big enough to house Mr. Buddy Brathwaite for some time during his run from the Police and if you get any leakage through that coral you will have problems bearing in mind that you are taking over 90% of the garbage of this Island and concentrating it in one particular area. Mr. Speaker, that was my position then under the Democratic Labour Party regime and that is my position now. I urge caution in this matter. I urge a serious review and I urge a serious consultation with those people who have experience in epidemiology, that is in the spread of diseases in relation to this course and other areas. Whereas they can point at the same time against us because of opinion they can get from geologists, hydrologists and other engineers etc., I warned them because you can only imagine, Mr. Speaker, the serious dislocation not only in the local population but to other aspects of this country.

Some time ago speaking, I would not say here, Mr. Speaker, because they would stop me, but speaking I reminded this Honourable House of what happened to a certain country in Europe when there was a typhoid epidemic at the particular time. I could not remember the name but I think the name was Burma and it was years before the Tourist Industry could be re-established in that place. It was just the matter of a leaking pipe infecting the water and some tourist dying from typhoid.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have done my best in a non-partisan manner in the interest of Barbados and in the interest of those people in St. George represented by the member for St. George North whose house lies in the area of surface drainage and who can look through his window and see the water coming down from the hills and coming right down into the valley down there. He should have good knowledge of that, Mr. Speaker. He has roamed those hills, he knows where the same fissures are. He knows where the caves are, he knows where the problems are and just like one of his colleagues was able to get up and speak his mind I would urge him now to get up once again and defend his position that he took in 1976 more openly than I did but nevertheless that was the position he took and that was the right position.

12.55 p.m.

Mr. ODLE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Resolution and I do hope that the whole matter will be gone, through smoothly, amicably and swiftly so that

the properties which we are speaking about will be taken over by Government.

I must make some comment on the speech of the member for St. Michael South Central who just sat down and who made a speech today which he made at no time during the campaign in 1976. Not on any one occasion did I hear coming from the hon. member anything in terms of a criticism of the siting of a plant at Free Hill, and what I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, such a prominent member of the Democratic Labour Party at that time, the second most powerful man, and not a word against the siting of the plant in Free Hill, but today he comes and he is asking us to be cautious. Is he telling us now that at that time he knew that the party he supported had not been cautious and was taking a risk?

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is in the light of the substance of my speech suggesting that I am taking a position now which I did not take in a matter that could cause serious problems in relation to the Barbadian population. I made it quite clear that my position then was that I did not support it for environmental reasons.

Mr. ODLE: Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly understand what the hon. member said. The fact is he had no position then, he has a position now, but do not talk about a position you had then and you do not have it now.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member speaks of garbage being dumped in the quarries at Free Hill. As I understand it, not now, but years ago when the DLP first brought forth the proposal it was not a question of garbage being taken from all over the country and being dumped in any quarry, it was a question of processing the garbage, the end product would not obviously be the same thing that was taken to the site. I am not a technician, but I myself in the interest of the community held discussions with engineers and advisers to the Democratic Labour Party Government at that time and they assured me that there was no danger whatever to the water supply and that there was no danger to the general health of the community, even though I took issue with them then as I am going to take issue with it later on in my speech.

What I am somewhat concerned about is the fact with the garbage disposal set up that we were going to have there does not appear to me to be any accretion or improvement or increase in the value of the land of the people who live around that area. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, maybe in years to come it will bring about an increase in the value of the properties, but in the immediate future I cannot see that that is possible and I therefore in view of some of the complaints and

the queries which have been brought to my attention by some of the residents, namely, that their tax bills have gone up, I am asking that the Minister or Ministers concerned take a look at that situation in terms of bringing relief to those residents in the area.

The matter I want to talk about now is this. While I have no fear or particular worry about what happens with the spin-off from the garbage disposal unit, I know the dangers of having dozens and dozens of garbage trucks coming up to the plant to get rid of the garbage, and what bothers me is this. The day may well come when justly or unjustly, rightly or wrongly, the workers may have to go on strike and we may be faced in St. George with the problem of 30 or 40 garbage trucks sitting idly with nobody looking after them, filled with garbage and no work being done. That is the danger I am worried about. It can happen, rightly or wrongly, but I am not concerned with that. I love trade unions and I support them, and I may find myself in a most embarrassing position having to support the cause of the workers when I know there is great exposure and danger to the people of this country, and I am asking now that the Minister or Ministers responsible take into account this possibility and not wait until it happens, make some provision now to deal with a situation such as that which I believe is conceivable. Therein lies my greatest fear, Mr. Speaker.

With this in view, as I said when I started, I sincerely hope that this Resolution will meet with the approval of all hon. members. It might be a good thing to fill in the caves where Buddy Brathwaite and all the Buddy Brathwaites may want to hide. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central is much more of an expert in caves and the whereabouts of the caves in the parish of St. George than I am, despite my long association with that parish.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with the acquisition of land for the siting of the pulverisation plant, and I would like to make it quite clear that the idea of a pulverisation plant being put up in Barbados started with myself when I was a Minister. The matter, thoroughly gone into, had Cabinet approval and that is how it came here, with the assistance of the Millbank Technical Services who made the money available for the acquisition of this plant.

Now, Sir, there are many methods of disposal of garbage. There is the traditional method referred to as land fill, where in valleys or where you do not have valleys you use bulldozers and push out an area where you put the refuse, you roll it and then you fill it over with soil at the end of the day. That is the method used all over the world, even in the United States. It is cheap, especially where you have land readily available. Then there is the pulverisation method where the

garbage is put through a machine, it is broken up into smaller bits, it is compacted and then it comes up. By so doing the attractiveness to rats is reduced, the smell is reduced, the rate at which it decomposes is decreased, and you find that when it is dumped and compacted a vehicle can travel over the refuse so pulverised immediately afterwards. That method is being used more and more by countries all over the world, and Barbados has nothing to be ashamed of in trying to use that method. Then there are the costlier methods, one being incineration which is far costlier than the pulverisation of refuse. I have had the privilege of inspecting incinerators in the United States during a brief tour in 1973 and I was a bit shocked at the high price of setting up these plants.

1.05 p.m.

Then there was the problem of the ash coming from the incinerators and flying all over the area, and special methods had to be adopted to ensure that you did not get this nuisance from the ash. More recently there is the pyrolysis method in which the refuse is decomposed in the absence of oxygen by heat, and as a result of that method there are certain by-products of economic importance. During my period as Minister of Health we investigated the pyrolysis method and there should be on the files of the Ministry of Health a report of a company which came here and gave us a lot of information about pyrolysis and who also surveyed the Barbadian situation with the idea of seeing whether the pyrolysis method was suitable for Barbados. But here again the draw back was cost, so we settled for the pulverisation plant.

I would like to make it quite clear that here in Barbados we have some outstanding professional people, and one such person is Mr. Archer at the Ministry of Health, and anyone in this Chamber who has doubts about the pulverisation plant can check with Mr. Archer, a man of great ability and a man who is held in great respect outside of Barbados; and I wish some Barbadians, especially those concerned with the Government, would respect the stature of the man. Mr. Archer did a detailed study to arrive at a place where the plant and the refuse dump should be set up, and after a survey of existing quarries and caves in this country he came up with the one in St. George. It is believed that it will take about thirty five years for this site to become exhausted, and it is big enough to house the plant. In other words, the plant will be there, the refuse will be pulverised and straight from the plant it will be dumped and compacted. When that area becomes exhausted the plant can be dismantled and taken to another site. If you use smaller quarries it will mean you will have to take down the plant too frequently, and in this process of frequent dismantling there could be serious problems to the plant.

We have been hearing about contamination of water over and over again. The Ministry has been assured that there is no problem of contamination of underground water by the siting of the plant in that location. What can happen is that when you have heavy rainfall the water will percolate down through the pulverised material as it does through the soil and it may carry some substances that do not dissolve and become suspended in it; but underneath that you would have a layer of rock which has very high filtration properties which will seek to remove suspended matter of that nature. But going a step further it has been pointed out to us in the Ministry of Health that if we have any doubt at all about the safety of this method, the floor of the quarry can be lined with plastic. That is the position.

But what I am a bit concerned about is that the plant has been lying around for some time and I am concerned about how efficient the plant is compared with the condition in which it left the manufacturers five years ago; and I would suggest that the plant be serviced by the manufacturers before it is set up. There is no point rushing and setting it up after it has been lying down for all these years.

Refuse in Barbados has been a problem for many years, and I think that within the limit of our economic potential pulverisation offers the best solution right now for the adequate disposal of refuse.

In passing I would like to point out that apart from compacting and dumping in case of quarries there is another use for the pulverised material. This can be used for agricultural purposes as a form of manure here in Barbados where over the years, due to flooding in some cases and fire in others, the humus content of the soil has been drastically reduced and as a result the water retaining capacity of the soil is reduced. In such cases one can use the pulverised material as a way of improving the humus content of the soil and perhaps certain benevolent bacteria in the soil. You will find that large areas of Barbados have been denuded by the removal of coral and therefore cannot be used right now for any economic purpose. By filling in these areas, those areas which have been so denuded in the past can be brought back to economic use in a short space of time. You fill in with the pulverised material and in five to seven years the lands can be used for growing crops.

We are also all concerned about the tourist industry, but one of the things I would like to mention here is that we look at this matter in the wrong way. We should be primarily concerned about Barbados. We should try to make Barbados comfortable for Barbadians and not be thinking primarily about tourists. In making Barbados comfortable for Barbadians tourists will also enjoy the facilities provided for Barbadians. But I think

too much emphasis is being put on tourists and we forget the legitimate claims of Barbadians, and in this process of catering to tourists Barbadians are being reduced to the state of second class citizens in this country. I do not agree with this. Let us make Barbados a place for Barbadians and in so doing we will make it attractive for others coming in to enjoy it.

I would like to assure all those who have fears about the pollution of underground water that you can get such pollution occurring in many ways. Right now in Barbados there are wells that have been polluted by human waste matter. You do not have to have a pulverisation plant for that, and the Ministry of Communications and Works can confirm that some wells have had to be taken out of use due to the high bacterial content of the water as a result of contamination by human waste. There are many ways of such pollution and there is no point stressing this fear about contamination of the underground water by setting up the pulverisation plant in St. George or in any part of Barbados, when we have gone into the matter and have assured ourselves that none of these possibilities will arise; and I think the Ministry is in a position to take other methods to doubly ensure that this problem does not arise.

I would also like to say that I feel that this matter should have been treated with a lot more speed. It is a very pressing matter where the disposal of garbage is concerned and it is regrettable that we have had to wait five years to reach this stage, for the site was selected when I was Minister of Health. This is an interesting example of how slowly the wheels of Government can turn. In the interest of this country and of those concerned with the health of this country and with the environment, I would like to see this matter implemented quickly and a serious attempt made to get rid of the garbage all over this country.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central did what I consider today to be a rather foolish thing. He set out to make people believe that he only knew about the pulverisation plant in early 1976, and that he is concerned about the state of the water in this country when this plant comes into use.

The hon. member for St. Michael North Central has raised what I consider a very interesting point from the point of view of the public of Barbados, and I want to confirm the statement that the Ministry of Communications and Works through the Waterworks Department carries out weekly bacterial tests on all water supplies in this country.

1.15 p.m.

Not only are tests made to the various wells and springs, but these tests are carried out at standpipes along the various roads, in kitchens, in business houses, in school kitchens, etc. to make sure week by week that the water consumed by persons in Barbados is of a very high quality and standard. I think that it is rather foolish to raise the fears of Barbadians about the quality of water in this country. I have travelled...

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believed that you have listened to my speech, and you are aware that I said nothing that would raise the fears....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you trying to elucidate now? What Standing Order is the hon. member raising?

Dr. HAYNES: The one which deals with imputing improper motives, imputing to me that I am trying to raise the fears of Barbadians as to the existing standard of water in Barbados. I want to make it clear that I made every effort to stress that the standards of our water are among the best in the world at present. He said that certain fears were raised, and I think that he will have to withdraw that statement.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I am not withdrawing any statement. The hon. member does not understand what he said in here today.

Mr. SPEAKER: An hon. member can only withdraw a statement at the request of the Chair.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member talks about putting garbage down in holes and that with land fills, the water will seep through into our water basin, Mr. Speaker, at this given moment Barbados is dumping its garbage on what is called the land fill system. The hon. member should be aware that at the top of Brittons Hill they dump garbage high enough that it even caught fire. In Bush Hall garbage is dumped in holes. If the water is not contaminated at this stage, how will it become contaminated when you are dumping in a hole in St. George? I say that because you are putting garbage in holes now. People will feel that we are about to contaminate the water supply. That is the whole conclusion to be drawn from what the hon. member got up in here and said today. (*Aside:* It is a question of density). It is no question of density. Even your own hon. members do not agree with you.

The hon. member for St. Michael North Central has raised a very interesting point. When I was Minister responsible for Agriculture I saw this file. I believe that the machine is so equipped that parts can be attached to it to remove metal. I think that it can eat up a domestic refrigerator. It has an attachment which can

remove metal, and residue can be profitably used as humus in our agricultural process.

In all other countries where pulverisation plants are used, the residue is sold as fertilisers; and it is not necessary to place any holes. Farmers have already requested to have the output from the plant; so I do not know how much the hon. member knows about the plant. I would have thought that he would have investigated the plant which his political party negotiated and brought to Barbados to lay down for three years, and find out all about it instead of coming in here today to raise the fears of people about contamination of our water system.

When he talks about cholera etc. there is not everybody in Barbados who comes to the House of Assembly; but everybody in Barbados who reads the newspaper will understand that our water system is about the safest in the world. I once had a foreign diplomat saying to me that Barbados is losing out on a great potential, that we should bottle the water and sell it around the world. When people read in the newspaper tomorrow morning that a doctor got up and criticised the putting of stuff in a hole, the first thing you are going to hear is that Barbados' water is contaminated. He should be well aware that other countries are trying to drag down Barbados because of the strides that we are making; and he gets up in here and makes statements of this order.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is rather surprising that a Resolution of this sort should evoke the type of heat and acrimony — not acrimony, but the harsh disagreement which has been evidenced. As the member for Christ Church North Central indicated, if 24 Cabinets voted for it he would be against it. I can quite understand that position; but I would like to make it quite clear from the outset. Let not the Government, let not the Barbados Labour Party Administration hide behind the coattails of the Democratic Labour Party in this matter. Come out and say that we have examined this particular matter, and on the basis of the evidence, and on the basis of the technical information available, we believe that this is the best decision for the establishment of a pulverisation plant at this site; and take the consequences of that decision.

You do not have to come and say, as the member for St. James is saying, or has implied that this is something introduced by the Democratic Labour Party; because, as I have said on previous occasions, you are free to accept the previous proposals of the Democratic Labour Party as your governmental quality, or you are free to reject them just as you have rejected the North Point and whatever else you may have rejected. It is a clear decision of the Barbados Labour Party Government

to go ahead with a project initiated and developed by the previous Democratic Labour Party Administration, like so much else that the present Government is doing.

Now, I as a former Minister of Health, know a little about this matter. I believe that I had just about a year of responsibility for the Ministry of Health when we were concerned with the collection and disposal of refuse. Make no bones about it. This is a problem for the several communities in this country. This is a national problem. Refuse or solid waste, does not generate itself. It is generated by people by and large, and it is the people of this country who generate garbage, refuse, streets sweepings, whatever you want to call it, under the umbrella of solid waste. It is generated by a quarter of a million people of this country, whether in terms of households, whether in terms of commercial establishments, whether in terms of agriculture, or whether in terms of manufacturing. It is the people of this country who generate solid waste, and that generation of solid waste is growing at an alarming rate.

The development of refuse has come to what I would term it as an exponential growth. That is the term in which we will have to view this type of development as far as the generation of refuse and garbage is concerned. I hope that the Minister of Education can understand these terms. Mr. Speaker, I believe that approximately — maybe the Minister can give us the exact quantum of refuse moved by the Sanitation Service Authority in any one year.
1.25 p.m.

I suspect it must be around 400 tons per year. I hope the Minister in replying could tell us how much refuse is generated per day and one thing is certain that refuse has got to be moved and it has got to be moved efficiently from the places where it is generated and it must be disposed of efficiently.

Now I will have something to say about the efficient movement of refuse from the constituency which I represent, St. Michael South, and indeed from other areas of the country because I still believe there is a vast amount of work to do in the improvement of the collection of refuse. Two areas in my constituency in St. Michael South and there are other areas in this country in which refuse is not being collected either as efficiently as it should be or it is not being moved as frequently as it should be so let no one believe that this is a problem which has been solved. It is still there in the community that constitutes this land of ours.

Having once collected this refuse it has to be disposed of and there is no magic about it. It can only be disposed of by burning it or by burying it or carrying it out to sea or disposing of it in some such way and I

would say, Mr. Speaker, that whatever method we use raises serious technological and economic problems because there is no economic way of disposing of refuse. To the best of my knowledge, there is no method yet devised whereby refuse can be disposed of in an economic fashion, in other words to make a profit.

Mr. WARD: If the hon. member would give way, there are a number of countries which are now using fuel in place of energy to create steam. I wonder if he can understand that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not deny there are a number of countries using fuel. There are a number of countries also using incinerators but that does not mean that it is an economic method of disposing of the refuse. You can use it. I hope the member for Christ Church North Central understands you can use it. He might have a problem of thinking on this particular matter. He might have a problem of thought, Sir. I do not deny that there are these different methods and when he mentions incineration, it raises economic problems, and it raises technological problems, and it raises environmental problems.

There is a technical problem of the types of techniques and the devices used in it because there is a lot of heat generated and so on and there is the problem of how you control it and how you treat the particulates that result from the burning of this refuse.

I believe I have given a little more attention to this than the member for Christ Church East and I do not know why they believe that they can put me right on this. I have studied it, I know the technical language and I also know the problems which this community faces, so Mr. Speaker, we have got to realise that we generate the refuse and we have got to deal with it.

Now the Ministry of Health under the previous administration decided that this was a problem which required action and again on a scale that had not been taken previously. Therefore, as a result of a decision, I do not recall whether the member for St. Michael North Central indicated it or not, but we faced up to the problem and decided that we needed a new set of equipment as well as a new approach to the disposal of this refuse and so in about 1975 I believe, or 1974 rather, a decision was taken that new rolling stock should be acquired and I believe up to that point then, as a result of that new decision, the Sanitation Service Authority increased its rolling stock so that at that date it was responsible for some 61 collection vehicles, 7 traxcavators and front end loaders, 2 cesspool emptiers, 2 mechanical sweepers, 3 landrovers, 2 pickups, and there are still in the old age and 15 push-carts and 1 water-cart.

Mr. Speaker, this was a deliberate attempt on the part of the previous administration to upgrade and and

increase all of the rolling stock for the Sanitation Service Authority for it to deal with this specific problem to the generation and potential growth of refuse and garbage and solid waste in this country.

In addition to that, a decision was taken by the previous Minister, the present member and then member for St. Michael North Central that a Pulverisation Plant should be acquired. Now let us not get confused about this. A pulverisation plant does not play up with garbage, the language is a bit foreign. That must be a touristic type of phrase, one which the Chairman of the Board of Tourism might use. I do not know if they play up in the Tourist Industry.

Mr. WARD: If the hon. member will give way. This is a sarcastic term about the Pulverisation Plant. It is a mess, a total mess. If he ever goes to anyone of them he will see how the pulverisation of garbage is a total mess.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can only say that the hon. member gave way.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I cannot say that the Speaker is sarcastic as far as the member for Christ Church North Central is concerned. I would never say that because the Speaker is never sarcastic. He keeps a balance in these debates. I would never say that of the Speaker.

Pulverisation is merely a process of packing the amount of garbage that comes up so that you have a greater storage capacity available. Now the previous administration looked at an alternative site. We looked at Bagatelle in St. James, a quarry which was not in use or only in use to a limited extent and on the grounds that that particular area would present a danger to the water resources of the country. I think it had been excavated to something like 60 feet down, whereas Workmans was only 40 feet and 60 feet was going pretty close to the watertable. On technical advice it was decided that Workmans was the most appropriate site for the siting of the Pulverisation Plant.

1.35 p.m.

Now, there are problems, as I indicated, with any method of refuse disposal or solid waste disposal, and Workmans is no exception to that particular problem. There will be problems of access to the site and I think that when members over there respond to speeches made from over here they should realise the technical expertise and the knowledge and the brain power that is on the Opposition benches as contrasted with what is over there on those benches, and the front bench had better take note, because their popularity is now at a lower ebb than ever it was. The member for Christ Church West was out of the country, three of them facing their National Executive, the front bench Cabinet.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member trying to pulverise the Hon. Ministers?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. I think he may be trying to pressurise and depressurise.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I can do anything. We are talking about pulverisation and I can pulverise and depressurise, if the member wants me to say that. It is the National Executive who pulverised those three members, not any member from over here. It is the front bench, and they had better take warning.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the plant at Workmans, not the one at Roebuck.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, at Workmans. The National Executive worked on them. They could not get that coveted post, it was the back bench, the member for St. Michael West.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us leave Roebuck Street and go back to Workmans.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member probably wants to say that on this side all roads do not lead to one man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us stick to the Resolution now.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, I will stick to the Resolution, Mr. Speaker. I know on this occasion they lead to Mr. Vic Johnson, whoever he is.

Mr. Speaker, there are problems as far as the access road is concerned, and I would like the Minister, whoever is replying on behalf of the Government, to indicate whether the serious problems as far as access to this particular site and as indicated quite rightly by the member for St. Michael South Central, whether those problems are receiving serious attention and whether a plan for adequate access is being worked out. Some of those roads are only between 12 and 16 feet wide, and with those heavy vehicles travelling on those roads presenting problems for vehicular traffic and pedestrian, it is necessary for the appropriate Ministry to work out a proper plan and programme for dealing with that particular problem. It is a genuine problem, and we cannot avoid it.

The other problem that is associated with it is the environmental nuisance that will be created. This is not to say that it is not a good decision to site the plant at that particular point, all I am saying is that whatever site you choose on balance there are going to be pluses and they are going to be minuses, and there are environmental problems, and it is wrong for speakers on that side to indicate that the member for St. Michael South Central

was being a bit wide of the mark to draw the attention of this Hon. Chamber to these problems. There are problems, and there is no point covering them up. There will be a problem of noise, because a pulverisation plant if it can exclude all of these things and if it can digest, as the member for St. Joseph, just back from speaking — he has not given a public speech for a long time — the first time he has caught his voice since being moved to the Ministry of Communications and Works.....

Certain Remarks were ordered to be expunged from the record by the Speaker at this stage.

There will be a question of noise, and that is one which has got to be satisfactorily dealt with, and I would like the Minister who is speaking on this particular matter to indicate what steps are being taken to reduce the level of decibels so that there would not be that problem as far as hearing is concerned.

Now, I would like the Minister to indicate whether the plant will be adequately enclosed in this quarry and whether it will be going 24 hours a day or what is the period of time for operation of this particular plant, because if the intention is to operate at night there will be serious problems as far as the comfort of the good people of St. George — let me speak for them, because nobody in here speaks for them very adequately on that side so let me speak for them — I am interested in their welfare and I am interested that they are not disturbed at night by any noises which may bring them from the comfort of Morpheus or into whosoever arms they go into, so that is another problem.

Now there is a problem of leaching, and leaching relates to the trickle or the flow of water or other dripping from the actual refuse into the water table. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the disposal of refuse or the concentration of refuse is concerned, the BOD content, that is, the bacterial oxidation demand, is much higher as far as refuse is concerned than in other areas, and it is absolutely necessary, and I think this is what the member for St. Michael South Central was drawing attention to, it is absolutely necessary to ensure that every precaution is taken to ensure that no harm comes to the water resources of this country, and there are quite a number of diseases, a number of infections which can result from inadequate or inefficient handling of refuse especially when it is concentrated, and I would hope that serious attention is paid to this particular problem. As I recall it, the technical experts of the Government were satisfied that this problem could be contained. Some 73% of the refuse generated in Barbados comes from the greater St. Michael area. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: 83.6%). I heard something about 83.6%, Mr. Speaker, I believe that figure comes from a hat, I do not think that comes from the Sanitation Services Authority. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Where did you get yours from? Out

of your pocket?) Whatever the percentage is, it is a high concentration of refuse that is generated from the greater St. Michael area, and what we have got to be certain is that removal and disposal of that refuse is done as efficiently as possible.

1.45 p.m.

Now the Sanitation Services Authority has a very important role to play in this regard. Sometimes we believe that the fact that we have a refuse problem is due to householders who do not put out their solid waste at the right time or who have bad domestic habits. But there can be inefficiencies as far as the collection of refuse is concerned, as far as the transportation of that refuse to the disposal site is concerned, and above all as far as the management of the site itself is concerned, and I hope the Minister is giving serious attention to the proper and adequate management of that site, because it is not only the operation of the pulverisation plant itself but also the disposal afterwards of the compacted solid waste that will require adequate management. And I hope that the necessary resources and inputs are being made into that particular aspect of the operation to ensure that there is no environmental hazards or scars on the good people of St. George as a result of the location of this particular plant.

Mr. Speaker, I would say this much that as far as Barbados is concerned I come down on the side of the pulverisation plant. I believe that when you take into account the methods for the disposal of refuse in a country with limited land area and a country which depends on a salubrious and attractive environment for its economic development and economic well being, pulverisation of refuse has a significant role to play as far as the development of the country is concerned. I believe that we have a ready made method of dealing with this problem because I believe there is a biblical statement that every valley shall be filled and every mountain brought low. If we have these quarries, even if these holes have been dug into the earth and the coral excavated, then we have to fill them back up and maybe if the job is done properly the land when filled back in can be used for some appropriate public purpose such as a playing field or some other use.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Underneath all this talk I hope the hon. member for St. Michael South will tell this Honourable House why the pulverisation plant was not constructed when he was Minister of Health and the plant was here in this country.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: No point of order, Mr. Speaker, rather disorder. Mr. Speaker, I hope these problems will be given very careful attention. I have indicated as far as the House is concerned, and as far as the people of this

country are concerned that I am in favour of the establishment of a pulverisation plant, but I am calling the attention of the Government to the problem of ensuring that the plant is effectively administered. (*Asides.*) You were Minister of Health longer than I was.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must address the Chair; I can take care of you.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but what I am concerned about is whether they will take care of you. So, Mr. Speaker, I have raised these problems and they are serious problems, but this does not in any way alter my position on the pulverisation plant. This was a Government decision, a decision of the previous administration. We stand by that and we accept the decision of the present administration because they have examined it and have come to the conclusion that it is in the best interest of the people of this country. So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the particular Resolution and I hope that efficient implementation will be the hallmark matter of the present administration.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, is it worthwhile for me to start now. I am going to be some time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of interruption is 2 o'clock.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. A great deal has been said on this matter of the pulverisation plant; some of it is myth, some of it is folly, some of it makes sense.

The first thing I wish to say is that the plant itself, the physical plant and equipment, has been lying down in this country since 1974. I have never understood why the hon. member for St. Michael South failed to establish the pulverisation plant. He says I was Minister of Health longer than he was. That is true, but I wish to say this, that when I went into the Ministry of Health in 1976 I took nothing that I found for granted. Where agreements had been signed and the Government of Barbados committed, I could do nothing, as was the case at Emmerton; otherwise I took nothing for granted. I wish to assure this House that water resources studies have been done since I was in the Ministry in respect of potential leakage at the pulverisation plant at Workmans. I wish to assure hon. members that I myself have been to New Orleans in the USA and spent two days at a pulverisation plant there. I have stood in the middle of the garbage, stood on the land fill adjoining the plant, and have satisfied myself about aspects such as insects, rodents, odour, noise, even birds flying over the land fill; all these things I can speak of at first hand. I wish to assure this House that every possible review and consultation with medical authorities has been done; hydrologists have been consulted — one of the team

which came down here to do the water resources studies was specially seconded to examine the question of leakage and possible pollution.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about the matter of the environment. I do not think anybody in this Chamber can claim to be more of an environmentalist than myself. We all have the interest of Barbados at heart.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. Minister likely to conclude her address by ten minutes after two?

Hon. B. A. MILLER: I will prefer to conclude after lunch, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now adjourned until 2.45 p.m. today.
2.00 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I am advised that there are no replies to question ready. There is only one item under Private Members' Business standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South West who did submit questions; and I promised to allow the hon. member to give notice of his two questions. I now call on the hon. member for St. Michael South West to give notice of his question relative to money paid to the Chairman of the Board of Tourism.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, to ask of the Minister responsible for Tourism:

Will the Minister state the total amount of money paid to, or on behalf of, the Chairman of the Board of Tourism on account of travelling or per diem expenses, excluding air fares, during the first two years of his tenure of office?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member — his question relative to the breakdown of control prices of petrol.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, to ask of the appropriate Minister:

Will the Minister state the breakdown of present controlled prices of petrol in respect of amounts allocated to the Refinery, the oil companies, the dealers, road tax and duty respectively, per gallon?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Private Members' Business. There is only one item of Private Members' Business, and

it stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South West.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when we last considered this Resolution — for easy reference I will recall the terms of the Resolution which is to express profound regret at the loss of life and hardships suffered by Barbadian crew of International Seafoods Ltd.'s vessels and calling on Government to guarantee the welfare of Barbadians serving on those vessels.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Government will have any difficulty in acceding to this Resolution because I believe — I want to believe — that the Government would regret the loss of any life of any Barbadian, but particularly if that Barbadian happens to lose his life in any foreign country while serving on any vessel registered in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, I shall not recall the total history of International Seafoods Limited, nor shall I wish to rehash what has been said before; but I would like to make the point that there seems to be some total confusion on the part of the administration as to what precisely is to happen with this project which all are now agreed was a project pregnant with the possibilities of success, a project which, on the face of it, and taking all the circumstances into account, was one which could only do Barbadians good.

I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, that prior to the coming of shrimping to Barbados in 1968 or thereabouts, our earnings of foreign exchange from such ventures as fishing were comparatively minor; and if one looks at the earnings in the years 1963, 1964 and 1965 at the total exports of fish and fish products, and looks at 1968-69 one will observe that we earned in excess \$7 million (US) in foreign exchange; and the context in which International Seafoods was established was one in which we attempted to continue the development of the country, especially through the earning of foreign exchange, something which I am satisfied that all the members of this side will agree has to be done if this country is to survive, and if we are to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that that particular project had to become the basis of political contention; and what I wish to focus on primarily is what the Resolution speaks of. That is the whole question of the manner in which the persons who work on the vessels of ISL have been treated. Now, Sir, on a different occasion we heard that it was due to the contributory negligence of those who worked on the ship that caused them to be in the state that they were. I think that I am correct in saying that I have heard at least two Ministers on that side alluding to this particular possibility; but, Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that those persons did not cause the company to be established. Those persons did not create problems between Brazil and Barbados, and I wish to make this point: It is a cardinal point of foreign policy that the protection of the nationals of a country

must be among the very first priorities of any country. Whether the Barbados administration is one run by the Democratic Labour Party, or whether it is one directly by the people on the other side, the fact remains that all Barbadians....

Mr. SPEAKER: When you say people on the other side, I take it that you mean hon. members on the other side.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I was not speaking of them individually.

I was speaking in a collective sense. Anyhow, the hon. members on the other side. I take the point — all of them. The point is that when a Barbadian leaves Barbados, or one who has been given the privilege of being a resident of Barbados — I am speaking principally of nationals of Barbados — the Government of Barbados has a prior responsibility to ensure that when they go off into foreign lands they can count on the support of the Government.

Now, Sir, I would not expect the Minister of External Affairs to establish an embassy in Belem. Our relationship with Brazil, and the existence of trade between Barbados and Brazil, and specifically between Barbados and Guyana would not have required giving our resources to such an office; but in the light of the fact that we are purported to have an agreement with the Government of Brazil, or with the authorities of Brazil, and in the light of the fact that those on that side must know that Governments in Latin America are not as enlightened as any Government of the Caribbean, and that they have scant respect for human rights when compared with Governments in the Caribbean, it would seem to me that the Minister of External Affairs should have exercised a healthy scepticism about anything which is reported officially from a foreign Government in Latin America on the human rights of a Barbadian national, especially if that Barbadian national is nothing more than a worker on a shrimping vessel.

With all due respect if in the eyes of Brazil a man who is working on a shrimping vessel is not regarded with any particular interest. It is not my intention to deal with Brazil. I am dealing with Barbados, and I am saying, Sir, that the Minister of External Affairs in any Caribbean territory, and particularly the Minister of External Affairs in Barbados should have a healthy scepticism about any reports which come in about nationals of Barbados from Brazil.

I have heard the Minister himself making what can only be considered as a plea, that we in Barbados should accept the fact that somebody in Brazil wrote a letter saying that all was well and that this man was only killed

because of his own negligence, that we should accept that, close the file and that should be the end of that.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt we will hear him say that soon after getting the information the Ambassador from Barbados to Brazil who is resident in Venezuela monitored the situation. I wish to make it clear that I am not in this Resolution seeking to question the competence or the integrity of that Ambassador. What I am saying is that the Minister of External Affairs cannot convince me that he should really rely on reports from the British Embassy in Belem or whichever embassy it was in Belem. It was his duty — and I am saying categorically — that it was his duty to despatch an officer to that country, or to that town for as long as it is necessary to see that a thorough and complete and satisfactory investigation was carried out.

3 p.m.

I am not satisfied and I am satisfied that the vast majority of Barbadians are not satisfied with what the Minister of External Affairs put before us as a country as the sum total of the responsibility which the country should have for one of its nationals. I go further, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member on one occasion had the audacity to suggest that if we wanted to get information we ought to have written to him at his Ministry to find out information about something of this nature and all of the information which was forthcoming, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the queries which were made on the floor of this House.

I do not believe, Sir, that the Minister in his most sober moments would question the right of any hon. member to raise such questions. I do not believe that he was serious when he suggested that on a matter where a Barbadian national had actually been killed and where another one had been damaged and where there were wide spread stories of others being under extreme pressure, I do not believe that he is serious when he suggested that we should write to get information. It is the duty of the Government to inform the people and if that Government says that it is practicing open Government it has an even higher duty to inform the people.

Mr. Speaker, I make bold to say that if a person from the upper echelons of our society had had a misadventure in one of the Latin American countries that we would tend to treat it in a much more systematic way.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I must object to the slur the hon. member is introducing in this debate which is the implication that I as Minister of External Affairs would discriminate between nationals on the basis of class that is exactly what the member is saying, Sir. I want to keep the debate on a certain amount of decorum or else I can equally reply,

(Certain remarks were ordered to be expunged from the records by the Speaker, at this stage).

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am maintaining that sufficient effort was not made by the Government of Barbados to inform the people of Barbados about what was happening. These people left here and for 6 months no one could get an official or other word except the rumours which were going around and the representations made by the family of the people who were there languishing on vessels which were tied up in the Port and we were being told, that they were not under arrest, but they could not move. Well, I do not know what arrest is but if you cannot move, you are not free to go. I do not know if you are under arrest. Perhaps they were falsely imprisoned.

Mr. Speaker, the family of the man who was killed, after the Government of Barbados made the announcement which seemed to suggest that they were satisfied with the investigation, the family, according to reports in the media said that they were not satisfied. Clearly, of course, they have been suffering from the fact that they are the family and would feel the loss more acutely than say for example the Minister of External Affairs, but that is a matter which is unimportant.

Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that when one has had a discussion with those persons who were in Belem, I do not know why they feel constrained not to make public statements but I speak to you, Mr. Speaker, and say that it seems to me that conditions were horrible, that they were treated in a sub-human manner and I maintain that when this Resolution was brought we did not know what was happening. It was brought on the basis of what was probably, but now, Sir, I am in a position to state that the conditions under which they existed in Belem were sub-human and anyone who has been a seaman can tell you how awful it must feel when you are far away from your country and not certain whether you are going to be rescued. Six months they went.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution before this Honourable House also speaks about financial loss. We have had 5 different versions from the Government on what is the prognosis of International Seafoods. Now, Sir, during that famous enquiry which the Government would prefer to remain anonymous, during that famous enquiry the present General Manager of International Seafoods made the point that International Seafoods was a viable project and, Mr. Speaker, even during the first year of the energy crisis that Company was able to earn money, a profit. It is there for the record.

I go further, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who inquired himself concluded that if all things were equal the project in spite of the energy crisis would be a

profitable concern. Yet, Sir, we have heard on the one hand that they were winding down the Company. Only a few weeks later we saw a statement in the local newspaper that they were winding it back up. It was again capable of making money and then you heard the Prime Minister himself alluding to the fact that it now looks as if International Seafoods will be a viable concern. I would humbly suggest that they all get together. *(Asides.)* If the hon. member does not reflect, he might not have been here. He goes away quite often, he might not have been here to reflect that it was during the Barbados Development Bank's Annual General Meeting that this point was made. They should get together, put their heads together and see and decide what they are going to do with it.

As for the Fishing Agreements which they claimed to have had, Mr. Speaker, it is without significance that none of the problems that occurred to International Seafoods can be bound accruing to Trinidad and Tobago. The Trinidadians are more competent. The Trinidadians had no by-election and did not have to prove any point prematurely and so did not find it necessary to send boats off to Belem before they were ready, complete with television cameras, etc.
3.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must wind up in another three minutes. I took into consideration that there had been some interruptions and the member was accorded an extra ten minutes.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Sir. Let me in those three minutes make these points. The reason why the Trinidad and Tobago Government did not run into this problem was because they did not have an agreement with a private company and lead the people in their country to believe that it was a Government to Government agreement. The difference between the agreement with the Barbados Government under the Democratic Labour Party was that it was an agreement between the Government of Brazil and the Government of Barbados. This agreement was an agreement between the private sector in Brazil and one has to assume the Government of Barbados, but they led the people of Barbados to believe that they had a full agreement, that is why the Brazilian Navy was able to arrest the vessels, because the Brazilian Navy is not the Brazilian Government, but the Brazilian Navy knew that the Barbadian agreement was not satisfactory.

And as for this business of the Guyanese arrangement, every other week we are hearing how much fish they are going to get off Guyana. Guyana has been there for a very long time, Mr. Speaker, Guyana has necessarily to agree to a fishing arrangement in the Caribbean Community because it is part of the spirit of the Caribbean Community. They need not try to make any

political gain of that, suffice it to say that a few weeks ago a person who is working at International Seafoods reported to me that he had to get the gentleman who is General Manager to use his personal funds to back his pay cheque. The incompetence that is going on down there, whether it is by the Chairman, whether it is Mr. Stuart, the Executive, or whomever it is, the time has come for this country to stop losing money....

Mr. SPEAKER: And the time has come, the time has really come for the hon. member to conclude his address.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to second that Resolution, and in so doing make a few comments. This financial, social and human tragedy that has enveloped International Seafoods Limited.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one minute.

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

Dr. HAYNES: This tragedy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, need never had occurred. We have had a situation where we have an industry that was brought to this country, an industry which has the capacity for employment of hundreds of persons and did do so, a company which with appropriate agreements has the potential of exploiting our natural resources in the Caribbean and surrounding areas, a project that has the advantage of contributing significantly to foreign reserve savings, foreign currently earnings, and making a contribution to the development of the hotel industry, a project which utilised existing skills within the community, a project which further mobilised un-utilised plant that was existing in Barbados.

This situation appears to me to be one which has got itself so enveloped in political considerations that much of the present mess in my view now arises from that. However, I believe that some measure of objectivity might be brought into this discussion now that Sir Herbert Duffus on page 106 of his report has clearly indicated that 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 he enquired into. And secondly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on page 104 of the same report I want to draw to your attention the conclusion that in the International Seafoods enterprise the Government now owns a company which possesses a fleet of 20 refrigerated trawlers and other assets valued at \$8.6 million, and that the total sum expended was approximately \$11 million. On page 30 of the same

report, which I think is very pertinent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir Herbert Duffus had this to say:

"In August 1974 the Government of Trinidad and Tobago had made a very generous offer of a loan of \$20 million to the Barbados Government to assist with any balance of payments problems which may have arisen as a result of the fuel crisis, and this had not been used yet. Therefore in 1976 after a series of talks in Barbados and in Trinidad between representatives of the two Governments to which reference is made by Mr. Barrow in his minute of 7th April (vide Appendix III, Item 6), an agreement was reached between the two Governments for the establishment of a company on a joint venture basis to undertake shrimp fishing, and Barbados would draw on the \$20 million loan to finance its share in the scheme."

Elsewhere he adverted to the \$20 million but indicated that he was not asked to enquire into it in relation to International Seafoods, so now that the air has been cleared in respect of the question of corruption, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I spent the last two weeks personally delving through a whole lot of statements that have been presented to Duffus, and to look very critically to see whether or not statements made in respect of International Seafoods Limited were true or untrue.

What has emerged, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that between the years 1973 and 1976 that company generated sales to the extent of \$12,877,052 and the cost of such sales was \$13,446,937, leaving a deficit of \$569,885; that the company made a gross profit of some \$889,114 in 1973 and made a net profit in the first year of its operation of \$279,519. In the year 1976 the company also made a gross profit of \$4,227. But if you go back to the statement up to the end of July 1978 you will see that the company actually in 1976 made a gross profit of \$208,524. Now, when you look at the other aspects of that company, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will find that the interest payments over those four years, 1973 - 1976, amounted to \$3,210,876, and depreciation of assets amounted to \$2,108,875, making a total of \$5,319,751. In other words, over \$5 million of the attributed loss from the balance sheets was due to interest payments and also to depreciation of assets, paper depreciation, whilst at the same time if you look at the re-appreciation of the fixed assets of that company, it moved from a figure of \$4.4 million to \$8.6 million, as set out in the Duffus Report. Quite clearly, and I must be very candid about this, this would seem to me to be a situation that could only arise in a situation of under capitalisation on the one hand, and on the other hand if you look very carefully at the shift of cost of sales between 1973 and 1976, where in 1973 to sell \$2.1 million you actually expended somewhere in the region of \$1.1 million, but by 1974 caught up in the fuel crisis you were spending \$4 million

to generate \$3.7 million in sales, and that pattern continued right through and the first shift started to take place in 1976 where the company was actually back in a reasonable position.
3.20 p.m.

What was the task of the present Government in that situation? You can identify two things by looking at this statement here if we assume that the project can generate employment and utilize resources in the way I have outlined.

What was the reason for the increase in the cost of sales? The principle cause was fuel. What was the next major charge that resulted in the losses? The kind of interest you had to pay. It would seem to me that if the Government had directed its energy correctly rather than on false assumption of corruption in respect of International Sea Foods, if it had taken this kind of analysis of what took place, then the type of Trinidad agreement could have produced the two things that the company needed, capital and a cheaper source of fuel; these two conditions would have been met and we would not have been faced with the situation as exists with ISL now. The facts are here relating to the company. There are additional overheads not really relative to the discussion because these are the points which determine what amounts of inputs are necessary as far as that company is concerned.

Now having closely analysed the financial situation, I was appalled when I realized what the situation was, because I had never taken the trouble to go into ISL in any great detail; but looking at it I am very surprised that anyone could come to any other conclusion. As regards what happened at Belem it is a very tragic situation. The only agreement I have seen was in Portuguese. I had it translated but unfortunately I cannot find it to make it a document of the House, but it was an agreement between the manager of ISL and a private company, and I think it was June 27, that the captains and crew were instructed by the manager of ISL to proceed to Belem. They were told that they were to remain there for three days and then proceed to the fishing ground and return with a full catch in thirty days. Those people made the usual arrangements for their families here as regard the appropriate advances in terms of money.

When they got to Brazil the captains were told by the private individual that he never told the manager to send on any boats; what he told him was to wait for further instructions. The net result of this kind of unsatisfactory situation is that the families of these people have for a period of time been going down to the ISL office week after week and being turned around, not being given any money and being told that their husbands were being paid in Brazil while in reality those men were down there virtually locked up for five months. I think it

was on the insistence of the Brazilian Navy that the captains were given something between \$120 and \$135 a week and the crew members about \$60, and about every two weeks some rations were sent on the ships for the men. This is the kind of situation which actually existed in Belem. As far as I gathered, the rations were unsatisfactory and it was a totally undesirable situation for any workers in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my understanding that some \$700,000 were actually lost during that period. It is my further understanding that following a visit by an Ambassador and I think the Crown Solicitor some \$300,000 was paid and there are still some \$400,000 outstanding. This is what I have been informed; it may or may not be correct, I do not know, but the hon. Minister would be in a position to enlighten us.

Now during this same period we heard of this grand agreement with the Guyana Government which for reasons I have already explained did not deal with the question of fuel nor with the capitilization of the company, and indeed the crews themselves could have told the Government that this was a non-starter and not an agreement in the interest of ISL or Barbados. Indeed, I believe that we have heard a lot of conflicting statements; one moment the company is being wound up, at another that it is going ahead. Right now I understand that there is a cable from Brazil about negotiations being started again in order to have a proper agreement. I understand that this cable came on the 5th January but I can't substantiate that. But it is necessary for some Ministerial statement to be made on this matter. It is necessary, for example, for the people to know what precisely is the status of this company. People want to know what were the levels of losses between September 2, 1976 and now; what were the sales and the cost of those sales. Was there any substantial change in the capital structure of the company that is likely to reduce the interest load? Has there been any attempt to get cheaper fuel, for that is one of the factors militating against the profitability of the exercise. And indeed there is a whole range of other areas, like the management structure for instance. Is Government satisfied with the management structure? All these are things that should be explained to the public because we are hearing about one man dead, another man injured, families in Barbados starving as a consequence of that exercise in Brazil. These are things that we cannot take lightly.

I do not wish to speak for very long, but I think I have clearly demonstrated the potential for viability of this company based on such factors as sales generated and the cost of these sales...(Mr. SPEAKER TAKES THE CHAIR)

Mr. Speaker, I was just referring to the fact that having taken the trouble to examine the financial

statement of this company between 1973 and 1976 there is the inescapable conclusion of the potential for viability of this company, subject to the kind of capitilization and the acquisition of a cheaper source of fuel supply, and also if proper and effective agreement can be made between Barbados and other Governments in whose waters our boats will be fishing. Indeed it would seem to me — I cannot say what the Government's position is with the conflicting statements I have heard — if these two single things were to be looked into, namely, restructuring the capital of the company and looking for cheaper fuel, along with proper international agreements, then even the accumulated losses since 1976 could possibly be recovered.

3.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must recall. I think that he is straying from the Resolution.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, in the sense that I was trying to demonstrate that the present situation arose from a misunderstanding of what was the financial structure of the company, and the performance of the company during those vital years, and the failure to make proper diplomatic arrangements resulting in the human tragedy. I would say and re-affirm one sentiment made here by the hon. member for....

Mr. ODLE: If the hon. member would give way. The hon. member is also straying from elementary mathematics; because earlier in the speech he told us that 4,000 divided by 1,000 is approximately 400. That may be a form of new mathematics for which I am very grateful to the hon. member.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, that was a simple arithmetical error. To get back to the point, I want to say this: I have seen a lot of dead people in my life time; and one of the problems in this country — it does not only happen in Brazil or elsewhere — it is the attitude taken not by any individual or group of individuals in any Government, but in the community as a whole.

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER ruled that certain remarks should be struck from the record.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the generality of the situation. It is something that hurts from time to time and has always hurt when you see it, and when you see it with frequency you know precisely how you feel about these things. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Government to look very carefully at the points that I have raised, and to see if even at this late stage some rescuing operation in the industry can be put underway; because I believe that it has a future, and most people around the world seem to think that there is a future in that kind of exercise. Thank you for your patience, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to say that I will move an amendment to this Resolution, and I will move it at the end of my speech; but I wish quite early, on behalf of the Government, to reply to some of the wild statements made in the speech, particularly of the hon. member for St. Michael South West.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that you may be a bit unkind in referring to the speech of the hon. member as "wild".

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Wide off the mark.

Mr. SPEAKER: Wide off the mark is more appropriate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In the first place the point is that the Government understands as clearly as anybody in this country could understand, that one of its duties is the protection of its nationals. That is why every year we bring to this House a Resolution for a vote of money included under a Head of the Estimates which is for a sum of money for the protection of our nationals overseas. I make bold to say that for the short period of time that this Government has been in power it has done more than any previous administration since independence, and indeed before independence, to make sure that the welfare of our nationals overseas is properly looked after; and indeed, Mr. Speaker, you would have recognised that one of the planks of the Government's foreign policy has been to emphasise this as a main objective of the Government.

Now, I have prefaced my remarks to show how easy it is in a society that has now taken to rumour-mongering for people to believe to the extent almost as if it was a creed any matter of their imagination; because if I understand the attack on this Government, it is that the Government and the Minister of External Affairs in particular had no consideration at all for the events which occurred in Brazil.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. The Hon. Minister could not be dealing with the speech that I made on the first day and the speech that I made today. The hon. member suggested that I indicated that the Government had no consideration at all. That was not the gravamen of my speech. The point was that the Government on this occasion did not exercise sufficient care. That is not the same thing, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will take his words, Sir — "exercise sufficient care." Again the hon. member is wrong. The first indication to my Ministry of the death of Butts was on the 15th September, 1978, through a telephone call from Miss Joyce Butts speaking to an officer in the Ministry saying that the body of her brother was found in a Brazilian river on the 12th September, 1978, floating. The body was about to arrive in Barbados on the 19th. It would be

accompanied by Captain Butts, the brother of the deceased. Miss Butts said that she had informed International Seafoods Limited and that International Seafoods Limited told her that the Captain is responsible for looking after the body, and arrangements would be made for this to be done. We informed her on that date, Sir — and I am taking responsibility for my officers because I am not hiding behind any officers when it comes to ministerial responsibility. I instructed that when the body arrived with her brother, the Captain, and they should wish any further assistance, they should contact the Ministry again. That was the first telephone conversation.

3.40 p.m.

Information comes to the attention of the Ministry and in keeping with the establish practice of this Ministry, my official immediately told her as soon as he has more information contact us and should she wish any assistance, please let us know. First point. We accepted the responsibility on the first day that this came to our attention.

Further, Sir, the body arrived on the 19th and on the basis of the information coming to the Ministry and to me as Minister, on the 20th of September, 1978, I telephoned the Ambassador of Barbados stationed in Caracas, Mr. Brazane Babb, who is Ambassador assigned to Brazil as well, and I informed him of the limited information which was then available to us, and instructed him to make immediate contact with the Brazilian authorities in order to find out what was the state of play in the circumstances surrounding the death of Butts and any problems that the crew members should have.

Further to this, Sir, our files will disclose that on the 21st September, 1978 my conversation with the Ambassador was followed up by sending particulars to him of the passport of Butts, his full address and all of the legal details that we had. This was sent by telex, not savingram and the telex begins:

"Re Minister/Babb conversation of 20th September, 1978 on the death of Butts in Belem. Grateful you follow up with Brazilian authorities."

You see, Sir, I like to deal with the Eric Sealys, the rumourmongers, those people who like to destroy reputations and hide behind their sacrimoneous attitudes Sir, because the files do not lie and I have said before any file in my Ministry is open for inspection by anybody on the other side or any member of the public. When my Ministry and I are wrong, then I will be the first to acknowledge it.

As early as the 20th of September, five days after the first notification, I felt it my duty, not at the level of

officials now, to speak with the Ambassador and ask him as representative of the Government to take a personal interest and follow up the matter. This he did and I defend Ambassador Babb and his staff most strongly in this House, Sir. There is no point saying that the Government does not do this or that. If you have Ministerial directions on a matter and if you tell the staff through whom each one of us carries out a policy to go ahead and give support, there is no way that any member can get up and fool this House that there is the Minister and a big set of Cabinet Members who are idling and not taking steps to look after the interest of the people, Sir.

On the 27th September, 1978 we drew all of the information in our possession to the attention of the other Ministries concerned and also we passed on further information that had come to our possession to the Ambassador. Prior to that also, my telex of the 21st September, was followed up by a further telex to the Ambassador and this is what I had to say, Sir, because I know them you know, I can spot them out miles coming.

"Minister is concerned over the publicity coming here over the death of Butts and the possible political interest that may arise."

That was the height of the rumourmongering directed against the hon. member as well for St. Michael South East so that you had a situation where the rumourmongers in this country, the supporters of the Democratic Labour Party, Eric Sealy and his group would have been brought into place to cause embarrassment. I know them. I can spot them miles out. Any little peg that they can hang they hat on, no matter how cheap a rumour it is, because of the interest of power they are going to play on people's sympathy. They like to hear somebody is dead so they can play it up into a political scandal. That is the position, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. All the hon. members on this side are members of the Democratic Labour Party and the hon. member says that we like to hear that somebody is dead, Sir. We never told Eric Sealy to sit in the Honourable Chair that you are sitting in, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point made by the hon. member is well taken.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am saying, Sir, that the Democratic Labour Party and its adherents, Eric Sealy and crowd, are striving over the death of people today because it allows them to peg their success and their climb back to political power on cheap and nasty political jives to attack the Government alleging either that the Government is careless or is indulging in heavy scandals. That is what they do, Sir. Any files in my Ministry they can come for them. I went in with clean hands and I will

leave with cleaner hands. No matter how much Duffus white wash you all, I will leave with clean hands.

"On the 25th September, 1978 the Minister is concerned over publicity given here to the death of Butts and possible political interest that may arise. Grafton Butts, brother of the deceased gave a statement today to the Ministry. This will be sent in bag on the 29th. In the meantime Minister has directed that Ambassador arrange for an officer, possibly Miss Welch to go to Belem to obtain full Report on the matter. Ambassador may wish to phone Minister before the latter departs on Wednesday, 27th September, at noon for the United Nations General Assembly."

Now let us deal with that, Sir. I had phoned the Ambassador giving him instructions. I followed it up with further directions. You know why Miss Welch was being chosen, Sir, because she was the only officer in the Ministry at that time fluent in Portuguese. The other officer, Miss Osbourne, was on a diplomatic course in the South and the hon. member raised the point that we had a duty to send an officer to Belem to investigate. That was done, well ahead of his Resolution, well ahead of they having any concept of how the Ministry of External Affairs is properly run. We took the point very early, Sir, well aware of my knowing that given the political circumstance in Barbados today, with a party out of power and mad to get back into power, that they will stop at nothing, nothing, to use any tragedy to destroy the Government. I know that and I was watching for them to come down the line on that, Sir.

As a result of those instructions, Miss Welch was despatched to Belem. She went through and got statements from all of the crew members and other parties who could give statements, talked to the Brazilian Police on both the Federal and Provincial level, discovered as much as she could about the conditions confronting the crew. We will go back to that, Sir, and hear what some of the crew members told Miss Welch, which she has in writing, Sir, and furthermore established on-going contact with the British Honorary Consul in Belem and ask him to act on behalf of the Government of Barbados as an agent to follow up any investigations following from the Butt enquiry. Now, Sir, to follow up the enquiry, Sir, and watch the proceedings on our behalf.

There is a fundamental rule of International Law which any Government who is conscious of its International obligations take seriously, that before the exhaustion of local brevities in the Courts in a country you cannot intervene.
3.50 p.m.

You cannot intervene with the Government of Brazil on any level other than you see whether the

country has followed the rules of international law in carrying out an enquiry about a death occurring on its premises. That is the basic rule of international law, a rule that not only I know but the simplest child who has any commonsense ought to be able to follow. That is the position, Sir, but some people do not have that commonsense.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe the hon. member inadvertently is misleading this House. What is written down in the textbooks about international law differs considerably from the actual practice of diplomacy and the practice regarding the protection of nationals, and the hon. member is in no position to speak about that, because he has not even been able to do it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is an attempt at lecturing on law.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Not only that, Sir, lecturing on a subject of which the hon. member has neither erudition, information nor commonsense about. I am not here to help him pass his exams, Sir, that is a fundamental rule of international law. What you do is to allow the authorities to carry out their duty whilst watching the interest of your nationals, but you cannot on the level start yourself any form of other action beyond that. In this case the Government of Barbados through its Embassy in Venezuela took all the steps in order to go on with what was happening. As a matter of fact, I go further, Sir. I say that on the basis of Miss Welch's report we asked the Federal authorities to have a second look because some of the statements being made to us were contradictory. That second look was taken and it was at the request of the Government that the police re-open the investigation and have another look made.

Now, Sir, the inquest was completed on October 19, 1978 and copies of all the documents were given to our officers, they have been examined by the Government of Barbados, by the officials who have to advise us, and contrary to a report which has appeared in the Press, there was found on the body of the man by two doctors, not one doctor, no sign of a stab wound at all. There was a mark on his neck. When the body was hauled from the water it was hauled with a rope around the neck and the doctors have given sworn evidence before the coroner's enquiry in Belem that that mark was consistent with his being pulled by rope out of the water. The conclusion of the enquiry is that the man drowned and died from drowning. There is no evidence available to my Ministry on which I can advise the Government that there should be any further enquiry called for in Brazil on this matter.

Now, Sir, I am not a magician and I do not pretend to be one. I just want to say this, that daily there are

problems that occur with our nationals. I have reviewed the files in my Ministry and have found that under the Democratic Labour Party Government deaths of other Barbadian citizens, some of them murdered, have been reported and the same quick response in none of the cases I have reviewed was forthcoming. That is the point. I have seen none of any Minister even intervening to telephone an Ambassador in order to give him instructions to take such care on a case. The hon. member is entitled to come up there on a Saturday or Sunday when I am working and sit down and go through the files; they are public property. That is what he must come and do, not get around and talk without the basis of fact, and it is an undoubted fact in this case that we went all out, despite whatever rumours you hear, we went all out to check out every bit of information which we had in our possession and to ensure that our officers followed up on it.

Now, Sir, I want to deal with the second rumour. There was a rumour again which appeared in the Press that two men had been arrested. Even that rumour on instructions from me was checked out the moment it appeared in the Press to see if there was any veracity or any truth in the allegation. Again, there was none, and Ambassador Babb and his staff have advised me — and I must go on their advice, and I accept the responsibility for them — that in this case they are satisfied on a review of all the evidence and on the information available to them, that this was a genuine case of somebody drowning. That is their advice to me, Sir. Now, if the hon. member is suggesting that the Minister should get on a plane and go to Brazil himself in order to start an enquiry, just like they do not understand my constitutional role as Attorney General, they do not understand my role either as a Minister, Sir. The hon. member must understand, however, that if he wanted factual information — and I repeat, I am available at any time, and my Ministry has instructions that if a member of Parliament of any political persuasion asks for information that is not under Secret at any time, because it may affect national security or something of the sort, we reply promptly and give him the relevant information. At no time, and I repeat what I said, has the hon. member or anybody else ever come to me and ask me about what were we doing, what was happening. His resolution was brought into the House rather belatedly, after the adherents of the Democratic Labour Party had had their instructions from the bosses on high to go up on the platform.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is imputing improper motives. For reasons which you know, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot say, what he is saying is obviously not true. He says that the Resolution came in belatedly after the Democratic adherents had been instructed, etc. etc. I am taking the point of belatedly, Mr. Speaker. With your permission, I could say

that on the question of belatedly I do not think you will allow me to make the point but you and I both understand that it could not be true that what I brought in was belated, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It was long after the Ministry had been doing its duty. I left for the United Nations, as I said in that cable, on the 27th. Before I left for the United Nations I was in touch with the Ambassador. I was at the U.N., Sir, and I was on the phone from the U.N. to Ambassador Babb to follow up this case. The Ambassador was in constant touch, although we had no staff there, with the British people on the matter. What more are they to do? We monitored the trial through the British Honorary Consul, and we ourselves followed up with such as we could. We made representations to the Brazilian Government at the appropriate time at the Federal level, and got them at the provincial level to re-open consideration of the matter. What allegation is this that the Government has been careless? Careless about what, Sir? It is easy to throw around all sorts of unfounded allegations without having the basis of fact in your hand on this matter.

4.00 p.m.

And I make bold to say that if the hon. member wants to see the Coroner's report we will make it available to him. The Democratic Labour Party is full of doctors and they can enquire into it; they can get a forensic pathologist if they want to find out what other facts they can ferret out, because on the basis of the information I have, nobody could have done anything other than what we have done. We told the family the position. Obviously, Government like anybody else must have some sympathy when someone loses his life whether from natural or unnatural causes. As far as I am concerned the policy that is followed by my Ministry is that our people are all Barbadians; they are not Democratic Labour Party people or Barbados Labour Party people or rich or poor or black or white; whatever they are they are looked after by the Government and the Ministry follows a policy of non-discrimination in relation to people. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to try to reach the Pinnacles in this country by false sympathy or false positions. I have sympathy for people because they are human beings, and I am not going to pretend rather belatedly that I have now discovered the poor. I was born poor and I understand poverty and I would not like to be poor if I have to be born again; I do not think anyone would, for it can be a degrading situation. But I am not going to have any false pretences that all of a sudden I am holier-than-thou. I was mixing with the poor, for I was born among them and grew up among them, and it would be false for me to come in here and pretend that I am going to see people in terms of poor or rich in order to determine whether or not they are going to have equal treatment from this Ministry.

I want to make this plain. When members on the other side are on the public platform and want to make their gibes at me they may do so; but I believe that my track record is loud and clear for everybody to see, and political power does not interest me as it does other people. Some people seek political power, but I would like to run away from it and just try to get a job done properly.

Now to get back to the agreement. A lot of misstatements have been heard on the agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Government of Brazil. As usual the Opposition pontificates on rumours rather than on factual information. They say that the reason why there are problems is because the Democratic Labour Party had a Government to Government agreement, whereas under us it is not an agreement with the Government. That is not a true statement. If the hon. member wants me to lay the agreement on the table of the House I can do so. The Government of Brazil told the Democratic Labour Party, as it told all countries fishing or shrimping in their waters, that they were not going to renew any fishing agreements with any countries, not even Third World countries, on the basis of other than a joint venture arrangement.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, If the hon. member will give way, on a point of elucidation. I said that the agreement between Brazil and Barbados was a Government to Government agreement. Is the hon. member saying that is not correct?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of elucidation, that is asking a question.

Hon H. d.B. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on the instructions of both the Minister of External Trade and Caricom Affairs and the Minister of Agriculture as he then was, my Ministry very early after we assumed the Government took up with Brazil the question of renewal of the shrimping agreement. Eventually I wrote to my distinguished colleague, the foreign Minister of Brazil, asking him personally to intervene in the matter. We got a reply, a diplomatic note dated 29th November, 1977 which I will read:

"The Embassy of Brazil presents its compliments to the Minister of External Affairs, Barbados and has the honour to refer to his letter dated 14th October, 1977 regarding the agreement between the Governments of Brazil and Barbados relating to shrimping and fishing in the waters off the coast of Brazil.

The Embassy wishes to refer also to the preliminary talks between representatives of the two countries aimed at establishing joint ventures in fishing. In this regard the Ministry wishes to inform the Minister

that according to the guidelines approved by the Brazilian Government any agreements concluded by Brazil and now in operation will not be renewed or extended at their expiration, but may be replaced by other agreements envisaging the establishment of joint ventures as has been indicated in our preliminary exchange of views with the Barbadian authority.

With this aim the Brazilian Governments suggest that negotiations be conducted in Brazil from 9th January, 1978 at a date to be mutually agreed upon. This Embassy will shortly forward a draft proposal agreement which can be the basis for the said negotiations."

Now let me say, Sir, that prior to this we had had preliminary negotiations on two occasions, once in Barbados and once in Brazil, to try to persuade the Brazilian authorities that they should have a special regime for countries like Barbados which were geographically disadvantaged in the context of the Law of the Sea negotiations. The Brazilian reply was that although they would make a slightly different arrangement for countries like Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago, it would be by way of joint venture and they would not depart from this principle. They therefore asked that we negotiate on this basis, and this we did. We concluded an agreement with the Government of Brazil, which was approved by the Government of Brazil and it was then necessary for the Statutory corporation responsible for fishing to designate a private person or company within Brazil with whom we should have a commercial agreement, and that commercial agreement then had to be approved by the Brazilian navy so that they would avoid over-fishing and be satisfied that not only conservation took place but that depletion of the stocks of Brazilian fish would not occur.

The position is that on 23rd November, 1977, there was a meeting to formulate a complete fishing policy on these matters and present were the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Caribbean Affairs, the Permanent Secretary — Planning, the Permanent Secretary — Caribbean Affairs, the Permanent Secretary — Ministry of Agriculture, and the manager of International Sea Foods Limited. Very early the Government set out to assure that we had got the best possible arrangement. But what has happened? We have created an industry that depends for its primary source of raw material on permission that is outside of our control. It is not even that we can buy our way into fishing in the Brazilian Government seas.

Now while this was going on we had concluded an agreement with the European Economic Community for permission to fish off Cayenne. We had also approached the Government of Suriname both at the level of Prime Minister and at the Foreign Ministers and Trade Ministers level to see if Suriname would consent to an agreement.

Up to now we have had no positive reply from Suriname. In the mean time we have also been in consultation with the Government of Venezuela for permission to shrimp in Venezuelan waters, and we have been in consultation with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago who have said that we can go ahead and fish even without a written agreement. All these things have been done.

And the talk about the supposed \$20 million loan that I hear a lot of nonsense about. The point is that wherever possible we have kept pressing Government after Government in order to get permission to fish or shrimp in their waters because we recognize that International Sea Foods would be a complete disaster unless it has permission to fish in the waters of other countries. Will you tell me that this Government can say to the Government of Brazil not to enter into this or that type of agreement?

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker, we are very anxious to hear whether an agreement was entered into any why.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of elucidation. The Hon. Attorney General may wind up his debate. 4.10 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the position is, as I said before — if the hon. member wants me to repeat what I said — the Government of Brazil and the Government of Barbados entered into an agreement to do with fishing, giving us the right to fish within Brazilian waters subject to the Brazilian guidelines; and by a letter prior to the 11th July, a joint agreement was entered into and came into force fully as of the 11th July, 1978, through full exchange notes. I do not have the exact dates, but I think that it was on the 11th June, 1978, that it came into effect. Negotiations took place prior to June 1978, and after discussions they came into effect from June 1978.

Now, Sir, it was a matter and still is, as I understand it, for the two companies, the one designated by Belem Pesca and ISL to come to an arrangement after the agreement was entered in. They had to enter into a commercial agreement in order to satisfy the instruments of the agreement. The hon. member cannot say the differences arise because we do not have a Government to Government arrangement. The arrangement is there, but you must comply with the terms of the arrangement, or you cannot fish. If the terms of the arrangement are not acceptable, then you do not fish. It is as simple as that. This is what has occurred as far as this Ministry is concerned.

However, Sir, the position is that they then negotiated an agreement with the Government of Guyana and with the EEC for Cayenne.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must now try to wind up.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am winding up. The agreements we are still trying to negotiate are with Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, although in that case we are allowed to go ahead and deal with Trinidad and Tobago in their fishing waters subject to certain private understandings and agreements; and we are trying to get a final reply out of Venezuela. In my view, the Government has done the best that it can both on behalf of its nationals in these circumstances as well as in regard to establishing fishing agreements; and it is because of that, that I cannot accept this Resolution as it stands; and the Government will not accept this Resolution as it stands.

The other matters raised by hon. members will be replied to by the Ministers carrying primary responsibilities in the executive ministries, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture. They will reply to the particular point about International Seafoods Limited and the Commercial agreement; but, as I understand it, the agreement was concluded in February and entered into force some time between June and July, 1978. It was a clear understanding that a commercial arrangement would be made which would be acceptable to the parties, and I understand that those negotiations were conducted by International Seafoods.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Attorney General will wind up his debate..

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will wind up. In those circumstances, as I said, the foundation of the hon. member's Resolution here cannot stand; and I will move:—

"BE IT RESOLVED by this House that a Barbadian member of the crew died in circumstances which have been investigated by the Brazilian authorities to determine whether death was due to accident or homicide; and the authorities have found that death was due to drowning; expresses its profound regret at the loss of life and conveys its sympathy to the sorrowing relatives of the deceased, notes that the Government has done all within its power to ascertain the full facts surrounding the death and ensure that justice will be done, and commends the Government on the steps that it has taken to ensure and guarantee the welfare of Barbadians in Brazil and of all persons serving on the vessels of International Seafoods, and that the Resolution as it stands be deleted."

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to second that Resolution and to participate in

this debate because, Sir, I think that the time has come when the people of this country must learn to recognise that we do not have any Loyal Opposition on that side. We do not have people who have the national interest of Barbados at stake. We have people.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has just stated that the people of Barbados must learn that we do not have any Loyal Opposition on the other side and that they do not have the interest of the people of Barbados at heart. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I will never forget when this party was in power, just shortly after we had the Cubana incident, the Leader of the Opposition made a statement damaging to the interest of the whole of Barbados to satisfy his own narrow interests. Here again is Barbados, a member of the Third World countries, fighting to see that justice is meted out by another so called Third World Country, Brazil; and here we are being subjected to the same exploitative terms and conditions as another of the developing countries by Brazil; and what do we get? We do not get any joining of hands between this side and that side in a common front against Brazil. We get them espousing the cause of Brazil in here for narrow political gain.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is misleading this House. He is casting aspersions on the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have attempted on previous occasions to warn the hon. member for St. Michael South against clinging to this term that is hackneyed about a member misleading the House. If the hon. member can set out to prove, that is his function; but merely to get up and say that the hon. member is misleading the House, he has done nothing. If the hon. member is misleading the House, direct the Chair's attention to the way in which the member is misleading the House, and set it out to put the record straight.

Mr. TAITT: With all due respect. The hon. member said that the members on this side espoused the cause of Brazil. I am saying, Sir, that the hon. member is misleading the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am of that opinion too.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Hon. members of this country and other agencies for helping with the formation of opinion in this country do not do their fundamental duty and attempt to find the facts first before they attempt to mislead people. They publish and regard themselves as the repository of all the junk information that they have merely for the purpose of boosting their circulation.

From the very outset, this Government, when it assumed power in this country was saddled and plagued with financial liability in the form of International Seafoods Limited. We had a position in which the then Government of Barbados took up the taxpayers' money and paid off private shareholders without any appropriate evaluation of the net value of those shares. We had to face a loan agreement and the mortgage with the First National City Bank for millions of dollars. We had to face an unsecured loan which is still in dispute; and I want the First National City Bank to know that that is still in dispute.

4.20 p.m.

If they gave credit to their friends of the Democratic Labour Party without proper security they have just cause to recover it. Sir, we have to face facts. We had on the files when we came in an alleged agreement with Trinidad. I went to Trinidad in the company of the Permanent Secretary, and the Government of Barbados and the Attorney General had sent a memorandum and article of the Association to the Government of Trinidad for the formation of a Joint Company and I discovered then within three or four weeks of coming into power for the first time that a situation had developed in respect of International Seafoods which was never known to the public under the Democratic Labour Party regime that Brazil was saying from an early date that the Agreements they had at the time in 1976 when they expired could no longer be renewed upon the same terms and conditions.

Never before has any member of the Democratic Labour Party during the course of the period of time that they were in power or any time after told the public of Barbados that they knew that Brazil at an early stage had said that they were not going to renew the respective licences under the same terms and conditions and that is the reason why you could no longer have the Joint-Venture Company with Trinidad and Tobago in which Trinidad will merge the boats together and you have a common licence with Brazil because Brazil said that she was not dealing with any Joint-Venture Company other than a Company composing of nationals of the particular Government and nationals of her own. Why you did not tell the public that? So that the question of Joint-Venture failed because it was predicated upon the ability to persuade the Brazilians to acknowledge a Tripartite Agreement and that is why I say that it is time we in the Third World recognise that Brazil is another savant. Let us deal with that.

Now these criticisms about the Ministry of External Affairs. As early as November, 1977 discussions started about the proposed new terms of Agreement and in

January, 1978, a team left from Barbados to negotiate with their counterpart officials and the team consisted of Mr. Oliver Brown, Solicitor General; Dr. George Reid, then Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Finance and Planning whose responsibility it was then; Ambassador Brazane Babb, the Barbados Ambassador to Brazil and Mr. Stuart, Managing Director of International Seafoods, and Mr. Hewitt from the Ministry of Finance who was the Secretary, and all of these gentlemen were people who during the Democratic Labour Party regime were dealing with the question of International Seafoods with the exception at governmental level because during the Democratic Labour Party regime there were Simpson and his friends who ran down there, after the Government had paid him off his money when the shares were not worth a penny and they gave full value for them.

We go further, Sir, after those discussions they took a long time for the Governmental Agreement and the barebones of the Agreement were submitted at Ministerial level. Why did not the hon. member from the other side tell the public that it is customary and normal that their technicians meet first in these International Agreements, they set out the barebones of the Agreement and the rest is reserved for Ministerial level. When the Ministry of External Affairs came back in, a draft agreement was approved and we have the date too, and we will give you the date because when people walk over there and get half the information from their pimps inside of the Government Departments they ought to realise that those pimps do not give them all of the information. You cannot get all.

On the 8th August, 1978, and this is time for straight talking. On the 8th August, 1978, (*Asides.*) You have an agreement over there, send it over here and I will send mine over there and let us compare it. This is the 8th of August and it is from the Charge d'Affairs of Brazil writing to the Foreign Minister and he said:

"I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your note NR 77001 of July 11th 1978 delivered by the Embassy of Barbados in Caracas to the Embassy of Brazil in that same capacity" and it reads as follows:

"The Minister of External Affairs in Barbados presents his compliments to His Excellency, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federated Republic of Brazil and have the honour to refer to the negotiations."

I want you to listen, Mr. Speaker...

"Has the Honour to refer to the negotiations on joint ventures in the Fisheries sector and transitional linking arrangements for such ventures."

And I want this to be clear to the other side and to the agents which submit misinformation in this country.

"Which took place during the Month of February, 1978 in Brazil between representatives of the Government of Barbados and the Federated Republic of Brazil. The representatives of the Federated Republic of Brazil and of Barbados agreed to the annexed text of the Agreement and further agreed that this Agreement would come into force through the exchange of notes and a date to be decided upon by the two Governments.

The Minister of External Affairs has the honour to propose that this Agreement on joint ventures in the Fisheries sector to be deemed to have come into force with effect from the date of his note and would be grateful if the Minister of Foreign Affairs confirm that this date is acceptable to the Government of the Federated Republic of Brazil

The Minister of External Affairs of Barbados avails himself of this opportunity to renew to his Excellency, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federated Republic of Brazil the assurance of his highest consideration." In reply, "I have the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Government of the Federated Republic of Brazil agreed to consider the date of the 11th July, 1978 as that of the coming into force of the joint ventures in the Fisheries sector.

Signed in Brazilia on 15th February, 1978."

Now, Sir, clearly in black and white there, the representative of the Government of Brazil is saying that from February, 1978 the two Governments had agreed on a text and the text provided that the Agreement was to come into force with the respective Governments. He is saying that they agreed on the 11th of July, and yet the hon. members on the other side said they had no Agreement with Brazil and yet they are going to claim that they are responsible. They cannot lock up anybody for telling the truth. You leave them to their own conscience and to the electorate.

4.30 p.m.

Now, Sir, with that we can proceed from there. The agreement very clearly said that a commercial agreement had to be worked out between a Brazilian company and the company designated by Barbados. International Seafoods was designated by Barbados, and I want to say that under the terms of the Brazilian regulations only a leasing arrangement can take place which is approved by the Navy and by Sudeppi, and this is where we as Third World countries must understand, those of us who understand a tradition in a country of non-prevarication and reasonable haste in decisions, and understand that when one agency of Government makes up its mind and it is approved by the Cabinet that it is carried into force; not so in Brazil, Brazil has three Governments. There is the

President, the Navy and the Army, and the Navy has been blocking agreements in Brazil not only with Barbados, with Trinidad, with the United States of America, and this year the Brazilians preferred to see the shrimp kill themselves off the coast of Brazil rather than to let any other outsiders, Third World or otherwise, shrimp them. Brazilians prefer to see that. I am glad I am not a Minister of Foreign Affairs, I am very glad, because if I had to deal with them across the table and the forum of the United Nations I would let them know well that they are the real new neo-colonialists in the world, and they are talking of wanting people to be part of one Group 77 with them. (Mr. SANDIFORD: Your speech will go back). I want it to go back, I am glad it will go back, because it is time that the Third World countries understand who want to use them only in international fora.

In this respect the conduct of Brazil in respect of the fishing agreements off the coast of Brazil in my opinion is as stinking as any other colonialist would deal with them. That is my view, and I say so.

Now, Sir, the Managing Director of Seafoods and his counterpart in Belem signed an agreement which has not found favour with the Brazilian Navy. As far as the Cabinet of Barbados is concerned, let it be clearly understood, the Cabinet of Barbados has made a decision, a very straight decision in respect of International Seafoods, that International Seafoods — and I will say it again, because I said it in here last time and the agencies of misinformation reported what I said wrong. I will say it again, that we feel that there is a future for deep sea fishing off the coast of Latin America and we also feel that it is possible to use some of these shrimp boats to catch fish within the 200 mile limit of Barbados. We said that here. We feel that it is possible to use the same boats to catch trawl fish and to catch flying fish and dolphin, and experiment with long lining. Therefore, we have made a very clear decision in Cabinet that so many of those boats as are proven to be necessary to carry out that pure fishing activity we shall keep, the rest will be subject to proper international paying procedures and they will be sold, because, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of Barbados have had to pay from the inception of International Seafoods large sums of money, and we do not believe.....(Dr. HAYNES: How much since 1976?)

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member knew anything about business law he would know that it is the duty of the person who is designated to wind up a company to do an inventory of its assets together with a statement of its liabilities, and that is precisely what is going on now. When that is completed the hon. member will know the full extent of the financial obligations we found that his Government brought upon the people of

Barbados. So, Sir, that is the position, there is no magic or mystery.

When we came into power we insisted that an effort be made to encourage Barbadians to eat this trawl fish, and it is very simple, the United Nations and FAO had carried out a survey of the Caribbean in the early 1960's, and the United Nations/FAO survey had demonstrated that there was a potential for trawl fishing within the territorial waters of friendly countries to us in the Caribbean, and they were the ones who demonstrated that croaker, sea trout and sea bass, shark and things of that kind could be markets, and we insisted that shrimp boats when they came back from Brazil also trawl fish and bring fish here to be sold to the public, and we moved from 280,000 pounds to 350,000 pounds, and last year they sold 480,000 pounds. I would like to see it go to four million pounds a year, but the truth of the matter is, Sir, that you do not need 20 of these boats to catch that four million pounds a year, so all those agents of misinformation in this country who do not spend their time trying to ferret out information first before they write their junk, let them understand that the Government of Barbados' position has been made clear, there is no inconsistency, the only inconsistency is in the minds of those people and in the minds of others who want to buy the boats cheaply, but they cannot get them like that, they have got to be paid for in hard, solid currency after a proper valuation, because we understand our responsibility, and the position will be that we will be encouraging the development of trawl fishing and that type. If incidental during the period of time you are trawl fishing you catch shrimp, we will sell the shrimp, but the whole thing is this. We know that you cannot predicate a shrimping industry upon the ability to get access to another man's ground when the other man is telling you straight that he is only using you.

Now, Sir, I want to go further and I will disclose this too. The Democratic Labour Party was advised by CIDA and by the Inter American Development Bank not to participate in International Seafoods as a shrimping venture because they said they had reason to believe that the Brazilians were going to play nasty when it came to the renewal of the agreement. Everybody suspected that the Brazilians were going to play nasty when the agreement expired. You were told that, and notwithstanding the fact that you knew that the agreement had but a short time you still went and bought Simpson's shares and paid him at par, and it was indicated to you that the Brazilians were saying that they were not going to renew the agreement.

Let us hope now that all this talk about joint venture with Trinidad, all this talk about people not having an agreement with Brazil is cast aside. Let us

understand that the best agreement that we have is the one that we have with Guyana and the one that we have with the EEC, because this is where the two of them come into vogue now. We went to Guyana because Guyana is known to have resources of trawl fish, some resources of shrimp, but the shrimping resources of Guyana are not as great as the shrimping resources at the present time of Brazil. There is a theory, let us get it straight, that periodically the shrimp moves from down in the Amazon and moves up. There is a theory that in the course of the last five or six years the shrimp is down off the coast of Brazil and Brazil feels smart with that, and she prefers to let them kill one another and commit cannibalism rather than let people like us catch some. Let her go ahead with them, because one of these days they will move from up there and she will be in a worse position, she would not even have got the foreign exchange she would have had if she had let people fish them.

4.40 p.m.

Now, Sir, the Guyana Agreement was an agreement which was negotiate with Minister Brathwaite, myself, Minister Hope and Minister Kennard, and it was an agreement in which we were permitted to fish throughout the area in Guyana whether the shrimping season was on or not. When the shrimping season is on we have to give four thousand pounds of the trapped fish to Guyana and we have to sell 50% of the shrimp to Guyana at an economic rate and the rest we can sell to anybody. Outside of the shrimping season we are permitted to fish in Guyana's waters. Whatever we catch Guyana has agreed to buy if we do not want it for ourselves, and we do not have to give them anything free. In return for that we have to pay Guyana every quarter a licence fee. I will not tell hon. members in here what is the licence fee because we have been asked in view of certain negotiations that are going on not to disclose this but I will be willing to tell the hon. member outside; but in any case it is not \$100,000. It is a special CARICOM rate, but we have been asked as a matter of confidence not to disclose the rate at this time. But it is not \$100,000 and it is acceptable to us.

But the fact of the matter is that it has been proved that not more than eight boats would be economic for that type of activity, so what do you want us to do? Continue with twenty boats? Without getting a proper agreement with Brazil and limited shrimping off Gayenne or Guyana, what are we to do?

Mr. SPEAKER: All the hon. member can do is to second the passing of the amendment to the Resolution.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir, I beg to second the passing of the amendment to the Resolution, because in my opinion it sets out very clearly the real sense of what Government has been doing in respect of this and it deserves our support and shows that the Resolution

brought by the other side is based on misinformation, rumour-mongering and things of that sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Private Members Business and Government Business is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the hon. member for the City was addressing the Chair. She is now entitled to exercise her right to continue if she so desires.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, just before we rose for lunch I believe I was saying that in respect of the debate on the pulverisation plant all of us, on both sides of the House, who had contributed to the debate were interested in seeing that the best should be done in this matter for Barbados. A lot has been said about the environment. I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South Central in particular raised many points which he described as environmental and went on to say that a lot of the serious considerations which we should examine in this matter of the pulverisation plant had serious environmental repercussions. I am fully aware of that, and I think I should begin by saying that the threat which some hon. members imagine to our underground water supply is not so great from leakage arising from the dumping of garbage whether in its raw state or pulverised. There is greater potential for pollution damage threatening our underground water supply. From, for instance, the mislocation of certain factories. For instance, many of the garment factories which deal in the dyeing of fabrics can do greater damage to our water supply than a dump two or three times the size at Workmans. The nitrates in dyes which have to be washed out of various clothing material pose a greater threat to our water supply if that discarded water goes into our underground water system at the wrong point or in the wrong zone. Again, the residue from a paint factory would do far greater damage to our water supply and on a much larger scale than would any leakage from a garbage dump in its raw or pulverised state.

Perhaps I should outline again in the briefest of terms how solid waste disposal is managed in Barbados. For years and years we have been using the land fill method, the system of putting garbage into an unused gully or an unused water course; you put soil over it, treat it with rodenticides to hold down rats and flies; and over a period of years the gully or water course is filled up, it settles and the land is reclaimed. The land fill method has been suitable to Barbados for many reasons, Barbados is a small country and every square inch of land that we can reclaim and put to some use, whether as the hon. member for St. Michael South pointed out, for use as a playing field, or for agricultural or factory use — every square inch that we can reclaim is worth many times its weight in gold to us. So the land fill method is beneficial to Barbados. It is also a cheap method.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about incineration as a method of solid waste disposal for Barbados. Those who have environmental interests at heart will realize that incineration presents serious problems. In a small country like Barbados we would have serious smoke problems, we would have ash problems and serious problems of the disposal of the end result of incineration. And there is another factor which militates very strongly against incineration — it is exceedingly expensive.

4.50 p.m.

The incinerators are fuelled by electricity, Mr. Speaker. Electricity requires oil, and that is costly. The pulverisation plant, it is true, is again run by electricity; but it is not run on a 24 hour basis. The garbage is piled on the plant floor, and at a specific point in time, when there is sufficient estimated tonnage of garbage on the plant floor, a button is pressed and the load of garbage is pulverised; and so it turns out that you are looking at the matter in round terms you are looking at the matter of the disposal of solid waste from the Barbados point of view; but we have to look at the cost factor involved here.

Hon. members made reference to the possibility of insects, odours and noise arising from the site of the pulverisation plant and certain other sites where pulverisation material may be deposited. Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure hon. members of this House that the end product of the pulverisation process is what is described as inert. It has no attraction for insects of any type. It has no attraction for rodents of any type. As I said, I spent two days in New Orleans at a pulverisation plant. I saw no cockroaches. I saw no rats. I saw no mosquitoes; and this was a site next to the Mississippi River. It is inert and there is nothing for them to eat or feed or live on. Not even the birds were interested in the pulverised material which was put on land fill because nothing could live on that material.

The noise factor is another factor that I should look at very closely, Sir. The plant is going to be housed and will be enclosed and will be itself down on the floor of the quarry; and I am satisfied and the officers in my Ministry are satisfied, and the experts are satisfied that the noise factor will be no greater than the noise factor to which many other Barbadians are accustomed. I, for instance, Mr. Speaker, grew up in Brighton all of my life. The Rum Refinery lorries travelled up and down Bridgetown main road in which I lived, day and night. They had chains attached to the bottles and so there was another noise factor introduced, in that form. I have never, heard, Mr. Speaker, that people who lived in Brighton could not sleep or went mad because of the noise.

People who live near sugar factories and other factories — again Mr. Speaker, in the Ministry of Health

there is a Department of Public Health Engineering; and part of its job is to monitor things like noise levels. I do not know if hon. members are aware. I suppose that the hon. members for St. Michael South and St. Michael North Central who have been Ministers of Health before me would know; but on a daily basis, sometimes, on a weekly and monthly basis noise levels are taken in various places in Barbados. Noise levels are taken in Bridgetown on a very frequent basis. Noise levels are taken in and around various factories in Barbados on a regular basis. All of these things are part of the function of that special Public Health Engineering unit.

Mr. Speaker, another point which I want to advert to is the point raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central about the flow. It is true that the flow to this is going to be sealed. I have taken double, treble and sometimes quadruple measures to see that leakages will be at a minimum. There have been set up since I was Minister, certain monitoring posts for Workmans and various other points, at wells and pumping stations, including the Belle, to make quite sure that when we begin to deposit pulverised material at Workmans, if there is any leakage which is going to carry chemical or other bacteriological matter which is going to be harmful to our water supply it will be picked up at the soonest opportunity. All fail-safe systems have been put into operation already.

I do not remember if the hon. member for St. George North raised the point that he was worried that if there was a strike by the Sanitation Service Authority workers or if there was a breakdown of the plant that there would be a pile up of trucks all the way down the road from Workmans to Bridgetown and, I suppose, all kinds of garbage staying there for days and stinking. I wish to point out that the site at Workmans will not be the only point of disposal. The site at St. Philip and the site at St. Lucy will continue to be sites for land fill under the old method. All of the garbage in Barbados will not go to the pulverisation plant at Workmans; so that we will have alternate land fill sites in case there should be a major breakdown — and it will have to be indeed a major breakdown because again at the plant there will be its own emergency electricity supply and its own fail-safe system. If all of that breaks down, we still have the sites at St. Philip and St. Lucy as alternate sites.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that someone adverted to the question of the access roads and the narrowness or otherwise thereof. I think that it was within the first three months of my coming into this Ministry, work on one of the access roads started. I think — I would like to say that I more than think — because I have visited that site and the people who live around it on three occasions; and I would be going there again tomorrow. The people in Workmans are pleased with the fact that they are having roads widening works and an improved road surface in and around the site at Workmans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the fears of some members of the public and some members of this House....

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, I hope that the fears expressed will have been allayed. I have taken nothing for granted. I have doubly and trebly checked all possible problems which might flow from the siting of this plant at Workmans in particular. Anyone who has had anything to do with the running of the supply of water in this country, such as the Chief Engineer of the Department, Mr. Archer, who is now manager of the sewerage project, myself, and the Minister of Communications and Works, who has anything to do with the quality of the water supply in Barbados will make sure that nothing will be done, and certainly not by the Ministry of Health that can in any way threaten that water supply.

I am fully aware, and I have gone into some trouble to make myself knowledgeable about this. It is like a great huge lake under Barbados with fresh water newly filtered through our coral stone lying at top; and it would be more easy than we perhaps dream to poison that whole lake. So it will not be a question of poisoning a well in St. Philip and being able to use a well in St. Lucy or in St. Peter. It is possible to poison the whole water supply. Barbados, unlike Dominica, St. Lucia and other territories of the Caribbean, has no surface water. We have no rivers and we have no lakes.

5 p.m.

That reputation we have in the world and I can say without reservation that the high quality of our water supply and the preservation of it would not be damaged or threatened in any way. I wish to assure hon. members of that.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, there is one other point I would like to raise about the business of pulverisation and why in many respects it turns out to be the most suitable method for Barbados. There are side products of pulverisation. I saw myself in New Orleans a relatively simple piece of machinery which was put into the works which could extract all the non-ferrous metals from garbage. Another piece of machinery I saw put into the works which extracted paper from the garbage and yet another piece of machinery I saw which simply could be put into the conveyor system, so to speak, which could extract glass from the garbage.

Now it does not behove me or the Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to rush into things without doing a serious and careful cost analysis. Even before I came back to Barbados and put these ideas up to my staff

for investigation, I myself was aware of the fact that there was no immediate economical market in the Caribbean for non-ferrous metal or the glass. What it would cost Barbados to ship glass extracted from our garbage to the nearest point where that glass could be recycled would not be worth it. The cost of the freight would not be worth it and the same goes for the non-ferrous metal.

There is a smelting plant in Trinidad now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it is possible that perhaps in the near future it would be economical for us to extract the non-ferrous metals from our garbage and perhaps the pulverisation plant might approach the possibility of being self-productive. I do not know. All of these things are being looked into and I am prepared from the beginning to remove the garbage off our streets.

Another reason too, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why pulverisation or some kind of mechanical treatment for disposal of solid waste is important for Barbados is this. We have a serious rodent problem in this country. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central has talked about it on a previous occasion. We also have a serious mosquito problem in this country. It is true that Barbados, perhaps more than any other territory in the Caribbean, handles and manages those two problems in a far more professional and expert way, but nevertheless there are still problems and they are problems which cost us money to fight daily. These factors have got to be taken into account. We cannot forever, Mr. Deputy Speaker, go on dumping garbage always in the land filled style in this country.

Also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you pulverise garbage you are getting a more compact end product than you do when you dump your garbage. It is possible that within my life-time we may run out of natural disused quarries, natural disused water courses and we have got to plan ahead. We have got to do some long-term planning. One other interesting aspect which might interest hon. members is that the pulverised material may have more immediate uses in Barbados. It is possible, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that some of that pulverised material will depend, I believe on the height to which we can pulverise. You can pulverise to a quarter of an inch, you can pulverise to half an inch, you can pulverise to an inch, just as you do with the bricks that we build with.

I am investigating the possibility that a certain quality of pulverised material may be used in road surfacing in Barbados. We are also investigating the possibility, as the hon. member for St. Joseph pointed out, of pulverised material being used as composite material in agriculture. All of those things are being looked at, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is true, that when the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works suggested that there are firms already approaching his

Ministry and mine with a view to purchasing large quantities of this pulverised material for industrial and agro-industrial use so that for all of these kinds of reasons, Mr. Deputy Speaker, pulverisation, it is believed, is the best style of solid waste management and disposal for Barbados.

Barbados is a tiny Island and pollution is something which can overtake us perhaps more quickly than territories which are mountainous and which have natural streams and lakes to take away some of the surface pollution. Barbados is flat and it has no surface water which is another reason why it should be kept clean and I wish, before I sit down, to take this opportunity to make it clear to members for their information and particularly to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that the Sanitation Service Authority is picking up just over 5,000 tons of garbage a month. Now the fleet that we have on the ground, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can carry and dispose of more than 5,000 tons of garbage a month, and I am setting a target of nothing less than 200 tons a day. We have the capacity to carry it. The compactor can do it and it has got to be picked up.

It is true that there has been some improvement in the collection of garbage. It is true too that some people do not want to hear about garbage at all. It is clear to me, for instance, that the member for Christ Church North Central is one of those persons who does not want to talk about garbage at all. They are people in Barbados and some people too you would not dream of who are so intent on not having garbage on their property that they will put it into their motor-car at night and drive to somebody else's premises and deposit it there. I believe that the hon. member will see around this country some large garbage containers, some large blue ones.

5.10 p.m.

Now, the compactor trucks which we have had in Barbados for some years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were always capable of dealing with that kind of garbage container. It is on wheels, the men wheel it to the back of the compactor, it is hooked on, the driver inside presses a button, it takes it up, empties it, puts it back down and the men wheel it back on to its location or site. Now those compactor trucks came down here years ago with that facility and it is only now that we have been able to get those large containers on the road. They are meant to be located, first of all, at the end of streets which are too narrow for the trucks to get up them, they are meant in the second instance to be located at well known dumping sites where we are still having great difficulty persuading people that they ought not to dump loose garbage, and I would like to take the opportunity to appeal to all hon. members in their constituencies and perhaps through the vehicle of their

constituency groups to stress and re-stress again, and I believe the doctors among us in particular will agree with me, to the ordinary people in Barbados, the man in the street, every single one of us, that each person has a duty. All the blame cannot lie with the Ministry of Health or with the Sanitation Service Authority, everyone has a responsibility.

I believe that members of the public have begun to see that I am serious. There is a maximum fine of \$5,000. Certain hotels have been prosecuted during the course of the last two months, certain householders are going to be prosecuted this month and next month, and certain business houses in Bridgetown are presently being processed to be prosecuted, and I am serious. When you dump loose garbage on the side of the road you are not only endangering your health, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is what every Barbadian must recognise, you are endangering the health of us all, and this is not an issue over which we can be partisan, and I am serious.

We are going to be picking up the stray dogs very soon, so within a few months you will not be in a position to blame the dogs. The licences, I am happy to say, are going very well. In fact, it turns out that people have responded so well to the licensing of dogs, they are so anxious for us to deal with this problem, that the Rates and Taxes Department is actually beginning to run out of tags. There are 35,000 more tags on the way here now, they are held up I believe in a place called Nebraska, United States, and we are trying to air freight them into Barbados quickly, because the response has been so good and so responsible. As soon as those dogs are licensed and properly tagged and we begin to pick up the strays who are helping to aggravate our garbage problem, that excuse which people like to put up to me will no longer be a valid one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that in the course of my contribution I have satisfied the queries and the apprehensions voiced by hon. members. I do believe that contrary to certain other opinions expressed in here that pulverisation is the correct method for Barbados, I am satisfied that it will do much and go a long way to solving, although it will not entirely by itself solve the problem of garbage disposal in our island.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, first I must congratulate my colleague, the Minister of Health, for having the dogs tagged. I have seen them walking around with their little chains around their necks, but in the meantime I see a lot of them in the garbage cans at night too, so I think you will have another problem on your hands. They look very well with the little tags around their necks, but they are still pulling about the garbage cans, so you have an extra problem.

Sir, I listened to speeches made on both sides of the House today, and surely I cannot speak with any degree of authority on health, since I am not a medical man and I have no responsibility for the Ministry of Health. In my capacity as Housing and Lands Minister I am introducing and seeking parliamentary approval for the acquisition of land at Free Hill in St. George, but out of this debate I heard a number of things, and one which really struck me was as usual the speech from the parliamentarian on all subjects, the member for St. Michael South Central.

If I remember well, some time in 1974 or 1975 the member for St. Michael North Central was Minister of Health. I think it was at that time, as he quite clearly said, he introduced the idea of having a pulverisation plant in Barbados. It was also in 1974 when he asked for an investigation into the hospital, but he was rejected and rebuffed publicly and was told in no uncertain terms that the second most powerful man did not want it. It puzzles me now that early in 1976 that this one time second most powerful man, a man who reads the newspapers, all the medical journals, probably had access to Government files, had the ear of the Prime Minister, did not know that they were going to site a pulverisation plant in St. George. This is strange thinking, and I will tell him about the land now that he is backing out of. I fall into some funny Ministries.

The member for St. Michael South Central was contesting the election in 1976, so he had a different swan song. Do not bring the pulverisation plant in St. George, my supposed-to-be constituents are going to be affected, so this plant was shelved; \$750,000 was down in St. Cecilia Barracks, from 1974 \$750,000 was lying down in St. Cecilia Barracks simply because the member for St. Michael South Central was able to persuade the then Prime Minister to shelve this. Now, this evening we are hearing about all the environmental problems. He did not tell him that then, but do you know what are the environmental problems? It is not that you are concerned, you are always talking about the poor people, but the word "poor" is not in your dictionary, exploitation is in yours, because you bought land 400 yards away from Workmans -- and I will say it publicly and destroy you -- at \$1,200 an acre and was offering it to the poor people at \$18,000 an acre. 5.20 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the property which I own in the Workmans Area is called Hillbury and is isolated in distance, etc., from any other part of the proposed site and could not possibly be affected by that site in the first instance, and in the second instance I bought no other property in St. George. I was a member of a company that bought a plantation called The Hope, which has been disposed of

without profit to that company, simply because it was bought for the purpose of a development and the people involved in the exercise packed up and the project was disposed of as a mixed farming project. So let us get that straight.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am now going to straighten you out. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central said that he did not know about the pulverisation plant in 1974 or 1975. But he as a member of a company was able to dispose of the Hope plantation which he bought at \$1,200 an acre and sold it at \$18,000 an acre.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is misleading the House....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Misleading the House... (Disorder)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Will both hon. members take their seats.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. I state categorically that the hon. member is misleading the House, because the cost price of the matter referred to was not \$1,200 per acre it was somewhere originally about \$4,000 an acre and ended up at a cost of about \$6,000 an acre, and the average disposal price of the land was between \$6,500 and \$7,000 an acre. So the cost price was between \$6,000 and \$6,500 and the average disposal price with no profit involved.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The hon. member has made it very clear. He just said he did not make a profit not more than a split second ago....

Dr. HAYNES: The hon. member is again misleading the House. It was not an individual matter it was a corporate matter.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What corporate matter? He was the front man who had the ear of the Prime Minister. He said he made no profit and yet he said it was bought for \$4,000 an acre, then it was \$6,000, maybe \$6,500 or \$7,000. I want to know if I bought something at \$4,000 and sold it for \$7,000 if that is not a profit. But you bought it at \$1,200 an acre and sold it at \$18,000 an acre, and I have the evidence to prove it.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is again misleading the House and you should put an end to this sort of thing. (Disorder)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He has to prove that I am misleading the House. As a Minister of Government I cannot come in here and mislead the House. I have made a statement and he must refute it with facts.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You are a fluke, that's what you are.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In Barbadian terms the word "fluke" is insulting. The hon. Minister said that my colleague is a fluke and I wish he would withdraw the remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that that is not unparliamentary.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Very well then, he is not a fluke, he is a political joker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please get back to the debate, and will the hon. member please address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Very well, Sir. The hon. member for St. Michael South did something in here today that I don't believe anybody can now say that the DLP is not a united party, for out on a limb the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was — he always has something dirty to throw in — and the hon. member for St. Michael South West had to come to his rescue and make a speech in here to command the attention of members on the other side so as to save him. But you did not know that I was coming in later.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is again misleading the House. I am shocked to see that whereas the hon. Minister of Health could understand the substance of what I said, there is great difficulty here. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central was talking about immediate leakage. I myself was speaking on the question of subterranean drainage. There was no conflict at any point.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am not talking about health, I am not a health man, I am a healthy man. I am dealing with the acquisition of land for the pulverisation plant, where the hon. member for St. Michael South Central exploited the people of that area by buying land at \$1,200 and selling it at \$18,000.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will have to take a stand on this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you will take your seat I will take a stand. Will the hon. member take his seat. The issue is such that one hon. member has said one thing and you have had the opportunity to refute it. It is simply a question of opinion now; he said one thing and you another.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I know for a fact that the land at the Hope in St. George was sold for way in excess of the \$6,000 the hon. member is saying.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker....

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order.... (*Disorder*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will all hon. members take their seats.

Mr. TAITT: It cannot work so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have ruled you must take your seat and the Minister will continue.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I understand that there are charges of misleading from both sides of the House. I have acted as Attorney-at-law for some purchasers of land at The Hope who paid way in excess of the amount stated by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have made your point; please take your seat.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I said the average price at which the land was sold; the spread over price was \$6,500. (*Disorder*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.
5.30 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: I was on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on your entry.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I wonder if you could be told by the Deputy Speaker what was the position at the time, if I was on my feet or the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central has caught my eye.

Dr. HAYNES: There was a point which I want to clear up. The hon. member for St. James has made allegations that I bought land at \$12,000 an acre, and sold it at \$18,000 an acre. I have to inform this Hon. House that the land was bought by a company in which I was a shareholder, that the initial price of the land was some \$4,000 an acre and that over the years the charges in interest and various other factors meant that the cost was well above \$6,000. That is most important, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member consider that to be a point of order that he is making?

Dr. HAYNES: It is a question, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a moment. The hon. member is making a speech which I am not prepared to hear at this moment. The hon. member will take his seat. The Hon. Minister will continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. As I was saying, the acquisition of land at Free Hill which is before this Chamber, relates to the setting up of the pulverisation plant at Workmans, St. George; and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central earlier in the day made reference to poor people whom he was defending in St. George. He said that he had to speak in support of the people in St. George; and I am categorically stating here today, Sir, that the member for St. Michael South Central while referring to poor people, bought land, a plantation or had interest in a plantation where he paid \$12,000 an acre and sold it at \$18,000 an acre.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the Hon. Minister must desist from repeating that argument. You have already made your point there and there is no necessity to repeat and to continue repeating this. I would have to rule against you then.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a further point of order. The hon. member for St. James.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please.....

Dr. HAYNES: I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please. If you cannot contain yourself — I will have to show the hon. member that I must contain myself. The hon. member will be heard on a point of order.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a certain imputation in relation to improper motives in the position which I took in relation to environmental problems relating to the pulverisation plant. I would like to draw to the attention of this House that the Hope Plantation is situated to the north of the pulverisation plant, and there is nobody living at that plantation. So there is nothing that I can possibly say in relation to Workmans and Millington that can possibly relate to the Hope Plantation. It is just total silliness.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, there is still hope for us. The Minister will be heard.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Now, Sir, I would like to assure this House that according to the study the

pulverisation plant would be in Zone 4 in which, as I understand it, there will be no problem about contamination of our water resources. This is what I have been advised by the technocrats, the experts, and it is only they that I can be guided by. Reference was made today to 73%, and when I hinted across the table in a rather jovial manner that it was 83.6%, I was told that this must be coming out of a hat, conveying that I did not know what was going on. It was 73% in 1974; but there is a 10% increase between 1974 and 1978; so you have been doing your homework, but you are not up to date with your homework.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, I do not think that you would allow me to make any reference to my colleague about anything in Roebuck Street on Thursday night.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is a pulverisation plant there, that is his business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We may have to think about the pulverisation plant there. I hope not to be in that pulverisation plant again. It was 16-12-11; but it was 4-1 affair with you. He, 179 and you 42. You see the great difference? You came third. That was all back bench power.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us journey from Roebuck Street to Workmans in St. George.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is the ideal way. You have to take the way up Roebuck Street, My Lords Hill, Bulkley etc. I think that enough has been said about this Resolution. We have had a long and interesting debate on it, and a number of things have been revealed today. We have had the views of the member for St. Michael South Central, and then those views were contradicted by the member for St. Michael North Central about environmental studies. Then you had the views of the member for St. Michael South. So we can appreciate their problems when it comes to medical men giving opinions. If, however, I had to make a choice I would opt for the saner of the two.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE ACQUISITION OF LAND AT PRESCOD BOULEVARD

The Third Order of the Day was called — A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of

land at Prescod Boulevard, St. Michael, for vesting in the Industrial Development Corporation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution again, Sir, deals with the vesting of land in the Industrial Development Corporation. There are lands at Prescod Boulevard where the Ministry of External Trade, Tourism and Industry would like to have that land for the purpose of putting up another set of cluster blocks. They are seeking the permission of Parliament for the purpose of having this land vested in the Industrial Development Corporation.

5.40 p.m.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, noting that my acquaintance, the President of the Republic of the Democratic Labour Party, is nodding his head in approval, it does not appear as if there will be anymore debate on this, Sir, and without anymore introductory remarks, I will like to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member who introduced the Resolution has indicated, we on this side do not propose to debate on it. I should merely like, since this is not going into Committee, to remind the Hon. Minister that during the time when the Deep Water Harbour was being constructed, the Ministry responsible for the Deep Water Harbour had some lands of the IDC vested in that Ministry for the purpose of building a new administration block. I believe that now it has been completed that there are some lands left over and I am drawing it to your attention that it is perhaps desirable that the IDC should be re-vested in the remaining lands, so that we can have on both sides of the Prescod Boulevard the Cluster Blocks and the continuation of the industrial development. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, an enquiry has taken place in respect to all of the land concerning the Port area and as to what is vested in IDC and what is not vested in IDC. It is correct that at the time of the expansion of the Port that there was an area of land situated between the Cold Storage Unit and the old area where the University was which was formerly vested in IDC. That land was requested to be handed back to the Government for the purpose of doing certain port works. I believe that the contractors who worked at the Port, needed that piece of land in order to set up some of the precasting units.

In addition to that, there was a parcel of land situated between the Feed Mill and where the University was which was granted for the purpose of building the Port Administration Building. There will be no question

of that going back over. The building is actually completed but now, Sir, that the Port is completed the Port Authority and Customs have suggested that the container area possibly be expanded to permit that area of land sometime in the future which was handed over to permit the Contractors to set up their pre-casting shed, that area of land to remain within the Port Authority so that if any question ever arose in the future about space within the Port area for unstuffing a large number of containers and things of that kind that there would be no question of interfering with the activities of the container Port.

In addition, Sir, modern Port development is moving so rapidly, Sir, that there are certain demands and requests for leasing of space within the Port area for certain types of liquid trans-shipment out of Barbados. Bearing all of those facts in mind, Sir, it may be possible that that land would not be re-vested but nevertheless the Government itself is conscious of the fact that there was an area of land to the East of the Prescod Boulevard which was hitherto not vested in IDC and an examination has gone out and it is proposed that as much as that as possible will be vested in IDC so as to make up for the piece that they have lost.

Now this particular piece of land is the land situated between Prescod Boulevard and the Advocate Company Limited and N.E. Wilson and it is in fact the piece of land on which the storage building has been erected for small businesses. Honourable members will see. When they pass there they will see the buildings erected there.

We also have a piece of land between that building that has been erected and Motor Services Building, which hon. members are aware that we brought back into the unexpired terms of the lease. There is a lot of argument as to boundaries going on down there for a number of years, since 1962, but I think that the boundaries have not been settled and that the Chief Surveyor is now in a position to certify the boundaries and we also have that area which is at the present moment vested in Government but which we propose very soon to make a decision on subject to IDC's views on it and then there is the area between that same area coming in the other direction between Mannings and this area.

Now there is a boat on one part. There has been a lot of requests from various people in Fontabelle whose land touches on that for leasing of that land in order to erect their houses and things of that kind and a decision will soon be made in respect of that. In addition, we have the whole area of the land that has been reclaimed as a result of the reclamation that took place as part of the Harbour extension and we have the land which is now the subject of a study for the Spring Garden Industrial Park.

Bearing all of this in mind, the Government will soon be in a position to rationalise land ownership in that area and it will certainly be vested in a single body as to whether it will be vested in IDC or be vested in the Land Reclaim Limited. I am not in a position at the present moment to give a decision but one must also bear in mind that we are investigating. The Government is committed to investigate the possibility of having a Free Trade Processing in Barbados and, Sir, actually we now have a team of experts from Uledo and the Centre for Industrial Development in Barbados who are looking into the law and the possibilities both in respect to the Port and Airport. This is their first visit to Barbados. It took us two years to get them after going through a long set of negotiations and they are actually here now having their discussions so one has to bear that in mind as well as the Consultants' Report on the possible use of the land arising out of the Spring Garden, Black Rock Road.

There is some question as to the suitability of the foundation which one would find there. There is no doubt that use would be made of the land but as to the particular type of use I am not in a position to say, but we are bearing all of those matters in mind and I can assure the hon. member that IDC will play an important part in the planning and management of any land in that area.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Just one small matter, Mr. Speaker. In this Resolution there is a typographical error. I assume it is a typographical error. In the second paragraph "Resolved that His Excellency the Governor-General" and there is a misspelling of Excellency and I do hope that that particular error be corrected where the "s" will be deleted and the "x" substituted therefor.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is drawing attention to a typographical error in paragraph two of the Resolution. The first line of paragraph two.
5.50 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, seeing the research officer at work again, we have to respect his views when expressed in here, and I would move that this Resolution do now pass as amended and that the letter "s" be deleted and the letter "x" substituted. All of a sudden you are hearing about precedents and so, so I just want to be on a good wicket.

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that we revert to Government Notices, with the leave of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no objection, leave is granted.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$24,123 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. 25, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$12,585 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1978-79, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79, No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, if we can have the concurrence of the other side, there are a number of Bills which need to be done and we will meet in two weeks' time.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on this side we can see no difficulty about that. We assume that the Bills will be sent in an early time and that we would not get them the day before. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, they will be circulated before that).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 13th February at 12.00 noon.

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

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