

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15th May, 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); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Dr. R. B. CADDLE, M.D., Ch. B.; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker) and Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., M.R.C.P. (Edin.)

Prayers were read.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Hon. C. L. BOLDEN entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday 24th April, 1979.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of Tuesday, 24th April, 1979 be now confirmed.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 8th May, 1979.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of Tuesday, 8th May, 1979 be now confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations, the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 8th May, 1979, stand confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year 1977.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay Statements showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders for the months of November 1978 to February, 1979.

Also, Statement showing money Order Transactions through the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments and Administrations for the months of November 1978 to February, 1979.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Lower Estate Plantation, St. George for the provision of a playing field.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Nurses and Midwives (Registration) Act.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Nurses and Midwives (Registration) Act, be read a first time.

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

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

STATEMENT BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the decease of one of its former members. I refer to the late Frederick Eustace Connell Bethell. Mr. Bethell served as a member of the House of Assembly for the parishes of St. Peter and St. John. This was not the limit of his political service in this island, for at various times he was a member of the Vestry of St. Peter and of St. Michael.

Mr. Bethell was born in Barbados and was educated at the Lodge School. He was a member of a planting family and was himself a planter, owning Friendship Plantation in St. Michael. Subsequent to his defeat in Parliament he continued at the centre of public affairs. He was well known in the world of horse racing and also continued his activities in the field of agriculture. He has been succeeded in this area by one son who is now President of the Agricultural Society.

Fred Bethell belonged to a world now past in political terms but his contribution to the House of Assembly and his activities at the time of great political turmoil are to be commended.

I would like to offer to his widow and surviving relatives the condolences of the Government.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, while it is true that I was not fully acquainted with Mr. Fred Bethell, I still deem it my duty, having also served as a Vestryman, to express my deep appreciation of the invaluable service which Vestrymen rendered in those days. Those were the days, Sir, when the die hard conservatives dominated this country in both local and central Government. There was the situation that they were there to represent their own interests; but, Sir, it is from those systems with which we have come along and seen, and which I have the honour of being the only member of this House to have had the honour to have served, I deem it my duty as a member of the opposite side to say that I must regret the passing of Mr. Bethell.

In those days, Sir, it was a colossal task for men of my calibre and colour to have the temerity to dare to sit

with men of similar colour of the late Fred Bethell. I still realise that the contribution which they have made in those days should not be forgotten. Mr. Speaker, when I reminisce on the past, I can only say that it was through those systems which motivated certain black people to take the interest of the people of this country at heart; and to offer themselves in an honorary capacity and therefore, speaking from that point of view, I would say that those who have rendered service in the past, regardless of their philosophy or ideology, regardless of their conservatism, we must still acknowledge the contribution which they have made, and in some measure have contributed to the transformation of the political field in this country; and therefore I extend my deepest sympathy to the relatives of the deceased, Mr. Fred Bethell and to say that I place on record how this House appreciates the services that he has rendered to this country as a vestryman; and while it is true to state that I was not acquainted with him as a member of Parliament I would still say that this House appreciates former members of the House of Assembly who in some measure have still made some small contribution towards progress of this country; and I have very great pleasure in associating myself with the remarks of the Hon. Prime Minister; and while I know, Sir, that I may be threading on your corns, I would suggest that a letter be written from this House expressing our deep appreciation to the relatives of the deceased for the services which he has rendered to this country.

Mr. ODLE: Mr. Speaker, I would wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the former two speakers. Mr. Bethell had very strong roots in St. George. It is my understanding that the first school he attended was in St. George and that he never failed to praise the education that he received at that school. He has always been a successful farmer and agriculturalist, and in the area of horse breeding.

I always like to measure a man's success in the terms of the opinions which I have received from those people who had to work with him whether in the capacity of a watchman, of gardeners or men working in agriculture. I have been informed that Mr. Bethell was a man who was always willing and ready to hear of their problems and to lend help whenever possible. I would certainly like, Mr. Speaker, that his example is one which others will follow.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, my acquaintance with Mr. F. E. C. Bethel has been much more limited than other persons who have spoken so far. I personally knew Mr. Bethel when I was a schoolboy at Lodge School in the Fifties, and one of his sons was at the Lodge School with me. He was a tall and imposing personality and to a young boy someone you would look at with a certain degree of awe, but at the same time one looked at him

even as a schoolboy and realised that he was making a contribution to Barbados both politically and in the field of sports. I would join with the hon. member for St. Philip South and say that in spite of the fact that his political philosophy may have been different from ours today, nonetheless in his own time, having regard to the mood of the international political scene when Mr. Bethel was around, he was one who in his way and in the times prevailing did make a contribution to Barbados especially in the area of agriculture.

As a sportsman he brought many rewards to Barbados. In the Fifties it was Mr. Bethel's horses perhaps more than any others which carried the flag very proudly for Barbados in Trinidad and even in Guyana when there was racing at D'Urban Park, and when the history of horse racing is written in Barbados obviously Mr. Bethel's name will feature very near the top when one thinks of horses like Mary Ann, Test Match, Abu Ali, Blue Stream, Madelinoi, Anna and more recently Smile Please. In the last few years he has not been so active in racing, but he still came to the Garrison and he was a man that I found very approachable, willing to give of his advice to young people interested in horse racing and to some of the new syndicates which have sprung up in Barbados, and Mr. Bethel was always courteous and full of anecdotes.

I know his immediate family, his sons and his nephews, one of whom Larry Bethel shares Chambers with me better than I knew Mr. F. E. C. Bethel, and to his widow and immediate family I would join with the other hon. members who have spoken in this debate in tendering sincerest condolences.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any other hon. members who wish to contribute to the late Mr. Fred Bethel?

I beg to be associated with the remarks of sympathy extended to the family and relatives of the late Mr. Fred Bethel, a former member of this Honourable House. His Parliamentary career was not long by any standards, but there is one thing that is noteworthy of Mr. Bethel in that he was a planter in every sense of the word. He was a successful planter, and I am sure that he left the parish of St. Peter with a reasonably good record of his relationship with the workers on the estates which he managed there, and I believe that the same thing can be applied with respect to his relationship with the workers in the parish of St. Michael where he owned Mount Friendship Plantation. But Mr. Bethel, whilst being a planter, did not at all times adopt the plantation attitude towards his workers, and that I can term to be responsible for the measure of success that he achieved as a planter.

I merely want to say that we are happy for the services that he rendered to the Nation through being a member of this Honourable House and I am sure all hon.

members would wish that our deepest sympathy be extended to his widow and the members of his family. Accordingly I have to ask hon. members to stand in their places with me for two minutes as a mark of respect to the late Mr. Bethel.

Hon. Members stood in their places for two minutes.

A letter of sympathy will be sent to the widow and the son of the late Mr. Bethel conveying the sentiments of this Honourable House on this occasion.
12.45 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18 and 20 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6, standing in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister be the instant Order of the Day.

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

THE PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1979

Order Number 6 was called — To move the Second Reading of the Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the payment of pensions, gratuities and other allowances.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, from time to time difficulties have arisen and even more difficulties have been foreseen in respect of the well known position in virtually all our Pensions Legislation which provides for the retired public officers, Parliamentarians, the Governor-General, employees of Statutory Boards and Teachers to take their gratuities and a commuted pension in lieu of a full pension. Nearly all of those pensioners asked for a gratuity and refused pensions. I think that the number of people who have refused gratuity and taken full pension can be counted

on the fingers of both hands since 1947 when this originated. You go whole years and nobody ever asks for a full pension.

It is therefore considered that we should view the situation for the protection of certain persons. We should view the situation as if people are going to take gratuity and this Act is designed to allow the Governor-General or the Minister, as the case maybe, to exercise options on behalf of persons who by reason of death or mental illness or other incapacities cannot exercise the option. I hope I have not put it in a complicated way but it is obvious that if a public officer is invalidated on the grounds of mental illness he cannot exercise his option of taking a gratuity although it may be in his interest. It is also obvious that if a member of Parliament dies while still in office his Estate cannot exercise the option because he did not exercise it of taking a gratuity rather than a full pension.

The Laws relating to Parliamentary Pensions are under consideration relating to qualifications and so on but since in general we consider that the power of the Governor-General or the Minister to grant the gratuity should be made a general Order, we thought that we would include Parliamentary Service into the provisions so that when we are providing for that if the following persons failed for any reason to exercise their option of becoming entitled to a pension or a gratuity that that option could be exercised for them.

The Governor-General, the Prime Minister, members of Parliament, Casual Employees of Government, the Judges, Casual Employees of Statutory Boards, General Employees of Statutory Boards, Public Servants and Teachers in Secondary Schools, the Act will apply to all those persons. Other Legislation may extend the power to Estates of members some of the benefits which this Act does not extend but in the meanwhile, Sir, since cases have arisen, particularly one relating to a matter of mental illness, the Government has decided that this would be a useful provision to have, Sir, and accordingly I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of this Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

12.55 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 7 be the next Order of the day.

BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND ACT

Order No. 7 was called — To move the second reading of A Bill to amend the International Monetary Fund Act, Cap. 18A.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the letters IMF seem to have a fascination for political communities in the Caribbean, and for politicians some of whom know well, some who should know better and some who do not know at all. I do not see present in this House him who does not know at all; but I see at least one who should know better and I would like to take the opportunity now that we have to make a major amendment to the International Monetary Fund Act, to deal — I hope not at great length but comprehensively — with Barbados' relation with the International Monetary Fund.

The IMF started in 1945 as a result of a meeting held at Bretton Woods. A large number of members of the United Nations subscribed to it, and if you turn to the back of the instant Act now before the House you will see the names of the original subscribers and the subscriptions which they were supposed to pay. Some of the Communist countries withdrew from the International Monetary Fund — I cannot say exactly which — but the Fund has got bigger and bigger as more and more countries have become independent and as more and more countries have sought access to the facilities offered by the World Bank for borrowing money for development purposes. The reason is that you cannot have access to the World Bank facilities unless you are first a member of the International Monetary Fund. Barbados is a member of the Fund, but I do not suppose that its membership and such things as special drawing rights excited many people's attention until comparatively recently when as a result of general disorder in world economy various countries began to seek recourse to the IMF in order to assist them with budgetary and day to day financial problems. These are problems for which you can go to the Fund. If you have development problems you will go to the World Bank and seek to borrow money.

Now I just want to state in quite categorical terms that it is nonsense as the phrase is used by economic commentators today to say that Barbados has ever been in the hands of the IMF. There is a great deal of talk about the IMF compensatory facility, and Barbados did make an application to the compensatory facility in 1977. But it is very important to remember, as was stated quite clearly and never contradicted at the time, that the compensatory facility is a way of drawing out some of what you may have put into the IMF, in order to compensate for balance of payments conditions occasioned by circumstances outside your control. These conditions are quite limited in many ways, and the one under which we applied related to export prices. You can apply if you have a drought as a result of which your agriculture production falls short; you can apply if you have a calamity that destroys your export crops. We applied under one of these terms and although hon. members opposite will not want me to pay them such a tribute, we did not apply on the grounds of mismanagement of the economy before we got into power; we applied on the very simple ground that the price of our principal agricultural export had fallen and we were seeking some compensation to make up for the short-fall in export earnings. It is well known that the compensatory facility is not granted if the IMF considers that there is some fundamental fault in the economy that should be corrected, for example, by devaluation or import restrictions. It will not be granted if the IMF feels that a country is being run incompetently, as in that case what you need is an application for assistance from the IMF rather than an application for funds from the compensatory facility.

We passed all the tests; the IMF was satisfied that the prices we were getting for sugar had fallen — the price had fallen drastically from about £1300 a ton to £600. They were satisfied that the price had fallen, they were satisfied that the Government was taking appropriate measures to deal with a balance of payments difficulty and they accordingly granted us funds from the compensatory facility. I believe that if you take the IMF member which originally subscribed twice as much as any other members of the fund — I refer to the United States which originally subscribed something like \$2.7 billion while the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union subscribed only just over \$1 billion — even the United States has applied for use of the IMF compensatory facility. I have never heard of any American President being attacked in the House of Representatives or on television because the United States have got back some of the money it subscribed to the IMF. It appears that the privilege of being attacked for asking for what is yours is reserved for the small politicians such as a Minister of Finance in Barbados.

1.05 p.m.

I do not believe that from an Opposition platform you will hear President Eisenhower attacked for asking

for the IMF compensatory facility for the USA. It seems that it is only the home grown politicians who come under the lash of hon. members opposite. I think that this is something which you would call the colonial mentality. People abroad are all right. What they do is good enough, but people at home have to be abused for doing what is reasonable and legitimate in the circumstances; but it may very well be the hon. member for St. John who is trapped within a box of his own making; because in this House approximately a year and a half ago — it may be a little less than that — he said that Barbados was going to be in the hands of the IMF within 18 months.

Now, when he said it, he added a rider that he has forgotten; because if he remembered that rider, he would not be walking about seeking to justify that statement and procuring others who do not know as well as he to justify that statement; because he added the rider that if the country did not curb its habits of consumption, we might well be in the hands of the IMF within 18 months. I would not have gone all the way with him, because I was prepared to take such steps as would improve trading in the country in respect of consumption, and therefore I would not have to put it in the third party status.

On this side we believe in handling and guiding the economy in such a way as to help the country to do what we think, and believe, and what has proven to be right. I was not just leaving it to exhortation to deal with the problems before they arose; but I think that the hon. member now is putting himself under some kind of pressure to keep on and on suggesting that the economy of Barbados is weak despite what is being said by the Government and therefore we will soon fall into the hands of the IMF.

How the hon. member manages to say with one voice that I have manipulated the revenue and expenditure figures of Government to show that the Government's position is bad when it is really good, and then with another voice say that I am telling the people that the Government's position is good when it is really bad, I do not know. I have always admired the hon. member for his ability not just to ride two horses at the same time, but two horses going in different directions. On the same night, on the same platform, the hon. member repeated his accusations of manipulation and that the position is bad; and later on, notwithstanding what the Government tells you about the position being good, it is really bad.

Now, Sir, what really is the position? The Governor of the Central Bank has been kind enough to get for me the figures on the Government's foreign exchange position. At 30th April the Central Bank could account for Government holdings, a balance of \$1 365 000, in

foreign exchange. That, of course, is a record. The country's international reserves and public holdings less the net deficit of the commercial banks, foreign reserves on April 30 stood at \$156.5 million.

I have heard a great deal about how much we owe abroad. If we had to pay back everything that we owed abroad tomorrow, Dr. Blackman could write a cheque for it, and there would still be foreign reserves. (*Cheers*). A good part of our foreign debt is for project loans, loans to finance projects that have gone up or are going up around the island. Loans from the Inter-American Development Bank and loans from the World Bank are for relatively small amounts. So, as far as the IMF is concerned, I really cannot see why there should be any fear.

Now, I must agree — if I was allowed to read a newspaper I would read the headline "BARROW: IMF WATCHING;" but I cannot understand these speeches in which somebody hits hard, hits powerfully, and with all the force at his command and says that two and two make four and it is the fault of Tom Adams. Of course the IMF is watching the economy. The IMF watches the economy of every single member state. The IMF not only has the right to do so, but it is obliged to do so. If you read the Bill which is now before the House and turn to the Schedule, you will see that Article IV, Section 3(a) says that "the fund shall oversee the international monetary system in order to ensure its effective operation, and shall oversee the compliance of each member with its obligations under Section I of this Article."

Then it goes on to say that "in order to fulfill its functions under (a) above, the Fund shall exercise firm surveillance over the exchange rate policies of members, and shall adopt specific principles for the guidance of all members with respect to those policies. Each member shall provide the Fund with the information necessary for such surveillance, and, when requested by the Fund shall exercise a firm surveillance over the exchange rate for the guidance of all members in respect of those policies. It will be realised that every country which has joined the IMF has to maintain an international monetary system in a certain way, because the IMF not only has the right, but imposes a duty indeed to investigate the economy of every country that is a member.

The USA is an example. The Secretary of the Treasury has to account to the IMF for how the American economy is run. The Government of West Germany and the Government of Japan, two of the strongest economies in this world, have to account to the IMF. They have to account to the IMF about their economy, and if it appears that it is good, or if it appears that it is bad, the IMF makes suggestions and so on. The Governments of Yugoslavia and Rumania, two of the Communist countries which have not left the IMF, also submit their accounts every year to the IMF; and indeed,

this year, God willing, I will have the duty to attend the Board of Governors meeting of the IMF in Yugoslavia. 1.15 p.m.

That is when we will have to be worried. The IMF has to examine the economies of all of these countries, all of its members, 150... I do not know all the members. I am reading all this about the IMF taking firm control of the economy, I am hearing that we in the Government did the same things that the IMF would have told us to do if they had taken control. What is that supposed to prove? If there is a right way and a wrong way of going about restoring of the economy to full fiscal health and the IMF is going to tell you the right way, what is wrong with you yourself following the right way without having control? Does the hon. member want me to do what I know is wrong and what the IMF would have advised in order to bring down the economy so that it would not be possible to say that we took the steps to bring the economy back from the brink to which it had been carried just because they are roughly the same sort of steps that might be advised?

As far as devaluation is concerned, Sir, no man can give a permanent pledge that currency will never be devalued. Don't fool yourself about that. No man can give that pledge. You can give a pledge that you do not intend to devalue it this year or next year or whatever. No man can say that Barbados' currency will never be devalued, and while we have free elections in Barbados I would be a madman to give a pledge which would be equivalent to saying that this country could never again fall into the hands of some financial incompetent who might so run it that the currency would have to be devalued. I could not give that pledge. Suppose some miracle occurred and some hon. member — I do not mind the hon. member for St. John, he is moving towards greener pastures — but some other hon. member were to be given a chance to put his policy into effect, well the prediction of the hon. member for St. John might well come true.

What I will say is this: that the Government has never considered devaluation, and if we did not consider devaluation in the day of 1977 when we had to pay for the policies that led to the run down of the balance of payments in 1976 — again I think only a madman could believe that the run down of the balance of payments during the month of September, 1976, could be caused by us, not when the goods being paid for were ordered six months before, but if we did not consider it then, there is no possibility of considering it now, and I will say this, Mr. Speaker, we are not considering an upward revaluation either; but it is more likely were the American dollar to continue to fall that we would look at an upward revaluation than at a downward one. So any question, all these scare tactics of trying to frighten people and talking about devaluation I can only presume

that they are being put out in order to create the very problem which a devaluation might have to be resorted to as a cure. I really think that it is mischievous for anybody who has held the responsible position in the financial affairs of this country, even to utter the word, even to think about uttering the word.

Effectively we had a revaluation when our foreign reserves were much less than they are today; a revaluation we had then, an upward movement of the Barbados dollar, when we were not in the same financial position as we are in today, and yet there is some talk about a wage freeze and a devaluation. I suppose, Sir, that after a certain time certain ossification of the brain sets in, a mental freeze sets in and your criticisms have to be cast in the mould of criticisms that might be appropriate five years ago because you cannot think of new ones, but if what I understand was published at a certain academy on Friday night represents the serious thinking of persons who are supposed to be offering an economic alternative to this Government and offering policies which could more fruitfully be followed as the policies of this Government, then Barbados is in a very sad way indeed. I would appeal to hon. members opposite to give me something to think about, give me something to bite on, give me serious criticism and made me think, because as Disraeli said, no Government can be long secure without a formidable Opposition. Put a little ramrod in the spine of the Opposition instead of going on talking a lot of foolishness that anybody with an elementary knowledge of public economics can dismiss.

Hon. members opposite have not observed something. In the last two years of their regime every time the press had to deal with the Budget and the Budget reply, they had to say something about ideas put forward in the Budget reply. When a University economist from Cave Hill was asked to comment, he was asked to comment on the Budget and on the reply. Nobody has wasted time asking the hon. member for St. John or the hon. member for St. Michael South Central; nobody has wasted time asking for a comment on anything they have said, or the hon. member for St. Michael South West. Get some ideas and bring them into the House of Assembly instead of trying to inflame people into believing that they are criticisms that can validly be made along the lines which are sought.

I see sales tax. I have never heard that the abolition of a tax can be subjected to so much criticism by an Opposition. If it was so wrong I call on the Opposition to give a pledge that if returned to power they would reimpose the sales tax. Put that in your manifesto or be silent hereafter. Put that in your manifesto in 1979, 1980 or 1981 whenever the bell rings, and I will say you are real men if you know it is so wrong to do it. And you note, Mr. Speaker, things are repeated over and over again which are really so untenable as if the doctrines of

Dr. Goebbels are running around in George Street in the shape of a little dog that is biting everybody as they come in to make them believe that if you say something often enough true or false, people will believe it. Who says that when the sales tax was removed that the cost of living did not come down? You can go and look at it in the tables which will show a fall in the cost of living October and November 1976; you can go and read it in the Central Bank's Reports which will indicate that the fall in the cost of living was largely due to the abolition of the 5% retail sales tax, — you believe in the Central Bank Report; well go and read it — and yet over and over you will get this about the sales tax did nothing, it went into the merchants' pockets and so on and so forth. Put it in the manifesto if it is so wrong to remove it. Put your print where your slander lies in this particular case.

Now the Bill before the House — the IMF. There have been a number of Resolutions passed by the Board of Governors of the IMF over a period of time. As long ago as April 1976 when the hon. member for St. John was a Governor, Resolution 31/4 was passed which dealt with a number of amendments, exchange rate arrangements which provided for adjustable par values thereby recognising the existence of floating currencies, gold was downgraded, the special drawing right was upgraded as a reserve asset, various procedural steps were recommended for improvement of the Articles of Association. I do not believe that hon. members will wish me to go over each by-law ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order please on the Government benches.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: By-law of the International Monetary Fund which has been amended, or go over each section point by point.
1.25 p.m.

Suffice to say that it is necessary for Barbados to do two things; first of all, to recognise that the Central Bank is now in existence because our Act was passed in 1970 and our Act contains a Section 7, "Until such time as a Central Bank for Barbados is established it is authorised to carry on all transactions for the public." However, we now have a Central Bank, Sir, so we have to amend the Law to reflect that.

We also have to pass a new Schedule to reflect the amendments of the Articles of Agreement. The matters, Sir, are highly technical. I do not believe that hon. members would want a Select Committee for this. The previous Government acceded to the changes in the Articles and we have no objection whatever to the changes so I suppose there will be a bi-partisan attitude towards that and the rest of the Act. It merely deals with amendments consequential on the establishment of the Central Bank

with a few alterations in the amendments, Sir, which have come about since 1970.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak on the Bill.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, we have just been treated to a most remarkable exhibition. The hon. member has spend exactly 47 seconds after he said "Now to deal with the Bill". He spent 47 seconds in dealing with the Bill and for the other 13 minutes he delivered a prolific or a harangue arising out of some newspaper article which he read and which I have not read and therefore I am not in a position to take him up on at this particular juncture.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member for St. John is not attempting to reflect on the ability of the Chair.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On what, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Or his observations.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not see how anything that I have said refer directly or indirectly either to Your Honour in your present or your past capacity. I was referring to the introduction made to this measure by the Hon. Minister of Finance who ended up by saying that since the last Government endorsed it or subscribed to it, that it was a bi-partisan matter. There was absolutely nothing I had to say on the amendment or there was absolutely nothing that he had to say on the amendment and it is regrettable.

I am in a very invidious position that he should spend all of his time delivering a harangue attributing statements to me that I never made. I did not interrupt him, Sir, and therefore I am entitled to correct any misstatements that he made. If you do not want me to speak I will leave the Chamber. Just tell me that you do not want me to speak, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am begging.... I am appealing to the Leader of the Opposition to please take your seat. You should know the Rules. The Leader of the Opposition, I maintain, is reflecting on the ability of the Chair. Each time the hon. member remarks that the Minister of Finance carried out a harangue for this period of time, it

is a reflection on the Chair. I was present when the hon. member was addressing the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am merely saying that I could have interrupted the hon. member on several occasions when he was attributing statement to me which the records of this House would show that I never made but I did not do so because I was amazed in the way in which he conducted the introduction. He made a statement of fact spending exactly 47 seconds. I have it written down here. "Now to turn to the Bill, it is a bi-partisan matter" and I am paraphrasing therefore I cannot be accused of reading my speech.

He said it is a bi-partisan matter since the last Administration had supported it or endorsed these amendments. Now I am saying, Sir, that I have never mentioned the Academy of Politics inside here and it is our Institution. I have never read the speech to which he has alluded but I am saying that he is abusing the privilege of this House to come in here and to make.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the Hon. Leader of the Opposition must withdraw the remark forthwith.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What remark, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: That the Hon. Prime Minister abused the privilege of this House. (Pause). You must withdraw it. (Pause). I call on the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the remark for the last time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Alright, I withdraw the remark. Therefore I will say that I am not allowed to speak and therefore I have no privilege and I will sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: As soon as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying that he is not allowed to speak, I never said that. I never told the Leader of the Opposition that he could not speak. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is begging to be sent out of this House. I will not do so today. I will do so tomorrow or any other day but not today.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Anytime you want to send me out, Sir, you can send me out. I have been in here 28 years and it is remarkable....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member speaking about?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am speaking on the Bill and I am not being allowed to continue my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wants to make a contribution on the debate?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether you call this a bi-partisan approach. What I am saying is that on this side we are certainly not opposing this Bill and the reason for that is quite clear from some of the remarks of the Minister of Finance and Prime Minister that quite a bit of the transactions, discussions and so on resulting in this Bill that is before us today took place during the time that the Democratic Labour Party had the privilege of running the Government of this country, so we are not opposing this Bill.

It was during the period, Mr. Speaker, as you will very well recall, being on the Opposition Benches at that time, it was during the time the Democratic Labour Party Administration was running the public affairs of this country. May I add, under the very capable management of the Financial affairs of this country by the Democratic Labour Party under the previous Minister of Finance, now the Leader of the Opposition, that the Democratic Labour Party took Barbados into the International Monetary Fund and into the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development before known as the World Bank.

1.35 p.m.

What we are discussing today is therefore a result of the far-sighted decisions taken on behalf of the economy of this country and in the interest of the people of this country by a Government which then and an Opposition which now have the interest of the people of this country at heart. The present amendments are the result of discussions which have taken place over a period of time in various international monetary conferences, in the Committee of 20 and in the Interim Committee. As a result of these wide ranging discussions we are now called upon to deal with this measure which is before us.

Membership of the International economic Community involves certain obligations, and indeed in the 1930s, as a result of the social and economic dislocations at that time certain countries started to move away from the gold standard and there was a measure of chaos in the international payments situation. And after the Second World War certain countries whose names are set out on the back of the Bill, met at Bretton Woods to bring some order to the whole question of the International payments situation. As a result the United States dollar became the leading reserve currency in the world. That particular system established at Bretton Woods has also collapsed under pressure of the quadrupling of oil prices, under pressure of recessions in the major economies of the West. Under pressure of increasing payments deficits by the non-oil producing countries and also under pressure of falling prices generally for the primary product of the same non-oil producing countries. It therefore became necessary for a review of the International Economic and Financial situation in order to deal with the chaotic situation which had again crept

into that system, and it was under the previous Democratic Labour Party administration that these wide ranging discussions as to what should constitute the new system set up at Bretton Woods and what changes should be made — it was under the Democratic Labour Party administration that these discussions — took place. Most of them coincided with the tenure of office of the Democratic Labour Party and we participated in various places in these reviews and discussions. So what we are doing here today is the culmination of a long period of gestation in the hope that the international economic and monetary system could be revised and updated to suit the 1980s, 1990s and hopefully into the coming century.

Now these amendments before us today are far reaching. There are far reaching amendments because they represent — from my reading of the Bill — far reaching efforts on the part of the international community to come to terms with one of the major problems facing the world, that is, the management of the several economies that constitute the world economy. And it speaks in a variety of ways. This piece of legislation, for instance in Article 1, sets out the purposes of the International Monetary Fund and it speaks of one of those purposes as the facilitation and expansion of balanced growth of international trade. Particularly it speaks of the promotion and maintenance of high levels of employment and real income, and the development of productive resources of all members as primary objectives of economic policy. It refers also to the adequate management of the affairs of countries as far as their economies are concerned, and generally it indicates that the International Monetary Fund has a responsibility that whatever policy it may introduce or recommend to member countries must bear in mind the fundamental concern of the individual economies for price stability, economic growth and high employment levels.

Now I would say that this whole question of the International Monetary Fund which is now before us is not one which is merely concerned with a mechanistic arrangement of exchange rates and related matters; it speaks directly to the living standards of each citizen and individual in this country; and it is in this concept that it must be viewed, because when the Bill speaks in terms of price stability we must draw to the attention of the Government and to the people of this country that prices in Barbados have been rising substantially since 1976; and this is a matter of concern to the wage earners in this country. It is a matter of particular concern when we are dealing with a measure that bears on the relationship of Barbados to the rest of the international economic community. We must be concerned about the substantial increases in prices; we must be concerned that as a result of whatever financial policies or economic policies that may or may not be pursued by this Government, that it is an inescapable fact that when we take our dollar to the supermarket we find it cannot buy as much as it did yesterday. This is a matter of concern especially when this particular Bill

before us states that policies must take place within the framework of price stability. So I would call upon the Government to make a positive statement on the question of price stability because the only stability that consumers can now find in this day and age is an increase in the cost of goods and services. That is the only thing that is stable, a kind of constant increase in the prices of goods and services in this country. And I would like the hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to indicate what is his policy in relation to price control in this country and in relation to the establishment of a Viable Price Control Commission to deal with this factor that erodes the purchasing power of the consumers in this country.

1.45 p.m.

He has a duty to make such a statement especially when he has brought a measure here which deals with the level of employment and the real income of the people of this country. Now I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it was John Maynard Keynes who was the proponent of a certain theory in this and in another generation. He was also a politician. Sometimes it is forgotten that he was a politician. I believe that he was a liberal politician. He indicated that there should be an effort for the establishment of an international clearance union so that they would be some type of currency which was served as a reserve currency for the world.

Now, as a result of the wide ranging discussions which I referred to, and the various decisions taken by various authorities within the IMF, special drawing rights — we have to come to terms with that term — special drawing rights are being established now as a major reserve of those countries. This certainly is the goal; but it has not yet reached that stage; but there is an effort for the special drawing rights through the establishment of special drawing rights, and as I have indicated the main purpose of this particular piece of legislation which is before us, to more firmly establish the IMF as a body of surveillance over the economies of the world.

Now, it is easy to use a little intellectual sophistry to indicate that the IMF not only has the right, but the duty to oversee the economies of all countries of the world; but if it is indicated that the IMF is watching a country or overseeing a country, that is not the sense in which it is used. It is used in the sense that they are dangerous signals on the horizon; and they take an even closer look at the policies of a Government, and they give suggestions in order to intervene and to impose against any package of corruption deals.

We do not need to use any intellectual sophistry when it is said that the IMF is watching merely to indicate that the fund is carrying out its duties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask in relation to this particular measure two specific questions. On Page

33 of this Bill, Article 8(2), it reads in part: "No member shall without the approval of the Fund, impose restrictions on the making of payments and transfers;" and I would invite the Ministry of Finance to make some comment on this particular section, particularly in relation to the CARICOM situation.

From time to time we hear manufacturers in various countries of the Caribbean indicating that certain deals have taken place between those countries, and that these deals and transfers are not being made, or not being made as promptly as they should be. I am not saying that manufacturers in Barbados makes these claims. Perhaps they have made these claims, but I wonder if the Minister in his topmost position — because he goes to the summit of the Caribbean, down to Trinidad and talks to the doyen of the Caribbean and of the Western Hemisphere politicians. He should have a very good view of matters, whether it is a measure of major concern to Barbados, or the manufacturers in Barbados or the Caribbean, or in CARICOM generally; and whether we can expect any improvement in the situation as regards these particular transactions within the CARICOM area as a result of his going to the mountain and arriving at certain conclusions.

I will deal more with that at a later stage. Section 5 relates to the furnishing of information. It says that member countries are required to give a great deal of information to the IMF, including information of official holdings at home and abroad and on foreign exchange. The country is supposed to give information on price indices, all commodity prices in both wholesale and retail, and of export and import prices, and a variety of information, and if we take a very good look at statistics published by the Central Bank of Barbados, I believe that the requirements are much wider than those statistics published in the Central Bank's various reports and publications; and if Barbados is going to meet those obligations under this particular piece of legislation, I am asking the Minister of Finance in the interest of the much vaunted "open Government" of this country that such information as is furnished to the national authorities, such as the International Monetary Fund, should also be made available to members of Parliament who, after all, have to pass legislation to make it possible for that information to be given to the IMF.

I am asking that the veil of secrecy that surrounds the financial transactions and reports of the economy and the various memoranda relating to the Barbados economy which has to be made available to the IMF, and indeed to the World Bank, that members of this Hon. Chamber should be given a greater quantum of information as far as the economy is concerned, according to the terms set out in this particular measure.

1.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is now 2 o'clock and I do not intend to go on for much longer. I merely wish in conclusion to ask the Minister of Finance inasmuch as there is reference in this particular Bill to the sale of gold and the International Monetary Fund has started the process by auction and I believe by other means of getting rid of at least up to one-third of its gold holdings, and I note that the member countries are supposed to benefit in some way or another from that distribution of gold, whether Barbados has in any way benefited from that sale by auction or otherwise of some of the gold holdings of the International Monetary Fund, or whether it stands to benefit in the future from such disbursement; and finally, if the Minister of Finance could indicate why the delay in bringing this particular Bill before us. We note that it is retroactive to 1st April, 1978, which indicates to me that there has been some delay somewhere. I do not know whether it is in the Ministry of Finance. I know my colleague and friend the Attorney General does not hold up any matters especially when it comes to financial matters; he gets those out very quickly, as quickly as the Minister of Housing gets up those houses at Redmans Village. A lot of things have happened for the Minister of Finance and for the hon. member for St. Thomas. I wonder if he could indicate the reasons for the delay in bringing this measure before us.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If nobody else wishes to speak, I would be happy to reply. I will be short. Perhaps the hon. member for St. John would be kind enough to say how long it takes on this occasion.

I was very interested, Sir, in the most useful and informed lecture delivered by the hon. member who made an interesting contribution to this debate, the hon. member for St. Michael South. It is refreshing to know that the ranks of Barbados scholars still contain persons even on the Opposition side who can do their own research and do not have to take people to write things down on a sheet of paper for them, who can apply their own knowledge and their own capacity for analysis to problems. I listened to his exposition of the Bretton-woods Agreement, and Sir, a brief could not have been written better for the Minister of Finance. The hon. member for St. Michael South clearly missed his calling when he proposed to direct from the top rather than advise from just below the top. The hon. member had obviously carefully thought and prepared his speech, and I admire the way that he covered the point of relevance relating to price control since he evidently wished to weave this into his narrative, and he must be congratulated for his parliamentary skill as much as for his powers of research, for I must confess, Sir, I did not come into the House today expecting to be asked to make a statement on price control. It has taken me by surprise. However, while listening to the hon. member I have been able to glance quickly at the most recent figures in movement of prices in Barbados and I will say this: we are fully conscious,

and I do not mean this sarcastically, we are fully conscious of the injunction in the Articles of Agreement of the IMF that you should aim at stable exchange rates and also a stable price situation. We are fully conscious of the necessity to try to achieve both of these things, and when I spoke of revaluation, I will freely admit that I am a late convert but an enthusiastic one nonetheless to the belief that a revaluation in the circumstances of 1975 in Barbados was a useful thing from the point of view of keeping down the prices of your imports.

We have seen Jamaica running to 40% inflation this year; part of it is because of the dose of devaluation plus a continued creeping devaluation, and we observe that Kingston is now one of the two cheapest capitals in the world in which to live, that is, cheap for foreigners. It is still very expensive for Jamaicans. The devaluation helps foreigners to live in Kingston, but it makes things very expensive at home, and if there were no other reason in Barbados for seeking a stable exchange rate and avoiding devaluation whether deliberate or accidental, the issue of pricing would be that reason.

Sir, when an Opposition finds it difficult to criticise on any other ground, it can always safely, at least in the last 20 years, fall back into criticising a rise in prices, because prices have been on a general upward trend in all countries. Now in my Budget I made it clear and it will be found in the Economic Report and the Central Bank Report that wages are rising in Barbados faster than prices. I did something to restore the amount of cash left in people's hands after direct taxes have been removed, but all that will matter very little if you simply say everything is going up. Now things do go up, but I want hon. members just to share with me a very quick analysis of the statistics since September, 1976, of the movement of the retail price index. Contrary to what is always claimed by hon. members on the opposite side, the month of September, 1976, was the peak of an upward movement in prices that was quite sharp. In the first quarter of 1976 as the benefits of the revaluation made their way into the system, prices rose very slowly, but the false price control, and I say "false" because it was a price control policy in name only, it was a price control policy carried on with the aid of television and the press, not a price control policy that in fact kept prices down. The percentage markup system gave an incentive to importers to import expensive goods because their profits depended on their first cost and this was something that was never seen by the hon. member for St. Michael South West, and the false price control policy allowed between June and September a 12 point rise in the cost of food and an 8 point rise in the cost of living generally. That was in the three months before September 1976 when the Government changed.

Now the price of food rose in the remaining three months, but it rose at less than the previous three months. Hon. members will recall that the 5% sales tax

did not apply to food, so the price of food rose a little less than 9 points. The price of housing hardly changed at all in the last quarter of 1976. Household operations and furnishings were cheaper at Christmas 1976 than they were when we took power, clothing declined by 10% in price between our taking power and Christmas, 1976, and clothing costs less in Barbados today according to the table than it did when we took power.

2.05 p.m.

We can only go by figures, Sir. Mr. Cameron Tudor had some theory that Jeans costs \$69.00 but he must have needed very ample Jeans to contain him, Sir.

I can only refer members according to the Bible. Look at the Bible. In September, 1976 the index for clothing was 301.3. In February, 1979 the index for clothing was 298.3 and I am reading from what has become the Opposition Bible. It is well known that there is more competition in clothing now, Sir. I will tell hon. members if they want to know what the Government's policy is. The Government decided that the Negative List was also a means of keeping artificial prices in Barbados as shown at a Meeting of the Manufacturers Association Clothing Division. We told them that we were seeing signs that clothing was rising in price more than was warranted. This was last year, Sir, because all through 1977 clothing was lower in the index than it was when we took power. It began to go up again at the beginning of 1978. It surged in March last year. We had a Meeting and we revised the Negative List. We allowed some competition to be introduced into the supply of clothing into Barbados and we have been rewarded by very staple clothing prices throughout the rest of 1978 and if you feel that we are to be criticised because of the articles of clothing which are in the index, such as men's pants, women's blouses, brassieres, children's clothing and so on cost roughly the same now as it did when we took power well then they will criticise us for everything.

Now medical and personal care has risen 40% since we got into power, that is Doctors' Fees, what it cost to have a hair cut and one or two services such as those. They have risen 40%. The price of food since we have come into power has risen 20% and I just gave you an example but in 1976 even Medical and personal care went down slightly. Transportation remained the same. Education and Miscellaneous remained virtually the same in 1976 but the effect of the removal of the 5% Sales Tax was seen in the fall of household operations and clothing because that is where the 5% Sales Tax was.

Now our policy as far as food is concerned was not to remove price control except where we wanted to let the price rise a little. Our policy was to remove licensing

because the licence of the importation of lamb and beef was leading to a situation where licences were being dispensed as a political factor and the people who were getting the licences, and I make no apology for this, were in fact allowing people who had money to bring in meat for a fee and it was adding to the price of meat in this country because they were having in effect to pay two Importers. We put an end to licensing of beef and everybody knows that beef and lamb have remained extremely staple in price and even now have not got back to the levels they were under the Democratic Labour Party regime.

They have asked for our policy. Has our policy paid off? The overall increase in the cost of food during the 29 months covered by this Survey is 20.3% and the overall increase in the cost of living over the same period is 24.8%. It has increased. All these things have increased but the areas of increase are not areas where the Government has immediate control.

The cost of Medical care has gone up 40%. The cost of transportation has gone up 30% that is as a result of the increase of the cost of gasoline. The cost of Education, Recreational and Miscellaneous has an average of 25%. Household furnishings and Operations we are looking at that now because they have made a surge this year, 1979, and we are looking to see the reason why. We are looking to see why should the cost of furniture have suddenly been increased. It is something we are examining now.

The Government's Price Control policies since the hon. member has asked are designed first of all not to give the incentive of importing expensive things but to substitute a unit mark-up wherever possible for a percentage mark-up. Secondly, not to have such restrictive import conditions and to prevent importers bringing things in the cheapest manner and certainly to make sure that real essentials in life that the prices are either controlled or very closely monitored.

We have now had a price control on Sweet Drinks to stop the Manufacturers from ripping off the public as they fully intended to do following the Budget. They intended a good solid rip off. The price of \$6.44 was a small increase. We did not have to do it. We did not have to have price control. They brought it down. Ask the hon. member for St. Michael South West if his friend Sam Ashby ever brought down the price of Beer through friendly persuasion. We do not have that type of friend in the business community who can come and tell us this.

What is the price of ham, if you want to see what we have been criticised for in respect to the price of ham because we saw to it that friend or no friend involved,

because in fact you have to be hard on friends, but perhaps some people do not have a reputation for friendship. Hon. members opposite can talk about price increases. I cannot stop them from talking about price increases but I know that when they were in power we had twice the inflation rate of Trinidad. We had three times the inflation rate of the United States and more. We had a higher inflation rate than Jamaica and Guyana and I know that we now have a lower inflation rate than our Caribbean partners. Prices go up less here and they go up less here in average than the three main countries of Great Britain, the United States and Canada and they have gone up before.

2.15 p.m.

But in the Budget Speech I even did something that no other member, whether Minister of Trade or Finance had ever done: I went to the trouble of having an analysis made of the domestic and foreign components of the inflation rate. A little over 6 percent was imported and 3 percent was domestic, and very few countries in the world today can say that they have a domestic inflation rate of 3 percent; very few, if any. We cannot help what we import; we are trying our best to, but we can help what we generate domestically. And we might not even have a domestic inflation rate of 3 percent if we did not have a surge in medical and personal care and the surge in furniture. Obviously nobody wishes to put pressure on furniture manufacturers that would lead to lesser employment, but we have to look at these things. I believe that part of the increased price in furniture may be due to another measure — you can buy furniture now very easily, you can get better terms for furniture than for refrigerators, for example. Prices go up in response to the money available to spend on a particular article. You may raise the price on what is moving faster. These are things we are looking at and hon. members must believe that we do it sincerely. Government in Barbados is not advanced by telling the public you are trying to help your friend by increasing prices, especially when the prices are not in fact increasing on the scale as in the past.

The hon. member for St. Michael South made reference to the IMF situation. I think he was making a pre-determined point but I think he was agreeing entirely with me when he said we must make a distinction between the IMF looking at an economy because something is wrong, or looking at it in an ordinary supervisory function. All the IMF is doing in Barbados is looking at the country from an ordinary supervisory function. The gentleman who came to see me yesterday was at my college at Oxford and we sat at the feet of the same tutors. I hear that I am not an economist. I am not an economist but at least I have had the opportunity of a little exposure to it and the gentleman I referred to is the head of the Fiscal Affairs Department. Where is he going after Barbados? Why is he going to Trinidad? Do you think he is going to Trinidad because Trinidad is

economically in trouble? Is he going there on vacation? No, he is going there to see Dr. Williams and the experts they have over there. He came to Barbados to see how their experts here were getting on in connection with how we drew the Estimates, and to exchange a few complimentary words about the economy. He embarrassed me a bit while down here — you call for open Government but we cannot give all the information; I do not believe I should read out everything. But I would say there was a little difference of opinion between the last IMF team that came down here and our Ministry on the question of prospects. I will not say where the difference lay, but I had a long conversation with our executive director on the telephone just before a Board meeting and he made a statement to the IMF Board. I would say some of what he said to the IMF Board because he was really putting our case as against other places. He commented that the development of manufacturing had been receiving particular attention but significant success in exporting had been achieved with a diversified type of product; exports of manufactured goods had increased remarkably in 1978. He spoke about tourism and the extensive efforts being made to expand tourism and spread it among different markets. He said that our authorities in Barbados take a more optimistic view than the IMF staff of the fiscal situation, and in this they were supported by the more recent information and in fact we were right. He commented on the success Government had achieved in reducing the fiscal deficit. He argued about one or two matters relating to housing and congratulated the Government on the raising of housing bonds in order to house the people better. He congratulated the Government on its role in the newly formed and publicly owned Barbados National Bank. He commented that the external debt burden is low, that its servicing rate is only 2 percent of the value of exports of goods and services, etc. I do not know if this helps the hon. member for St. Michael South.

One specific query: The hon. member said that members of the Fund are pledged not to restrict payment on current account. The only argument we have with the IMF is that we do not restrict any payments on current account but on the amount Barbadians may take abroad when they go on vacation. But the Central Bank says that Barbadians do not apply for the amount of money they can take abroad and therefore they do not think that it is necessary to do anything about the limits. In Guyana it is \$15; in Barbados it is \$1500.

As far as payments within CARICOM are concerned, the hon. member will be familiar with the CARICOM Multi-lateral Clearing facility. We are in credit with this facility to the tune of \$8 million and no difficulties whatever are placed in the way of Barbadians paying for goods or services bought abroad. What we are trying to do is to ensure that in the last analysis Barbadian manufacturers who sell goods abroad will be able to

be guaranteed payment by the Central Bank; in other words, we are trying to enlarge the concept of the Multilateral Clearing Facility. I know that Dr. Blackman has in mind a complete clearing facility to let the Central Banks in CARICOM make all the payments irrespective of the credit or debit position of individual Governments, but we have not quite moved to that stage yet, but a CARICOM multilateral clearing facility which is in the hands of the Central Bank itself is in credit.

I gave figures only to April 30. The Central Bank Holdings of foreign exchange yesterday were \$126 million and the CARICOM facility another \$8 million. The special drawing rights are \$10 million. As regards gold we only had yesterday in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York an amount of \$240,000, so the Central Bank's total foreign exchange holdings yesterday were \$152 million. The Government's own foreign assets which include \$3 million the Crown Agents have for us is another \$20 million in Sinking Funds. The National Insurance Board and the National Gas Corporation between them have nearly \$2 million in foreign assets assets yesterday were \$177,434. If we had to pay all our liabilities including the private liability of Barbados – I said earlier that we could pay all the foreign debt – but if we had to pay all the Government's foreign debts including what is not due until the year 2010 and pay the banks in Barbados and pay back Trinidad and pay back the compensatory financing facility that they talked about at the Academy of Politics and elsewhere, we would still have something left in the kitty. I do not mean that we will be well placed but we would still have something.
2.25 p.m.

On the question of gold, I touched on gold during the debate on the Budget. We did not speak about it at the time, but the Central Bank in consultation with myself did obtain substantial quantities of gold sales at the price of \$42 US an ounce. Well, I said take our share of that gold at \$42 an ounce. We did take a few gold bars and put them in the Federal Reserve Bank; and I instructed the Governor of the Central Bank, when the price of gold reached a certain figure, to sell half of the gold reserves. We sold half, and made a profit of some million of dollars. I believe that this question of gold sales is by a sort of tradition shrouded in secrecy. You do not give the actual amounts.

Since then they sold more, and as the hon. member will realise, that if the actual bars of gold we have amount to \$240,000, that we have done substantial gold sales; and I think that the prices we obtained were exceptionally favourable. I believe that every time we sold, the price of gold fell very shortly thereafter. So we have not really done very badly. Those are the questions which the hon. member wanted answered. I do not believe that there are any other questions that the hon. member raised; but I am very obliged to him for his most useful and stimulating speech.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, at this point I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.30 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
2.30 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees has left the Chamber to represent the House at the funeral of Mr. Fred Bethell; and I would like to move that the member for St. Philip North be the acting Chairman for the remainder of the day's sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that there will be no objection to this. The hon. member for St. Philip North will be acting Chairman for the remainder of the day's sitting. When the sitting was suspended, Government Business was the Order of the day.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. SIMMONS in the Chair.

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded in each case by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Clauses 1 to 8 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG the Schedule was called and agreed to.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS the Bill was read a third time and passed.
3.35 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 is the instant order of the day.

THE IMMIGRATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1979

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, Cap. 190.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, immigration legislation has caused the Government difficulties for a number of years. The Government was engaged in one substantial law suit relating to the famous Seymour case which caused a very great shift in the attitudes that had to be applied to certain persons not Barbadians but resident in Barbados, and partly as a result of that and partly as a result of observation of the anomalies in the Immigration Act of 1952, a new Act was passed in the year 1975 and brought into force early in 1976.

The new Act has been shown to have also a number of anomalies and chief among these anomalies is the use of the word "resident". Resident has a special meaning in this Act in our law as presently constituted and a resident is indeed almost a citizen. There are very few things that a resident cannot do. He cannot be removed from Barbados, he can buy land and sell land freely without exchange control permission, at least without any more exchange control permission than is applied to a citizen, he can vote, he cannot in fact stand for the House of Assembly, and he cannot transmit the status of resident to his children if they are not born in Barbados, and off-hand I cannot really think of anything that a citizen can do that a resident cannot do. You can take away a man's residence but only for a very good cause, security reasons or commission of crimes similar to those by which you can take away citizenship from persons who are registered as citizens. This status however is described just by the single word "resident" and the extent of the status is perhaps not known to everybody who applies for residence, particularly under Section 6 which gives the

Minister general power to grant permission to become a resident to a wide class of persons who either by reason of association with Barbados or by reason of their skill or by reason of their capacity to invest are considered desirable to allow to reside here. We find that you get a lot of resentment when somebody comes here to be an investor, perhaps deposits \$100,000 with the Central Bank that is by no means unusual, sets out to buy a property, sets out to carry out a business which is going to employ ten or twenty Barbadians, and then you tell him that he cannot become a resident. People get very resentful of this without realising that residence is just one half step behind citizenship.

We therefore consider it desirable to amend the Act to change the use of the word "resident" to "permanent resident". We think that most people will clearly understand this. They will understand that you do not come to a country and just because you have money become either a citizen or a permanent resident, and we want to introduce the word "permanent" before "resident" in most of the places in the Act so that you will apply to become a permanent resident if you have been here five years or if you have a connection with Barbados or have certain proven skills; and we are introducing a new word "immigrant" and an immigrant will now be a person who appears as likely to make a suitable resident or citizen of Barbados in due course. When you come here you can apply on the one hand to be a visitor, as a tourist or intransit, these are the transitory things, or for a work permit or to be an immigrant. If you are an immigrant, it means you are coming in the hope of settling, but you and the Government will see how you and Barbados get on over a period of time, and at the end of that time you will then be allowed to apply to be a permanent resident.

This broadly speaking is the scheme of the Act, and as you go through the Act you will see we have introduced the word "immigrant" and the word "resident" in the appropriate places. There are many persons who of course come to Barbados without any intention of becoming citizens mainly because they are American citizens. They want to live here for the rest of their lives; there are some who are working people; there are some who are wives and so on and so forth. These are the people it is anticipated will wish to become permanent residents, but not necessarily citizens because they may not wish to give up citizenship of some other country. The Act will cover all these people.

The new Section 6 of the Act will have a marginal qualification for the status of "immigrant". It will be observed that if you are employed full time in the Public Service, Statutory Boards or Government agencies, you can get permission to become an immigrant. That will mean you will not have to be asking for a work permit all the time. It won't mean you will stay here forever,

but it will mean that you will be here as an immigrant without having to fret about a work permit and a work permit fees, and then a person can be an immigrant if he has established himself successfully in Barbados in a profession, trade, business or agricultural enterprise; so he will have to get a work permit first of all to qualify and then if he seems to be somebody suitable he can apply for the status of immigrant and after the passage of five years he can then become a resident and in due course of time a citizen, and then we will also allow people to become immigrants if they are likely to establish themselves, but only if they already have the means to support themselves. This is a very common provision in virtually any country. I know virtually of no country in the world that you cannot emigrate to if you have a profession and money. You can go anywhere under those conditions. It is very hard on the country that we leave, but you can go to England if you have money without questions, you can go to the United States if you show some amount of money and you have a business to go to, you can go to the Soviet Union, I believe, like Christina Onassis if you have the necessary funds. They will let you go there and live with your Russian husband rather than assist him to leave the country and live with you. Children, Sir, who are the children of permanent residents or citizens can apply to become immigrants. Father or mother can apply; it is either father or mother; you do not have to be married to sponsor a child, and also if you are an immigrant child to be supported by a grandparent, the status can be applied for on your behalf.

Now, Sir, there is a section in the Act, a new Section 16A which is framed in the terms "The Minister may give amnesty to any person who remains in Barbados without permission to do so." Since Cabinet and I have to apologise to my colleagues because they do not know of this, since Cabinet approved this form of wording and I approved it, it has been pointed out to me that to some extent this would trespass on the function of the Director of Public Prosecutions because, for example, if a prosecution were to start, this would allow the Minister to give an amnesty for the offence, and this is not what was intended. All that is intended is to give the Minister permission to allow somebody who for one reason or another is prevented by the Act from remaining in Barbados to remain.

3.45 p.m.

I do not want to go into all the details. We have to have a careful study of Section 32 of the Act. The Solicitor General himself drew this to my attention this morning, Sir, and for that reason, although I am going to ask the House for a second reading, I am also going to ask for a Select Committee to look at this Section and to look at one or two other Sections because it does seem that things have been going unparallel. The Solicitor General has been giving opinions of the interpretation of the present Act but it does not seem that he was con-

sulted when the draftsmen were straightening out the provisions and therefore in due course I will ask for a Select Committee and perhaps the hon. members opposite would consider who they would like to be members.

Since I have reached the question of Amnesty, Sir, I would like just to deal with the number of allegations, or concerns, I may say, Sir, about the Immigration policy and Immigration affairs over the last two years. Particularly, I would like to deplore certain statements ascribed by columnists in the *Advocate Newspaper* which have been the subject of references to me by the Indian High Commissioner, His Excellency Maharajah Godhpur and by a number of the members of the local Indian community and I would also say, Sir, by a number of concerned Barbadians, concerned because they do not wish, nor does the Government, to see any element of racialism introduced into the country.

Now when we came into Office, Sir, we approached Immigration on an open basis. We published the names of the people granted residence, published I believe in the Official Gazette as well as the names of people granted citizenship. We did not want any suggestion of underhand operations. We wanted things to be done openly for all to see. We introduced certain procedural speed-ups. I directed that all applications had to be processed in 28 days or any delays explained in writing to the Minister.

We believe, Sir, that one of the ways of putting pressure on people is to keep applications waiting a long time so that the man wonders if it is not in order, he wonders what he has to do to put it in order and so on and so forth and I would just like to say also, Mr. Speaker, that I have found absolutely no evidence in the Department of Defence and Security dealing with Immigration; there is absolutely no trace of evidence of anything improper involving the Public Servants that work in that Department. Sometimes they are slow because they have been imbued with some very restrictive ideas by the former servants under which the Department worked and sometimes a little more time is taken. Sometimes it takes longer than it is anticipated to make inquiries through the Police and so on and so forth but for improprieties I cannot say that at any stage anything has been drawn to my attention or has suggested itself to my attention as far as Public Servants are concerned. There have been one or two things where I have not liked the look of a file but not a Public Servant in the Department of Immigration.

Indeed, without calling any names, I would like to commend one former Permanent Secretary for taking a very careful note indeed and signing his name to it of a Meeting held between a former Minister and an immigrant in this country. A very careful note was taken, entered in the file and is still there to be read, Sir.

Now we have also tried to give firm guidelines on the granting of residence to persons on retirement or to persons who are seeking residence on the basis of financial status. We have been, as far as the Law has allowed, administering a policy that husbands of Barbadians should be allowed to stay in this country with their wives and be allowed to work freely. Caricom nationals, Sir, who were ordinary residents in Barbados prior to September 1975, all who have applied — I think 250 only applied. I hope I have that figure right, Sir, but I think that is the number — they have all been granted either permission to reside, or Work Permits, all subject to suitable amendments of the Act so as to allow them to become residents.

The Department itself has been strengthened, the Department of Immigration, so that it can operate with greater efficiency and that more or less summarises the positive measures. Now, Sir, there have to be one or two negative measures because we have had as a commitment of dealing fairly with Caricom nationals who have come forward and put their problems to us, we have had to increase the number of deportations and deportations are principally of the local Caricom immigrants. I would not like to give the proportions generally but a good number of those persons have been convicted of criminal offences. It is a strange thing, Sir, but it does not seem that Barbadians who go abroad commit crimes. I am speaking under correction. If the Attorney General was here he would tell me but at the most there is only one Barbadian in prison in a Caricom country.

We have a fair number up at Station Hill, Sir, and they form a little community of their own up there. You have from Trinidad, Guyana, St. Vincent, and St. Lucia. I do not think there is anyone there from Jamaica but we have a few and we do get these difficulties from time to time. We do not deport everybody. There may be two or three exceptions but certainly there is one exception I remember and that is a minor shoplifting case and that was in the constituency of the Hon. Acting Leader of the House. Generally we try to administer these things with humanity but normally anybody who is guilty of a crime is asked first of all to serve his sentence, if any, and then deported. So far this year we have deported 32 people. Last year we deported 81 and last year also, without formal deportation, we asked 180 people to leave the country and they left. At least I think they left. We also refused entry to 159 people last year.

We have had to apply, as I said in the House some time ago, special conditions to the entry of Asians, and I use that in the widest sense. This brings me to the matter which I read in the *Advocate Newspaper*. Now I do not know if I have the letter in the file near to hand, Sir, but I remember what it was. In November 1977,

following numerous complaints that Syrians and Indians were living in Barbados in breach of our Immigration Laws and moving in and out of Barbados freely, I directed that a check be made on all persons of Syrian or Lebanese origin who were moving in and out of Barbados and all persons of Indian or Pakistani origin or holding Indian or Pakistani Passports.

3.55 p.m.

I also directed that a list be prepared on a regular basis and forwarded to the Department of Immigration for analysis and this has been done. I think the problem is much over-blown by the alarm which perhaps arises out of prejudice.

To deal first of all with the Syrians. A very careful analysis was made of persons of Syrian or Lebanese origin who were applying to come to Barbados or moving out of Barbados. Syrians and Lebanese have been coming to the West Indies from the time Syria and Lebanon were part of the Turkish Empire, and there are still some in Barbados who were of Turkish nationality for the first years of their life. But it is only in comparatively recent times that they have been represented as a problem, and they cannot amount to a problem if you examine the situation. I do not believe that there are more than 140 or 150 of them, counting men, women and children, of Lebanese descent in Barbados. They are nearly all persons with connections in Trinidad and other West Indian territories. They are very law abiding persons. Some may have trespassed on the Itinerant Traders Act or the Immigration Act itself, but you never hear of them being involved in crimes. They carry out a function which until recently Barbadians would not perform. They are prepared to work long hours, getting into their motor cars and carrying bolts of cloth into the country and selling to poor people who can only afford to pay a few cents a week and cannot go and get a shirt at a few cents a week from Cave Shepherd or Da Costa. Nobody can deny that this involves a lot of hard work. They work hard, and they have progressed to shops in Swan Street and they work hard in the shops there. They are under pressure from the local population. There was a rumour once some years ago that a Syrian had kicked somebody and the shop was nearly destroyed in the twinkling of an eye.

As a member of the Barbados Labour Party I am very aware that there are many people on our side who have sometimes been critical of the Syrian community, as of the Jewish community; that almost to a man they have shown themselves quite openly to be supporters of the Democratic Labour Party. I believe that to be true, but when we came into power at no stage did we allow any

of that to influence our attitude towards them. I do not believe there is a Syrian who can say that the Government has discriminated against any Syrian because he is a member or supporter of the Democratic Labour Party. What we did was to make checks and we located seven Syrians who apparently were working in Barbados as itinerant traders, and if they had ever paid the licence it would have been a long time ago. It seems that by some magic they were able to keep their files from reaching the Immigration Department. When you asked for their passports they said that the passports had been destroyed in a fire at Fontabelle some years ago. These people were written to and it was put to them that they had been avoiding paying the itinerant traders tax and had avoided paying income tax and were illegally in Barbados. After some hesitation, I believe in the case of one gentleman his lawyer — who is a member of this House of Assembly — wrote back saying we could not do that to his client. We wrote back saying that perhaps we could not do it but we would like it tested in Court and I intended having a deportation order made and executed on the 27th of that month; but on the 25th he turned up with a certificate from the Commissioner of Inland Revenue for several years payment of tax that he had been assessed and he had paid, and also a certificate from the Accountant General for all the years he had been in Barbados without paying the itinerant traders tax. So they paid their traders taxes, they squared themselves with the Commissioner of Inland Revenue — one person was sufficiently public spirited to lay all his financial affairs in the open; he had been here for five years, had got money out of the country, had deposits in North America and agreed with the Central Bank to bring back the money to Barbados if required to do so. He said he would have been glad to be law abiding but the nature of things in those days seven or eight years ago made it impossible. He was granted residence in Barbados and in the end proved much more thorough going and open than many a Barbadian businessman has been. I would like to say that I am quite satisfied that the Syrian community understands very clearly that the Government intends to be fair. The only thing I would add to that is that we have allowed two people in on compassionate grounds because they have been involved in the fighting in Lebanon. It was a question of their lives being in danger and we have allowed them to join relatives here.

But I pass this out as a word of warning: Barbados is small but in these matters which concern us we do have some very useful investigative capacity and we have somebody in Beirut who carries out investigations on Syrians and Lebanese desiring to come to Barbados, and we are able to make the necessary checks where appropriate.

Now the latest thing is that Indians have been flooding this country within the last two years and that they are dangerous people to have around; that Idi Amin was right in expelling them from Uganda, and so on. We

do not seem to have a sense of proportion in this country. Nobody would say that Sir Eric Gairy was a man or an example for any one to follow, but when a respected columnist like E.L.C. puts Gairy in the same class as Amin he is really losing sight of reality. I don't think Amin was right or even wise in expelling the Asians from Uganda, and I certainly have no intention of expelling any Indian from Barbados. But a check, however, is being made because I am not satisfied that the Indian community — Muslim or Syrian — has entirely grasped that we are serious about our immigration policy, that we are fair in our immigration policy and that we want to deal fairly with all cases of immigration.

4.05 p.m.

There are in Barbados according to the best estimates, about 900 Muslim Indians. Their native language is Gujarati, and they come from various districts near Bombay. Nearly all of them have their origin in a small village called Kalifa. They have been coming here for about 40 years. There are older Indians who came here from as far back as World War I when a number of Bengali Muslims came to Barbados. I believe that there is still one living in Carringtons Village or somewhere. The hon. member for St. Philip North is surprising me by telling me that his grandmother was one of these Bengali Muslims to whom I am referring. I did not even know that; but in our party we have no prejudices. The General Secretary of our Party has a mother who is a white Barbadian and his father is a Muslim. Mr. Hashim Degia is Gujarati and is one of a number of Bengali Muslims who came in relatively small numbers; and in those days there was virtually no Indian immigration to Barbados from Trinidad and Guyana; but in the late 1930s numbers came from Gujarat.

Mr. Degia, senior, who was the elder of the community for many years came here in 1938. I believe that I recall his telling me that he only found three or four Gujaratis here and a few Bengalis. He was a politician in India too, Sir, and so his son is following in a certain tradition. The numbers have not grown particularly. As I said, there are about 900. I will return to that a little later. The Hindu community in Barbados is a mirror image of the Muslim community, because Muslims in Barbados particularly come from India, but the Indian Hindus come from Pakistan.

History is simple. Any name ending in ANI belongs to a person who is a Sindi from the area of Hyderabad which is in Pakistan, not too far from Karachi which is the capital of the Republic of Sindi. The interest of the Sindis in the West Indies started in 1937 when the original Kirpalani who was a member of a well to do merchant family from Hyderabad came out to Trinidad to trade with the community of Trinidad Indians who of course were from nowhere that any of our Local Indians come from. They come from places as different as Russia

is from Spain. While we classify our Indians in the same way we forget that India has more people than Europe, and has more languages, more national traditions and more colours; because you can find an Indian of every colour from pale white to dark black, and all live in the one country of India.

They came out, and their names will be familiar. I do not want to dwell on the names, but any names ending in ANI, except for one Kesseram – I think his name was really Gopwani, but for some reason the name has been changed. Those with a name which you see ending in ANI are all Sindis from what is now Pakistan, but what was part of British India; and there appeared to be some 600 of them. I have gone to a little length on this to show that we are talking about a very small number of people of Asian origin who do not account for 1% of our population. We have about 1,500 people of Indian origin. We have about 150 Arabs. I do not know if you will consider Mr. Bernstein as being Asian, Sir, because I believe that he and others come from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Germany or Rumania; but assuming that Israel is their native country, and therefore there are about 60 Jews here – I would not like to tell you the number of Chinese, Koreans, Vietnamese and so on – so we really are dealing with a very minor problem indeed; and in some ways it really is shameful that it attracts so much attention.

Taken as a group, the Asians in this country are more law-abiding than the native white Barbadians, more law-abiding than the English immigrants who outnumber them; and they are certainly more law-abiding than the black Barbadians and than our Caricom brothers and sisters who have settled here. I can hardly think of ever having seen an Asian charged before the courts with an offence other than perhaps an offence arising out of immigration or their status in the country; and not a great many of them. However, there is a little tendency for the Indians to ignore some of the provisions of our Immigration Laws. The tendency is to concentrate partly in the area of marriage and partly in the area of trying to work with their relatives in Barbados.

I have been having a check made since November, 1977, and at the latest count, Sir, there were something like 70 or 80 persons of Indian origin unaccounted for by the Immigration Department. These are people who have entered the Island and who have never been given work permits or an extension of their visitors' permits or where they live. We do not know where they are. They cannot be found at their addresses. The Immigration Department of the Police is engaged in making a search for them.

The number of Indians who come to Barbados in any case is very small – no more, as far as I can judge by looking at the reports – than about 50 a month.

When you consider that 50,000 people a month come to Barbados through the Airport – tourists, Barbadians, salesmen and the like – we can understand that 50 people is really not very many, although they may be difficult to identify and to trace. Again, there is a widespread belief that there is a great problem of marriage of Indians. I think that there is some problem, because especially the Muslim Indians seem to be very concerned with problems of religion, including worship and marriage. We have had a difficulty with the Muslim Indian community refusing a very well qualified young Barbadian boy who has been to a university in Saudi Arabia and who speaks Arabic excellently, and who has degrees in theology from Saudi Arabia. I am referring not to the Black Muslims but to the real Muslims, where they would not have him as their priest, although to teach their children Arabic at the Muslim Sunday School he has been pressed into service; but to have him as a full priest they refused. The Indian community wanted to bring in a priest who could hardly speak English.

However, I do not want to go into all of that. That is in the pipeline. We also occasionally have these difficulties with marriages. So far as the statistics provided to me reveal, 39 Indians applied for work permits between January, 1977 and today, May 1979. Of these ten were married to Barbadians. There are a further nine known to the Immigration Department as Indians who have entered Barbados to marry citizens of Barbados. Nearly all of these are Indian girls born here.
4.15 p.m.

We appreciate that this does present some theoretical problem because theoretically if all Indian children can bring a spouse from abroad, the Indian community would increase by geometric progression, but it has not reached anything like that stage, and the situation is being fairly carefully watched. We do have to make some difficulties in the way of marriages of convenience and even in the way of arranged marriages. I understand there was some outcry published in the pages of one of the newspapers that we were only allowing people two days here, and apparently, Sir, you need to be here three days before you can get a marriage licence, so if you only have two days legally here and if you overstay your leave you are not legally here.

Some years ago in the Carmen Bailey case the Solicitor General ruled that nobody who was illegally in Barbados could be married here, and apparently it has been taken that this is the reason for the two day rule. Well, Sir, I did not impose the two day rule personally; this would have been dealt with at a level other than mine, but as far as I am concerned, if there is a suspicion that anybody is entering Barbados for the purpose of getting married so as to have the right to stay in Barbados and you see this person and you suspect them and you as an immigration officer have the sense to say

"two days" to prevent them qualifying for a three day marriage licence. I congratulate that immigration officer. I am not going to be critical because although we do not have such a problem with Indians, we have had a problem with persons from Haiti, Santo Domingo and Colombia, and these are women. They come here and they get married and then they apply for citizenship giving addresses in Nelson Street, sponsored by certain persons who show themselves active in political activity around the place, and what can you do if they are lawfully married to a Barbadian.

The police have had a situation with one lady, I think here name is Adams — I do not mind calling it — from the Dominican Republic who when interviewed by the police did not know her married name, did not know where her husband was. He is a very well-know criminal who was given \$500 to go through a form of marriage at a place that it is doubtful whether a marriage could legally be carried out at all. She did not know her married name when the police went to her. I wonder if she knows it now. I would prefer her to use that name than the name of Adams, but her married name certainly is not Adams. But if certain steps have to be taken to suppress marriages of convenience while we are awaiting the legislation to deal with such marriages, then I applaud the effort of the immigration officers.

I would just say this about the complaints that have appeared in the newspapers. I do not want to dwell at too great length on what appears in the Press, but we have to give some notice to it. I understand that it was said that the Indian community was put in arms against the Government because of giving people two days and harassing Indians who are coming here. I also understand that at the Mosque at the weekend the person who is presumed to have given this report to the newspaper was very severely criticised by the community, and I understand that another report has since been put out repudiating the earlier report. Apparently, Sir, the person who has put out the second report repudiating the first and saying that the person responsible for the first should lose his position in the Moslem Association is in fact the author of the first report as well; but it is not for me to comment. He is obviously a very good server of his association and faithfully reflects their views when made known to him, but I do not believe there is any substance in the allegation that there is unrest in that association. Equally I state that there is no substance in any allegation that we are about to be swamped by an alien community that will not conform to our rules. What I say, Sir, is give any community in Barbados time. There was Indian immigration into St. Lucia, into St. Vincent, into Grenada and into Dominica. In all these countries the Indian community has become completely creolised; they have english names, they are christians, they have the same habits as their fellow citizens black and white. In Jamaica there is an Indian lady who is a member of the

House of Representatives; in St. Lucia there is an Indian lady who is a member of the House of Assembly on the Government side and an Indian man who is a member of the House on the Opposition side. You could not recognise it from the names which are Rock and Williams, but nonetheless they are completely integrated into their communities. In the passage of 50 years to 60 years this has happened. In Grenada Mr. Bhoula was a creolised person in political life and the Indian community there is also completely integrated, and I deplore the prejudices which are giving rise to the current concern.

I have collected figures to have a reply sent to the Indian High Commissioner or perhaps some of them might care to discuss the matter with him and no doubt the Press would be glad to have an opportunity of interviewing him, and I expect that he will now be able to put to rest any fear of a brown peril, of a yellow peril, or a green peril as far as I am concerned with immigrants from abroad.

We have also heard how the policy of letting in husbands is flooding the country. From 1977 when the policy started until the present 120 husbands have been allowed to come to the country. This is a mere flea bite when you compare those with the number of Barbadians who leave the country. Sixty-seven came from Caricom. They have counted 19 Indians in that, although I think only ten actually applied. Nineteen were British, five were American, three came, I have here Kittitians; I do not think that is right, that probably should be Caricom, and one husband each came from Canada, Italy, Germany, Norway, New Zealand, Holland, France, Ireland, Nigeria, Malawi and Venezuela, and I think that the relatively small number of husbands who seek residence in Barbados well justifies the long-standing of the Barbados Labour Party that wives should be allowed the same privilege to have their husbands live with them in Barbados and work as husbands now have to have their wives.

I cannot possibly anticipate all the questions that hon. members may ask whether about Indians or otherwise, but subject to the fact that we will not be seeking to complete this Act in all its stages today, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments about the question of the Immigration Bill. Specifically I want to deal with an article which appeared in the Advocate-News recently, no more than three weeks ago, written by a fellow attorney who writes in the Advocate at least once a week. I must say at the beginning that I was disappointed and to some extent outraged at the content and the tenor of what was in fact supposed to be a feature article. Without any hesitation I would characterise it as bigotted, intolerant,

hysterical, sensationalist and the applying all the attributes of Powellism in reverse.

I am amazed that there are people in this country who have lived abroad, specifically in England as part of an immigrant community in the English host country and could still write articles like that offensive to minority groups in this country without any basis of fact.
4.25 p.m.

I am very grateful that the Hon. Prime Minister has taken the time to give the House a full exposition of all the statistical information relating to the Immigration by various groups in this country over the last couple of years because the figures clearly give the lie to it and this is why I classify it as "sensationalism". It clearly gives the lie to what was suggested in the article that the flood gates were open now to all types of immigrants and particularly the Asians in question.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 40 years now there have been Indian immigrants in Barbados, even much more than that. I think there is a Godin Road in St. Peter in your constituency, Mr. Speaker. My great grandmother who lived in Queen Street in that area was a Godin but I am not taking the stance that I am taking today because of any family relationship. I am taking this stand against the article that appeared in the *Advocate News* because I was one of many black Barbadians and West Indians, including the same Author of the article, Mr. Bayley, who lived in England in the shadow of foreigners, virtually from its inception to the time it reached its height about 1968/69 and I know how we were affected as minority groups in England by quarrels, vapourings and incitement to race hatred. That is why I cannot understand how one who lived in those times could now find himself in the position of adopting the same posture adopted by a racist bigot such as Enoch Powell.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the infiltration of Indians or whatever group over the years has polluted this country's culture to such an extent that there should be cause for concern in 1979. Now I believe that in some cases there has been some cultural cross fertilisation procedure. I am not saying necessarily with Indians because my experience has been both here and in England that Indians tend to live — I use the word "Indian" as including Pakistanis — they tend to live in little communes, in their own habitats, without any mingling with any other races but yet I have never found that they have done acts deliberately calculated to upset the equilibrium of another groups living in this society.

I believe that it redounds to the credit ultimately of a society if it is able to absorb within its midst the collection and administration of various ethnic groups and that all could live in reasonable harmony. We are still a long way from a total racial integration in Barbados and

for that matter in the West Indies but that is no reason for us to be intolerant and unreasonable in our attitude in respect to minority groups. That is all I have to say today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this Bill but when I look around here on this side and I notice that the heavy-rollers are not in here, I consider it my duty as a representative of the people to make my contribution. I want it to be known that I am expressing my own views on this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, when legislation is brought before us to deal in the interest of non-nationals, I would, say, Sir, that it has my whole-hearted support. I have no doubt that you will forgive me when I say that I have a deep affection in my heart for Indians. I would be a very ungrateful person if I did not make that statement clear today. Now, Sir, while this point may be irrelevant I do hope you will appreciate it. It was through the Indian Government that my son was awarded a Scholarship and without that Scholarship he could not be a Consultant today. Therefore, I must admit that I become despondent when people are giving the Indians such adverse reports.

Mr. Speaker, as I aforesaid, when legislation comes here to deal with non-nationals, I intend to give it my support and I hope you will bear with me, Sir, when I give the reasons for my support. Mr. Speaker, in enacting legislation here today we should try to project a very good image of our country to the world and especially to our brothers and sisters in the Caricom areas.
4.35 p.m.

We have to take into consideration, Sir, the number of Barbadians who reside in other countries, and therefore in introducing legislation we must be sympathetic to the cause of those who are residing in our country. We should never attempt to give the wrong impression that we are closing the doors to others when we have Barbadians who, I say without any doubt, are at the mercy of other countries.

Now, Sir, I am fully aware that we must have laws and regulations to control their entry and the number, due to the size of our country and the densely populated areas we have in this country. But when we consider that publicity will be given to any legislation we introduce here today, we must concentrate on the repercussions from countries like Britain, Canada and the U.S.A. It is my opinion, Sir, — and this may be a conservative estimate — that we have approximately 150,000 people or more overseas. I have my own views on this important matter but I don't want to express them now as it might do Barbadians overseas more harm than good; so I will only touch on the fringe of the matter.

Approximately 60 years ago the flood gates of the U.S.A. were opened to our people, and I am in a position to say that in my early childhood I had the experience of sharing in the funds which were sent back to my relatives for their upkeep. I make that point, Mr. Speaker, to let you see how sympathetic we should be in dealing with non-nationals. We cannot afford to close our doors against these people except they are criminals, and also of course taking into consideration the number we can absorb into this country. I have a clipping in my hands, Sir, which I think you will grant me permission to quote from, and it is a statement or letter written by the Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union imploring the Prime Minister of this country to do his utmost to see that our people in United Kingdom are protected and to try to fight against the policy of the new Conservative Government that they be repatriated. I fully share Mr. Walcott's view, but we have to do our bit to prove to other countries that we are not discriminating against the nationals of certain countries.

Mr. Speaker, while it is true that the United States of America has its major problems, especially since the oil crisis, we cannot get away from the fact that that country has contributed greatly to the community of Barbados. People were able to remit funds to their relatives, they were able to build homes, deposit money in various banks, and all through the American Government opening the door for our people to obtain employment in the U.S.A. I have drawn this to the attention of this Hon. House to show that we must use our discretion in dealing with the various applications for residence in Barbados. We must not come to any hasty conclusion by saying to any one: "You are a non-national, you are a Syrian, or you are an Indian." Nor must we say that Amin did this or Amin did that; there is no comparison with what Amin did and what this democratic Government — the freest in the world — can do or should do.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, we have large numbers of Barbadians in a particular country and I will not call the name of that country because I have already said it could do more harm than good. But I should like to clarify the point by only touching on the fringe. Some are in that country permanently, others are there temporarily; and I know, Mr. Speaker, that from your experience and your mixing with your constituents that you are aware that some of our people in that particular country are there temporarily. But, Mr. Speaker, imagine that country going to the extreme and thinking about deporting our Barbadians. What would we say? We would consider it to be the worst country in the world if that was done.

4.45 p.m.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you cannot accept all the letters which have been written in the Press in good faith. We have to think about the interests of Barbadians over-

seas which is something of paramount importance to us, representatives of this country. Mr. Walcott in his letter is very concerned about the repatriation and deportation of our nationals. I too am very concerned, and therefore I do not for one moment think that the Government has done anything wrong in considering better terms, as I put it, for some non-nationals. What I do say, Sir, is that the applicants should all be scrutinised well; and those whom we feel can make some contribution to the economy of this country, it is my opinion, and I repeat, speaking for myself, that they should be given an opportunity to do so.

There is one thing that I must comment on, and that is to compare Mr. Walcott's letter with the remarks of the hon. member for Christ Church East. Now, Mr. Walcott's letter deals with the vast number of people who are unemployed; and perhaps the Minister of Finance could clear the air on this when he gets up to reply; but the hon. member for Christ Church East on his departure claimed that he is going away to encourage Barbadian nationals to return to this country to assist the development of the country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you mean to encourage Barbadian nationals to return.

Mr. WEEKES: Our nationals, Sir. I would like to say this, and perhaps the Prime Minister would explain the full details.

Mr. Speaker, this could give the wrong impression to certain Barbadians who go overseas; because in travelling to the various countries I am fully aware that a reasonable number of them would like to return to this country; but there is no employment here for them. On the one hand Mr. Walcott is saying that we have a large number of people in this country who are unemployed. On the other hand, the hon. member for Christ Church East has stated that he is going overseas to recruit people to return home.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that in recruiting these people, their numbers cannot exceed more than 12 to 20; and therefore if we make such a broad statement which will go into the media and which goes throughout the world, we can give in some cases the wrong impression to Barbadians who are living overseas, and make them come to the conclusion that there is employment in this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are nationals of various Caricom countries who have been coming here from time to time; and in future owing to the legislation, they have to return from time to time to their various countries and then return to Barbados. I am drawing this matter to the attention of the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, hoping that some solution can be found to assist those people who in the true sense might not happen to live here permanently, but in the coming year may want to return here and reside permanently. I

am asking that favourable consideration be given to those applicants.

Mr. Speaker, I think that you will agree with me that if Barbadians overseas are impressed that there is employment here and they relinquish their positions overseas, whether they be menial ones or other posts, and return to this country with the understanding that they can find employment here and the answer is "nil" they will find it very frustrating and disappointing; and in any case they will come to the conclusion that we have misled them.

4.55 p.m.

I can only implore the Government in processing the various applicants to scrutinize them carefully, and especially with our Caricom brothers and sisters we should do everything possible to help them to reside in this country. To me, Sir, this is a duty which we owe to these people. You will remember, Sir, that there was a time in this country when our nationals did not give full cooperation with the reaping of the canes and it was the Vincentians who came over here and assisted us. It is true, Sir, that our people are now getting into the habit of assisting in the reaping of the canes.

While I regret of two recent tragedies, I must state that in any country you have bad sheep, and therefore I am fully aware that there are a number of Vincentians here who have been coming and going from time to time and who would like to live here, and I am asking that they be given favourable consideration. Mr. Speaker, I do hope that I have drawn to the attention of the House the salient points for my reason for supporting sympathetic consideration for non-nationals of this country, and I must say that we as Barbadians have our clothes on the line and would not like the rain to wet them, and therefore it is our duty to do everything possible to assist others regardless of the size of our country and regardless of our population, and I am asking that the Government give favourable consideration. Sir, I repeat that anything which is done in the interest of non-nationals after taking into consideration their character, their vocation and all aspects of their lives, we should never close our doors against them.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the hon. member for St. Philip South on the very humanitarian and understanding speech which he has made in this House this afternoon. This is a subject bristling with emotion for some people, but I think it is very necessary that Barbadians should recognise certain principles that are fundamental to what the hon. member has described as the freest democratic country in the world, and they are principles of which we can be justly proud. Despite the fact that this society began as a slave society, our forefathers have tried down through the ages to remove the ugly strife of racialism from the society.

Some people will contend that that strife has not been fully removed and maybe they are right; but it will indeed be a retrograde step for this country if we began to judge our policies on the basis of race, and that is why I join with the hon. members who have spoken in condemning attempts by people in the Press or on public platforms to equate our immigration policy with a policy based on race which will victimise people because they happen to be Indians, Lebanese, Jews, Syrians or whatever else they would wish. We must not forget that one of the worse decimations, the worse incidence of decimation of mankind occurred purely on the grounds of race, and I refer to the Second World War. We must not forget also that in Africa and particularly in Southern Africa the people are not being only discriminated against on the basis of their colour, particularly black people and Indians, but they are being mercilessly murdered because of their colour, and it would be a great tragedy if this country became so inward looking that it will not raise its sights beyond the narrow day to day battle of survival and consider that the goal for Barbados is a society based on colour. That would be totally wrong.

You, Sir, know the stand which this Party has taken on these issues, and I think we ought to be commended by our own people for being forthright on issues such as this; but it is at home that we must set the example first and foremost before we can parade on the international stage with our heads high as being against racialism and we can only do this at home if we maintain a proper balance. There are inequities in the society; most of us recognise them. We are working towards the removal of these inequities, perhaps not at the pace that most of us would wish, but what we must not be side-tracked into doing is re-establishing a society based on the colour only to cite inequities against which we should all now be together and arrange together fighting these sorts of things.

5.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I have in the past two years heard myself, from public platforms, a few misguided people who would resort to race and I am surprised that some of them attract notice at all but it is race, plus violence, that one sometimes find coming from their mouths. What surprises me is that, and I hope that the Press does not believe that I am launching an attack on them, but what surprises me is that there seems to be a fear on the part of our other vibrant institutions, including the Press, to stand up to such people on the basis of principle.

I, myself, have made statements publicly both from the public platform and in addressing groups and others against the racialism being preached by the People's Pressure Movement and its adherents and I have been

attacked to the point of some of them calling for my assassination. I intend to continue a campaign unrelentingly against anybody in Barbados who believes that racialism should become a hallmark of progress in this country. Regardless of who it comes from, no matter how much assassination they preach, I am dedicated to making sure that this does not take hold in Barbados. I also intend, as my Government intends to do, to ensure that we have a balanced policy and that whatever inequities exist, or whether racial discrimination exist, or whether it exists in this country, if it comes from black, from white, from brown or from blue, if there are such things, to ensure that an end has to be put to that also.

I think one must take a stand on principle and it is regrettable that some other people have now joined this sort of bandwagon to hound down people because they happen to be non-nationals in this country. This is wrong, Sir, and I am therefore glad that the hon. member has spoken so freely on this subject together with the hon. member for St. Philip North. What it says is that good things came out of the East and those of us in the West recognise what they represent and we find that the East and the West can join in their efforts on this particular point.

The hon. member raised one point about the hon. member for Christ Church East and I think with respect, that he probably did not get the full impact of what the hon. member for Christ Church East has said. It is part of the policy of Government to encourage nationals who have funds for investments to come back home to invest those funds and those who have skills that are lacking in Barbados to come back home and give those skills. Let me give you one instance, Sir.

Mr. WEEKES: While I appreciate all that the hon. member has said I do not think that that particular point which he has just made was explained fully in the newspaper.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I agree, Sir. Perhaps the paper was not as complete or comprehensive as the hon. member had spoken but what he was saying is that in the areas where you have a shortage of skills, and there are some areas, we will try to encourage our nationals to come home first, and if our nationals are not available then, of course, whilst we are training nationals we will have to look to our Caricom colleagues to assist us in this field and if they are not available then we will look to the Commonwealth and other countries with whom we have very close relations.

Of course we try as much as possible to encourage nationals who are resident overseas to invest in Barbados since we rely very much on the flow of foreign exchange from abroad to assist in the total development of the country and more important for this country is that we

seek to encourage Barbadians to keep as close a connection with Barbados despite the fact that they might not be physically present here at anytime. I think that it is in that context that the hon. member for Christ Church East spoke and I hope that we have given a satisfactory explanation to the hon. member for St. Philip South. I only wanted to add those two remarks to what has been said.

The subject has been thoroughly canvassed in here and I hope that the message would go forth from the House of Assembly that on both sides of the House that there are persons who are against this hounding down of people on the basis of race or colour. It is unbecoming to Barbados. It is contrary to the conditions which we have established and contrary to the basic principles of humanity and we cannot be thrust on the international scene without preaching against the horrible act of apartheid if we are going ourselves in Barbados to try and establish a similar doctrine for whatever reason it may be.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as indicated, the Government would like this matter to go to a Select Committee. Sir, the matter is urgent and I sincerely hope that the Select Committee will meet early to perform its duties quickly.

I beg to move, Sir, that the members from this side to be selected for the Committee to be His Honour the Deputy Speaker; the Attorney General, the hon. member for Christ Church West; the hon. member for St. Philip North; and the hon. member for St. Thomas. If the Opposition would like to nominate two members that would be up to them.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member for St. Michael South and myself be appointed members of the Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection the hon. members mentioned will serve on the Select Committee.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be the instant Order of the day.

BILL TO REPEAL THE UNITED KINGDOM DESIGNS AND STANDARDISATION MARKS PROTECTION ACT

The Eighth Order was called – To move the Second Reading of the Bill to repeal the United Kingdom Designs and Standardisation Marks Protection Act.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker this Bill need not detain the House for any time at all. It is simply to repeal the United Kingdom Designs and Standardisation Marks Protection Act. This is an Act which makes United Kingdom designs in respect of cotton automatically protected within Barbados. It is no longer relevant to Barbados in view of our independence nor is it relevant to our state of industrial development, and that is why we are asking for the repeal. I want to let hon. members know that we are presently working on legislation for design copyrights and trademarks and we hope within a year to bring substantive legislation to the House.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SIMMONS in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE EXEMPTION FROM
PAYMENT OF DUTIES OR TAXES ON CERTAIN
ARTICLES IMPORTED IN CONNECTION WITH
THE BRIDGETOWN SEWERAGE PROJECT

The ninth Order was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the exemption from the payment of duties or taxes on certain articles imported into Barbados for the purpose of being used exclusively in connection with the Bridgetown Sewerage Project.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this a very straightforward matter, a Bill which as its title says will provide for the exemption of the payment of duties on articles imported into the country to be used for the sole purpose of the construction of the Bridgetown Sewerage Project. It is all part and parcel of the terms and conditions of an agreement between this Government and the Inter-American Development Bank. It is not new to Barbados; it is the same sort of arrangement that obtained with the Port Contract and other large contracts, and the most I can say by way of enlightening the House about

the status of the sewerage project is that work has started and several of the said articles in respect of this same project are at this moment on the high seas. We had hoped that they would have arrived yesterday, but I believe there is going to be a few days delay because the ice had not broken on the St. Lawrence Seaway as we had thought. However we expect some heavy equipment to arrive during the course of next week. In all other respects the Sewerage project is on target.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SIMMONS in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Mr. Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee on the Bill, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.
5.25 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SUGAR INDUSTRY
(REHABILITATION, PRICE STABILIZATION AND
LABOUR WELFARE) (AMENDMENT)
ORDER, 1979

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 4 standing in the name of the Minister of Agriculture be the instant Order of the Day.

Item No. 4 was called — A Resolution to approve the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) (Amendment) Order, 1979.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, this is just a simple matter in the sense that it seeks to amend the principal order by deleting the words "1977" and substituting therefor the words "1978". Accordingly, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BONNETTS,
CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that item No. 2 standing in my name be the instant Order of the day.

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

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

Order No. 2 was called — A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bonnetts, Christ Church, for the purpose of Housing Development.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Hon. Attorney General, and Minister of External Affairs seems to think that this is the most important item on the Order Paper for today. As far as I am concerned, I think that all of the items on the Order Paper are of paramount importance. The purpose of this Resolution is to acquire a parcel of land at Bonnetts, Christ Church, for the purpose of establishing yet another housing development under the administration of the Barbados Labour Party. *(Cheers)*

One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I have set out that this land should be acquired immediately, is that in the fiscal year 1980–81 we can have the infrastructure and all the relevant amenities put in. I can assure you also, Mr. Speaker, that at Bonnetts we are hoping to have something a little different again — a complex within a complex. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you are looking at me with that look.

Mr. SPEAKER: I look with the eyes of St. Peter.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I will be travelling North to Alaska, and I will have to stop in St. Peter before I go to St. Lucy. This development, Mr. Speaker, apart from having private units will also have a number of services in the area because lots for chattel houses is another problem in the Ministry of Housing; and that is the reason for having this provision.

There is going to be a very large development and I can hear the hon. member for Christ Church West will be very delighted. I do not know why he has this great delight unless his majority fell from 12,000 to 2,000; but I do not think that it will be that easy for him if I were to hold back the development. Yet I will assure him that I will not hold back on him or on members of the other side.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding this Resolution and I want to congratulate the Hon. Minister for his foresight in introducing this Resolution for this development. He recognises — and if I may quote — he says, I think that Jesus himself said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I build my Church."

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope he will build the first house in St. Peter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: This is not to improve building because that area is a rocky area and does not have many problems for foundation; but seriously, now, Sir, let me say that a certain past hon. member came into this House in 1966 and he proposed to his then Government that this area of land should have been acquired for development. I am speaking about Mr. Patsy Springer. It is significant that although he moved a Resolution, the party to which he belongs did nothing about that area at that time.

I came to the House in 1971, and at that time I tried to get the Democratic Labour Party Government to put down a community centre in the area, and to organise the area in which there was very bad lighting, and obviously some sub-standard housing. I believe that they sent an inspection team to the area, but nothing was ever done. That inspection team was not sent until just before the elections took place.

I am happy that the Hon. Minister and the Government has reacted to the needs of an area which needs upgrading badly; and I hope that the development will go through speedily and without any complications. I want to assure the Hon. Minister that whatever little influence I have in this area, will be put behind the scheme to assist him.
5.35 p.m.

I believe it is an area in which I got about 89% of the votes cast, so there is no room for improvement. I have never been one to want 100% of the votes; at least one must encourage other people, but I can assure him, if he wants me, that my constituents in that part of the area tell me it is true it is likely I will get no less than 95% of the votes whenever the next elections come in Barbados.

Sir, the area is one deserving, as I said, of development, which is about 12½ acres. I will ask the Minister that in the planning that takes place to remember that there are families there who have traditionally lived on the land either as tenants or because they own a bit of the land, and I know that most of them who are there have expressed a wish to remain on the spots on which they are, subject of course to any realignment which must take place, but they recognise that the development would be for the over-all benefit of the area. It will re-

move some of the health hazards. We have very serious health hazards in that area, and I think the Minister of Health would like to know this because it is an area that breeds mosquitoes to a large extent although it is so near to Bridgetown and there is a lack of proper drainage facilities.

I should like also to ask the Minister to look at what is called Dogs Alley or Thomas Gap which is next to the Bonnetts area to see in what way — it is a tenantry — the Government can make sure that the tenants who live there get security of tenure. Most of the people are prepared now to buy their lots; I believe the land owner is a non-resident at the moment. I say, Sir, it gives me great pleasure in seconding this Resolution; it will give me a greater pleasure when I am in a position to witness the ceremony at which the Minister declares, I am told if he is still Minister, the houses are ready for occupation. I would expect this would be within a year to eighteen months, and with the hon. member for St. Philip North looking on I am sure that things should go rapidly ahead in that part of Christ Church.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT KING STREET,
ST. MICHAEL

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 is the instant Order of the day, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at King Street, St. Michael, for the purpose of Housing Development.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this is not a very difficult Resolution. It is to acquire a bit of land so as to assist with the actual road in and out of the St. Cecilia Park, if I may refer to it on this occasion. It is a Resolution which just needs the approval of Parliament in the light that I have already notified Parliament and had my Cabinet's approval to start building at St. Cecilia. This they are well *au fait* with at this point, but while I am on this, I should just like briefly to touch on a little comment which I saw in the editorial of the Advocate which was complimentary to my Ministry and also was a caution to the Ministry about the swimming pool which apparently I feel so happy about.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of all concerned that all possible health hazards have been taken into consideration. There is going to be, I can assure you, a trained life-guard placed at St. Cecilia Park where the swimming pool is going to be fenced around, there should be a number of persons who would be using

the pool at any one time and all the health hazards will be well taken care of. Even further, to be so sure of this, the Government as from 1st June would be taking over the entire life-guard service in Barbados. This was one of our manifesto pledges. At this point I say that the Jaycees have played a very important role in establishing the life-guard station service throughout the entire Island, but I dare say with changing times they have been unable to keep the services at a level which is in keeping with the whole transformation of the country. The Government therefore in its manifesto had pledged that they would take over the service, and I can assure you that we are extending the service, we are going to keep the life-guards up by giving them real scientific training, and at this point I am having discussions in my Ministry with the hope of getting down an expert from one of the agencies to assist in giving lifeguards a full knowledge of what is meant by the work of a life-guard in the country. I thank the Advocate for cautioning the Government. I am not afraid of any adverse comments, and when they are complimentary I am taken by surprise.

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

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this brings us to the end of Government Business, and I am quite sure I have indicated that if hon. members wish to go into Private Members' Business or Question Time I have no objection.

I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Private Members' Business.

Item No. 1 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Philip North.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on this matter when I introduced it. I would ask that further consideration be deferred for today.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, further consideration of this measure will be postponed.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Item No. 2 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central whom I do not now see in his place.

Item 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition whom I do not now observe in his place.

Likewise Items Nos. 4 and 5 stand in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central whom I do not now see in his place.

That brings us to the end

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, did I understand that Items 2, 3, 4 and 5 stand in the name of members of the Opposition whom you said are not in their places? I am not quite clear on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 2 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central whom I do not see in his place. Item No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition whom I do not observe in his place. Item No. 4 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central whom I

do not see in his place; and similarly Item No. 5 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central whom I do not now observe in his place.
5.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, there being no other business for today's Sitting, I beg to move that this Sitting do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, 29th May, 1979 at noon.

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

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