THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6th November, 1979

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.15 a.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); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B. A., Ed.M.; 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. M. C. C. WARD; Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker) and Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., M.R.C.P. (Edin.)

Prayers were read.

Mr. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, the Minutes of the Meeting of the 16th October, 1979 were confirmed.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, the Minutes of the Meeting of the 23rd October, 1979 were confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Barbados Citizenship (Registration of Births and Deaths Abroad) (Amendment) Regulations, 1979.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1979.

and

An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the Several Districts of the Island for quarters ending March and June 1979.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following:

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 1979.

NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following:

Resolution to approve the vesting of land at the Bridgetown Harbour in Land Reclaimers Ltd.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following:

Resolution to approve the lease of land at the Central Agronomic Research Station at Graeme Hall, Christ Church, to the Caribbean Agriculture Research and Development Institute.

and

Resolution to approve the lease of land at Fontabelle, St. Michael to Manning Wilkinson and Challenor Ltd.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: I receive from the hon. member for St. Lucy intimation of his intention to beg leave of this Honourable House to raise a matter under this Standing Order No. 18 as one of urgent public importance. I am of the opinion that the matter sought by the hon. member to be raised under this Standing Order cannot properly be considered as one which falls in content under this Standing Order. The matter is of public importance but there is no urgency in my view.

The hon. member however, is free to table the matter in the ordinary way so that it can be placed on the Order Paper and be discussed at the appropriate time. I am therefore disallowing this notice of a Motion.
10.25 a.m.

I must also let the hon. member for St. Lucy know that if he desires to give notice of it at this time in the ordinary way I will grant him permission to do so.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

> WHEREAS the Transport Board has a responsibility to provide an adequate bus service throughout the island;
>
> AND WHEREAS in the parish of St. Lucy the bus service is completely inadequate;
>
> AND WHEREAS this inadequacy is causing serious problems to the travelling public;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that this House calls upon the Government to take necessary steps to ensure that the bus service in St. Lucy is improved without delay.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, just on this matter which the hon. member has just given notice of – I am not going into any debate – I would just like to assure.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, I just want to inform this Hon. House that there can be no debate on the matter raised by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, with great respect to Your Honour's ruling, I think my experience would have given me that knowledge, I just wanted to state that the Government is particularly interested in having a full dressed debate on the transport system in Barbados. I would like to give him that assurance in my capacity as Acting Leader of the House.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I think at our last sitting we on this side indicated that there was a reply to Parliamentary Question No. 22 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West. We gave that indication and we are ready to deal with it today, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20 and 42(5) be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting. I would like to assure hon. members on the other side that we are quite willing to allow them to have any Private Members' Business which they would like to debate during the course of the day. We will assure them of that, Sir.

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

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker a Resolution which I gave notice of last Friday I understand has been circulated to all hon. members in this Chamber, and I would like to deal with this Resolution today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you propose to seek the leave of the House to deal with it in all its stages today.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I understand that notice has been given and it has been circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right, notice has been given.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, at the last sitting of the House Government gave members on the other side and this House the assurance that Item No. 2 would be debated today, and I therefore move that Item No. 2 standing in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister be the instant Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 2.

THE INTEGRITY IN PUBLIC LIFE ACT, 1979

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in recent years the traditional accusations common to all democratic countries, and perhaps more pursued the more democratic the country is that politicians are persons that have to be watched carefully, and that unless watched carefully will find means of enriching themselves have come to be much resented by those

politicians who are conscious of their own integrity, conscious of their own sincerity, conscious of the financial sacrifices they make rather than the financial advantages they obtain from participation in public life. This is a feature not confined to Barbados. In many countries in the last five, eight or ten years, considerations of ensuring public confidence in the conduct of politicians have informed much debate. In the United States, in Canada, notably in the Commonwealth, in Britain, in the smaller Commonwealth countries – Sri Lanka, New Zealand, Jamaica – and now in Barbados politicians have been trying ways and means of not only ensuring their integrity as a collective body and as individuals, but of ensuring that the public can be satisfied in their integrity.
10.35 a.m.

Different forms are being used in different countries to achieve this. In the United States there has been widespread voluntary compliance by many public figures with a voluntary revelation of assets. In addition, many public figures in American life have placed their assets in blind trust or some form of financial management which ensures that they have no knowledge of the fate of their investments and other commercial interests while they are engaged in those aspects of public life that could conceivably be thought of as putting them in a position to benefit themselves if they were managing their own business affairs. In Canada there are strict rules – some may say too strict – which make it very difficult for lawyers in public life, even after they have left public life, to engage in litigation of which they might have had some knowledge while they were Ministers of Government. In Britain, conditions are less strict, but the House of Commons itself has very strong internal rules, and it is perhaps in Britain that more politicians get drummed out of public life for financial infelicities than anywhere else. In the Caribbean – in Jamaica – integrity legislation has been passed, and although it occasioned the resignation from the Senate of one leading member of the Opposition, it seems to have been largely accepted.

And the theme of acceptance of integrity legislation is the next point I would touch on. Normally the public welcomes the efforts of politicians to ensure that some measure of integrity in public life is being maintained. Normally the public welcomes what they see and what is intended as a protection against unjust enrichment of politicians and against all the little ills that the insincere and dishonest flesh is heir to in public persons and persons who rise to the commanding height of Government. Now we in Barbados have not been immune from the disease that I referred to at the start of my speech, the disease of assuming that politicians will do well for themselves or will act in an improper manner if they are given the opportunity.

I am handing you a document, Sir, and if we look at the last four elections in this country hon. members may appreciate that the issue of integrity in public life has been pursued at some depth on political platforms. In 1961 the Hon. M. E. Cox and the Hon. R. G. Mapp were pilloried and abused on political platforms. It was said that their passports would be taken away so that they would not be allowed to leave the island. At a meeting held in Green Hill in November, 1961, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition – then the senior member for St. John – accused Mr. Mapp of introducing water meters into the country because he was under the influence of Mr. K. R. Hunte who had brought water meters and had them in a warehouse in Bridgetown. An utterly false accusation, but this is an example of what politicians have to put up with. Earlier Mr. Cox had been accused of speculating in the disposal of huts and equipment belonging to the United States Air Force that had to be cleared from Seawell Airport in 1948. All these things had to be put up with. In 1966 we had to put up with the accusations from the Leader of the Opposition – then the senior member for St. John – that Barbados Shipping and Trading Company had given $63,000 to the Barbados Labour Party and had concealed this by making false claims to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. This was represented in a court in Trinidad and the judge found the member not to be speaking the truth. This is what we had to put up with.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, we all know the viciousness...

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is accusing me of perjury in a court in Trinidad. This is a serious accusation and I ask that the hon. member withdraw it. There was no such finding in Trinidad. The hon. member is not speaking the truth and must withdraw the remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is taken.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The judge found there was no perjury because the allegation was irrelevant not because it was untrue. He found it irrelevant and the hon. member would know that to commit perjury one must make a false statement on oath.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement that I made a false statement on oath in Trinidad.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not propose asking the hon. member to withdraw.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not surprised.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are not to be surprised at a ruling of the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am surprised, then.

Mr. SPEAKER *rose. (Asides: Don't send him out.)*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, nobody is surprised at what the hon. member says.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has used some remarks which do not lend themselves to the dignity of the hon. member or of this House. I want to appeal to the Leader of the Opposition to contain himself. I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to contain himself.
10.45 a.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: In 1946.....

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the hon. member cannot rise on a point of explanation.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Alright, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The reason why I am dwelling on these things, contentious though they may be, is because there seems to be a spirit abroad of suggesting that hon. members on this side have been in the practise of making unjustified statements about hon. members on the other side as to their public integrity. Unjustified statements never came from this side and this is my purpose of dealing with these matters.

The statement of $63,000 was repeated on a platform in Marshall's Gap five years after; a statement about Mr. Mapp five years and a day after, and the hon. member said in Marshall's Gap in Bridgetown in November 1966 that we got this money from the B. S. & T., and we ran 21 candidates and gave $3,000 to each candidate and that one of the candidates, Mr. Keith Rouse, went to him and asked him what to do with it and he told him "Rouse, spend what the Law allows you to spend and keep the rest. Tom Adams cannot take it back from you." This is a completely untrue statement.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to protest. I do not know Mr. Keith Rouse.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please. On what does the hon. member rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am rising on a point of order. It is a series of untruths by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER stood up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair is standing. Will the hon. member please observe the Rules. I am telling the hon. member that I am not going to send him out today. I am not going to send him out today. He must remain but he must conduct himself in a manner becoming the dignity of this Honourable House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. I hope that the rules of relevance will prevail and will be observed by all hon. members. Merely handing Your Honour a piece of paper saying that he is going to talk about people is not sufficient protection for the use of a debate from the hon. member, as the hon. member well knows and I wish you would remind him sometimes.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a decision to be taken by the Chair according to the Standing Orders.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad that the hon. member now says that he did not know Mr. Rouse so that all those who heard him in Marshall's Gap can judge him by his own words out of his own mouth. He does not remember what he says.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sorry, sorry, Sir. *(Asides.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am hearing him trying to curse other hon. members. It is unbecoming the dignity of this Honourable House. I am begging the Leader of the Opposition to behave himself as mature statesman would.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I am selecting only a few of the unjustified accusations under which our Party has had to labour in Election after Election. In the Election of 1971, on this occasion, I do not think I have any knowledge of any statements made by the hon. member for St. John about the finances of hon. members on this side but we do of course know about the abominable libel which was published in the *Democrat Newspaper* about the hon. member for Christ Church.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. In 1966 the hon. member was neither a Leader of this Party, his Party nor the Leader of the Opposition so how could I send Mr. Rouse back to him. Were you the Treasurer?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order. I want all hon. members to realise this that if on this side, if

on the Government Benches an accusation is made against any person or any hon. member on the other side, the hon. member on the other side will have ample time to rise and reply in the course of this debate. All hon. members will have an opportunity to address the Chair today as probably this apparently is the most important Debate ever to come before this Honourable House. I invite the co-operation of all hon. members.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: For the benefit of the hon. member who has just sat down I was Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party in 1966 and signed all documents such as were related to the finances of the Party. The hon. member knew that then but I do not know how he has forgotten it. Mr. St. John and I were Trustees of the Labour Party for nearly 15 years. That is besides the point. The statement was never proved anyhow about Mr. Rouse and the $3,000. It was never true. That is the point the hon. member is missing.

In 1971 we had this contemptible libel which attempted to implicate particular hon. members, the Leader of the House, the member for Christ Church South Central and the Hon. Attorney General, then member for Christ Church West, of improper financial dealings in relation to Codrington College. The result of that is well-known. The libel action resulted in record damages and the credibility of the now Opposition Party respected the truthfullness and allegations that it make about financial dealings of others which was very seriously aired.

Now in 1976, after many years of patience, the members of the Barbados Labour Party decided that what we knew of, and I repeat the word "infelicities" could no longer be tolerated. In this House during a debate in that year I produced a photostat of cheques which had been paid by Mr. Sydney Burnett Alleyne to the then Attorney General in the tune of $20,000 and to Mr. Cameron Tudor. Some consternation was made. That is absolutely a true allegation.

The defence put up by Mr. George Moe was such only to emphasise the legality of the original dealing. Mr. Cameron Tudor has never put any defence of any sort. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says that to describe the acceptance of regular cheques of Sydney Burnett Alleyne by the Attorney General of Barbados and the Minister of Foreign Affairs is not irregular and is not something to be ashamed of you can understand why we need to demonstrate to the members of the Opposition the meaning of the Integrity Bill. You can understand why we have to demonstrate to the Opposition the meaning of integrity and the importance of understanding what integrity means if this is a matter to be ashamed of and that George Moe should not have taken money from Sydney Alleyne then I should never have to say anything else in the justification of this Bill. 10.55 a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, I take it your reference to Sydney Alleyne is to Sydney Burnett Alleyne.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sydney Burnett Alleyne, thank you, Sir. I am not pressing on other matters because there are a number of marginal matters which were recited during that campaign, all of which were true; matters like cement licences, the dealings of the former member for St. Andrew with land and so on, I am not even worrying with that. I am not going into the matter of the former member for St. Andrew, because when the Housing Commission Report is laid on the Table of the House that will be a sufficient commentary on that, so I am not dwelling on that, and I have not given any notice that I am dealing with Mr. Edwards, I am not dwelling on that, that can wait on the report of the Commission, but to speak of accusations which were made.

We did not make untrue accusations over the cheques, Mr. Tudor has never given an explanation of what Mr. Sydney Alleyne could have given him $20,000 for; never any explanation. I know that in my office and in the office of the Attorney General the former Foreign Minister of Guatemala – and I am naming the country – and the General in charge of the Army Training School in Guatemala informed on separate occasions the Attorney General and subsequently myself, in the presence of the Commissioner of Police and the Permanent Secretary of Defence and Security that he had given Sydney Alleyne a cheque to influence the Government of Barbados in its attitude towards Belize in the United Nations, and the General in charge of the Training Camp said that Sydney Alleyne had been taken to a training camp in Guatemala. If you want revelations and if you want proof, these are matters you do not have to rely on the Attorney General and me, you can go and ask officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Commissioner of Police and Permanent Secretaries who were present and took notes. So let nobody say that we made unjustified accusations or made accusations when we spoke about Sydney Burnett Alleyne in a scare sense; let nobody say that.

We spoke of other things, we spoke about the acquisition of Bath Plantation and the part played by Mr. Bernstein. Whatever you may say about the Commission of Enquiry, every statement made by me on platforms and in the House of Assembly, right down to the Dear Cecil letter written about Golden Mile by the hon. member for St. John, every single one of those accusations was found true in the course of the Duffus investigation. Every one, Carib West and the circumstances of its purchase, North Point and the circumstances of its purchase, Bath and the circum-

stances of its purchase, and indeed Golden Mile and the authenticity of the letter written to Dear Cecil in New York from Singapore using one of Mr. Lee Kwan Yew's stenographers by the hon. member for St. John, then Prime Minister, using one of the Chinese stenographers to Cecil Hewitt in New York about the advisability about investments in Golden Mile Limited. It was written by the hon. member for St. John and it took Sir Herbert Duffus 20 minutes to get him to admit it because he did not want, I believe, to see him disgrace himself on oath in the enquiry. All of those accusations were proved true, the interpretation placed on them is different, but they were true, and this is the background to the Bill which now comes before the House.

Whatever interpretation you attach to those infelicities, whether you view it as correct, whether you view it as merely unwise or irregular or just infelicitous, it is the interpretation which is at variance with the facts, and based upon those considerations, Sir, the Barbados Labour Party resolved in its Manifesto in 1976 that for the future some protection would be given to the public by way of integrity legislation. During the last Session I moved a Resolution calling for the introduction of integrity legislation for Ministers and Members of Parliament. After much equivocation that Resolution was sent to a Select Committee. However, except for Mr. Speaker, no member of the then Government, the Democratic Labour Party, attended any meeting of the Select Committee on integrity legislation and it failed to obtain a quorum. We therefore proposed in our Manifesto that we would pass legislation providing for Members of Parliament, Senators and politically appointed members of Statutory Corporations to disclose their financial assets and liabilities on assuming office, periodically during office, and on termination. That was our commitment and this legislation is the result.

I do not believe, Sir, that it should be necessary for me to have given any kind of justification for integrity legislation. I have been away for a few days, Sir, and earlier in the month I was away for a slightly longer time attending financial meetings, and therefore I have been somewhat insulated from developments during the months of October and November on the political platforms. I have thus been somewhat surprised to find that a campaign is being whipped up against integrity in this country. I cannot put it any highers, but I am a little shaken to discover that there are persons who are putting forward arguments against a Bill designed to assist with maintaining standards of morality and integrity in public life. I can hardly believe it, Sir. There are certain paid hangers-on who can be relied on to put a case for anything if they are given enough money. They can be relied on to adhere rigidly to the principles of rent-a-crowd, so much an hour for attendance at the House of Assembly and kick up a fuss, they can be relied on to adhere rigidly to the principle of where the money goes, so goes my mouth, but I cannot honestly and seriously believe that adherence to a major political party can oppose integrity legislation. I will not believe it until I see the Opposition vote against this Bill today. I invite them to vote against integrity in public life today, I invite them to vote against morality in public life, because what we are putting before you today, Mr. Speaker, from the Government side is a principle, we are putting a Bill which enshrines a principle of integrity in public life, a principle designed to ensure the respect by the public for those politicians who conduct themselves in a straightforward and honest way, and to give some possibility of detection to those who do not, with a view to driving them out of public life.

11.05 a.m.

The Bill has details. I daresay some of the details can be modified and will be modified. In the Select Committee to which it is intended to send this Bill if it is given second reading, there may very well be points for modification. I see one particular point has excited a great number of people and there may be points in which in the spirit of open Government we on this side will be perfectly happy to see amended or adjusted in the course of the parliamentary progress of the Bill. We are getting numerous representations of one sort or another about it. We understand that there is a certain nervousness among some members of Statutory Corporations who perhaps do not understand the Bill. Some independent Senators too are a bit nervous.

I am going to deal with Section 45(2) and I observe that this has excited some attention. There is some query as to the necessity for blind trust. There are other areas where the modification process which the Bill has already undergone in the course of the three years it has been under consideration, may very well prove insufficient, but these are matters for the Committee. But the principle of this Bill is perfectly simple. We could not get the last Government to adopt a self-denying ordinance for itself by way of an integrity Bill, so we are introducing it. We are going to ask that the persons specified in the Bill make regular declarations as to their assets and that they repeat these declarations annually so that a Public Integrity Commission will be able to assess from what is known of the wealth of hon. members whether they have been guilty of unjust enrichment or whether there is any appearance of undue enrichment during their term of office. It is really a very simple principle that every year Ministers and Members of Parliament, Senators should make a declaration of how much money they have, what property they own in and out of Barbados, and under certain conditions what property is owned by their spouse and children. Every year these declarations should be updated and examined by a Public Integrity Commission.

The Public Integrity Commission will not be a Government body; it will be appointed under principles that have not, so far as I know, been found in any appointment procedure known to the Laws of Barbados. The Commission will consist of three persons. They must be

retired judges, magistrates or persons who have held senior positions in the judicial or legal service of Barbados; or a retired Auditor General, Commissioner of Inland Revenue or Financial Secretary; or the President or past President of an Association of Accountants or the Barbados Association of Accountants, or a member or past member of the Privy Council other than a person who would have to make the declaration, that is, a member of Parliament or a Senator or a member of a Statutory Board. Effectively that really confines it to the Roman Catholic Bishop, the Anglican Bishop and the widows of certain distinguished persons in this society. In other words, the Public Integrity Commission is not what is popularly known as yard-fowlism; it will be a Commission of persons chosen from groups of people whom all Barbadians can hold in high respect.

And how will these people be chosen? Not like the Public Service Commission where, in fact, although I must exempt all persons who have held the office of Prime Minister in Barbados – the Public Service Commission in effect can be chosen by the Prime Minister because he can ram through unpopular choices – I am not speaking of the hon. member for St. John. I cannot say the hon. member for St. John ever chose a Public Service Commission in a partisan way and I do not believe that I have, but I am sure that with his customary lack of charity he will ascribe every conceivable sin and misdemeanour to everybody on this side. But we can be charitable to him in his decline.

For the Public Integrity Commission one member will be appointed on the recommendation of the Prime Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition. Another member will be appointed on the recommendation of the Leader of the Opposition after consultation with the Prime Minister; and the Governor-General will appoint the third member without consulting anybody – it will be in his own absolute discretion. There has never been any legislation in this country more fair to the Opposition than the selection of this Commission. All members of the Commission will have full access to the declaration, but in respect of irregularities by members of that side a report will be made to the Leader of the Opposition, and in respect of irregularities on this side a report will be made to the Prime Minister. If there is more that can be asked for I do not know what it is. Do they want a Public Integrity Commission to which they appoint all the members? And we are accused of infringing the liberties of Barbadians by this Bill, challenging the Government in its efforts to ensure that those who get $20,000 from Sydney Burnett Alleyne will have to give some explanation for it if it shows up in their assets. And in seeking to ensure this, we are being challenged. Do they want me to show the third name on the cheques?

Now, Sir, one or two points of explanation had better be offered at this stage, because I believe that although nobody is willing to come out openly and say that they are afraid of the Bill, there are a number of persons who have some doubt about it. Rumour has it that there are two members on the other side who would suffer serious embarrassment if declarations had to be made retroactively. Rumour has it that some members of Statutory Board and some members of the Senate would be uncomfortable. To deal with this I would ask that the provisions of the Second Schedule and the Section which supports it, Section 5, be very carefully studied. The persons under the Act as it now stands, who will be obliged to make declarations, will be members of the House of Assembly or the Senate and Leaders of political parties.
11.15 a.m.

The Political Parties are defined as in the First Schedule, that is, "The Barbados Labour Party, The Democratic Labour Party or any other group of individuals who hold themselves out as a Political Party by having public meetings or by advertising as such, or by other means, at any-time when no law of Barbados requires the registration of Political Parties." That is the present position. This is the intention of introducing this legislation.

The Governor General, Sir, then may, by an Order subject to the confirmative Resolution, apply Part II of the Act to an individual who is an official of one of the bodies mentioned in the Second Schedule and those are popularly known as Statutory Corporations. They are set out, Sir. They are The Agricultural Credit Bank, The Barbados Agricultural Development Bank, The Barbados Industrial Development Corporation, The Barbados Marketing Corporation, The Barbados National Bank, The Barbados National Stadium Corporation, The Barbados Port Authority, The Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, The Caves Authority, The Central Bank of Barbados, The Child Care Board, The Cinematograph Film Censorship Board, The Gambling Committee, The Insurance Corporation of Barbados, The Land Taxation Relief Board and so on.

Those persons will be subjected at the most only to Part II of the Act which relates to conflict of interest. Those persons will not have, even if the Act applies to them, to file regular declarations. They will however have to observe procedures which the Act implies that will restrict their capacity to contract with the Government or with the Corporation or with any Agency of Government because that is what Part II of the Act relates to. It prevents members of Parliament from entering into a contract with Government unless certain procedures are followed. Part II discusses these procedures from Section 17 – 26.

Part I deals with Financial Disclosures. I think that some improvement might be possible

in Part I. There might very well be some Sections where a good Select Committee will be able to make close analysis and make suggestive alterations to the House on these but it is not for me to indicate any area where this may take place at present.

Part II deals with conflict of interest. I think the conflict of interest provisions are relatively thought out. They are matters of principle that Government Contracts should not be entered into by persons in public life unless the Government or persons are seen to be acting at arm's length. This relates to the purchase or acquisition of any land from the Government or any Agency thereto purchasing anything like Bonds, Treasury Bills, the borrowing of money, Insurance, supplying of goods or services, construction, demolition, repair or maintenance of any public works or for anything which Government enters into involving money, we are forbidding persons of public life to enter into these contracts except providing the conditions will be that for a member of the House or Senate a Resolution of both Houses will be specifically necessary before he or she can enter into any Government contracts or gain any benefits from any Government contracts.

There is a lot said of procedures, Sir. Again this will be for the Select Committee. I do not want to pursue it. Obviously the members will not want to take part in any debate where they are involved and if they take part in any debate, if they enter into any contract, if they have any business with the Government they can be punished and a penalty is provided for this but this is in the Parliamentary Privileges and Amenities Act.

It may involve they losing their seat. That is what we are being criticised for. Being the Government we are being criticised for introducing legislation for stopping any of them from involving themselves in Government contracts of any sort and that is why they say we are a wicked Government. We are trying to stop people from doing what is being done in the past and we are called a wicked Government.

Part III deals with the Monitoring of Declarations. It lays down certain procedures. These have been taken from the legislative provisions in other countries. It sets out Commissions.

Part IV of the Act is what is called Administration and General. Regulations can be made by the Public Integrity Commission and so on. There are various matters relating to offences. I have been looking at one of these offences because it seems to have excited a good deal of public discussion and that is Section 45(2). The people who have been criticising this Act have fallen into a number of different categories.

Mr. Cameron Tudor, I think it was in the month of May, in the *Nation Newspaper* criticised the Government for not bringing the Integrity Legislation. We brought it in July and by August he was criticising the Government for bringing it. I can understand Mr. Cameron Tudor not wanting to hear the word "integrity" close to him. He would not sleep comfortably at nights with the word "integrity" under his pillow.

Mr. Joy Edwards has been known to write people's names on a piece of paper and put them under his shoes so that he stamps on them when he walks. He also, I believe, would be one of those people who the word "integrity" he would have to write and put in his shoe and stamp on it everytime he walks. I do not think I can pay too much attention to criticisms made by Mr. Tudor on a Bill on Integrity in public life.

I truthfully do not think I should pay too much attention to criticisms made by Mr. Eric Sealy about a Bill on Integrity in public or indeed private life either but there are other people.

I have been shown an Editorial in a copy of today's *Advocate Newspaper.* I am not suggesting that anything in it is true. I know the Advocate's narrow approach to these things. I think it is a very sensible editorial very cogently put together. I see an article by Dr. Leonard Shorey talking about freedom of speech and discussing the Bill entirely in terms of Section 45(2). I have never known Dr. Shorey to be in favour of any matter in which the Barbados Labour Party has been shown in any light. I have been following his articles. He is a man of integrity but it does seem that the spirit of intervention was aroused chiefly on behalf of persons opposed to the Barbados Labour Party.

We obviously have some regard for Dr. Shorey. He is on the Community College Board and we do pay attention to him on Government Commissions and so on. If there is one man who should not accuse the Barbados Labour Party of showing hostility to persons who oppose it it is Dr. Leonard Shorey. If there is one man who has had unlimited freedom of speech and to be con-

gratulated for it and has been rewarded for what he said, it has been Dr. Leonard Shorey and yet he will join in a chorus led by Eric Sealy and you know who is in the background pulling the strings here, there, and everywhere.
11.25 a.m.

Well, we cannot help for these things, but I would just like to give an assurance. Dr. Shorey can accuse us of threatening free speech, he has absolutely nothing to fear for his position, for the regard in which we hold him, we will accuse him of absolutely nothing. He is not going to be in the sort of danger that Mitchie Hewitt was in when he wrote an article against the then Government and was moved to the Tourist Board the following week, he will not be in any danger that several citizens of Barbados who were abused by the hon. member for St. John during the constitutional debate, he will not be in the danger they were in – Mr. Justice Ward, the Anglican Bishop, the Catholic Bishop and others – he will not be abused or humiliated or embarrassed or disrespected by any hon. member of this side.

We disagree with him, and I think his emphasis is misplaced, and for an educationist he could perhaps have had a bit more balance in what he was saying, but nobody can be perfect, and nobody's judgment is going to be Al on every occasion, and he can be absolutely assured that relentless though his opposition to the Government may be, he will remain in a position to which his qualifications entitle him and which his pronouncements on education, his knowledge and his experience dictate that he can reasonably occupy.

That is the difference between us and them, and again nothing more need be said about freedom of speech, the right to express one's opinion, than that. Under the old regime the records do not afford any example of Eric Sealy talking about blood, about killing, about bullets for the ballot. Those remarks could not be made, because Mr. Sealy then even when he was on our side may well have known that he was dealing with desperate people, and that such remarks somebody might very well say, "well, he wants to do it to me, let me do it to him first," but under our Government the most unbridled freedom of speech in this country has been, the most unbridled freedom of speech.

Hon. members on this side have been accused of being murderers, we have had persons talking about killing members of the Government and making it conditional to hide the name, but everybody in the audience knows what you are talking about. You talk about burning down, you talk about destroying, you talk about moving the Government before 1981, you now have a former member of this House talking about if you do not win by the ballot in 1981 they will win by the bullet. Tommy Miller should be ashamed of himself, an old man like that should confine himself to the Bible and the bottle instead of talking about the bullet and the ballot. Let him deal with the first two B's and leave out the last two. All of that we have in Barbados today, and it is a measure of the character of the people that in the face of the abuse of the Governor General, the Bishop, the Dean, Officers of Government, that the public have remained calm and talking about the business of exploiting the improvement of the economy which the Barbados Labour Party has been able to bring to the country.

I really cannot find the history of section 45(2). The copy of the original draft which I have here in my hand, which I originally saw, does not contain that section at all. I gather that it means that during the pendency of a complaint by the Commission that nothing must be said about the enquiry, and I am instructed that that is equivalent to introducing the offence of contempt of court. In other words, in the same way that you cannot comment on judicial proceedings while they are going on, that you must not comment on the Commission. That is what I am informed, I did not draft the section. (A VOICE: You read it though). I read it now since I came back and heard the lies you are telling on us.

I gather that the other part creates a very limited offence. This is what the draughtsmen are explaining, that what it says is that you must not say that a person has made recent acquisitions of wealth or incurred expenses disproportionate to his known source of income and wealth. It does not forbid you from saying a man is rich or he has money, but it is supposed to forbid you from accusing a person of committing an offence under this Act. That is what I am informed. When we reach the Select Committee.... (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You don't know anything about it?) Hon. members will have a chance to deal with all this in the Select Committee.

For the benefit of Dr. Shorey, my feeling as a lawyer is that it is not necessarily slanderous to say that a man has acquired wealth disproportionate to his known sources of income. A man can be given property, he can gamble and get property, there are many ways of getting money. He can race horses, he can peddle dope and get money, if you are coming down to that. He can declare to the Inland Revenue that his income as a doctor is $62,000 a year but when a check is made of the surgery and the books are analysed it turns out to be $140,000, if you want examples. You can keep $30,000 in your safe that nobody knew you had apart from fees, but when you declare it to the Integrity Commission it clearly will be disproportionate to your known income, so let us not make too much of what is your declared income. All of these circumstances can account for disproportionate wealth, and since an offence is created by the Act, all apparently this section is intended to deal with is that offence.

I have given you absolutely all my knowledge and considerations of section 44. Believe or believe not, but if hon. members think that we have not legislated yet to stop Eric Sealy from inciting people to kill us and saying that we kill people and think that we are merely trying to bring some little half-hearted, water-washed clause to deal with that in this form, hon. members must really have a lot less respect for the Attorney General and his powers to draft a Bill than I gave them credit for. I can assure hon. members that if it were intended, for example, to legislate against telling lies on political platforms, if it were intended to do that that a form of words would be found, and not in this Act, but put in another Act to say that the prohibition on telling lies against a candidate at election time will be extended generally to prohibition against telling lies about people's personal lives in general. The Government has no such intention; be sure of it.
11.35 a.m.

The Government has no such intention, but there are ways and means of dealing with things. One of the reasons why I object to this accusation is that it is an accusation against our competence that if we wanted to legislate against the telling of lies by politicians we would have done it in so incompetent a fashion. These are the things you have to put up with – lies on the front page of a newspaper: "Prime Minister charters plane to take luggage to St. Vincent." All these things we have to put up with, and it is suggested that this particular Clause – some would change the present law relating to the telling of lies on political platforms. People say that in the last election we said what we like and now want to stop others but this is not so; we do not need the protection of any law. We said what we did and nobody has sued us under any law. But the things that were false – the $63,000, Mapp and the water meters – they are the people that need protection, not us. When we say something we prove it. We have no fear of any accusations we make and no fear of having them tested in the law courts. I hope hon. members are aware that the only newspaper operating in Barbados in the last 40 years that has not been successfully sued for libel is "The Beacon", because we have always tried to maintain a standard of honesty in what we say. The others can tell the lies, as far as we are concerned.

To summarize, Sir, we have carried out an election pledge by introducing this Bill which seeks to preserve public confidence in the integrity and honesty of persons in public life. We know that we have to take the lead because the Opposition is opposed to it. I will not be so uncharitable as to say that the Opposition does not want this Bill passed because perhaps they are unwilling to make declarations and are therefore picking up something that is nothing, along with their hangers-on, to excite the public in an unreasonable way. I cannot believe that the Opposition is so adamant not to have integrity legislation that they are choosing a roundabout way of opposing the Bill because they are afraid to approve the principle of the Bill openly, which is the principle of integrity and morality in public life. I cannot believe that instead of welcoming a Bill on integrity in public life the Opposition is trying to mislead the public with a lot of mischievous subversion about objectives and reasons for the Bill. It would be impossible for me to think that a man so outstandingly known for his integrity as the hon. member for St. Michael South would be any party to such a proceeding. I would find it impossible to believe that a man like him who has never had anything to do with Cayman Islands banks or with Eric Sealy, I cannot believe a man such as he is would have any such purpose in mind to oppose the Bill at all costs and have all the teeth taken out of it if possible. I cannot see him willing to pull wool over the eyes of the public in this matter. I therefore have to think that all the other members of the Opposition are like the hon. member for St. Philip South, mistaken in their application of Section 45(2) and of the general purpose of the Bill.

As far as public concepts are concerned, it has to be realised that this will impose some restrictions on the rights of honourable members. I suspect it may very well be that members of the Opposition would be more likely to enter into contracts with the Government than hon. members on this side, but which ever side it comes from this could be anticipated that there is likely to be debate in Parliament about public contracts in the future. We have to take that in our stride when we stand for Parliament in future; we have to understand that when we have a business that carries out contracts with Government from time to time such contracts will be subject to scrutiny of the public so that the public can be sure that no member of Parliament – Opposition or Government – is ripping off the Government in any way. This will become part of public life in the future.

Now as to the procedure for dealing with this Bill. The Government proposes to send the Bill to a Select Committee of fairly substantial size. We will be asking that Your Honour chair the Committee and that there be four members of this side and two members from the Opposition. I would ask the Select Committee to give all possible opportunity for accepting reports from members of the public and from members of Parliament if they wish to make representations; members of the Press, Dr. Shorey – I hope he will come and give evidence. I am giving an invitation to Dr. Shorey from now to come and give evidence and set out his views and explain why he thinks Section 45 is unnecessary. I very much hope he will come and express his views. I am not ramming this down anybody's throat. I want the views of the National Union of Public Workers, who wrote to us in 1978 saying they wanted to see a

copy of the draft legislation. We want them to come and give their views. Whoever wishes to come before the Select Committee, I sincerely hope the Committee will establish rules that will enable this to be done.
11.45 a.m.

I very sincerely hope, Sir, that the Committee would establish rules that will deal with all of these points. The question of the retroactivity of the Bill, I hope that the only person who is affected by retroactivity is Mr. Smith, the former Leader of the Opposition. I hope that he will come and give his views, if necessary.

If Mr. Tudor has views that are worth listening to he can come and I promise I would not ask him what he did with the money Sydney Alleyne gave him. I promise I will not ask him that, if I happen to be a member of the Committee. Everybody can set out their views. That is what we mean by open Government and that is what we intend to bring to the House. We want to have integrity in public life. We want to make sure we have legislation for all times and not just for one period. We want to make sure that politicians can again ascend the pinnacle of respect that perhaps they enjoyed 30 years ago in this country when the Barbados Labour Party was fighting a sincere fight to bring the masses out of the political exploitation to which they were being subjected.

In those days we never heard that the politicians who represented the people indulged in matters that called for legislation such as this. We want to return to those days, a return to the first Government of this great party that brought this country into the situation where we can have a debate such as this. That is the purpose of this Bill; Integrity, honesty and morality in public life. *(Cheers.)*

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second this Bill and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, let us declare from the outset that the Opposition will not be sitting on any Select Committee dealing with this Bill.

We have sat here this morning and we have listened to a lengthy introduction on this measure and we have all been able to assess the motives from which this Bill has sprung. It took us back into the 1950's to 1960's when certain accusations were alleged to have been made against certain members of the Barbados Labour Party and one could not help thinking that a major consideration in bringing this legislation was somehow or another to get something back on those who were making the accusations. Now when legislation.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member is not imputing improper motives in the bringing of this Bill before this House.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will never impute improper motives to the Prime Minister of this country. I have the highest respect for the Prime Minister of this country. I did not intend to impute any improper motives and that is the honest truth.

Mr. SPEAKER: You think very highly of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has his Cabinet who are members of this Honourable House.

Mr. SANDIFORD: The Prime Minister has his Cabinet. I hope he has them all behind him on this particular measure and this is the second challenge I will throw out that I hope that on this particular measure we will have a free vote in this House because it is one that affects the interest of all members. I am challenging them, if it is something that it is in the interest of everybody in this country and to all members, there is no need to put on any grit on that side. Let all members on that side and on this side vote according to their conscience on this measure and I am challenging them to have a free vote on the issue. Take off the Party grit. Let members speak openly on each particular Clause including Clause 45 so that they can express their views.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now there must be some order in this Honourable House.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I do not mind the shouting from the front bench.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member is challenging us. He knows perfectly well that it is not normal in any circumstance for a political party to have a free vote on a matter contained in its Manifesto and he should not mislead anybody but for what it is worth, at a meeting attended by all of the members of our Party who were present in the Island last night, this matter was carefully discussed and there is no one on this side who is opposed to the principle of this Bill. A free vote will make no difference.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the Prime Minister to make a second reading speech.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sorry, Sir.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad for that intervention from the Prime Minister. If a free vote will make no difference then have a free vote. Let them speak. This is not a meeting in here of the Barbados Labour Party. This is a meeting of Parliament so let them speak in here but not in the caucus of the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is only the Chair that can prevent an hon. member from speaking in Parliament.

Order, now.

Mr. SANDIFORD: They do not have the courage to come in here on a matter which they claim to be above partisanship; a matter which is above party politics. They are not prepared to come in here at a national level and have a free vote on this issue. Now, Mr. Speaker,...

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are provisions in this legislation which have caused considerable concern to members, not only of Parliament, but both sides of the House and also to the public at large. This particular legislation puts members of Parliament and those who will be called upon to declare their assets in a most privileged position. It put them in a most privileged position because when once the Barbados Labour Party Government has rammed this legislation down the throats of the people of this country, it means that henceforth, no member of the public can say anything about the wealth, the acquisition, reason or otherwise of members of Parliament except it is done through a particular process through some Body called the Public Integrity Commission.

Now this gives members of Parliament a type of privilege to which they should not be entitled. They should not be entitled to that type of privilege. This puts them in a type of position in which people whom they are supposed to represent cannot speak about members of Parliament and it puts members of Parliament in a position as far as their wealth and acquisitions are concerned way over and above the ordinary person in public in this country.
11.55 a.m.

This is a dangerous trend in legislation. We would have thought, and the people would have thought, that that type of privilege and security would not be given to Members of Parliament, and I find it a matter of considerable difficulty to sit down and support legislation which is putting Members of Parliament above the voice and above the comments and criticisms and scrutiny of members of the public. It is a dangerous principle and I am deeply concerned about it, and I speak with considerable feeling on this particular matter, Mr. Speaker. We should not seek to put ourselves in this type of privileged position.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I hope the hon. member is not imputing any base motive to me, since in my speech I invited all members to join the Select Committee so that anything they do not like in the Bill can be removed. The hon. member is implicitly saying that in that part of my speech I was not honest, because as soon as he assumes that the Bill will pass as it presently is constituted, he is saying that I am lying when I suggest that the Select Committee can make alterations to the Bill, and it is an imputation on my motives, because if he goes on and addresses the House on the Bill as it now is, he is implicitly suggesting that the Government is unwilling to change any of the provisions.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, what nonsense are we hearing from the Prime Minister today? Must I speak on the Bill as it will be? I must speak on the Bill as it has been circulated to me. What nonsense am I hearing today? I cannot speak on any Bill that may be in the minds of anybody, and I want to assure the member again that I am not imputing any dishonest motives to him, I am not doing that, but now he does not want me to speak on this particular measure. I must not speak on the Bill as it is, I must speak on a Bill the wording of which is only within the confines of his mental processes or of the four persons over there whom he wants to put on a Select Committee, two over here, which again is a question of two to one. They say ten to one is murder and now he is going to put four over there on this Committee and two over here on a matter which is supposed to be above partisan politics.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. If the hon. member does not want to serve on the Select Committee because there are only two, I give a pledge that the entire Opposition can sit on it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I feel, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister now finds himself in a very difficult jam with the type of legislation which he now has to amend somehow or other because it is improperly drafted, not sufficient consideration has been given to this particular measure, it concerns dangerous threats to the freedom of speech of people in this country, dangerous threats to the freedom of speech in this country. (ASIDES!)

Mr. SPEAKER: We must have some order. The hon. member for St. Michael South must be heard in silence.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the origins of integrity legislation did not start with a statement by the Barbados Labour Party in 1976 that they would introduce integrity legislation in this country. There has been legislation relating to the integrity of Members of Parliament and all public officers in this country for a considerable period of time. Way back in 1929 legislation was put on the Statute Book relating to integrity. There are provisions within the General Orders of this country relating to integrity as far as public officers are concerned. There is legislation relating to the conflict of interest of persons as far as contracts and Government contracts are concerned, and those are matters relating to the tendering process. All of that is well known in this country. There are laws relating to libel and slander, there are laws relating to Parliament, to the election of members, to bribery and corruption. We therefore ask what is the need and purpose for this particular legislation that is before us. Is it that the existing legislation has

been found to be defective in any particular way? What are the cases that have been brought before the courts to indicate that existing legislation is inadequate? I have been trying to cast my mind back and I can find no particular case that has been brought against any hon. member of Parliament under existing legislation to prove that that particular legislation is defective, inadequate or deficient in any particular way.

So we have really got to question this and to ask why it is that this particular measure is being put in this particular way, and that when the very first speaker on this side, myself, starts to speak I am told not to speak on the measure that I have before me but I should speak on the measure as it will be amended. I must exercise some type of mental gymnastics in order to get that done. We must therefore look to find out the motivation and it will be very difficult, and it is impossible for the Opposition to participate in any Select Committee relating to this measure because of the antecedents. This particular measure must be seen as a political ploy on the part of the Government as part of a continuation of its 1976 election campaign and as a forerunner of its campaign for the next election. That is what it is, plain and simple, and the people of this country must understand that is the purpose.

When the Barbados Labour Party campaigned previously in the 1971 election and the 1976 election they accused the members of the Democratic Labour Party of being a corrupt administration. They said it openly, all types of wrongdoing was attributed to members on this side. That was the campaign. They got the Government, the people of this country decided to entrust its government to the Barbados Labour Party, that is the decision of the people and, as it is said, the voice of the people is as the voice of God, and having got into power they proceeded then on the basis of election charges of corruption and lack of integrity in public life to set up a Commission of Enquiry into the corruption for which the Democratic Labour Party Government was accused. They brought in a Jurist from Jamaica, Sir Herbert Duffus, an expert in ferretting out corruption. He had done it in Grenada and they brought him into this country to ferret out that corruption, and he enquired, and he could find no corruption in terms of the issues and matters that were placed before him. So having drawn a blank on what was supposed to be the major exposure and expose of corruption, and having failed to find that corruption a bitterly disappointed leadership of the Barbados Labour Party now comes and is pursuing the same course by some alternative.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it now that the hon. member must be satisfied that he is imputing an improper motive to the Government in bringing this measure.

12.05 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Now that this legislation is before us, and now that we are dealing with this question of integrity and honesty of persons in public life, and now that we have seen the background from which this is coming – a continuation of the Barbados Labour Party's policy having failed by Commission – a major Commission set up.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I must warn the hon. member for St. Michael South that if he continues to pursue that argument, I would have to ask him to discontinue his speech.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I have not imputed any improper motives; I have said so; but if you feel so you can rule. You do not want me to speak on this Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will rule at the appropriate time.

Mr. SANDIFORD: And I will speak at the appropriate time. This is time to speak on behalf of the people and I will speak out. *(Asides)*

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am making the point, Mr. Speaker, that the Barbados Labour Party failed in its major effort to point out corruption on the part of the Democratic Labour Party. They set up a Commission of Enquiry and that Commission found no fault in the matters placed before it. And I am saying that up to this day there has been no debate on that particular matter in this House. Normally when they set up their hifalutin commissions there is a report. I remember a Resolution worded very eloquently about the report on the status of women by the hon. member for Christ Church West. But where is that hon. member today and where was he when the Duffus Commission reported? The major complaint was about massive corruption on the part of the D.L.P., but the D.L.P. was absolved completely. Having failed in that major effort, we now have a piece of legislation again drawn against a backdrop of veiled suggestion of corruption. In spite of the Duffus Report we still hear them talking about Carib West; we are still hearing today, in spite of the Duffus Report, that all of the accusations made were true. So we have to ask ourselves the purpose for which this particular piece of legislation has been brought and we are saying that it is part of a campaign – nothing to do with any high national plan for which you are appealing to the Opposition for bi-partisan support – for as I have said it is putting parliamentarians in a special position where members of the public after you have rammed this legislation down their throats will not be able to make a statement about their doings. I do not want to be a part of that and I don't think that you, Mr. Speaker, would want to be part of it. It is a matter which I draw with all the sincerity at my disposal for the

consideration of hon. members. *(Asides)* Don't tell me not to speak here but to speak in a Select Committee. This is the second reading of the Bill and I am expressing my views here, and I am saying that after you have rammed this down the throats of the people of this country, a future Democratic Labour Party administration will see that it is removed. We are not going to allow you to bring this type of legislation which I would label as offensive to the people of this country and let you think you will get away with it without objections being made.

As far as integrity in public life is concerned, we know why we have certain things called blind trust, and I would like to give the reasons why we have blind trust, and I would like to state that one of the reasons behind the existence of these blind trusts of which on the one hand the Bill makes provision for open declaration of assets and liabilities but at the same time give the big loophole for persons to have their assets and liabilities placed beyond the reach of the open declaration which ordinary and poor members would have to make. *(Asides)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please; there must be order in this Honourable House.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for your protection. I heard an hon. member say something to the effect that something I said is a lie, and I would ask you to be consistent in your rulings. I will not stand here and let another hon. member shout at me about a lie. Last week I was accused of lying when I said that I received my papers on a Monday and they said it was the preceding Friday.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South is now being irrelevant. Will he please address himself to the Bill before the House?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my language at the time was a bit intemperate. I beg to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. SANDIFORD: You see, Mr. Speaker, why I have respect for the Hon. Prime Minister, and I am saying you should protect hon. members over here.
12.15 p.m.

To continue with the debate I suspect that one of the main reasons behind the inclusion of this in a blind trust would run something like this "to give a person in public life or a person seeking to be a person in public life the option of placing his assets in a blind trust so as not to discourage any person who is also a person of some wealth from seeking to serve in public life or continuing to so serve."

In other words now, you have one type of law for ordinary members but then you are going to create some little avenue called a blind trust which would enable persons of wealth – *(Asides.)* I am quoting. I am not certain where it comes from but I am reading it here "To give a person in public life or persons seeking public life the option of placing his assets in a blind trust so as not to discourage any person who is also a person of some wealth from seeking to serve in public life or continuing to so serve."

I do not know if this Resolution went before Cabinet. I do not know. I am not a member of the Cabinet. I am not a member of Prime Minister Adams Cabinet so I do not know if this was part of the argument put forward. I certainly do not know that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There is something in this country called the Official Secret Act. The hon. member is exulting in the fact that somebody has obviously broken it by supplying to him details of a Cabinet Paper. Is that permitted in the House? It is not only a Cabinet Paper but it is part of a brief which I supplied to the Cabinet Secretary. The hon. member might very well have his source within the Cabinet Office but I am not going to carry out any witch-hunt against anybody but is it normal in the House? I might have read it out. In fact, if he wanted to see my brief I would have sent it to him. I have sent briefs to hon. members on the other side but is it normal in the House to read matters which the Official Secret Act says must not be published.

On a further point of order, Sir, the hon. member really must pay heed. If he looks at the Act we have to set out how much is to be granted and each year you have to delcare how much it has decreased or increased. All he has to do is to look at the Act. All the blind trust does is to stop you giving the details of the assets. If you put $1 million.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, you are trying again to make a Third or Second Reading speech.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Alright, Sir.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Now you see I am talking about motivation and now I hear the disclosure that what I am saying here is part of the brief of the Prime Minister; that this comes from his brief. I do not get so close to the Prime Minister to see his briefs. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the question of integrity is one, as I have indicated, which every Parliament has got to face. This particular Parliament has now been brought face to face with this particular matter – Barbados Labour Party style.

I would like to say from the start that there were particular reasons. I listened to the countries which were listed. There were particular reasons in each of these countries why integrity legislation was introduced.

I heard the case of the United States and it is very well known that there was reeling in the complete fall in public respect for congressional life and presidential politics arising out of the Watergate scandal. It was necessary for there to be some legislation in the United States dealing with this matter of integrity and the code of conduct for members and the declaration of assets as publicly seen within the context of special circumstances operating in the United States in the 1970 period.

In the United Kingdom there were loud accusations about persons in Parliament operating as Public Relations Consultants and other charges also which led that particular Parliament to come to terms with this question and introduce certain types of legislation and declaration of assets as far as members were concerned but nowhere in the United Kingdom do you get the type of privileged position for members of Parliament and nowhere do you get the type of invasion of privacy as you get set out now in this Third Schedule.

That has nothing to do with Jamaica. The Jamaican legislation is only by the way. Jamaica had some special circumstances I believe in the early 1970's. I do not recall the date off-hand. It was sometime in the early 1970's.

Sri Lanka was mentioned and some other countries. In each of these countries there were special circumstances in the public life of those countries why Integrity Legislation was introduced in order to reform the law.

Now conflict of interest. I believe in something – you can tell me if this is coming from your brief.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: My brief is dated the 30th of November, if he wants the brief. He will understand the Bill when he sees it in full rather than in part. He can have it, Sir. It is dated yesterday. I can give it to him if he wants to have it. It is notes on integrity in public life with the Cabinet Secretary's note on it. If the hon. member wishes to boast of having perverted somebody to give him a private document he can have it. This is open Government. There is nothing secret in the brief. He can take it and read it through. I think he should. I had better give you the copy because it does not have the Cabinet Secretary's signature on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister is entitled to a final right of reply. I cannot have the Prime Minister rising and making four, five, six and seven speeches. It is not the proper thing to do and I will have to rule against it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I hope you will take particular note. Mr. Speaker, you have told the Prime Minister not to make a fifth, third, or second reading speech. He has already made his speech but I heard the Prime Minister say that I perverted somebody and I consider that that is imputing improper motives to me. This is the second or third time that these types of motives have been made to me and I am asking you to call for those words to be withdrawn because I consider that a reflection on me when I am spoken of as perverting somebody. I await your ruling.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: While the hon. member is awaiting your ruling, I beg to move, Sir that this House be now suspended until 1.45 p.m. and I can also assure the hon. member that the brief which the Prime Minister has offered to him he could look at it during lunch and digest it, Sir.

I beg to move, that this Sitting be now suspended until 1.45 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is suspended until 1.45 p.m.
12.25 p.m.

On Resumption:–

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I indicated when I moved that the Standing Orders be suspended that I would give the opportunity to members to do Private Members' Business. In that light, I beg to move the Private Members' Business be now taken.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time is the instant Order of the Day.

QUESTION RE PRESENT CONTROLLED PRICES OF PETROL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 22 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 22 reads as follows:

"To ask the Minister of Finance and Planning: Will the Minister state the breakdown of present controlled prices of petrol in respect of amounts allocated to the Refinery, the oil companies, the dealers, Road tax and duty respectively, per gallon?"

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, at the time at which Parliamentary Question No. 22 was asked the price structure for petrol was as follows: Refinery price 102.30 cents per U.S. gallon, marketing company margin 12.09 cents per U.S. gallon, dealers' margin 17 cents per U.S. gallon, road tax 106.14 cents per U.S. gallon, duty 4.54 cents per U.S. gallon.

Mr. TAITT: Is the Minister in a position to give us the current state of the movement of the amount for the dealers?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: As of September 1, 1979 the price structure which was then, and is currently now, Refinery price 178.7 cents per U.S. gallon, marketing company margin 28.68 cents per U.S. gallon, dealers' margin 22.62 cents, road tax 117.5 cents per U.S. gallon, duty 4.54 cents per U.S. gallon.

Mr. TAITT: Does the Minister intend that the margin of the dealer and the marketer should be equalised or equated as soon as possible?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That question, Sir, should be directed to the substantive Minister under whose portfolio such matters as those directly fall. I would draw the hon. member's attention however to the fact that the price of petrol, gasolene, is not entirely under the control of the Government acting on its own initiative, because apart from increases in basic costs that may be announced the Government is governed by what is known as the price structure set out by the particular Caribbean organisation which sets ex-refinery price as a basis that may not be immediately apparent, except in marketing terms, and that each price negotiation tends to represent not only negotiations with dealers and marketers, but also an examination of its application to Barbados.

The Government is currently reviewing the entire structure of the marketing of petroleum products in Barbados and reviewing its contracts with various oil companies which operate here; particularly the future operations of the National Petroleum Corporation will take all this into account. We have recently reviewed our contract which was negotiated with the Esso Oil Company for bunkering and other price charges at the Bridgetown Harbour, and I am hoping to be able to tell the hon. member whose interest in these matters is well known that we have persuaded the Esso Oil Company to make a number of substantial concessions by way of review for the Government and which represent contracts set as long ago as 1971.

I have no doubt that when the substantive Minister is in a position to report to the House on the operations of the National Petroleum Corporation he will do so either by way of a ministerial statement or by way of a response to a Parliamentary Question.

Mr. SANDIFORD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. We note that the road tax component of the petrol price structure has increased from 106.14 cents to 117.5 cents, and in view of this increase in the road tax component and the deterioration in the state of the roads, would the Minister consider a reduction in the road tax element of this structure?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I thank the hon. member for his question and his having knowledge that when a road tax on petrol was first introduced in Bridgetown in the 1920's its stated purpose was the development of roads suitable for motor cars to drive on. I assume the hon. member is fully aware of this. The hon. member's attention may also however be drawn to the fact that the road tax has gone up by 11 cents per gallon but the refinery price has gone up by 76 cents per gallon and the Government does not consider that to be excessive.

The point of the roads has also been taken. As a result of certain research it has been revealed that when the hon. member was a member of the Cabinet that decisions were taken to use an inferior quality of asphalt for repairing the roads, a quality of asphalt which if the rain falls within 24 hours of its being laid down is washed away and the rain washes away the road surface. Talks also between the Ministry of Trade in Barbados and the Ministry of Petroleum and Mines in Trinidad, talks which have been the subject of discussion as recently as two weeks ago in Barbados, are all in the direction of employing a superior grade of road repairing asphalt so that when we repair the roads we will not have to be repairing frequently in the future. Up to last Friday the Deputy Prime Minister and I were in London discussing the same matter and he was reporting to me that he had recently been told that the grade of asphalt which was used by the last Government to repair roads was known as "a make work asphalt", an asphalt that you use when you have a large labour force and you intend to repair the roads frequently.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Do I understand the Prime Minister is saying that he will reduce the labour force and not repair the roads frequently?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No, Sir, the Prime Minister is saying that he will apply an addition 6 cents road tax to get a better grade of asphalt so you will not

need such a large labour force for repairing the roads and the workmen can then be turned to on building the Spring Garden Road, the roundabout and the new road which will shortly be driven between Wildey and Haggatt Hall and the other major road works, the first for fifteen years to be seen in this country.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: A supplementary, Sir. I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister this: the people who are now responsible for drilling oil in Barbados – I am not sure who they are – have for the last three years indicated in various reports that they are producing one-third of the requirements of Barbadians, and we have seen different figures at different times. Could the Prime Minister indicate what is the current level of production of crude oil....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a proper supplementary.

Mr. TAITT: With the greatest respect, Sir, I have not finished my question.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a proper supplementary; that is the end of the matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would not have those figures so I could not answer the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: That brings us to the end of Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Private Members' Business. The hon. member for Christ Church East.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to proceed at this time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Suspension was taken, the hon. member for St. Michael South had requested withdrawal of certain remarks by the Hon. Prime Minister and I now ask the Hon. Prime Minister to withdraw.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I withdraw the remarks, Sir. I am satisfied that the hon. member for St. Michael South is in no way responsible for suborning or subverting public servants to give him the document he has. I believe he got it from one of his colleagues.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe, Sir, that this debate is proceeding according to the highest traditions of this Chamber under your enlightened leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I do not really wish the Government to be too concerned about the sources of my information. I believe any hon. member who has done adequate research on this matter could have got from public document information regarding the conflict of interest of members with regard to situations that have taken place in other Parliaments. Such documents are indeed available to members of the public, and I refer to one document which is by no means a secret document and is entitled "Members of Parliament and Conflict of interest", put out by the authorities in Canada in July 1973. As I said, there is nothing secret about this document which is a published document. I see the Hon. Attorney General has a copy; I hope hon. members over there do not believe that is a copy I had and the Attorney General now has. Rather, it is a document that could be available to all hon. members. The hon. member for St. George South is an expert on Canadian matters, having studied in that country, and he has taken a deep interest in things Canadian and he would know that these documents are available to members of the public. But the basic problem that Parliaments dealing with Integrity legislation have to face is a problem as to whether there should be disclosure of interest or whether there should be the avoidance of interest. These are the two approaches one may take to this problem – avoidance or disclosure. Under the principle of avoidance members are placed in such a position that they are full time members of parliament; they have no outside interests and therefore no conflict between their outside interest and their interest as members of Parliament would arise. I believe that there are a few legislatures which make such a provision – may be Tanzania and the United States – I am not too certain, but that is one approach, and under that approach members of Parliament would be paid a salary that would enable them to be full time members of Parliament with no outside interest; and in those conditions they may in circumstances make provision for paying their assets into blind trusts and such particular device. In Barbados this is not the case. Members of both sides of this House, from the time there was a House, always had outside interest, and I would put forward the argument that this House would be the poorer if members were not allowed to have outside interests. It would mean that if you were a printer you could not have an interest in printing; were you like the member for Christ Church East, a distinguished member of the Bar of this country you could not be engaged in your profession.
2.05 p.m.

It would mean therefore that if one were an Attorney-at-Law that one could not pursue one's profession at the Bar but would have to devote one's energies solely to the business of Parliament, that is, if you were following the principle of avoidance of interest.

I am making a simple point but there are two approaches. I realise the substance of the argument might be beyond the member for St. George South but if he would just listen and let me speak I think he would be able to follow. If, on the other hand, therefore, you have the other area of making provision for the disclosure of assets, the present provisions of this Parliament and certain lawyers in this country, I refer to the General Orders as they relate to Public Officers and I am relating also to this legislation as the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act, I believe it is called, certain provisions which disqualify members of Parliament and general provisions relating to Government contracts, all of these make provision for some type of disclosure and when a member is speaking on a debate in here he is supposed to disclose his interest, so that members, not that he should not have interest, but that a member will be able to assess his contribution against the background of his own personal position to see what influence, if any, that personal position may have had on the members' contribution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all members of this Parliament, all members of the public who are income earners in this country, have to disclose every year to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue and there is no way, Mr. Speaker, that your assets and your liabilities would not have some bearing on that disclosure that you have to make to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. Those are the present provisions.

Now if there is something that has suddenly arisen to establish that the existing legislation for disclosure is inadequate and that the declaration of interest is inadequate, so far we have not heard that on the Floor of this Chamber and so far nothing has been said in the public debate to indicate that the present legislation in this country is inadequate to deal with the matter.

As I have indicated, there were charges of corruption but a Commission was set up and that Commission cleared the Government and the major public officers of any conflict of interest or of any corruption and we rested with that particular Report. What would have to be told to this House is what has suddenly arisen in this country that would merit this type of legislation, cumbersome and inquisitorial. What is it that has made it necessary for us to be debating this today.

I have pointed out the circumstances in which it has arisen in the United States of America. Special circumstances operating, indeed both prior to the Watergate scandal and as a result of the Watergate scandal. I have pointed out the circumstances in Canada where there were special provisions operating in that country and why it is justified to come down the road to this whole matter and I would say now that as far as I can gather, this legislation is based on Canadian experience.

I have pointed out the circumstances in the United Kingdom and in Britain why in accordance with their Parliamentary traditions, not in terms of any codes or anything like that, but in terms of British Parliamentary Practice why they have gone for those measures dealing with the declaration of assets and things like that.

Here, in Barbados, we do not get those circumstances and to say that this is part of a Manifesto, it was also part and would be agreeing with me, and my contention, that this legislation, as before us, is part of the political policies of the Barbados Labour Party Government and that the ultimate aim both proximate and ultimate of this legislation is to attack the Democratic Labour Party Government and to keep the Democratic Labour Party Government out of power at the next Election but none of these tricks none of those devices will prevent the people of this country from making their decisions and making the right decision when they are allowed to vote.

Now as far as Clause 45(2) is concerned, after or if, because I am not certain yet; I am not certain if this measure will pass this House, because I am challenging those Government members over there to speak out on the Bill just as we are going to speak out on it here.

I am saying and I am charging that after this legislation is passed that members of the public who express any statement concerning a person in public life alleging that that person has made recent acquisition of wealth or property or recent financial or business dealings and matters of that sort, that they would be guilty of an offence and that the penalty in this legislation would be $10,000 or two years imprisonment or both and I am saying that that is onerous and that is wrong. I am saying that a Government should not try to brutalise the people in this way because this is what it is, brutality against the people of this country.

Now that fine of $10,000. Let me say something about it. In the Independence of Parliament Act, the brief, in Canada, there is reference to $10,000 but the brief refers to $10,000 which would be the fine imposed on a Senator for failing to disclose his assets

or for breaching any provisions of the Act and I want you to follow me very carefully, Mr. Speaker.

What has happened now is that they have taken the same $10,000 which the members of the Canadian Parliament would be called upon to pay and they have now imposed that $10,000 on the poor suffering people of this country.
2.15 p.m.

A whip to weal their backs, that is what it is, and that is why we are not going to participate, because this particular measure here is aimed directly, not only at muzzling free speech in this country, but also adding further burdens on the backs of people in this country, at a time when they can hardly bear the burdens they have to bear now. We have got to consider these things very carefully and understand them. The $10,000 has not been pulled out of any hat, because here we are looking at it. People who through the death of some person – maybe a parent or so – come into a small estate, something just over $1,000, find great difficulty to go through the types of tortuous exercises of taking out letters of administration to get something like one or two thousand dollars. They have to take out these letters of administration, they cannot get that $2,000 unless they go through some tortuous process to get that money, but we can find time to come down with legislation of this sort, if an ordinary member of the public gets up and genuinely believes that a member by recent acquisitions has increased his particular assets, whether it is true or not, he may be opening himself to being called before something called a Public Integrity Commission, and then his end may be $10,000, two years' imprisonment, or $10,000 and two years' imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if you were on these Opposition benches and the distinguished Leader of the Opposition, the best Prime Minister this country has ever had, if we had brought down legislation of this sort, I can imagine, you, Mr. Speaker, and the member for St. James from over here speaking and attacking a wicked Democratic Labour Party Government. Now you are over there – no, Mr. Speaker, you are on the heights there and you cannot participate in these debates – but I hope that none of your constituents from any part of the constituency of St. Peter would find themselves running afoul of this particular legislation, $10,000, two years' imprisonment, or both.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the principles behind this legislation are concerned, one basic principle is, as I pointed out, the disclosure of assets. But whereas people may believe that it makes provision for a clean breast of disclosure, then there is this loophole of the blind trust, and I am charging again that this particular provision is in this Bill in order to permit the wealthy and who may be in public office to stay. They say they do not want to discourage any person who is also a person of some wealth from seeking to serve in public life or continuing so to serve.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know that the hon. member would not try to repeat himself in this debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for reminding me, but as you yourself said – although I do not necessarily agree with you – that this is perhaps the most important piece of legislation ever to come before this Parliament. I myself do not necessarily agree with that, but I agree it is an important piece of legislation and it is necessary lest there be any misunderstanding whatsoever, we have got to underline, and it is accepted rhetorical advice, that emphasis should be achieved by repetition, and it is necessary to emphasise certain things. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Come out of the sun now, it is hot.). I have unlimited time here, do not try to muzzle me now as you are trying to muzzle people.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at these things which must be disclosed. Have a look at Schedule 3. Members of Parliament will be called upon to list the numbers, the names and the addresses of each bank account; they are called upon to say what cash they have and where they are holding it. If they have it under the pillow or under the bed or under the rock they have to say where it is held. They have to publish debts receivable. If anybody owes a member money you have to disclose the debts receivable and not only the debts receivable, but you have to list by whom payable, so if any member over there or over here comes to the assistance of any constituent – let us say that constituent lives in Burma Road or Farm Road, St. Peter – (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Or Bayville). Leave the good people of Bayville alone, they will come home with me again. Anybody from Farm Road, from Burma Road, or from Six Men's, St. Peter to whose assistance an hon. member may come, that is the constituent, the ordinary person in the street I am talking about now, this Government over there, look at them, that Government over there is asking that we all list who are the people who owe us money.

The ordinary person can pay a particular instalment, that is my understanding of this, list by whom payable, and if you are making a truthful return, and you are supposed to make a truthful return, because there is a penalty involved, you have to set out each individual who owes you money. This is the Third Schedule, and they are asking us to participate in that, to write down all these details. I would hope that they would get up and tell me that I am misguided on this particular one. This is as I see it here, not only debts receivable, not a global sum, not a total, but list by whom payable, and then it goes into investments other than mortgage investments

and business ventures. Well, I cannot deal very much with this, I am not in that heavy league, I do not have anything to put in any blind trust, I cannot get in that league, my interests are well known, I have outside interests like the member for St. Michael West, he works for a Statutory Corporation and I work for a Statutory Corporation.
2.25 p.m.

I am not talking about the BMC, I am talking about two educational institutions. So we have these outside interests. I am not getting into the investment part; I do not have investment brokers to whom you just give the funds and you don't know where they are investing them or what shares they are buying. As regards safety deposit boxes you must list contents and the purchase price; so if you have anything in a safety deposit box you can't hide it in there. Insurance policies – you have to set out each one of them and something called movable and other property. And do you know Mr. Speaker that if you have a motor vehicle you have to list it and give a description including the age; you have to put down the age of your car, you have to say whether it was by hire purchase or by loan? It may be a little Morris.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member while being given some scope in his speech should try to discuss the principles of the Bill.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will abide by your ruling but I am making a point that this section is inquisitorial and an invasion of the privacy of the family and the individual, and I am surprised that in this day and age a Government which claims it is representing women – you know the wives have to declare too? They have to set down if the wife saves something from the housekeeping money? If it is for everybody, I don't mind; if you want complete disclosure, let everybody disclose.

You refer to the Companies Act. The Companies Act refers to business people and I wonder if people of this country are aware that it may be necessary for business people to disclose their assets and liabilities; people of this country must be well aware that there is a provision whereby the list of those who have to disclose can be extended. And we have to disclose also how much money we spend each week on our household business. You have to disclose current household expenditure – I can only interpret that as the money I spend on running my household.

And Mr. Speaker, there is one basic principle that we should be well aware of in this connection. There is a principle, as I understand it from learned colleagues of both sides of this Chamber and from people outside this Chamber as well, that one principle which should not be included in legislation except under very special circumstances is the principle of retroactivity. But this legislation seeks to go back to 1976. I am saying that far from going back this legislation should be looking forward. I am charging that members of Parliament who have come in here under entirely different circumstances should not somewhere midway find themselves having to operate under circumstances in which the rules have been changed. And we recall that this matter of retroactive legislation under the leadership of the one and only Prime Minister of the West Indies Federation was one of the major factors in the destruction of that Federation. It is therefore not surprising that the second Barbados Labour Party administration is going back to this question of retroactive legislation, and I am certain that the results will be the same as far as the polls are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the disclosure of assets, liabilities and income expenditure is concerned, with me it is neither here nor there; I have nothing to be ashamed of, and if called upon to disclose, I as a law abiding citizen and a member of Parliament am going to disclose when you force this legislation down our throats. I will disclose, because I am not leaving Parliament. But what I am going to say further is this: The things we want disclosed in this country do not relate to the income of members in Parliament, their assets and liabilities and how much they spend on any particular item; that is not what we want disclosed. What we want to disclose is the circumstance under which people may be living; that they are not getting a fair deal under the present administration. These are the things we want disclosed.
2.35 p.m.

What are the circumstances which determine who gets a job and who does not get a job? Those are the things that people are interested in. These are the things that people want disclosed and if you are going to have open Government you have not done anything yet to show that there is open Government. Nothing at all.

In Sweden, I believe, any member of the public on paying a fee can go and see Government documents in the particular department. That is open Government but this talk here which you hear referring to disclosure of assets and liabilities and then you have a blind trust, this is what it says. *(Asides)* It is blind. You cannot see into it. You are not disclosing if you put your assets in a blind trust. You do not disclose in the same way as the member who goes and places his assets in a blind trust. You go and you put down some global figures and only if there is a query that the person operating the trust can reply so it is an entirely different situation. You get the impression that there is open declaration but then you have an avenue and a loop-hole.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side are not going to participate in that Select Committee and we are opposed to certain fundamental principles in this particular Bill and we say loudly that when we get back into power we are going to amend severely those particular provisions. *(Cheers.)*

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I went on a recent trip to China with the hon. member who just sat down and on my return on the 11th September, the aircraft on which I was travelling had some difficulty with its landing gear and I find the hon. member, who was not travelling on that aircraft, today having some difficulty in bringing his speech to an end.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the beginning that I share with the hon. member for St. Michael South two points that were made in his speech. There are only two points of substance that he made and he took a very long time to make them and he circled as though he had engine problems.

Before I deal with the two points, Sir, let us go back to the need for this Bill. It is well known that it was a Manifesto commitment of the Barbados Labour Party to introduce legislation of this nature. The ultimate details and terms of the legislation is a matter for rectification in the Attorney-General's Department and a matter for our discussion in here but if the Editorial of a Newspaper to some extent is reflective of public opinion, then the *Nation Newspaper* on behalf of the public has been asking for more than a year now, when was this legislation coming.

Mr. Cameron Tudor himself has asked us where is the legislation. Hon. members on the other side who have spoken publicly before the distribution of this Bill were calling on us to bring the legislation and today we are in the position where those who have been calling for the legislation now let us know that they do not want to take part in its discussion in detail.

It is not a question of bluffing. It is not a question that they do not know where they are going. It is not even a question of contradiction. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a matter of principle that even members on the other side of this House recognise that people in public life who hold positions of public confidence and trust are as it were, trustees on behalf of the general masses of people and we have certain obligations as trustees, not only in law but let us extend it to our present position.

People do not expect us to misplace the trust which they have imposed on us. Members on the other side are quite familiar with what happens in Election campaigns. Now you went in 1976 to canvas somebody and the criticism which you met was indicative of the level of criticisms which have dampened political life in Barbados. You heard, "What you want to get in power for? You want to thief just like them too." Members on the other side must have heard that.

You want to tell me that members now do not have their own integrity at state to want to see the day when that kind of criticism will disappear from political life and people would want to join us on our programmes whether it is on our motives if and when one is in public life and this is why I am calling on the Opposition to support the Bill not only in principle but in detail subject to such amendments as are hammered out in Committee stage.

We have a responsibility as members in public life to see that we improve the quality of public life and therefore bolster the general public confidence in us as Parliamentarians and people in public life. We will get outside and in the corridors out there and talk among ourselves how people are hard on us and the attitudes they have for politicians but now we are trying to give a lead by way of legislation the Opposition is adopting a stance of withdrawal from this legislation which, in my submission, can only help to bolster public trust.

It goes more deeply than that, Mr. Speaker. I may offend a lot of people now with what I want to say. Mr. Speaker, I do not care if I offend people now with what I have to say because it is a deep conviction which I have. If I may look at the matter historically perhaps in terms even of race, Mr. Speaker; all over the African continent it is clear since the days of Independence and decolonisation in Africa that as soon as a Government gets out of power in Africa, the ex-colonial Government, former people who were oppressed and dispossessed, would then assume positions of power and in running their own destinies they loose power and are automatically accused by the incumbent people of corruption. It is all over Africa. It is happening in the Caribbean too.

It behoves us therefore, as black people, if we are interested in the development of our race along the appropriate lines, to ensure that our behaviour, publicly, internationally or otherwise is of such quality that it bears respect throughout the World. *(Cheers.)* I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is an attempt to enhance the dignity of politicians in Barbados. The legislation is a code of ethics for us to follow.

2.45 p.m.

In the legal profession that Government of the Democratic Labour Party in 1972 introduced legislation regulating how attorneys-at-law were to function and they set up disciplinary committees and so on. There is a book published by a man called W. W. Boulton in England which you are given when you are called to the Bar which sets out

the ethics which you are expected to follow, but the members from the other side do not want to have a code of behaviour to follow. Why can't we have a code of conduct, I ask? I submit we must have a code of conduct. The hon. member for St. Michael South does not think that there has been anything in Barbados in the public and political life of Barbados to precipitate this kind of legislation, and yet not one of them took issue with the Hon. Prime Minister this morning on the introduction of this Bill, not one of them on the other side got up and disagreed with the Prime Minister this morning, the burden of his speech on that part of the speech was that members on the other side, not in here, of course, had been involved in less than honest and clear cut conduct while holding public office in Barbados. They did not disagree this morning with him. You will tell me that that is not even a reason for us now who are not so tempted and who were not so tempted in 1976 to want to clean up among ourselves?

Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member was speaking I said something in an Aside. The point I was making was that the Bill is onerous on us in terms of the requirements for disclosure. I have even said it seems to me I will have to employ a private accountant, all I want from the Prime Minister is an assurance that what I pay the accountant will be allowed by the gentleman over there in the Treasury Building who is in charge of tax. If they put me to that expense and it is a necessary expense, let me as a necessary expense have it allowed when I submit my income tax return.

What is the point of coming to this House with a wishy-washy Bill to allow Members of the Opposition to go and parade before the public and say, 'they told you about integrity legislation, look what they came forward with?' Let the public know that we are serious about integrity legislation, tight but not intransigent. We are willing to accept the criticism of the public and members of the Opposition on areas of the Bill which require amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if I may just quote the reason for conflict of interest provisions in the law, it is related to any situation where a person finds himself in a position of trust, such as we as politicians and people in public life are in respect of the people who sent us here, and in relation to private business, in relation to companies I would like to quote from a case of Aberdeen Railway Company versus Blaikie in 1854 where Lord Chancellor Lord Cranworth said on that occasion: "A corporate body can only act by agents, and it is, of course, the duty of those agents so to act as best to promote the interests of the corporation whose affairs they are conducting. Such agents have duties to discharge of a fiduciary nature towards their principal. And it is a rule of universal application that no one, having such duties to discharge, shall be allowed to enter into engagements in which he has, or can have, a personal interest conflicting, or which possibly may conflict, with the interests of those whom he is bound to protect."

From the 19th century people had seen the wisdom of not only outlining conflicts of interest but outlining even the semblance of conflicts of interest. We have recognised in our own system in Barbados that principle. I believe every Statutory Corporation Act has, not maybe in the Act but in the Schedule principles of conflict of interest, or at least calling for disclosure, that means the Chairman or members of the Board may have conflicts of interest. That is not far enough, business transactions and economic life today are far more complex than in 1854 when Lord Cramwell spoke, and we are entitled as legislators, not legislating for the present but legislating for the future, to anticipate circumstances by which people who perhaps did not have the standards as we have today, or where twenty four in this House have more yet find themselves in a position in public life and may do things which are disgraceful to holders of public office, and we have to legislate for that. Therefore I say the Bill ought to be tight, Sir.

In England, in the House of Commons a committee was elected and it reported. There was a register of members' interests in the House of Commons. The hon. member for St. Michael South, as far as I remember did not adhere to that, but there is a register of members' interests in the House of Commons. We have nothing so, we are now in a situation where you can have the register if you like of members' interest, but I do not believe that the principle of the Bill can be attacked seriously.

A criticism was made of the fact that wives have to disclose. If you do not provide for wives to disclose, they can get involved as well. I can invest in some property or something, transfer it to my wife or my son or something like that and still defeat the purpose for which the legislation was passed.

In the law of companies, as amended in 1967, they had extended the principle and it goes back to the basic philosophical concept that one of the pillars upon which any law is based is one of fullest possible disclosure. Similarly, in public life we should recognise that one of the reasons why people put us here is to expect us to behave properly. If we are behaving properly we should not worry about disclosing as much as possible to keep ourselves above suspicion.

My criticisms of the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I want to say categorically that when I read section 45(2) as presently drafted – and I do not believe it would have been intended to have been drafted as it is – there are obviously two sentences left out.

2.55 p.m.

"A person is guilty of an offence who makes a public statement, other than by way of a complaint made under section 34, concerning a person in public life alleging that that person has made recent

acquisitions of wealth or property or recent financial or business dealings, or incurred recent expenditures disproportionate to the known sources of income and wealth of the person in public life....." Obviously that section cannot be right, for where are words such as "falsely" which would impute motive into the section? The section should have words implying *mens rea* into it. Let me give a hypothetical situation. If somebody in public life placed a bet at Federal Racing Service and won $30,000 and I made a statement that that person had made a recent acquisition of wealth to the tune of $30,000, and I can substantiate this by calling on Federal Racing Service to show they paid such a cheque, I am liable to a fine of $10,000 or two years imprisonment. How can I be punished for telling the truth? Furthermore this must be nonsense because it does not give you a defence. If it does not give a defence, surely the best defence would be that it is true. And if there is no defence the whole thing as presently drafted is unconstitutional. And we shouldn't have to wait to test this in the courts. You have money to waste? You don't have to test it in the courts, all you have to do is to take it out. And what is recognised on both sides is the non-provision of a defence – a defence like truth which is already in the Civil Law, because if a man tries to slander me and what he says is true he has a defence; so there is no criminal offence. So I am suggesting that this section as presently printed is in error; I believe that some important words have been left out by accident; we are with the Opposition on this.

On the question of the blind trust: I have not been trained in North American law, but in the books I have read on English law I have not seen blind trust; I have seen secret trust. I cannot agree with blind trust because it seems to make nonsense of the Bill which calls for disclosure but then tells a man he has a way out; giving money to somebody else to manage and have no say in it; put his money with some one and know nothing about it and after five years find that he has lost his money? Foolishness. I cannot support Section 16 where the principle of blind trust is enunciated.

I support the principle of the Bill and I think hon. members on the other side on sober reflection as apart from the Sunday night meeting will see that the attitude of the Government is not one of wanting to muzzle anybody. This Government has had a great tolerance in allowing freer expression of views. I am not going to say anything about CBC other than to mention that even before I became Chairman of CBC in September there was full and free expression of opinion to the extent that the winning candidate in the last bye-election in St. Michael South Central could take it upon himself to abuse CBC on their own network. Other people – Eric Sealy and Dr. Gonsalves – who have opinions diverse to those of this Government can ring in and discuss any matter when the studio is open to callers on Friday nights. The record of the Government when examined is not one of wanting to muzzle anybody, and if this impression has been given on public platforms by the Opposition they have misled the public.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Michael South made some criticisms about section 45(2). He said that it is aimed at the little man who makes a statement about a politician and then finds himself having to pay $10,000 as a fine. The legislation says a person, any person and that refers to anyone of us. Assuming this is going to be the law, if anyone of us made a statement derogatory of anyone else we would be liable. It is not aimed at the little man and it is misleading to suggest that we are exempt.

I am not going into details, but I think that this is a good Bill for a Select Committee. If you have to disclose debts – if somebody from my constituency came to me in dire need for $20, must I write down that? I would give the man the money; I am not putting that down as a debt. But overall I am happy with the legislation.
3.05 p.m.

I am very serious, Mr. Speaker. I think that there are areas of detail where we can all put our heads together and perhaps it would not even be a bad idea if there could be a Select Committee since Senators are apparently caught by this legislation, a Select Committee of members from both Houses. I throw out that, where we can get a cross-organisation and divergence of views so that we can come up with something that is acceptable to all Parties.

I want to say this. The answer is not for the Opposition to stay off of the Select Committee other than to give the public the impression that they do not want to disclose anything they have. Stay off and see if this is not the impression they would give to the public that they have something to hide. I am reminded of the performance of the Opposition on Select Committees. We have had a number of them before, some that they themselves even called for; the Land Law for example, and they did not attend so that they themselves in recognition of their attendance or public responsibility have decided not to come on a Select Committee and they think that this is the way out because they know that their record on Select Committees cannot stand the slightest scrutiny. I can even read out the attendance and show how often they were not there.

Mr. Speaker, I will wind up by saying this. Lord Salmon was Chairman of the Royal Commission to deal with corruption, conflict of interest and so on in public

life. It came as a result of the Colson Affair around 1973 or 1974, an architect, and he said, and I quote "Legislation will help to stop the groundless suspicion which malice can now attach to innocent people and to a more convincing administration of openness."

I want to use those words in relation to the intention and purpose of this legislation that we are trying to introduce. "Groundless and malicious", and I would add, "suspicion", which can now be attached to innocent persons and also at the sametime to establish a more convincing administration of openness.

It does not however lie in the mouth of the hon. member for St. Michael South to poke fun at this Government when we talk of the concept of open Government. Here is one clear case of open Government. We are laying power in a Commission in which we ought to have the utmost faith because the provisions for appointment ensure that the Leader of the Opposition after consultation with the Prime Minister, will have the right to appoint one. The Prime Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition would have the right to appoint one and the Governor General would have the discretion to appoint the other so that there is no hanky-panky of restricting the Commission and to all intents and purposes it gives the fairest possible formula that the Opposition can see.

I started, Mr. Speaker, by saying that this was a Manifesto pledge and commitment. It must be presumed that in making up their minds how to vote the public turned by the rumours and the scandals of 1971 through 1976 decided that in our Party and in our Manifesto we were offering legislation and trying to do something to clean up the mess that was attached to people who were in public life. I assume that many of them read these words on page 2 of the Manifesto:

"After long debate in the last session, Parliament agreed to appoint a Select Committee on the Leader of the Opposition's Resolution calling for the introduction of Integrity Legislation for Ministers and Members of Parliament. However, except for the Speaker, D.L.P. members failed to attend the Committee meetings and it was unable to form a quorum." They failed, let me interject, Mr. Speaker, to sit on a Select Committee or they decided not to sit on a Select Committee.

It goes back to the days when they were in power and were refusing to turn up to meetings. "The Barbados Labour Party thus remains alone as giving wholehearted support to the principle of such legislation, which is increasingly being passed in other Commonwealth countries. The Party, therefore, repeats and expands the pledge contained in its 1971 Manifesto – It will pass legislation providing for members of Parliament, Senators, and politically appointed members of Statutory Corporations to disclose their financial assets and liabilities on assuming office, periodically during office and on termination."

The Manifesto is a document of this House. Since 1971 our position has been consistent. Since 1971 I can find no one in Barbados who is philosophically, politically or genuinely opposed to the introduction of this legislation. Today I have my doubts as to whether I can include the members of the Opposition within that category. I cannot include them with those people who are genuinely in favour of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to you.

Dr. HAYNES: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the question is, as this connotation applies, if we wish to put it in those terms, if one would believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for St. Philip North would try to suggest that the members of the Opposition are against the principle of Integrity Legislation. We have made it absolutely clear that we are not against the principle of Integrity Legislation. What we have made clear is that we are against a Bill that contains certain clauses which are highly objectionable in the sense that they are definitely in conflict with the rights of the people of Barbados to speak freely and without fear in this country.

We are against the inclusion of any such legislation, any provisions which would suppress the freedom of the people of Barbados. We take our stand on this because we feel that it is wrong. We feel that it is unconstitutional and we will fight it right down the line. Today, Mr. Speaker, as this debate continues we are witnessing the great falling down by the Great Combination again.

The hon. member for St. Thomas at one stage indicated that he did not know how Section 45 got into the Bill. The hon. member for St. Philip North has further indicated that he is as much against it as we are on the Opposition Benches. Mr. Speaker, it even goes further. The hon. member for St. Philip North has just read the Manifesto pledge. We have taken a position on the political platforms, the only avenue left to us in order to communicate with the people of Barbados that the Government should bring in its Integrity Legislation.

3.15 p.m.

We have called upon them to do this again and again on political platforms, even in the section which he read, page 2 of the Manifesto, it states very clearly that it will pass legislation providing for Members of Parliament, Senators and politically appointed members of Statutory Corporations to disclose their financial assets and liabilities on assuming office, periodically during office and on termination. Earlier today we heard the hon. member for St. Thomas make the point and give an assurance to members of Statutory Boards that under section 5 it would only

be members of Parliament and Senators and the political leader or an executive officer of a political party who would have to disclose their assets periodically, but that other arrangements would be made in respect of political appointees to Statutory Corporations, so immediately you see here the kind of political party we are dealing with, that right here on the floor of this House they will tell you they are implementing a Manifesto pledge.

I want to speak generally about this whole question of corruption in public life and integrity. Mr. Speaker, Government is by people governing people. No laws will ever prevent corruption in a country, and generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, the levels of corruption in any administration is a reflection of the level of corruption within the society itself, because there is very little intra-governmental corruption as far as I am aware, so corruption exists when there is contact between the general public and Government as such. Now, Barbados, unlike countries like Trinidad, Nigeria, has been blessed prior to 1976 with two administrations administering under the late Sir Grantley Adams who certainly administered the affairs of this country without anyone being able justifiably to point a finger of corruption at him, and under the hon. member for St. John, who although many an accusing finger has been pointed at him by the other side, nevertheless, though subjected to the scrutiny of a Commission that cost this country excessive amounts of money, that Commission was able to show that he too like his predecessor in office was able to run this country without any corruption at the political level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, prior to 1976 it is fair to say that this country, as far as the people in political life were concerned, was certainly relatively free from corruption. Why is it now that all of a sudden there is this tremendous demand for legislation of this kind? We have heard from the hon. member for St. Philip North that we must pass legislation in case people in the future should enter the Legislature and would not have the same kind of moral standards as those existing in Parliament at the moment. Mr. Speaker, it is also corrupt, in my view, to suggest that there has been any major phenomenon in respect of legislation controlling such matters as corruption or the question of political advantage on the part either of parliamentarians or the public service in this country.

As far back as 1908, I think it was, a Commission of Enquiry Act was passed in this country, as far back as 1929 a Commission of Corruption Act, and in 1963 there was yet another one, and all these Acts are on the Statute Book, so this is nothing new, there is nothing unfair about this apart from the question of a formal declaration which has already been dealt with in considerable detail by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Michael South. But, Mr. Speaker, what has really dragged the position of parliamentarians into the gutter in this country was the campaign carried out by the Barbados Labour Party between 1971 and 1976 alleging all sorts of acts of corruption against the previous administration. We only have to recall, Mr. Speaker, what they had to say about Caribbean Airways, what they had to say about Bath Plantation, what they had to say about Carib West, what they had to say about North Point and what they had to say about Golden Mile, what they had to say about International Seafoods, and, Mr. Speaker, at the end of all this they brought the Commission here.

I don't know if I have the time, but I think it is important for the record once again to read out the main conclusion of that Duffus Commission. I want to say this, at page 106 it is stated very clearly that there was no evidence of anything corrupt or fraudulent on the part of any Minister or any official of the Government or by any of the persons or companies concerned with the matters which were enquired into. That was the conclusion that Duffus came to. Since then I have been hearing that Duffus was correct. We were hearing that he was sent down the road where I live on several occasions, that Duffus was corrupt. However, I do not think that the people of Barbados will buy that, the fact is that it is the politicians themselves, not the people of Barbados, and not from the Barbados Labour Party because of the kind of attitudes they took towards campaigning during that particular period that has been responsible to a large extent for the state of affairs in this country in respect of the confidence that people have in persons in public life.

We have always looked forward to the Act, we have demanded it, but what we are concerned about is that couched within that Act there can be legislation destroying the rights of the people of Barbados to speak freely, and that is why we cannot participate in any Select Committee, because never let it be said that we are born from ancestors who were brought here in slavery, our ancestors fought to relieve themselves from the bond of slavery. More recently the late Sir Grantley Adams and the hon. member for St. John have brought this country to a position where we have a remarkable degree of freedom of expression, and we are not going to allow, we are not going to permit the son of the late Sir Grantley Adams who would never ever have brought this kind of legislation before this Hon. House to bring this here successfully, and we are going to fight it all the way, and we are going to fight it here on the floor of this Hon. House because we want our voices to be heard, not within the cloak of secrecy of any Select Committee. Let it be clear, because I want it to be known precisely what our position is so that there can be no distortion.
3.25 p.m.

We support the concept of Integrity Legislation but we are irrevocably opposed to any kind of legislation that destroys the freedoms of the people of Barbados, because when you look at Grenada, Jamaica or Guyana and see

what is happening in the Caribbean we have a responsibility and we on this side have an even greater responsibility because from time to time an administration get bogged down with a mass of administrative details. For example, it was only a week ago that I heard the hon. member for St. Thomas tell us what a wonderful administrative approach it would be to have one ID card for all Barbadians. That is Government's point of view. But did he reflect what the significance of this legislation would be in terms of the possibilities for the invasion of the freedom of Barbadian? He should have reflected on this aspect.

On the question of disclosure, I have no problem. The hon. member for St. Thomas has already disclosed everything that I own in Barbados, here on the floor of this House and then proceeded to say that under the new registration of rental of property they could collect the information from there. I have nothing to put in any trust and nothing to hide; my problem may well be to avoid embarrassing certain persons on the other side in declaring what they owe me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to look at some other aspect of this Integrity Bill. I have gone through the history of freedom of speech and I find that this legislation is fundamentally negative, repressive in character and draconian in spirit, with penalties which I consider so brutal that if Clause 45(1) and (2) should remain in the legislation, how many people in Barbados can find $10,000? A number of jails would have to be built.

There is another very important point to be brought to the attention of this House, that fundamentally the persons under our system of Government who are open to bribery are the people involved in Government such as Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, Chairmen of Statutory Boards etc.; not the Opposition. We have no fear of this legislation as far as disclosure is concerned; there is nothing anybody can offer us in Opposition. I suspect that the hon. member for St. Thomas would be much more concerned with what has taken place on his side than with this side.

Mr. Speaker, there was nothing in the DLP Manifesto about the inclusion of a leader or executive officer of a political party. This has been hinted earlier by another speaker of the other side. But I think this is sheer spite work where there are trying to silence political groups. But they cannot silence me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member suggesting that this legislation was brought through spite?

Dr. HAYNES: The draftsmen of the legislation. However, I would withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you are wise to withdraw.

Dr. HAYNES: There are one or two other aspects of this Bill which I would like to draw to attention. I believe in a free Press in a free country. I believe that a free Press particularly in a developing country is vital for the maintenance of democracy. I further believe and say that the only chance as far as I can see that developing nations from now on will have in maintaining democratic principles in the society is by frequent changes of administration. This conclusion is drawn from looking around the world. Other than that it is a question of looking very carefully and seeing what is happening with corruption in this country – Henry Christopher, Glyne Murray.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to attention that if the hon. member wants to refer to specific persons he must give notice.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to draw to the attention of the Government the importance of avoiding corruption in that area but I will at all times defend their rights to write whatever they want to write.

Mr. Speaker, there are many areas of concern that have developed in this country since 1976. There has been much concern over certain going-ons at CBC, at BMC, the Tourist Board, the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Parks and Beaches Commission and many other areas. In addition there are areas such as the Agricultural sector of the Barbados National Bank and certain loans made to certain members of the Barbados Labour Party from the Barbados Development Bank that I am very concerned about, and perhaps the hon. member for St. Thomas shares my concern in getting this legislation before the House.

As regards Section 45, this is one of the most wicked, pernicious and direct assaults on the people of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is following his notes quite copiously.

Dr. HAYNES: A lot of attention has been focused on Section 45(1) but I would like to quote Section 45(2) which reads as follows:

> "A person is guilty of an offence who makes a public statement, other than by way of a complaint made under section 34, concerning a person in public life alleging that that person has made recent acquisitions of wealth or property or recent financial or business dealings, or incurred recent expenditures disproportionate to the known sources of income and wealth of the person in public life....."

3.35 p.m.

In other words, if someone genuinely believes that he has a complaint to make to the Commission and that Commission determines that his complaint has been groundless, then he is guilty of an offence punishable by two years imprisonment or $10,000. The word "groundless" is in there. I would even quarrel with "frivolous, vexatious, malicious" perhaps, but certainly not "groundless" because that complaint might have been made in good faith and it is important to have a look at it and determine whether 45(1) should remain in there.

Already the Section of 45(2) has been dealt with very adequately and it is quite clear that everyone has accepted that as it stands, it is an infringement of the rights of the people of Barbados and that, and I take a legal opinion, it is legal nonsense and as I have stated at a public meeting a few nights ago, that although I am not a Lawyer, I took along my law books on the Constitution and so on and read and it looks to me certainly as though it was unconstitutional and I have made a public declaration that unless that is taken out that I would seek a declaration in the Court of this country that it is unconstitutional and exposes anyone who seeks to follow the Constitution of this country.

I am not just making this statement here today. I have made it before and I stand by it. I am very pleased to see that the hon. member for St. Philip North who is also an Attorney-at-Law and is in a better position to assess it against the Constitution of Barbados than I am as a layman, has come to this same conclusion and I hope that if we have to go to the Court, Mr. Speaker, to contest this that he would join me in that on behalf of the people of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few other points I want to make. This Integrity Legislation is in a sense, Mr. Speaker, very misleading because it is my suspicion that the vast majority of corruption that takes place in Government takes place at levels not associated with Parliamentarians whether in this Honourable House or in the Senate. My impression is that corruption takes place at other levels. There are also other areas.

What is the position of this matter in relation to gambling dens and so on? Does one have to disclose gambling dens and so on? What is the position, Mr. Speaker, in relation to bounced cheques? Now we have known that one of the major areas of corruption among Parliamentarians for a number of years has been the mechanism of the bounced cheques. It is not mentioned anywhere there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like further to say there is also an area where I think that politicians may have enjoyed a level and a degree of laxity in this country and that is in the area of obtaining loans, whether from public Institutions or Commercial Banks in Barbados without the usual collateral which the ordinary citizen would require. I do not wish to embarrass any person now. I can refer for example to a particular company who is in liquidation who has had a substantial loan from the Barbados Development Bank which I believe has now been transferred to the Agricultural sector of the Barbados National Bank but I do not wish to drag that side of things into the debate at this time.

In looking at this household expenditure and so on I think it is totally ridiculous to expect any person to give a true account of the amount of money that he spends in his particular house. If on your way home you stop off and buy a coca cola, if you buy some ice cream for your children that really and truthfully that sort of thing should be included if you are going to make a true return. It is almost impossible for anyone to truthfully give a complete return unless, as the hon. member for St. Philip North says, you will have to employ an Accountant and give him your returns from day-to-day and tell him how much you spend, how much your wife spends and how much your children spend and so on.

I also take issue, Mr. Speaker, with this question of requiring wives and children to declare their assets. I think that it should be enough that where a member comes for scrutiny by the Commission for the Commission to be able to call on the wife and the children in those circumstances and examine their financial position. I think myself that it is an unwarranted intrusion in the privacy of a family and I do not think it is necessary but I do appreciate the point made that people can siphon off money to their wives and their children but they can also siphon off money to Companies and other areas.

I question a blind trust. As far as this Honourable House is concerned the only member who I know likely to have the kind of assets that can benefit from a blind trust may be the hon. member for Christ Church West. I do not know. Do not get me wrong. I am not one of those people to come in here and run down black people because they either inherited or worked hard for their money. I want to make this absolutely clear.

What I am saying is that the structure whether or not one can benefit from putting money in a blind trust depends very much on the structure of your investment portfolio and probably the hon. member for Christ Church West, maybe the hon. member for Christ Church South Central and possibly the hon. member for St. Thomas but certainly in my case, Mr. Speaker....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member should put himself and the hon. member for St. John at the top of this; like the hon. member who owns airplanes and Cayman Island Companies.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who owns Cayman Island Companies and certainly I do not own any. I have said so before and I will continue to say so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have covered some of the main points in this legislation. I do not think that in half an hour I can do justice to it but I feel that in general and I want to reiterate that this side, this Opposition, is not opposed to legislation relating to Integrity or legislation relating to the prevention of corruption. We support it. What the argument is and we are fundamentally against is, any kind of legislation that will erode the liberties of people and I feel that as the Opposition, we have an even greater responsibility, in a sense, to take a stand on this matter and it is on this ground that we refuse to participate in the Select Committee.

One final point is that I am very pleased to hear the Government trying to suggest that 45(1) and (2) were inside there by mistake and that the general impression that I got is that they would heed the words of the Opposition reflected by the massive attendance at the public meetings and withdraw and remove that from the legislation and then I think that one would be in a better position to assess the true intention of the Government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I cannot imagine that with the speeches made that as well intention as the Integrity Bill is, that it could have caused such consternation among the ranks of the Opposition and one must wonder what it is that they have to hide.

I understand that this legislation which is called the Integrity Legislation seems to do two things. One, it is supposed to protect the private and financial side of people in public life and two, it is supposed to establish public confidence in the representative of the people. Now let us look at them one and then the other. It is necessary that anybody who wants to get into Parliament in Barbados and make a contribution to public life must not be tied down by any legislation.
3.45 p.m.

In other words, people must not be driven out of public life nor prevented from entering public life because of too restrictive and onerous rules about their participation in Government. On the other hand it is important that the public should feel that parliamentarians who are their representatives and trustees of the public confidence should continue to maintain that confidence.

I heard a lot of talk in the last two weeks or so which was reported about people on the other side on public platforms, and amidst all the welter of words, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has not yet zeroed in on those two fundamental principles. There was a lot of talk, the hon. member who just sat down showed off his knowledge of all the corruption there is in Barbados. He tells you who is corrupt and which Board and which Bank, and who is getting the money, and who is getting money unsecured, and who is passing on to the other, and all that. That is what the hon. member who just sat down related to this Hon. Chamber and yet when this Government is seeking to bring legislation to bring to an end all that type of activity he is talking about, and to give the public the confidence that we are prepared to by laying bare all our assets and liabilities to show that we are not getting rich behind their backs unlawfully or otherwise, we hear the Opposition decrying it, and if this legislation is to be directed at anybody at the moment it is directed against the members on this side. All the noise they are making, Mr. Speaker, the legislation is directed in the main at the people who are Ministers of the Government, the people who are running the Government, to make sure that they do not use their positions as members of Government to fiddle with the people's funds, so if anybody is to be affected by it in the short run it would be members on this side, and yet the hon. members on the other side seem bitterly opposed to what is in fact two very fundamental principles about legislation like this.

I have listened to the debate, and one of the things that has come through very clear to me is that the members of the Opposition do not even understand what this legislation is all about. They have used the terms "conflict of interest" and "corruption" interchangeably, and as far as I know conflict of interest has nothing at all to do with corruption, corruption is a criminal act punishable in the criminal courts. Conflict of interest legislation is seeking to prevent rather than to cure. They feel that if your assets and liabilities are declared on an annual basis and everybody can see what you are doing, and when you are passing legislation saying that Members of Parliament should not involve themselves in certain activities that are contractual with Government, that the likelihood of their being any corruption will be that much minimised, but there is this conflict over there in the minds of the members of the Opposition who really do not seem to understand what this thing is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that there must be some code of ethics for people in public life. I myself am not particularly disturbed at this stage about the poor image of politicians in this country – I have heard allusions made to it – where people believe by the very fact that you are in politics that there is something corrupt and dishonest about you. I am not too offended by that at this stage, but for the overall health of the nation it is necessary for us to take steps in a positive, honest and forthright way to bring an end to the circumstances in which that type of suspicion breeds.

Having said all this, Mr. Speaker, I must make what I consider a number of observations on this Bill. I myself would like to bring to the attention of this House and the members of the Opposition that other people have misgivings about clause 45(1) and 45(2), the one about making an offence of a public statement. The hon. members on the other side do not have any larger share of decency, honesty, sincerity or respectability in this country than anybody else, and all this talk about trampling on the people's rights and denying them their human rights, and removing freedom of speech and all that, you would think that the hon. members on the other side represent constituents but I do not. I am equally concerned about all the issues that I have heard mentioned and I would like to let the hon. members on that side know that they are not the only ones who have misgivings about it, the only difference between them, Mr. Speaker, and me is that I am prepared to go on the Select Committee and argue about it; that is the difference.

This section is as troubling to me as it is to them, but I am prepared to sit on the Select Committee and deal with it on the Select Committee, and I am not going on any public platform, Sunday night is a time for me to stay at home with my children, and I am not going on any public platforms and fool the people that there is a wicked Government in Barbados that is deliberately intending to deprive them of their rights to talk as they please, or if they talk things they should not talk they will pay $10,000 or go to prison. My lawyerly instincts tell me that something is wrong with that, and that is why I will take it up in the Select Committee, but not walk around fooling people that something so cruel, so heinous, so grave is happening to them and that the people on this side are callous and indifferent and ruthless and do not care about what happens to them. I consider that to be a serious insult to my own integrity and on the integrity of the members of the Government of which I am a part.

You hear all the talk about the question of the wife and children. That is one very dear to me. I do not believe that my wife is a politician, nor has she offered herself to represent anybody in this country and therefore I do not want anybody calling on my wife to make any declarations about what she owns. I feel very strongly about that, but equally, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to go into the Select Committee with any other members of the House on either side and put forward my views with as much virulence as I can put forward, and I am hoping that maybe my voice will be heard and it might prevail, but unlike the members of the Opposition I will not cop out of what is a serious representational role that is thrown on me. The Opposition says 'I don't like this and I am not having anything to do with it, I am not going into any Select Committee,' and this to my mind is a serious dereliction of duty. If you can go out there and tell the people that something is wrong with it, you have a duty to go into the Select Committee and fight it.

The same hon. members on that side who go around at night and tell the people that all hell is breaking loose with a piece of legislation like this, everything is wrong with it, you will get locked up and you can't talk any more in the society, then have to go out and tell the same people 'we had a chance to go on the Committee and talk with the other fellows and try to change it, but we said hands off that, we have nothing to do with that.'

3.55 p.m.

I want to know how hon. members are going to face the public on that. This legislation is not saying, Mr. Speaker, that anybody is corrupt; it is not – as the hon. member for St. Michael South says – a device or mechanism to take a second shot at any former DLP administration. This legislation is for the future declaration of assets to prevent in the future any form of corruption or the appearance of corruption. You know, Mr. Speaker, we say in this country that members of Parliament not only should be honest, must not be corrupt, but that they must shun every form of corruption. In short, it is not only what you are but what people perceive you to be. It is not enough for a member of Parliament to sit back and say I am all right, I do not take anybody's money, I do not steal, I am not corrupt, and therefore I do not fear what the people think. It is inherent that hon. members consider the public perspective of what politicians should be, and it is for this reason that the intent of this legislation is to give the public full confidence that members of Parliament are trying to show them quite clearly that they are doing something about various rumours that go around. For this reason I think that people who are serious should support this legislation.

I have listened to the point about retroactivity. I understand that the purpose of making this legislation effective from September 1976 is to give the public the assurance that we did not spend three years in office and are now wiping off those three years and starting from the fourth year. In going back to 1976 we are giving an account of our dealing from the time of taking over the Government. We did not say retroactive to 1966; that would make it seem that we were trying to get back at somebody; we made it retroactive to 1976 when we came into the Government, so that we can show the public that we have nothing to hide between 1976 and 1979. But an ineffective Opposition gets up and opposes something like this. We are prepared to show the people that there was no hanky-panky between 1976 and 1979, but an Opposition that jumps at every little thing gets up and tries to make the public believe that there is something mysterious about this.

The hon. member for St. Michael South got in here today and said that he did not see any need for integrity legislation in Barbados. That is a serious statement for any Parliamentarian to make who has to rely on the people's support and who has to oversee the spending of the people's money. I would really like to know what he is thinking. And the hon. member for St. Michael South Central says he is in favour of the principles of the legislation and then goes on for half hour to talk against it. There is not much that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central says that escapes my attention. He said that they were supporting the principles of the Bill. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is not easy for me to say a number of things I am going to say now, because I feel extremely uneasy and unhappy to be in the position to say that I agree with the hon. member for St. Michael South Central for a change. But I believe my duty is to put my position fairly even if it is uneasy for me to do so.

It is important that we consider that there are various ways in which a politician or a member of the Government can, if he wants to, be dishonest or use his wife as a conduit for illegal gains and hide them, and so when he declares his assets and liabilities it does not show what has been slipped to his wife. So I can understand what in the first place induced the framers of this legislation to go in this direction. But it cannot be reiterated strongly enough that there must be a balance between public interest and private interest, especially when the private interest involves politicians. And when I hear the hon. member for St. Michael South talking foolishness about this legislation giving privilege to politicians, how can you give the privilege to politicians and not to the public? I as a politician have to tell John Public what I did and open myself to public scrutiny. And he calls that a privilege? I did not know that this business of politics is one of the most fertile fields for masochism; I have never seen a bunch of professional people who seek to damage themselves more than politicians. So I must tell everybody what I did while in office. I get a feeling that I have to do this or my seat will be in trouble.

I also hear people getting on as though having money is a crime. I wish I had some. If I declare my assets and liabilities and my constituents see what a poor man I am they would probably say: "He is nobody; he cannot represent me." They like to support people who have money and when I say I have none I will have to fight twice as hard to keep my seat.

I find myself in a difficult position in respect of this legislation because I, like any decent thinking person in this community, feel that for people entrusted with vast sums of money and in a position to influence things to their own advantage there must be some code of conduct set up to control these people in their financial capacity. But on the other hand I believe equally strongly that you cannot take advantage of a politician just because he is a politician. And although he must disclose – and Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly prepared to disclose – it is a question of what you disclose.
4.05 p.m.

I am a little bit concerned about balancing these two factors. I am convinced that there is a code of ethics because I have always pointed out that the public's perception of politicians is not too good and if we are in this business it is incumbent upon us to do what we can to clear up those perceptions.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is or has been any wide-spread corruption in the Government of Barbados. I am not so naive as to believe in the infallibility of human nature and to believe that there has been no corruption but I do not believe that it has yet reached the stage where we have to consider it as critical. It is for this reason that I would like an Integrity Bill that matches the level of corruption in this society. There is no point at all in my submission, Mr. Speaker, to use the sledge hammer on what is at this stage nothing more than a small matter. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate for a fairly long time now and I believe it is fair to say that a fairly wide spectrum of views has been canvassed. I think the speech of the hon. member who just sat down was a very interesting speech and I should like to refer to a few points he made in a few moments.

I think that no one who has ever faced the public and said to that public "I wish you to choose me as representative for you" could possibly have any question about the accountability of those persons whom he or she would represent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, from the time there has been representative Government, one of the basic principles of representation has been or has been alleged to have been the accountability of the representative of those who he or she represents. Therefore, Sir, it would seem strange if any member in this Honourable House could get up and say that he is not in favour of some legislation established in these times which can be described as Integrity Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the members on the other side must attempt to make some political response from this side and therefore it would be in their interest politically to suggest that the members on this side are against Integrity Legislation. Mr. Speaker, any intelligent person who has been in public life and has been following what has been going on across the World in the last 10 or 15 years and has been privy to the Watergate scandal, the mini-Watergate scandal in Germany the business of some corruption in Britain and anyone who has been aware of the political campaign which went on

in this country in 1976 could scarcely say that he or she is not in favour of some form of Integrity Legislation, some form of a code of ethics or some form of accountability from those whom we represent.

I wish to make it clear at the outset that I did not understand anyone on this side to be saying that they are against the principle of Integrity Legislation. I did not understand anyone over here to say this and I wish to make the point that the hon. member for St. George South, who was not in his place, had so said and I wish to say that I did not hear him say so. I was sitting here and I did not understand him to say that he was not in favour of Integrity Legislation.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order. I am saying and I am saying again that the hon. member said that they were not for Integrity Legislation in Barbados. I repeat that.

Mr. TAITT: What the hon. member did say was, after having given a historical perspective of why there was legislation of this kind in various countries, he asked what was the particular thing that had happened, or he put it in another way, "I have not heard from the Government what it is that has led to the bringing of this legislation." That is what he said. We will have a chance to find that out.

Mr. Speaker, Watergate hit the World and there was suddenly thereafter a call from all quarters for some kind of Integrity Legislation and when the Barbados Labour Party campaigned in 1976 and before 1976 in an attempt to arrest the Government from the then administration, it went to the length and breadth of this country and indicated to the people of this country that the members of the then administration were corrupt and that the administration was a corrupt administration.

I almost fell out of my chair when I heard the hon. member for St. Thomas when introducing this piece of legislation, suggesting that all or most of the statements against politicians had been made by members of this side going back many years.

Mr. Speaker, just to give two examples. Even today when he was introducing the Bill, he managed to slip in, in the manner in which he is capable of slipping in, some reference to cement. Mr. Speaker, anyone who had gone around this country and listened to the platform of the Barbados Labour Party would have heard how almost all of them on the political platforms sought to give the people of Barbados the impression that I.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is accusing the Prime Minister of something about cement. What I recall very well is that when the Prime Minister was naming a number of persons, he gave me, Mr. Speaker, a list of names and he went on to say that there was something about cement. That is all he said. The hon. member now is worried about cement. Nobody said that you were in the cement field.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am not worried about cement but I am going to point out that on the political platform they led every single person in Barbados to believe, they, the hon. member for St. Thomas, the hon. member for St. James, and the hon. member for Christ Church West, all of them, Sir, led people in this country to believe that there was a cement deal and the records of this Honourable House will show this.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. He is accusing me also of saying that there was a cement deal. I am saying here categorically on the floor of this House that there was a cement business going on between him and Leo Leacock. I say that categorically. He has been seen at Leo Leacock's house over and over.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is well taken.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, it is the privilege of the House. As he has done before, he can say anything, and he says that there was a business going on. Get up and say what the business was and then come outside and say it. Of course, there was.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The cement business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George South has risen on a point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I have heard the hon. member for St. Michael South West with my own ears saying that this Government allowed only one person to import cement into Barbados and that was Jack Odle.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I said so and I believed it then, and it is a fact that if you go down and check who has brought in cement you will see that only one company brought in cement. I said so and I will say it again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe cement forms part of this integrity legislation that we are now discussing.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about it, because now that we have brought legislation they are getting up over there and they are trying to give the people of Barbados, including the Press, the impression that they are a bunch of little lambs that walked around this country with sweet innocence. Anyone who heard them, the virulence that came out of their mouths on political platforms, they should not have the gall to come in here and talk about who has dragged down us and who has not dragged down politicians in this country. Never

before in the history of Barbados has there ever been a campaign of vilification like there was by those members over there in 1976. *(Asides).* Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is in the public domain, and many of my constituents have said to me that it was the worst kind of campaign they have ever heard, and after they got into power according to one of the hon. members who is not now in his seat, apparently they had an investigation, a quiet, intra-governmental investigation, they searched every single possible avenue and then they said *sotto voce* so that the public could not hear, 'we have searched and we have found nothing,' and they did not have the decency to come back into the same venue and announce it. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: He has just invented that). Mr. Speaker – ask the hon. member who sits next to you – I want to make this point. Legislating and saying public integrity is not integrity. To say that you are bringing a Bill to preserve public confidence in the integrity and honesty of persons in public life is not to create integrity and public confidence.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something, Sir. How are we going to account to the Integrity Commission if an hon. member over there who is Chairman of a Statutory Board tells a deliberate lie to the public? How do we account for that to the Integrity Commission if one should do it?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. I am not sure that the hon. member is suggesting that members over here has told deliberate lies as Chairman of a Statutory Board, but the manner in which his phrase is being fixed, it seems to suggest that a member over here is telling a deliberate lie. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to protect hon. members over here from that sort of allegation which is very unfounded.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the question of integrity goes beyond reporting to an Integrity Commission. If a man out of principle serving as Chairman of a Board decides that in the public interest it is not desirable to do a particular act, and a Cabinet takes that man and humiliates him across the country, the question is raised can that be taken to the Integrity Commission?

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to go into details about these further examples of the kind of questions which are raised in this country about integrity in Government, but I want to turn to a particular point that has not yet been made. This legislation calls upon the Members of Parliament to disclose, it calls on their wives to disclose, and I am going to speak about that in a minute, Sir, but it leaves some discretion to the Executive to determine which, who or how many of the Chairmen of Statutory Boards would disclose. Now, under the Barbados Labour Party system of administration all those hon. members who are Chairmen of Statutory Boards would have to disclose because they are already Members of Parliament, but I wish to ask this question. Why will it be necessary and desirable that Ministers and Members of Parliament, all of whom it must be known by anyone who examines the administrative machinery in this country have very little opportunity to engage in really corrupt practices, why is it necessary and desirable that those Ministers, those Members of Parliament, all those Chairmen of Boards who are Members of Parliament must disclose, but those persons who may be Chairmen of Boards who may be among the most corrupt people in the community may only disclose if the Executive feels that it is necessary or desirable for them to disclose? But by the same token they turn around and call on the innocent wife of a parliamentarian and tell her that she must say how much money she spent at Goddards or wherever.

Mr. Speaker, there must be a way in which the wife of a parliamentarian or a Member of a Government who is suspected of carrying on some kind of shenanigan, that wife in legislation such as this can be ordered to come and make disclosures in the same way that a witness can be called into court to make disclosures, but I have to join with those who indicate that there is no way they could accept the concept of a wife having to disclose as a matter of course. The Attorney General, the hon. member for Christ Church West, walks around this country saying how he is for the freedom of women, and now he comes down here with legislation in 1979 and attaches women to their husbands like chattel, and I would wish to hear the hon. member for the City on this particular aspect. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The answer to that is to have no husband at all).

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be no cross talk in this Hon. House.

Mr. TAITT: But those who managed to get husbands should not be penalised, they should be allowed to get husbands in peace. If a women chooses to get a husband, must the Barbados Labour Party penalise her for that? I am reminded, Sir, especially if it is her own husband?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter for the law courts.

Mr. TAITT: We must have our moments of levity, but seriously, Mr. Speaker, you have heard me in this House saying how it is wrong that a woman's possessions or a woman's earnings should be attached to her income tax returns. I am unalterably opposed to that. Women must have some privacy, and when you come and say that all the wives of politicians will have to disclose period, full stop, what you are saying is that she is an appendage of her political husband, and Mr. Speaker, you know very well that the last thing in the world a political wife wants to be is an appendage to a political husband. *(Aside).* I am not familiar with the ways of the hon. member, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter.
4.25 p.m.

I believe that hon. members should address their minds, since we have heard at least two other members indicate their reaction to that particular part of the legislation; so I think Government should be prepared to move that bit of the legislation out altogether.

Now Mr. Speaker, I heard an interesting argument from the hon. member for St. George South as to the reason for retroactivity. It went something like this: The reason we are bringing retroactivity is to let the public know that we did not do anything between 1976 and today. Now, if Section 45(2) was not in the Bill that bit of logic could have some semblance of acceptance. But then they say if you say anything about it we will lock you up for two years and fine you $10,000. You say it is retroactive so that people will see that you did not do anything negative – you did not steal or get rich quickly but yet you come in Section 45(2) and say that a person is guilty of an offence if he says a person has shown a disproportionate amount of wealth. So this means that if I see a person suddenly come into a house like Ilaro Court, my constituent who is a keen observer would not be able to say look how so-and-so has a place like Ilaro Court. The point is that one would not be able to say that a man or woman in public life had come into a sudden manifestation of wealth. So in that sense what the hon. member for St. George South had to say is illogical; it cannot stand the test of logicality, so I cannot accept what he says about retroactivity. I go further and say that retroactive legislation is repugnant to all that we stand for in the democratic system. If they wish to have my assets, I must confess that I would be in much the same position as the hon. member for St. George South. But my constituents know that I am poor. I do not buy them drinks, they buy me, because they know that the Barbados Labour Party Government seem to be making sure that some of us do not eat; they know that attempts on the part of some of us to find employment outside of Parliament have been extremely futile; as a matter of fact, somebody's long arm is able to reach into the sub-regional agencies so that when a contract is offered to someone over here suddenly the contract is no more. I do not have enough time to reveal all of the depth of wickedness in this country.

The trouble with this legislation is that it is ill conceived and based on the necessity for them to keep a Manifesto promise after they were being prompted by us, and I have my doubts whether this legislation was drafted in the normal way that legislation coming to this House is normally drafted.

This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the Select Committee. What has not been said yet is that under the Standing Orders – unless I misread them – under Standing Order No. 61, Premature Publication of evidence, the Order says: "The evidence taken before any Select Committee, and any document presented to a Select Committee, shall not be published by any Member of the Committee, or by any other person, before the Committee has presented its report to the House." And there is another Order, No. 62(3) dealing with Select Committees which says: "A Report of a Select Committee may, on motion made, be referred by the House to a Committee of the whole House."

Mr. Speaker, you know what is remarkable – I did some research on this – since 1639 when the first Parliament sat in Barbados this provision has never been used. So that what we are saying is that we want to have certain questions on this legislation settled on the floor of this House. We wish to be able to question the Hon. Attorney General on various points; we cannot ask detailed questions on the second reading. We wish to go into Committee so that we can question the Ministers. I am not taken in by the facile argument that when you go into Select Committee there you will hammer out the details. This is a Bill that has a lot of politics in it. Select Committees in Barbados are not like in the United States where there are public Congressional hearings, and I think it is wrong to suggest that when a Bill goes to a Select Committee here it has the same kind of passage as in the Congressional system in the United States.

A lot of effort has been made to suggest that our not sitting on the Select Committee is a dereliction of duty; but it is because we were able from early – I am told by someone that there are changes to be made.
4.35 p.m.

We are told outside of this House that there are certain amendments which the Government intends to make and here it is they do not come and make those amendments first. There are going to come and tell us they intend to make those amendments. Well, Sir, perhaps if those amendments were made, perhaps if this Bill was properly prepared, perhaps, if the Schedule which my colleague referred to included household finances, perhaps if an ordinary member in St. Peter or St. Michael South West could speak his mind and say that such-and-such a Chairman, or such-and-such a Minister had suddenly got rich and not be in fear of going to prison, perhaps if all of those things had happened, there would be no need for one to wonder about a Select Committee or perhaps wonder about supporting this Bill and giving it critical support all the way through.

What I wish to make sure does not happen, Mr. Speaker, is for anyone to be left with the impression that they can go out and say that we were against Integrity Legislation. I say categorically that we are not against Integrity Legislation. We are against the system which

they have used to bring this Integrity Legislation. We are against the Clauses in this which would seek to muzzle, if they do, ordinary people if they do it.

We are against the Clauses which would give politicians a privileged position and again I touch on what the hon. member for St. George South said, the privileged position which was spoken of in the context in .45(2). Not in the context of household finances, but in the context of 45(2). It would make a political person or a public person as described in this Act immuned from the normal everyday criticisms of Barbadians when people should go to represent them and I am one of those people who believe, Mr. Speaker, that if I go and offer myself to the people of this country that I shall be their representative, I have made a contract with them that inherent in our agreement, is their right their unalienable right to criticise me, including sometimes telling lies on me because sometimes men who should know better, people who are better trained, like the Hon. Minister can go on platforms and tell lies but they the ordinary people, ought to be able in the course of their cultural and social development should say what they think. The laws of libel and slander deal with those people if it is necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is necessary to remind the hon. member to bring his speech to an end.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I will finish by saying that the members on my side will support the principle of Integrity Legislation for all times. We cannot support any legislation which would take away even one iota of the unalienable right of the people of Barbados. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I had no intentions of speaking on this particular Bill but I believe the hon. member who has just sat down made an allegation and I believe that it is time that all the facts concerning this matter should be disposed of and bring to an end once and for all this allegation.

The hon. member spoke and confirmed the statement made by the hon. member for St. George South that he said that only Jack Odle was entitled to bring cement into this country. Now we are talking about Integrity Legislation. We are talking about how one Government acted in relation to its members and the public in general and I believe if there was a dispute between the hon. member and the hon. member for St. James, dealing with cement, I do not see why he should involve other people in a dispute when he fully well knows the facts about the importation of cement into this country.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member will give way, Mr. Speaker. The point was made by the hon. member for St. George South and I do not think for the reasons which the hon. member is now saying that I had to expand on the point. What was actually said was that the Merchants in Bridgetown had now got control of the importation of cement. I am saying what was said for him to hear and I repeat it so that I do not wish the hon. member to suggest that I know the facts and I called the name of an hon. member in here in a conversation. Anything I say in here I can say outside.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the system of importing cement into this country was started when I was Minister and I can tell you what it is. I took office and I found that one Leo Leacock had a letter as the sole importer of cement in Barbados. He brought it and showed it to me. I said I had nothing to do with that letter. We published in the Newspaper that anybody was entitled to bring cement into Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: I supposed it was an unsigned letter.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: No, it was a letter from a Government Department. The position is that anybody can bring cement into Barbados. I want to make it absolutely clear that anybody can import cement into Barbados. There is a system which has been devised that importers are requested to quote what they can land cement at in Barbados.

Cement is now brought in by West Indian Supplies and was offered to Harrison's. Harrison's refused to deal with it saying that they thought it was surplus cement coming in from Nigeria. The next thing I knew that of all the quotes West Indian Supplies in quoting cement, were the lowest quotes available, and the Government acting in conjunction with the distributors because the quotes come to distributors in Bridgetown and they tell the Government these are the lowest quotes, these are the figures we are going to work on and set your price on this. There is no one man importation of cement into Barbados. If you are saying it on political platforms it is time you tell the people the truth.

I heard today every member on that side criticising paragraphs 45(1) and (2) and saying that you cannot talk freely in Barbados any longer. In here I heard members on that side talking about freedom of the Press, freedom of expression and all of those freedoms. It is the freedom you need to stop telling people untruthful things. It is easy to find out.

If you want to bring in cement tomorrow all you have to do is to give a quote in Bridgetown and see how you will fare. I would like to see the day when that system is abandoned. You would not be able to charge John X, somebody from the Democratic Labour Party, somebody from the Barbados Labour Party or somebody

from the People's Pressure Movement of being involved in any bribery or anything on cement and therefore it is time that we really look at what is Integrity in this country.

The hon. member talks about the Select Committee. I believe it is for political purposes that the members on that side say they will not go on a Select Committee on this Bill and if you really look at the Select Committee and if you look at how they operated in their time, the Severance Payment Bill was brought down to this House in a hurry. It was sent to a Select Committee of which I was a member and when I said the Bill was in total confusion and you needed more time to really look at the Bill to make it a workable proposition in the country, I was told by a member from the Government at that time, Frank Walcott is killing us for a Bill, we have had two serious fires in Bridgetown, what is now known as Norman's House and Cave Shepherd had been burnt down, people had been sent home and they were pleasing the Union at that time.

The Bill was brought down to a Select Committee. On the floor of this House I asked that the Bill be sent back. The Select Committee is the place where both sides can say what they feel or make amendments and that is why I say for political reasons, the member is not being truthful.

When the Medical Practitioners Bill came to this House and the Dental Practitioners Bill, both went to Select Committee. We had people in Barbados who were extracting teeth and who were not qualified Dentists. 4.45 p.m.

They were allowed to go before the Select Committee and state their case and petition the members of the Select Committee, so when they try to tell the Gallery and the public that in the Select Committee there are no hearings like the U.S. Congress, it is not true. Any member of the public can write to the Chairman of the Select Committee and ask to be heard on any Bill before the Select Committee, but they do not tell the public the truth on these things. You say you are not going into a Select Committee, why must you then go out in the night air when you can stand on a platform to have the Public Order Act to protect you from people heckling you in the crowd and telling you you are not telling the truth, but when you come to a Select Committee where the facts must be written down, where you must put forward your case, where you must put forward your views, you run from the Select Committee.

What then is Parliament? That is what we must ask ourselves. How does the Democratic Labour Party intend to run this country? Out on the political platforms? What is Parliament for? I once heard a member of the DLP say that Parliament is the worst place out that he regretted the days when he had to come to Parliament. I heard that on many occasions. Is it that we are now reaching the stage when they want people's law No. 1 and people's law No. 2? Don't you do it in Parliament any longer? The same Keith Rouse whose name I heard in here today, I had to advise him on the Dental Practitioners Bill, and I told him to go before the Select Committee, if your interest is being jeopardised, go before the Select Committee and put your case, and that Government listened to the likes of Keith Rouse, the Dental Mechanic, in a Select Committee. The hon. member there was Minister of Health at the time, and he is the one that started off this morning by saying they are not going into the Select Committee. How strange can you get? You vote a Select Committee and you invite the members of the Opposition to sit down with you on a Select Committee to produce a Bill which satisfies everybody in the country.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation. Mr. Speaker, on the Opposition benches we said we are not serving on this Select Committee on this Bill. I myself have served on a Select Committee already during this Session, it is this specific Bill we are talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of elucidation.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with this Bill, a Bill that they recognise is needed in the country? A bill they said they are suffering under, a Bill which they say is intended to keep them out of power, and why are they now not going on the Select Committee? You know, it is like the Budget Speech. We are not going to talk on television, we will talk in the market square. Soon from now I wonder if they will decide they are not coming in here at all.

Mr. Speaker, all I would like to say in conclusion is that the people in this country should be rather careful. In the Caribbean day after day you hear about overthrow of Governments, you hear of promises of elections, but then you get people's law; that is all I have to say. The people of the Caribbean should take stock of what is happening and wonder if parliamentarians do not want to join in the parliamentary system in which they have served before and because they are not now the leaders they want to stay outside. Be very careful what you hear and be very careful what you do. That is all I have to say on this Bill.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my short contribution to this Bill also, and in doing so I would want to recognise what we see coming out of this debate here so far today. The hon. member for St. Joseph who has just sat down posed a very pertinent question, one which is occupying the attention of the members of the Opposition, and obviously already occupying the attention of members of the Government,

and most certainly occupying the attention of the members of the public of Barbados, and the question which he posed is what is wrong with this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate not only members of the Opposition but certainly so far two members of the Government side and most certainly other members who will be speaking on the Government side have indicated very clearly a number of shortcomings in this Bill, and the Opposition has indicated that as far as we are concerned the way in which this Bill is drafted we could have no part to do with this piece of legislation.

In introducing the Bill this morning we had a number of statements from the Hon. Prime Minister, and one of the statements which caught my attention was one which was made to the effect that we are putting forward a Bill which enshrines a principle, and if we take that and analyse it and then apply it to this Bill we will see – and certainly we in the Opposition remain firm and confirmed in the view which we have taken on aspects of the Bill as outlined by the previous speakers – and certainly if a Government can say that it is enshrining certain principles in a Bill and then included in that Bill you have the notorious section 45(1) and (2) on which a lot of discussion has already taken place, then one can see very clearly the reason for the objections of the Opposition, and most certainly the kind of pressure which has been built up in this country as a result of the public awareness campaign which was conducted by the Democratic Labour Party, it would seem as if the Government has now taken the position that it would have to change its mind on what appears to them – and certainly from what the Prime Minister has said – as a principle which is sought to be enshrined in this Bill.

We cannot and would never accept that as any kind of principle. Certainly we are on the side of freedom of speech, and the possibility to allow anybody in this country to get up and make any kind of comment within the confines of the law, of course, and we recognise that there are laws here governing the whole question of libel and slander.

If I may move, Mr. Speaker, to some of the other aspects of the legislation which have not been dealt with in any kind of detail, the kind of principles which we see enshrined here. In certain parts of the Bill there is talk about the aspect of a Commission, and the way in which the Integrity Commission is going to function, the autonomous nature of the Commission and what have you. There is a provision in the Bill for the Commission making a report to the Prime Minister for tabling in both Houses of Parliament. I believe that in the introduction to this bit of legislation the Prime Minister should have given this House information as to the nature of that report, at least the kind of report which would be forthcoming on the Table of the House. Whether, for example, the report which is made to him by the Commission would be the same report which would be filed and become a document of the House, or indeed if the information which is given to Commission would be contained, at least all the information would be in that report and therefore would be filed as a document of the House.

4.55 p.m.

These are matters which have got to be explained.

And then Mr. Speaker, we read in the Bill about unauthorized persons and so on. I am not clear about the full import of this particular provision because it seems as if there are a number of loopholes for information to get into the hands of persons who in the Bill can be considered as unauthorized persons.

As you are no doubt aware, Sir, there are a number of people in this country who are concerned about this piece or legislation; concerned about the way in which the Government on one hand professes it is in favour of human rights and on the other hand brings down legislation which seems to limit that kind of freedom and does not do justice to human rights.

Another point which we have got to make relates to the question of retroactivity. I have heard a lot of talk, particularly in the last session of Parliament if I remember correctly, by the hon. Attorney General who used to make this point very clear about how wrong it was for any Parliament to pass legislation that was retroactive in nature. We therefore have to ask ourselves what really is the purpose of this retroactivity as it applies to certain sections of this legislation, because as I understand it the retroactivity does not apply to all aspects of the legislation as it appears drafted at present, and certainly there is need for some explanation on this particular point.

This is a very serious bit of legislation. The point has already been made that as far as the Democratic Labour Party is concerned we are not against the principle of integrity legislation; indeed I believe you are aware of the fact, Sir, that in 1976 I think when a Resolution was adopted in this Chamber about integrity legislation the Democratic Labour Party took the point, and I am sure that if we in the Democratic Labour Party had an opportunity to draft the legislation we would not draft this kind of legislation with the kind of provisions which seek to prohibit people from getting up and making statements about people in public life even if those statements are true. So we must fight this legislation down the line because we recognize that there are people in this country concerned about this and we therefore cannot allow this legislation to pass in this particular manner. We feel that the legislation is of such a nature that we would like to discuss all aspects of it in a Committee of the whole House because, as the hon. member for St. Michael South

West has pointed out, there are a number of matters we would like to raise on the floor of the House and not in the confines of a Select Committee, because the rules relating to a Select Committee are very confining. We think that a Government which professes to be an open Government -- and I heard the kind of contribution made by the Hon. Prime Minister this morning -- a poor contribution -- and a remark made by the hon. member for St. Michael South when he was speaking on behalf of the Opposition, and the impression one got was that the Prime Minister did not want to discuss the legislation in here; he wanted it discussed in Select Committee. We feel that this is a matter of public importance and one which has got to be discussed in the open for people to hear and see the various stances taken by people on this legislation. I would like to repeat the call of the Opposition for a free vote on this matter; let every individual member of this House have the right to vote according to his conscience on this piece of legislation, for it is a fundamental piece of legislation and I think that some of the Clauses in the legislation are contrary to decency, particularly when it comes to the question of making public statements.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might assist the hon. member at this point. This House has the right to give instructions to any Select Committee as to how it must conduct its business.

Mr. GREAVES: Now, Mr. Speaker, when this morning the Prime Minister indicated that the Second Schedule and Part II of the legislation will apply only to those persons in respect of a conflict of interest – I am on this question of retroactivity – what we want to find out is whether or not retroactivity to 1st September, 1976 would also apply in this area.

On the question of blind trust. Will retroactivity to September 1976 apply also to those persons in public life who had placed their business in blind trust? One must also remember that the hon. Prime Minister, some time in 1976 or 1977 I think, making a public statement to the effect that his Ministers had already made a declaration of their assets to him. Will this declaration be filed before the Integrity Commission is set up? All of these are matters which concern the public and on which we need to get some clear position from the Government. I think it is very clear what the position of the Opposition is on this matter.

I want to reiterate that we are not opposed to the principle of integrity legislation but the Bill as brought back cannot have the support of the Democratic Labour Party.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I did not think up to yesterday afternoon at a Parliamentary meeting of the Party that I would speak on this Bill; but after hearing a number of persons from the other side and outside, I would be failing in my duty if I did not make my contribution. As I understand it, according to the procedures of Parliament, when Bills come down to Parliament often there are errors – errors of omission, Bills can be withdrawn or Bills can be sent to Select Committee before they have a third reading and the assent of the Governor General. That is my understanding. A Bill therefore of this magnitude one would have expected responsible Parliamentarians to be of the opinion that a Government, and a responsible Government would have sent the Bill to a Select Committee. At this moment there are Bills still in a Select Committee on which members of the Opposition have either failed to sit or have been appointed to the Committee and have failed to attend Select Committee. 5.05 p.m.

I am not a Lawyer. This is the Lawyer's job, drafting legislation. That is the job of the Attorney General and therefore I am going to speak as a person ignorant of drafting. I cannot understand how in the opening remark of nearly every single speaker on that side they claim they are in favour of the principle of the Bill which we are now debating; the principle of the Bill.

They are in favour of the principle of the Bill therefore if I were in that position, I would have immediately allowed it to go into Committee. I would let it go to Committee stage and then in Committee stage, Clause by Clause you make your points, see if the Government will agree to any deletions, and the regular proceedings, then the third reading and then to the Governor-General.

I was in Opposition and I am thankful for my years in Opposition. Most often you must find something to say at nights, unlike the Leader of the Opposition who I remember very well said that he does not like public meetings. He said at Well House that he did not like public meetings, that the people should be in their houses sleeping instead of him being out there keeping them up. All of this he said at Well House. Now the very Leader of the Opposition is going across the country telling people that he brought in 3lbs of salt from the Caicos Islands and 1½ pt. bottle of Puerto Rican rum and picked up a few books in Photo print.

That sort of nonsense a big former Statesman, a member of Parliament, that is his contribution now for night talk; the same person who disliked public meetings. They must find something to say. A few weeks ago it was a member of the Party killing somebody. That like it has cooled down a bit. It was the Chairman at the B.M.C. and Richards. That like it has cooled down. It was the member for Christ Church North Central, he was reshuffled and that has cooled down a bit.I said they should starve, that has cooled down a bit, so they must have something to say.

What are they saying? Forty-five (2) says that it stops you from cursing at night. That is what they are saying. They do not remember, and the Leader of the Opposition in particular cannot recall the things he said about the Attorney General, how the Prime Minister was a mangoose and a trickster, and they could not address him. All of those things were said.

For me, Sir, I was a libertine. A person who had more bounced cheques than me was my father. Joy Edwards did not belong to that Party. All of those things. They said that I used to lie down on Irene Lucas' shop counter drunk with the flies in my mouth. Look the bird there. The hon. member for St. John. They said Adams gave us $3,000 but I had only received $1,500 and so I was quarrelling; all of that.

Now that we have brought about legislation to stop that sort of behaviour they are quarrelling. You agree with the principle. The Leader of the Opposition, look at him sitting down. He talked about his toe getting amputated. All of that sort of nonsense you are hearing. That is what you are telling young people and hoping that they would vote for you, talking about 3 lbs. of salt and a 1½pt. bottle of Puerto Rican rum. They do not want to hear that. What they want to hear is what is the position of the country. What is the economic position.

I want to hear the hon. member for St. John, as a former Minister of Finance tackling this Government on (a) Jobs; (b) Production; (c) Economic position; (d) the country's foreign policy and (e) Corruption. I want to hear that being talked about. I want to hear you tackling us about the $20 we gave the old aged pensioners, a raise from $13 to $20 in three years. That is what I want to hear about. The 14 year olds have gone back into school. We want to hear about these things. The Polyclinics, that is what we want to hear about. I do not want to hear about 45(2). They say they agree on principle and the simple procedure after that is into Committee and you sit down and determine what you are going to put in and what you are going to take out.

If the Government in Select Committee refuses to go along with the deletion of 45(2) or 36(1) then you have an argument to take to the country. You have no argument now. You go into Select Committee and you can say we feel that that aspect of the Bill is wrong. It tampers with the people's right and their freedom of speech. Those are the things which I believe can be dealt with when you go to the Select Committee. Do not go out there first trying to drum up support by saying that we are stepping on people's rights.

There is another part of this Bill which I want to touch on. I want to deal with the small man in public life in this country. I am a product of the small man. The Leader of the Opposition used to go to school with two Alsatians and two Dobermen in a coach. I had to go to school sometimes barefooted. That is the difference between the rich and the poor man. I am going to define the small man now.

Now I recall only a few months ago I was on my way to Parliament *(Asides.)* The Prime Minister too, he has an Alsatian and a Doberman. As I was saying I was on my way to Parliament and this is how people get mislead. A young man looked at me and said to me "Craigy, boy, you are driving a car now since you are a Minister."

Now my friend over there, not my Chinese friend, the member for St. Michael South West, the demoted General, learned to drive on my motor car in 1959. He had a motor bike which I used to learn to ride on and I learned him to drive on my motor car.

Now the member for St. Michael South Central, I used to drive him about in my motor car. Look at him there. I used to carry him at the Green Dragon and give him drinks and food. All that pretty work. I am going to read you out.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member said that in 1959 he used to carry me somewhere and give me food? Mr. Speaker, I was in Scotland then.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the hon. member was present.

Dr. HAYNES: I was in Scotland in 1959, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, you see he is so eager to hear what I am saying that he would not wait. I said that in 1959 that I taught the hon. member for St. Michael South West to drive on my motor car and the member for St. Michael South Central used to drive in my car in 1959. You never drove in my car? I took you to Rockley. I took you to Gary Sobers and introduced you to him, down by Dover Beach. You do not remember this, the great Sir Gary Sobers?
5.15 p.m.

This conveyed to me that you have to be a Government Minister, you have to be in something to be able to drive a motor car, because only since I became a Minister I was able to drive a motor car.I am in a very sensitive Ministry and this legislation is to protect people like me in particular from John Public. I am going to read a letter that I wrote to a man called J. N. Boos, this is the sort of bird you have to deal with, he is some multi-millionaire from Trinidad who is dealing with the Rockley Golf Course Club. I am going to read it to you and let

you know who you are dealing with. They cannot bring any carrots to me, my children are all grown up and I am safe.

Mr. Boos is Managing Director of the Rockley Golf Club and Resort, the Chairman, the big work. He called me up on the phone and told me he had a very urgent matter to discuss with me and I said to him he will have to come and see me at my office because I like the Permanent Secretary or somebody around to hear what is going on. He insisted he wanted to see me at my home. I told him, 'you come'; he said he could not come right away. I said, well give me an idea what it is all about. He had a problem, he said, with Town Planning that after he had built Phase I and he was given permission, he was seeking permission for Phase II and the present Chief Housing Officer in my Ministry, Mr. Allan Jones, then Acting Chief Town Planner, said he could not give the permission because it was not in keeping with the laws of Barbados. Mr. Boos knows now that "Lambie" was born poor so "Lambie" wants money. This is what I am dealing with, this is what the Bill is all about, to protect people like me. He knows that "Lambie" is hungry, that "Lambie" is starving, so he with a piece of change will come up, and he had the gall after I refused to see him to tell me that he would take the matter to the Prime Minister and to the Press. One Peter Boos. Well, you know I went staring mad, Sir, I don't live at the Prime Minister. This is the sort of Minister you are dealing with, and this is the type of Ministers I believe you have on this side that can side-step the corruption and the things which are dangled in your face. This is the letter I wrote to Mr. Boos:

> "Dear Mr. Boos,
>
> I am in receipt of your letter delivered by hand dated 23rd February, 1979 on the above subject, the contents of which are noted and clearly understood.
>
> In paragraph 1 you stated that I had promised to give you a decision by Wednesday, 14th February at the latest. It is obvious that you misunderstood what I said during our telephone conversation. What I did say was that I would get back to you on the matter by the 14th instant, since I had then to examine the problems you were complaining about.
>
> You should expect that as a person holding a responsible office I would have to investigate the matter before I meet with you or your agents in arriving at any decision."

This is a 14 million dollar job, Mr. Speaker, Rockley Golf Resort, $14 million in business.

> "The matter complained of fell on a sympathetic ear in the light of information given me to the effect that interest payments were in the order of $3,600 a day which I note from your letter are now in the order of $1,400 a day.
>
> You have admitted that having failed to reach me by telephone your only recourse was to give a very rude message to my Secretary. You may recall that I returned your call on that day and you confirmed that the message which my Secretary conveyed to me was a true version of what you had said.
>
> I can only conclude that you are attempting to intimidate me when you confirm the message given to me that you had said you were going to take this matter to the Prime Minister and to the newspapers."

Can you imagine a man out of Trinidad, Mr. Speaker, is coming up to me – this is what this kind of thing is all about – I am sure that if Boos had given me money that at some future date I would have to declare how much I have now as against what I had then. I went on, Sir:

> "Please be assured that you are welcome to go to the Ayatollah, the Governor General, President Amin, Prime Minister Adams, the New York Times, the Daily Mail, the Bomb, the Advocate-News or the Nation.
>
> In conclusion, I find your manner to be rude, crude, undignified and ignorant. In reference to the subject under consideration I draw attention to a letter dated February 23, 1979, copy attached, from my Permanent Secretary, addressed to Mr. J. N. Boos, indicating that the correct approach to this matter is to file an urgent and strong appeal and every effort will be made to process such appeal promptly. For your information, all the work of my Ministry is of paramount importance and is expeditiously dealt with.
>
> Finally, you may feel free if you wish to make this letter public property."

The reason why I read this letter out is this type of behaviour in public life that you can get from people like that individual and make politicians corrupt, and all this is seeking to do is to make sure that we on this side from September 2, not January of 1961, September 2, that is the charge of the Attorney General's Office, to make sure that people on this side are not accused publicly of corruption unless you can prove it, therefore declare your hand now. We are not saying to declare your hand in 1979, from 1976 – not that you can amass a fortune between 1976 and 1979 and then say that is what I had – they say from 1976. This is the whole gist of the matter.

Now, this nonsense that is bandied about about freedom of speech. Do you believe that Sawh can go in

Guyana and talk the things about Burnham that he talks about Adams in Barbados?

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard on public platforms in Barbados some things that I cannot believe my ears, even from the mouth of the member for St. Michael South Central. His first attack as soon as the Government took over was on CBC, the very radio station. Mr. Sealy is on it, Dr. Gonzalves who writes everything against the Government, Mr. Cameron Tudor in the Press, nothing is right for him since this Government came into power, Miss Joan Benjamin writing her articles. All of these things, we did not hear one word, not one single word about freedom of speech. What I would say is this – I have always said this and I have told my colleagues this, the Minister of Information and the Chairman of CBC – that I do not agree with any people coming into Barbados to use our television station and our radio stations to criticise the Governments in their own territories where they cannot do it. I have always contended that. I have seen Mr. Odlum come up here and castigate Mr. Compton's Government, Mr. Jagan on Burnham and Mr. Coard, Maurice Bishop, Ebenezer Joshua; you name them, they come here and use our television station to attack the Governments in their own countries. Rosie Douglas, you name them, and this Government stands firm in what we believe in. Now Mr. Coard is using the same words that I hear, 'muzzling the people.' We have not got to muzzle anybody, the country gave us the right to govern for five years, and I am a firm believer of the ballot box. If they are dissatisfied, when the Prime Minister duly calls an election they will return to power the party of their choice.
5.25 p.m.

We have been defeated during my time in politics in three elections – in 1961, 1966 and 1971 – but I have never heard a single member of the then Opposition abuse the people of Barbados for making their choice.

Philip Greaves, a man I have no respect for, got out there one night saying Barrow is their Prime Minister but I defended the same Barrow when he was Prime Minister when I was in Guyana. I will never condone abuse and propaganda on public platforms. I will not talk about anybody's wife but I will tell you that when you are out there with me give your heart to God and your body to me. That is how I play my game; I am going to attack you because politics is to get into power. For fifteen years the present Leader of the Opposition governed this country and nobody ever came to snatch a Budget from him during a Budget presentation. That is what happened recently in here. And you are always bringing people down here to make demonstrations. We could have brought out our supporters too, but what would have happened? Perhaps a lot of innocent people being killed? We are much more responsible than that. If you believe that the nonsense you talk at night on public platforms that we are not keeping our ears to the ground, you are mistaken. What we know is that in 1976 we kept on talking our way into the hearts of the electorate, and come 1981 we will tell them what we have done to retain the Government, not what we would like to do. I want to hear you on foreign policy, on housing. Tell the people these things that the fourteen year olds have gone back to school, and that the skills training programme is a success, that more people are working; and tell them of the $74 million worth of building operation going on in this country, that architects are refusing work. Tell them that every day there are advertisements for carpenters wanted, masons, plumbers and so on. All I am hearing here this evening is that you will not sit on any Select Committee. We have a Minister of Education that can get up and say "I do not agree with so and so in the Bill". Could any of you do that when you all were in power? You think Taitt could miss and tell the skipper "I am president of the DLP and should have the keys to go in there." That is restricting the freedom of movement of the president of the Democratic Labour Party, he cannot even move around as he would like. You used to be in the No. 5 position and I now see you turning over leaves for the Skipper.

I recall the same Brannie Taitt used to come to my home when he came from the airport; would leave his bags at my home. When he became Minister of Government he passed me one day on his way to the Senate he passed and did so – short. I had to telephone him and ask: "What happen? I can't see you." And he replied: "Man you got to understand; we are still friends but you won't be able to see me as before." And a whole division of this country came about since you were in power. Since you came into power in 1961 you divided the country even to the extent of husbands and wives afraid to speak to each other.
5.35 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your time is almost up.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This is what we call freedom of speech. All the time when we first came into Parliament we could talk as long as we felt like talking. Your Standing Orders said you could not speak more than half an hour on the Second Reading. Before that you could talk, talk and talk.

The Opposition is saying "we agree with the principle of the Bill. We do not agree with two clauses out of 53." Now they do not want to go and discuss it in a Select Committee but they can go out and talk about it on the public platform. They cannot stand the test in here.

Now my time is going and the Attorney General will have to speak and I hope he will bring this one up. Then they will have to find something else to talk about, because this will die a natural death.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is all I have to say on this Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is there any other Hon. Member who wishes to exercise his right to speak?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker you will of course bear with me if I do not appear to have the same volubility as the hon. member who just sat down. Long before we even had the amplifying equipment in this Chamber, I did not find it necessary to scream or holler in order to convince people about the validity of any statement which I might have to make.

I think it undignified and unbecoming for members of this Chamber to get on in such a vulgar manner.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I believe the Leader of the Opposition is referring to a member of Parliament, other than the Opposition on the Government side, that the debate was conducted in a vulgar manner, either by one member or by several persons.

I am calling on you, Sir, to ask the hon. member to withdraw that word because it is undignified for the hon. member to use such a word.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Did the hon. member use the word "vulgar"?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said it is undignified and vulgar for any member to conduct a debate in such a manner. I am saying this because I am winding up the debate on behalf of the Opposition and....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I am seeking Your Honour's ruling. The hon. member has admitted that he used the word "vulgar", and therefore I am asking you, Your Honour, to ask the member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that the hon. member for St. John has not said anything which the Chair would call on him to withdraw.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can bring the relevant Standing Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue with the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I wish to introduce an element of some standard to this debate and in a historical atmosphere. I think it was some time in 1975 when the hon. member for St. Thomas, and Minister of Finance introduced a Resolution, and what I am going to say is on page 5666. I hope the hon. member does not take exception to what I may say because I am taking it directly from the last 3 pages in the Sacred Book.

It is the last 3 pages of the Sacred Book which deal with the Revelation of St. John, the Divine and this has no reference to the hon. member. St. John said he saw the Holy City and then it was described and the number was 666 but on Page 5666 you will find that the then hon. member for St. Michael West read the words of the Resolution which had been introduced by the then member for St. Thomas and it read like this:

> "Whereas there is need in Barbados for a legislation providing that all members of Parliament, Senators and holders of public offices, including those of Prime Minister, Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, or Parliamentary Secretaries be compelled to disclose their assets when taking office or a seat in Parliament and thereafter periodically until they cease to hold such office or a seat in Parliament.
>
> BE IT RESOLVED that this House call on the Government to introduce legislation to this effect at the earliest possible opportunity."

That Resolution had been debated on some date prior to the 2nd of December, 1975. It was such a long time and as you know, sometimes due to the urgency of Government Business, Private Members' Business tend to get pushed in the background. It was some considerable time before the hon. member himself could make his submission.

The debate winded up, as far as I can recall, on the 6th January, 1976, and I read this to say that it is rather pert. I am sure that if the hon. member for St. James was there he would probably ask you to ask me to withdraw the word "pert" but you would understand that on that occasion the Mover of the Resolution was resisting that the Resolution be sent to a Select Committee. The Mover of the Resolution then is the person who now occupies the office of Prime Minister and was the Mover of the Bill.

5.45 p.m.

I was suggesting that because, and I repeat, the member for St. Thomas resisted the idea of the Resolution, it was not a Bill, and I will read out my reasons. I was trying to assist him and I suggested to him that if we left the Bill to be drafted by the lawmakers, that is, the legal draughtsmen, it might suffer the same fate as the Central Bank Bill which took seven years, as I said on that occasion, and he eventually agreed, I believe with me and the Resolution was sent to a Select Committee.

Now, just to show I am not talking off the top of my head, I will read some excerpts from the debate that took place, on the 26th January, 1976 as found at page 5827 of Hansard. Let us distinguish between what was being done on that occasion and what is being done here. On that occasion there was simply a Resolution asking the Government to introduce legislation, and this is what I said: "Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken in the matter because I do not think that we can really investigate the pros and cons of a Resolution of this nature, which can be very emotional and votecatching. I do not suggest that it should go to one of these Committees which sit interminably and do not report to the House. I am seriously suggesting that it should go to a Select Committee comprising members of both sides, and not necessarily the legal people, or exclusively insisting on legal people, legally trained people or who have been exposed to legal education. The Select Committee could report back to the House and then the discussion on the Resolution could continue. I have not spoken yet; I have made a motion. At this stage, Sir, I am reserving the right to speak on the Resolution when the matter comes back before the House."

The then member for St. Thomas said that he was sorry to strike a jarring note in respect to such sweet reason. "It is not often that you see the Prime Minister in a mood of sweet reason – in a mood where he stands above, perhaps, the pettiness of some other members of his Party. I do not think of anybody like the hon. member for St. Michael South Central or anybody like that." That was the late member for St. Michael South Central. "As I say, I hate to strike a jarring note, but it does seem to me with the best respect in the world for the views of the Prime Minister, carefully considered views after three years that this concept has been knocking around, that with an election coming up, the words which he uttered in commending the idea to a Select Committee of the House that this issue can raise a lot of emotion and so on, sending it to a Select Committee is to sidetrack this Resolution so that nobody would be pinned down at election time."

Then I said, "If the hon. member would just give way, I want to expose the fallacy of his statement. If you read the Resolution carefully, it requests the Government to introduce legislation. Now we can sit down here today and vote "aye" in favour of this Resolution, and we can go with the best of intentions to the Crown Law Officers and tell them to draft legislation, and with the work-load that they have it could take two years to draft legislation if they give it ordinary priority, but if they do it special priority it might take one year, whereas I was suggesting that if we are the custodians of our own conduct and so on, we could go into Select Committee with the plethora of legal talent that we have here and look at all the comparative legislation, and we could probably produce our own draft Bill, and then the Crown Law Officers would have no excuse for non-production of a Bill; but if he wants it that way, he is passing a Resolution which asks the Government to do something. If the Government did not want to do anything about it we would not have to send it to Select Committee at all. We would say pass the legislation and leave it to us and that is the last you would hear about it, because all I would have to do then would be to give it to the Attorney General, he would pass it on to the Crown Law Officers with instructions to draft as soon as possible – A.S.A.P. – and that means 1979 by the normal process in the Civil Service." And that is where we are, I was saying that in January 1976, was I prophetic?

I went on: "It took me seven years to get the Central Bank legislation on the Statute Book; so if you want it that way and you question my *bona fides* about the Select Committee, let us vote for it here and leave it to them to do what we should be doing for ourselves. It is O.K. with me, so whichever way you want to go I am going; go there or go there, it is all right with me."

And then the member for St. Thomas who had introduced the Resolution, who said he did not want to strike a jarring note, had introduced the jarring note. This is what he said: "Sweet reason prevails upon this occasion, Sir. I am glad for the admission that the Attorney General is not able even with the letters 'A.S.A.P.' to get work out of the Crown Law Officers in less than two years. I hear what is said, and based upon the experience of all of us in here, I don't think it can be gainsaid; but I would ask that the Clerk be instructed or one of the Clerks be given a special assignment by you, Mr. Speaker, to collect together the legislation, Jamaica, Zambia, and so on and have it available for an early meeting, the first meeting of the Select Committee."

So he was opposed to the Select Committee, I pointed out to him that the Select Committee was the quickest way to get the legislation before the House. The Select Committee was appointed, and I will read out the names of the members, and the Speaker said the hon. members so named form the Select Committee:

His Honour the Speaker
Myself
Mr. Talma
Mr. Greaves
Mr. Sandiford
Mr. Adams
Mr. Walcott
Mr. Forde
Mr. Craig

Now, Sir, there were two meetings of the Select Committee planned before the election. The first meeting

was on Friday, 6th May, 1976. We were accused in the Labour Party Manifesto that we refused to turn up, the only person who turned up to that meeting was the Leader of the House, Mr. C. E. Talma, and this is what the Minutes of the proceedings of the Select Committee report: "There was an abortive meeting of the Select Committee on Friday, 6th May, 1976. Present was – not present were – C. E. Talma, C.B.E., M.P. Also present was C. R. Boyce, Clerk of the Committee. Excuses for absence were offered for Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, Mr. Forde, Mr. Adams, Mr. Craig and Hon. P. M. Greaves.
5.55 p.m.

No excuses were offered for Opposition members of the Committee and it was said that it was due to us that the Committee did not meet. The Committee was then adjourned until 18th June and one person turned up at that meeting apart from the Clerk and Mr. Talma and no excuses were offered for members of the Opposition.

Now it is patently unfair for anyone to get in here and suggest that members on this side did not want this on the Order Paper. The point I want to introduce is no more acrimonious than that introduced by the mover of the Resolution, the hon. member who has just sat down and has now departed. I have a lot to say but just thought that I would give the background, and I have given chapter and verse from the Revelation of St. John the Divine on the mark of the beast No. 66.

I now come to the legislation. I do not have to go into our reason for not going to the Select Committee on this Bill. As far as I am concerned I just want to say that the legislation should be dealt with Clause by Clause, with the Chairman of Committees sitting in the Chair, in which manner we could discuss the merits and demerits of each individual clause item by item, instead of in the secrecy of an inner chamber where we are precluded by the provisions of the Standing Orders from disclosing what took place, and just coming back for a third reading that is only a formality. The Select Committee is a Committee stage of a Bill but the difference between a Select Committee is that it is normally a device resorted to where the matter has a lot of technical drafting points about it. There are two points in this Bill which need to be deleted and which can be deleted in here. You talk about open government, but Select Committees are held *in camera,* behind closed doors. This legislation should not be done behind closed doors. They say that basically this Bill is to preserve public confidence in the integrity of Parliamentarians, but I want to say something fundamental and that is that you cannot preserve public confidence by legislation; more over, you cannot preserve confidence in something already destroyed. Let us go back this way. The hon. member for St. Michael South was accused of saying that Barbados does not need integrity legislation. I think that even if he has said so he would not be far from the truth. There has been only one person from this House of Assembly ever convicted on any charges involving integrity and that was Mr. James Hanschell, the father of the person who was the Chairman of a recent commission. I attended that trial in here as a boy, and he was convicted by something like nineteen to three on bribery and corruption, in the parish of St. Lucy. They talk about African countries, that Africans do this and that. I am of the opinion, and you as a Constitutional lawyer will appreciate my point, that Barbados did not need an Order-In-Council to get independence; it only needed a date. But words and meetings do not make a Constitution; the Constitution is in people's hearts. This is the only Bill since 1976 where Government backbenchers have joined with the Opposition in opposing specific Clauses of a Bill. Never mind the ranting and raving that some hon. members.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw that remark; hon. members of this Chamber do not rant and rave.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: They don't Sir? However, I withdraw. Anyhow, at least one Minister of Government and one backbencher have joined with the Opposition in opposing sections of the Bill which they see as striking at the fundamental rights of the people. Indeed, one of the speakers on the Government side went so far as to say that the provisions were unconstitutional. And yet we must go behind those doors to be outvoted and then let it appear to the public to be all sweetness and light; so let sweetness prevail and this Clause remain in, and we cannot say it is not true, because under the Standing Orders we cannot disclose what too place *in camera.* I have been in here for twenty eight years. If you look at the record, even with the exception of the short sabbatical of thirteen or fourteen months, even without that I am still the senior member by many years and never before have I witnessed the spectacle of something unconstitutional and asking us to go to a Select Committee.

There is something else I want to draw to attention. The Bill is retroactive and somebody suggested that is to show that nobody has anything to hide. One former member said he was prepared to go to jail since he was no longer a member of this House, because the provision is unconstitutional.

Secondly, in a Resolution which came before this House in 1975 and in the declaration which was made in the Manifesto of the Government Party, it was stated that persons in public life – the only person from the time of Mr. Hanschell who was charged – there was a little investigation some years ago because they said that Mr. John Beckles was getting pig food from the almshouse – but the only persons who have been charged

in the court are people who have access to Government funds.
6.05 p.m.

There were no charges levied. That was a political gimmick but two have been charged in the Courts. People who have access to Government accounts, paying out money. Accounting Officers and people who have access to giving out Government Tenders. Government Ministers do not give out Tenders. Tenderers, if they do not agree with the Tender's Board have to go to the collective wisdom of the whole Cabinet. Government Ministers cannot award Tenders. Government Ministers cannot sign cheques.

Who can be more corrupt than people who are on Statutory Boards who are in a position to take on and dismiss people at will; who can give out Tenders without any reference from the Ministry of Finance; who can buy from where they like, the United States, Russia, anywhere at all without any instructions from Parliament.

What about the people at the Barbados National Bank who could buy the Barbados Telephone Company building which was put up twice for auction at a reserve price of $600,000 and then the Barbados National Bank went and bought it for some price they could not get it sold for. That is the building in Hincks Street. They did not come to Parliament for that.

All of those people should be within this Bill but they have been given the reassurance by the Minister of Finance that the Bill is not going to affect them. This is where they are putting a slur on their own people. I am saying categorically that if a Government Minister has the opportunity to be corrupt then he is interfering with the normal due process of the law and he is putting himself in a position where he should never be because if a Government Minister is normally performing his duties and not interfering with public officers who have these powers, the Accounting Officers and people like that, then nobody could really be in a position to corrupt. I am saying this and it has been brought to my attention where there is interference.

Nobody should interfere but all of these petty functionaries just because there may be an Election, do not let us exclude them. Bring them into the Bill now. Do not leave them out. Do not leave it until somebody say later on to include them. Bring them in now. Those are the people handling the money. Ministers do not handle money and therefore they are the people, if they are serious about integrity. You should carry out the promises which you made in your Manifesto and bring all of them in it.

Now there is something I must object to. I do not walk around with a little note book itemising every time I give somebody two or three dollars. Sometimes you stop at a traffic light and a little boy might say "Skipper, I want 25¢" and I give him 35¢, if I have it. I usually keep a little change for that purpose. This Bill calls on members of Parliament to give details of their expenditure.

When I go to the supermarket and they give me a little foolish slip from the cash register I throw that away. I do not even take gold bond stamps so I do not care, after I scrutinise the price and I decide I want something. This Bill is calling upon you to say how much money you spend at the supermarket each week and how much you spend on gasolene. This is in the Bill. It says so. I can read it out. Your grocery bill, your gas bill and everything because it says details of your expenditure.

The hon. member is laughing. He must have read the Bill. He cannot profess innocence like the Prime Minister who said he did not know how Clause 45 crept in there. The hon. member for St. Philip North had a very ingenious explanation. He said probably it was the Printers' error. The whole Clause. The printing error is the drafting.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I said that it seems to me that two very important words had been omitted. Not a whole Clause.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not see any gaps because if those words were left out, and the two most important words in the Bill, I would have seen gaps in the printing. It must have dropped out when he was reshuffling. When he was moving over here two words must have dropped out on the floor but we will not take you up on that now. We as Lawyers would know the validity of that.

Clause 7 of Part I says the duty of every person in public life, and it is only Parliamentarians who have to declare their yearly incomes, and expenditures other than liabilities, which must be in such a register. Now what does that mean? That if you do not put down your grocery bills you are not putting down your expenditure.

I want to say something about the blind trust. I do not want to go into all of that about the blind trust because that is not an expression that you usually run across. This is something imported probably from the United States. I do not like it. Like the hon. member on the other side, I do not like it because if you are going to have disclosure, let us have disclosure. I have nothing to hide. If you want to know about my expenditure go and ask the Bank about my overdraft. I would like to know where I can find some money for my overdraft.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sell your airplane.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will have to sell it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must address the Chair. Do not listen to cross-talk.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The one that you told Eric Fly cost $876,000 and I sold it for $17,000 and cannot even buy a Mercedes with that.

I beg your pardon, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order Please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW. I am saying it is absolutely ridiculous to ask a Minister or any responsible person just because they are in public life, to say what you spent at the grocery, how much you spent at the races and that sort of thing. I am saying that if people decide to acquire any additional wealth, I do not care which legislation you pass, if they come by it unlawfully you will never find out the truth because they can put it in the name of their wife or children or anybody like that.

As far as I am concerned I think that you have dragged down the image of Barbados. You cannot preserve public confidence after the public confidence has already been destroyed. You cannot preserve public confidence by passing legislation. You have to preserve public confidence by the way in which you behave, not only your personal behaviour but in the way in which you behave towards one another. That is very important.

Dr. Lewis said something very important a few week ago. He said "West Indian politicians do not know how to address one another." We cannot get people in the general public to respect us if we do not respect one another. People will have little idiosyncrasies. They may have certain weaknesses. Some may have many more weaknesses than others. The law of the land, I am satisfied, is sufficiently strong to deal with those people.
6.15 p.m.

The real problem in public life, as one businessman said, is to get people to come and give evidence. The real problem is to get people to come and give evidence, but I submit that the only -- and the businessman said that they in the business community – and somebody mentioned it earlier, that there is no intra-governmental corruption, the corruption has to be fed into the system, into the governmental system by the business community. It is the business community that corrupts the body politic, and the difficulty is to get people who are in the business community to come and give evidence, or *vice versa*. Why didn't he send those papers from Mr. Boos to the Director of Public Prosecutions? He reads out something on the floor of the House when that should probably be the subject matter mainly for inspection by the Director of Public Prosecutions, so you would not have people prosecuted that way. Ministers do not have access to that, but if there is any pressure being brought by the business community into the ministerial realm, then the evidence has to come from outside, and no amount of legislation that you pass is going to make anybody more amenable to prosecution if the people are unwilling to come forward.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have had an extremely long debate in this House on this Bill, and so it should be, because I think it is important that Members of Parliament in dealing with legislation that affect them in their private capacities more so than it affects the public at large, although it does affect the public at large, should give close scrutiny to this type of legislation. Let me say right away that the Government intends, and always intended, to bring down amendments to the legislation.

Members have spoken at length in this debate on perhaps only about three sections of this Bill, and in speaking there is a large measure of agreement on the necessity for such legislation, and there is a large measure of agreement on the fact that there is support for this legislation. There have been only two qualifications on those views, one is by the hon. member for St. John and the other by the hon. member for St. Michael South. Both of them have grave doubts in their minds as to whether the legislation is needed at all. I have no doubt in my mind that the legislation is needed, and the underlying principles governing anyone who comes into public life is that he gives up a certain measure of his privacy, and that since he is a trustee of the people's confidence he must have certain fiduciary obligations placed on him, and both the public and parliamentarians have an interest in those standards which they must set out, being carefully and closely defined.

If I may quote for the benefit of the House from the House of Commons debates in Canada on a similar Bill, this is what the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council and the Leader of the House had to say, and I quote:

> "Both the public and parliamentarians, therefore, have an interest in a set of well defined standards. For the public, the conflict of interest rules will provide a clear assurance that the highest standards do prevail. For parliamentarians, the rules will make it easier to ensure that their activities conform to the ethical principles that the public has a right to demand.
>
> Obviously setting clear standards is a complicated task. The rules must deal carefully and precisely with complex situations. There must be a fair balance between the requirements of sound conflict of interest provisions and the right of parliamentarians to manage their private affairs in ways that involve no threat to the public interest. The

rules must be strong enough to merit public confidence without being so rigid and restrictive as to be unfair or to deter capable individuals from seeking public office.

It is also important to develop rules that do not unduly disadvantage any particular group. Members have very diverse professional backgrounds and financial interests; what would be an innocuous rule for one member could have very serious implications for another.

The proposed policy meets these challenges by combining the two basic approaches to dealing with potential conflicts of interest – disclosure and avoidance – and by providing the mechanisms through which parliamentarians can seek authoritative advice on the application of the policy. Much has been said about the respective merits of disclosure and avoidance. Each mechanism is apt in different circumstances and in meeting different needs.

Public disclosure of financial interests is a method of allowing members to continue managing their financial interests while at the same time making abuse of office less likely by allowing the public to judge their conduct in full knowledge of all facts. To put it another way, by allowing the public to know the facts the member is assured that what he does is subject to public scrutiny. Avoidance provisions are designed to prohibit parliamentarians from holding offices and managing financial assets which involve a conflict of interest or appear to create such a clear conflict."

That is the Hon. Allan MacEachen speaking about the Bill in Canada. Let me begin by making some obvious points. The legislation on corruption and bribery which applies to everybody with equal obligation on all citizens, parliamentarians included, is contained in another Bill which this House will soon debate, and we have sought in the legislation therefore to avoid bringing the worst form of corruption, which is bribery, into this legislation, and we have sought in another Bill to update the legislation, which we had on the Statute Book for a long time and in which there are several loopholes.

This Bill seeks to do two things, possibly the disclosing of interests, about which members have talked at length, and avoiding conflict of interest, about which they have said very little in this debate. Now it is as important to avoid a conflict of interest as to disclose one's assets, and it is significant that in all the debate that has gone on in public on this Bill that no one has challenged the necessity for the principle in the legislation to avoid conflicts of interest, and it is a mistake of the hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for St. Michael South to assume that Members of Parliament as well as Ministers are not in an inside position to be guilty of breaches of conflict of interest.

6.25 p.m.

Let us take the case of the Government having information about the development of a particular area and a Minister of government or a member of his political party getting that information ahead of the public and going ahead and purchasing the land, and the Government then compulsorily acquiring part of the land and having to give him an inflated price. This has happened. There have been plantations sold in Barbados in which Ministers of Government had an interest, and some of the land sold back to the government with members of Parliament benefiting under the Democratic Labour Party. And there has been no disclosure of prices in this House or anywhere else. Let us face the facts; do not get up shouting about abridging freedom; it is in the public interest to make sure that we are subject to strict rules. I do not want to be acrimonious by calling names but I could give the hon. member a list of plantations that we ought to know about, where members have benefitted financially, not only by Cayman companies and hiding behind trusts – if you want to know about blind trusts; and that is why the blind trust is different. But they bought land, held it a little then sold it back to the government making more than they paid for it, and then say their hands are clean. That is an absolute fact. They can say they did not do anything corrupt, but it is a betrayal of public confidence. We have had cases where members of political parties because they are placed in that position can be preferred on contract to members of the public. Is the public satisfied with that? People being preferred in National Housing Corporation contracts for painting houses, because they are associated with people in the Government, and the man outside cannot get a fair way to tender on these contracts. Are we satisfied with that?

I have not heard anybody speak about the avoidance of conflict of interest. Why is the Opposition afraid to talk about that? There is more than enough evidence in this country about Parliamentarians being in a position to abuse the public confidence and sweep things under the carpet. That is why there is so much cynicism in this country about people in political life, and some of us who are coming here find ourselves tarnish with the same brush. Are we satisfied with that? This is what was said in the Salmon Report – the Royal Commission on Standards of Public Life, the Report of the Rt. Hon. Lord Salmon, the Chairman of the Commission in 1974–76? "Corrupt dealings are secretive. Few, if any, crimes are harder to prove. There is no way of making a true assessment of public sector corruption that as this now or over the decade". And it is because it is hard to prove that a lot of people have not gone to prison in this country. It is all right to get up and say

you have not proved anything, but we want to make sure that the opportunities are minimized and that the danger to the public is reduced to as little as possible, so that the public can look into our public lives and decide whether or not we have betrayed their confidence. This legislation seeks to achieve this.

I want to go back to the question of retroactivity and some of the points made by the Opposition. Before this Bill was brought to Parliament the Democratic Labour Party – including the hon. member for St. Michael South Central had gone on public platforms saying that the Government would never bring in integrity legislation.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I have already said that on many occasions on public platforms I have called on the Government to bring the integrity legislation to Parliament and I was looking forward to it, but not in a form which would take away from the people of this country their freedom of speech. And I said that in my substantive speech today and am being misrepresented now.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will not give way again on a point of explanation, Sir, because the hon. member is merely repeating what I said. He says they had called for the legislation, but they also said in public that we would want to be in power and then bring the legislation at the last moment. They also said I would never bring the legislation or prepare the legislation. Now the legislation has come down to Parliament and the Government is saying that it is prepared to make disclosure from the day we took over as a Government, but the Opposition is saying: "Oh no, you are bringing a bad principle of retroactivity." This is the first time that I have heard of a Government wanting to disclose the private business of its members but an Opposition which says it has nothing to hide being afraid of that principle.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The hon. member, perhaps because he did not hear or because he has misinformed himself, is inadvertently misleading this Honourable House. Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the question of retroactivity I specifically pointed out when the hon. member for St. George South spoke about retroactivity, that retroactivity as a disclosure of what they had done is blunted by provision of Clause 45(1) and (2) which would not allow the public to talk about it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: We are prepared to disclose our assets and liabilities from the time we took up the Government, but you are so frightened, you have so much to hide... *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member has said that hon. members on this side have so much to hide. A clear suggestion is that there is an imputation of improper conduct on the part of hon. members of this side, and I would ask that the remark be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that is no point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, if the Opposition are now big enough to go and tell the public that they agree with the principle of the legislation, if they are big enough to acknowledge that we do not want to hide anything from the public, and they want to come and give evidence before the Select Committee for the removal of that provision it will be removed. *(Asides)*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please; the hon. member for St. Michael West must not shout across the Chamber.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am saying to the Opposition that if they want us to say to the public that we should not disclose our assets from the day we came into office, say so or otherwise keep their mouths shut, instead of talking about people having grown fat since they were in Parliament. I have heard all sorts of allegations being made by their paid agents. We are not afraid to go back and disclose our assets; why are they afraid? Why is every member of the Opposition afraid to let the public know what assets and liabilities he has had on the 1st September, 1976?
6.35 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member has said that I, he said the hon. member for St. Michael South West, am afraid to let the people know what my assets are. I am putting it to you, Your Honour, that the hon. member is casting aspersions on my character. I said categorically that I am not afraid to let anybody know about my assets because I have no holdings in.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his point. Please take your seat.

Please continue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member for St. George South said that this is a Resolution for the future. He is quite right because whoever wins the Government of this country in the future I dare them to repeal this legislation once it is passed because the public would come to expect from you certain high standards but what is hurting the Opposition is that no matter how they talk about not turning up to Select Committees, they never wanted any legislation to go on the Statute Book.

They wanted a Select Committee to look at proposals without even having the basis for the beginning of a Paper.

Now that they have proposals that can form the basis of a good Bill with whatever constructive criticism they have, now that they have a Government that is willing to listen to constructive criticism and take this constructive criticism, they do not want to come in on the Select Committee.

We witnessed in this Parliament the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John asking for a Select Committee on the Land Bill. We gave him. He came to two meetings. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central came to one and Senator Connell came to one, out of about 13 meetings. The public was invited to give memoranda.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member well knows and I explained to him that he invariably fixed the meetings on the Land Bill at the same time that I had meetings of the Public Accounts Committee, as the hon. member for St. Philip North has explained to him already, and he knows, so what is the point saying that I only came to two meetings. I am Chairman of another Committee.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The point is that the hon. member for St. Philip North was also on that Select Committee and there were only two meetings that clashed. Yet we were told about how complicated those Bills were. We accepted several amendments to the Bill and we are prepared to accept amendments to this Bill in the interest of the public at large and Parliamentarians as a whole.

Do not bring confrontation where confrontation is not called for. The hon. member for St. Michael South West continues on his political note and seeks confrontation when he should be looking for compromise. That is why you can never be Prime Minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You do not understand the Government of this country. That is why they have pushed you from No. 1 to No. 2. You will never make it with the public. I will tell you why, Sir. I will rule the hon. member for St. Michael South West out of that part of the debate.

When we are dealing with a Bill of this nature, it would be a foolish Government who is not prepared to listen to the views from Parliamentarians themselves and members of the public and if their criticisms are constructive, to take them into account. This Government has a record of wide public consultation. Even when the hon. member decry it and when we ask for Commissions of Enquiry they say they are not participating in those either. They just sit down. Test public opinion.

The Government is not saying that its legal draftsmen, or the Attorney General, or the Government as a whole have all of the legal sense and it is obvious to me that in addition to the amendments which we have formulated in our Chambers that there will be other amendments that will come out of a Select Committee.

Had the Government been difficult and come down here and say that they are ramming this Bill through the House and they are not prepared to listen to any criticisms from within their own party, from their Back Bench, from their front bench, from the Opposition or from the public, it would have been a different story to call out people. You are going to call out people once too often and your head is going to grow from the people. This is what is going to happen to you because the people are not going to be fooled all of the time.

Now, Sir, I want to speak about the constitutionality. I am making a statement in my legal capacity. There are several Statutes on the Statute Books in this Island that if passed today would breach the fundamental rights and freedom of the people of this country. Some of those Statutes were passed by the Democratic Labour Party.

One such Statute is the Public Orders Act. Another such Statute is the Limitation of Public Remedy Act passed by the past Government to give to HARP, SRC, special positions in this country. The Limitation of Remedy, Scientific and Research Project Act was passed in the House and commenced on the 16th December, 1965 in which the Democratic Labour Party took away the rights of every average Barbadian citizen to bring an injunction against HARP to prevent them blasting off a gun and to destroy their houses in this country and the then Prime Minister piloted that legislation. *(Cheers).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Public Order Act placed severe limitations on the rights of the people in this country and it was said that it would have been unconstitutional. The Rt. Hon. Member for St. John would hear of no opposition. There was none of them in that Government that could get up and make a statement like the Minister of Education has made today nor like the member for St. Philip North. No freedom of speech was allowed to the members of the Barbados Labour Party when they came in here. A set of faithless men they were.

In the Constitutional Debate in this country the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John attacked everybody in-

cluding myself. He said that we have dragged Parliament to a sad state. We have no respect for Parliamentarians. I have tapes of him attacking everybody ruthlessly, including myself, which today in his old age he is reminded of. I have got them. He has called everybody all sorts of names, using the sort of terms that normally one would not expect from a leading statesman in the Caribbean, as he calls himself.

It is not surprising that the public at large have no respect for us these days. Those were the politics of denigration. The hon. member even got up and said he did not know if I had a bed to sleep on. That was the sort of politics that he preached. He is no partisan of virtue. He is not the sort of person to teach anybody anything about standards of conduct in public life at all. That is a fact and we must recognise it as such in this country.

It is above some of the otherwise good things you have done in Barbados so when you say that Parliamentarians are low down, it is because you have contributed to it. Let us be serious about that. The difference between their regime and this Government is this. If this Bill was passed and Section 45 was contrary to the fundamental right provision, that provision could not hold. The first time that anybody is charged in the Court of Law, it would be struck down. It is a fact. That is the difference between legislation passed subsequent to 1966 which is not amended legislation and legislation passed now.

If we were about to impede the rights of anyone, we would come in and use an elaborate procedure with the Clauses in the Bill setting out that notwithstanding Chap. 3 of the Constitution, that we are passing this Bill, breaching the people's fundamental rights and the Courts would be stopped from declaring any part of that Bill unconstitutional.

The public must understand this because this is in their interest. We are not doing that. It means that the first time that a person is charged, the Court will slap it down as unconstitutional.

I do not mind your comments. You want some prominence. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central always likes to be noticed, Sir. I do not know if his height worries him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, No. Please get back to the debate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On the other hand, when the hon. member for St. John brought in the Public Order Act in here and he brought in the Limitation of Remedy Act, the Court could not slam them down as unconstitutional because there was no written constitution for Barbados with any fundamental right provision so that there is a safety Clause in the Constitution of Barbados.
6.45 p.m.

The Rt. Hon. member for St. John knows that, but he is a politician out of power, hungry for power, and therefore instead of giving the people the total facts, not part of them and explaining to them, he is trying to mislead a few people into believing that this is a Government which wants to interfere with their freedom of speech and assembly; and that is the position.

We are prepared to accept any suggestions that will improve the Bill. I want to deal with two other provisions quickly, Sir. The provision of wives. It is difficult in framing any set of provisions to please all the people all the time, and I agree with the hon. member for St. George South that by placing wives in the provision there is some partial limitation of their full rights, but for this I must rely on the practice in other countries and indeed the argument advanced by the Rt. Hon. Allan MacEachen of Canada, and I quote him again: "The partial applicability to spouses reflects the need for another balance between conflicting objectives. On the one hand there is the important principle that parliamentarians should not circumvent the rules through the activity of spouses; on the other hand, it is important not to restrict the ability of spouses to pursue independent careers. The Bill resolves this quandary by requiring certain disclosures by spouses while exempting them from avoidance prohibitions. It is made clear, however, that parliamentarians may not escape the avoidance provisions by asking their spouses to undertake prohibited activities on their behalf."

It is a difficult balance, we are not saying that the way in which the Bill is drafted that it is the ideal balance, we are not even saying that it is the one that perhaps after debate in this House should be the final decision, but once members recognise that the Government has tried to grapple with the problem of dealing with spouses and to close the loopholes where members may use their spouses and their children as a way of beating the conflict of interest legislation, then there is no more difficulty in those circumstances, and again the Government is prepared to listen to the public at large coming before the Committee, as well as to the Opposition, as to how they say we should draft proper provisions for Barbados, given the dangers which we want to avoid.

I want to deal with the blind trust. The concept of the blind trust, because it is called blind trust, is not unusual. It should be known that President Carter has placed his peanut business in the blind trust, and all it means simply is that during the tenure of his office he will not be involved in the day to day running of that

business so that he will not be in a position of even beginning to be in conflict of interest, and I want again to rely on the report which the hon. member for St. Michael South quoted, or he said he was looking at in the preparation of his speech today. This is what is said in the Canadian report on the matter of the blind trust:

> "There are other ways of course in which all members can apply the principle of avoidance. For example, rather than disclose a member may choose to avoid a conflict of interest by divesting himself of disputable interests, or by placing his investments in a trust over which a member exercises no control.
>
> Divestment is probably the most stringent application of the principle of avoidance, in some cases is probably the best means of avoiding conflict of interest."

Now, I have heard a lot of talk in here about a blind trust being a way of hiding people. The Canadians, in their Parliament's report on conflict of interest see the trust as a way, as a most stringent application of the principle, because the member is not even allowed to deal with the day to day running of his affairs, so that there can be no conflict between his financial interest and the financial interest of the public at large.

Again I refer hon. members to the guidelines issued on the 7th August, 1979 by the Hon. Joe Clarke, the Prime Minister of Canada, in which he has set out stringent rules for the operation of blind trusts for members of his Cabinet. Why? Because in the experience of the Canadians, in the experience of the Americans, in the experience of other democratic countries it has been found necessary to make members divest themselves of interests so there could never be avoidance of conflict of interest. What is the criticism of the blind trust? I hear from one hon. member that there are only a few of us that it could apply to. If people persist in believing that I am rich, I like the feeling. We must always understand that we are passing legislation to deal with everybody, and there may well be members like the Rt. hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, people much richer than I could ever be in this country who would want to use the benefit of the trust legitimately, and we should not do anything to dissuade them from using the blind trust properly. The blind trust is a very good procedure, but again if the Parliament and the public do not want it the Government is prepared to say 'we bow to you'. For one thing, the Government is subjecting itself to stringent rules, but you are saying, 'Oh, no, we do not want that stringent application.'

The last point made by hon. members, if they made a point at all besides retroactivity and the blind trust,.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, the hon. member has just said that the blind trust is a good idea. I draw to your attention page 10 of the Bill – I am explaining a point made in my speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about blind trust – if you turn to page 10, *(Aside)*.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is on a point of explanation.

Mr. TAITT: Section 16(2) says, "Where any of the assets of a person in public life are placed in a blind trust, he need not give more ....." listen carefully, Sir – "he need not give more particulars in respect of those assets in his declaration than the amount and description of the assets placed in that blind trust and the date of doing so."

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member needs explanation to particular provisions of the Bill, I am willing to give him that at the Committee stage of the Bill, either in Select Committee or when the Bill comes back before the House, he will have the benefit of my draughtsmen, Sir, I am not going into the particular provisions with him on this Bill, Sir.

Let me say, Sir, that there is a feature of this Bill that the Opposition would like to push under the carpet. The Integrity Commission will be comprised of people who themselves must have the highest integrity, and the Government has gone out of its way to try to get as much agreement on the personality of these persons by a special provision which is contained in the Bill. That provision is as follows: "The three members of the Integrity Commission, one is appointed by the Governor General on the advice of the Prime Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition, another by the Governor General on the advice of the Leader of the Opposition after consultation with the Prime Minister, and one by the Governor General in his own deliberate judgment." I have never known during the Democratic Labour Party's rule any attempt made in order to avoid partisanship in the appointment of a body such as the Integrity Commission, but you would not hear them get up and praise this feature of the Bill, not a word about it, only the criticisms, none of the praises for other features of this Bill, only the criticisms of the Bill.
6.55 p.m.

There are other features of this Bill where it is said that we have left out public officers. The Rt. Hon. member for St. John said that the people who we should get at are the little petty functionaries – the people who work in the banks, civil servants should be under the Bill but not Parliamentarians. Now, Sir in this Bill we have made provision for an order to be made and debated in Parliament, subject to affirmative Resolution, to apply Part II of the Bill in relation to conflict of interest, to

civil servants and other people on Statute Bodies, but not a provision re disclosure of interest. Once again, if the Rt. Hon. member feels he should bring every civil servant under the provisions of the Bill, let him come on the Select Committee. Do not get up and tell the public that we are not putting in public servants and that we are only dealing with Parliamentarians. I would have thought that in any event that was a plus to the Government when it could subject itself to the rigours of the law and not seek to deal only with other people.

Let me finish by saying that the Government is prepared to accept further amendments to this Bill in addition to the amendment which the Government is bringing down, including amendment to Clause 45. It should have been obvious that the Government would have various amendments to bring. For example, there is a complete Clause missing from the Bill in the printing that has been done, but I have seen Bills brought down by the Democratic Labour Party with different pages missing, and we have had to make them withdraw Bills on occasion in these circumstances. We are prepared to accept amendments to the Bill, but what we are not prepared to accept is the suggestion from the Leader of the Opposition and his newly promoted Deputy that the present legislation is adequate enough and that there is no need for this legislation at this time. And I must state that that is the official view of the Opposition – don't mind the other minions. Who is running the Democratic Labour Party in Opposition today? If I was running it by now the Rt. Hon. member would have to take his place. Let us be serious; they say that they doubt whether there is any need for this legislation. That is the official stand of the Democratic Labour Party. You do not know what you want; you are afraid to have proper legislation and are misleading the public on one section of the Bill in order to hide behind the mask that you really want integrity legislation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must wind up now.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I rest on the views of your leader that he does not see the necessity for this type of legislation at this time; that is what will go to the public platform as your view and no other apologies from the lesser minions of your party.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If no other hon. member wishes to speak, I propose to wind up the debate on behalf of the Government.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition started out with the beast of the Revelation and quoted page 5666 of the Debate. But reference to page 5666 does not reveal that I made any speech on that page. The reference to that page reveals that Mr. Frank Walcott spoke against integrity legislation. There is no copy of the Resolution to be found on that page excepting so far as Mr. Frank Walcott read it out in his speech. Is the hon. member saying that Frank Walcott is the Beast of the Revelation?

The hon. member then turned to the next chapter in the saga of that Resolution and I will turn to the next chapter in Revelation, and the words immediately following are: "And I looked and lo a Lamb sat on Mount Sion and with him one hundred and forty four thousand having his father's name written in their foreheads." And at verse 3: "And they sang as it were a new song before the Throne." And verse 5: "In their mouth was found no guile because they are without fault before the Throne of God."

And so we turn to the following Chapter which is the chapter relating to my contribution to the matter of integrity legislation of 1976 and all I want to say very shortly is this: The hon. member is probably not aware, but I was aware that the reason for the abortive meetings of the then Select Committee lay in the duplicity of Mr. Chezley Boyce and perhaps other members of the Democratic Labour Party, because that meeting in May which none of us attended was almost immediately on the eve of the City bye-election and was called at a time when it was known that all the members of the then Opposition were canvassing or making speeches at political meetings, and I say it was called at that time so that no meeting would be held, and I say categorically that I got no notice of the meeting; and subsequent meetings which were attempted to get a quorum were not attended by Mr. Chezley Boyce. That is why he had to be dismissed, for his manner in dealing with the affairs of the House of Assembly. I do not believe the Leader of the Opposition had any awareness of what happened during those meetings.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. If the hon. member knew of meetings, why did he not send an excuse? The point made was that we did not want the Committee to meet, and what I pointed out was that we did not attend and members of the Opposition did not attend, but Government members who did not attend sent excuses. It is quite misleading to say that we did not want to have the meetings because I did call a meeting.

7.05 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member is correct about not giving notice to Mr. Boyce. Now the first meeting was a meeting called during the City By-Elections at a time when they knew we could not come. I knew of it and sent an excuse saying that I would be taking part in the By-Election campaign. It is the second meeting that I did not know of and I am absolutely convinced that not even Mr. Boyce knew about it and could write down that I knew of the second meeting.

I am getting back to the point which the Attorney General has very readily indicated is the bases of the Opposition's argument in this debate. We have a situation where the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition feel that there is really no problem of corruption in public life as far as politicians are concerned and that this is only a problem limited to a few public officers like civil servants and that the existing legislation is sufficient.

I do not accept that in the atmosphere of 1976 that the standards and morals of public life in Barbados were adequate. I do not accept that. I think that even after that there have been many persons who have exhibited certain behavioural patterns. The hon. member for St. James and Acting Leader of the House has given example which showed that there was a general spirit abroad of suspicion and the validity of politicians.

I have here in my hand a most unusual document for a country in which there is no corruption. I have heard, for example, of an invitation from a well-known, businessman, Mr. Kesharam, inviting members to meet the district Democratic Labour Party representative for St. Michael South East, Mr. John Connell, on Thursday the 19th of August, at his residence at Highgate Park for cocktails and preserves. Now when you reach the stage that a businessman in this country is circularising a large proportion of the electorate within a constituency inviting them to come and have drinks with a candidate could we actually say that the standard of morality in public life is satisfying?

Subject to the General Election the hon. member for St. Michael South East who I believe was complaining, but nobody has been accused in the Court of Justice for refusing to give evidence against Mr. Kesharam. I have not heard anything mentioned about people trying to buy out the Elections for votes for a general candidate but nobody has accused him of that but in the generosity and magnanimity of that although he actually saw the goods being shared out declined to continue the prosecution of Mr. Kesharam and yet he is the sort of person who is being pillowed by the paid hangers-on and the paid lackeys, certain elements who are not hon. members of this House.

That is the sort of atmosphere with which we were contending with in 1976 and the hon. member for St. John on speaking of Mr. Hanschell's conviction before the House of Assembly in 1973 is perhaps a little misleading when he realises the nature of the Bill before the House because Mr. Hanschell was not convicted of accepting bribes. Mr. Hanschell was convicted of giving the people rum. Three persons voted against him. The hon. member knows it and I was also there.

He is bringing in colour and race because Mr. Hanschell was white and he is critical of him in that matter but he has forgotten that his opponent Mr. Walter Reece, was also convicted for opening a barrel of rum and giving the people a drink before they went to the polls as well as he gave them breadfruit and that none of them ran in the subsequent Election.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M G. M. ADAMS: Subsequent to the Election, Mr. Lisle Ward, as a young man ran. Mr. Walter Reece was the successful candidate who was also accused of acts of treason and acts of corruption. It is a well-known Election. I do not know why the hon. member is so obsessed with Mr. Hanschell. He even got on a platform at Eagle Hall quite recently and said that the reason why I appointed Mr. Hanschell's son to be a Commissioner of Enquiry is because I owe or my father or somebody owe him a fee on the mortgage.

I do not know why there is this obsession with Mr. Hanschell, a man who has been dead for about 30 or 40 years and is still forming part of the Hon. member's public speeches. There is something wrong when a man still harps back on a man who died perhaps before the end of the war and whose sons are older than the hon. member.

It was a notorious and unfair decision of the House of Assembly that convicted Mr. Hanschell and every hon. member of the House at that time was aware that he would have to do it to some extent. As a result of that the Electoral Law was changed so that a man's political openness could not vote him out of the House Assembly. That was the last decision brought by the House. Subsequent to that the procedure was transferred to the Court.

I have dealt on this in great length because I think a few words should be said in favour of the late Mr. Hanschell and to set the record straight.

To get back particularly to the points which have been raised in the debate. There are really four points; the point of the blind trust, the point of the spouses, the point of the retroactivity and Section 45.

The blind trust first of all. I will just give an opinion. I am going in due course to nominate myself to be on the Select Committee because of the views I am going to put forward. In my opinion it is a device for insuring that a politician does not benefit from private information. President Carter has his peanut business in a blind trust but he still knows about his business but if in the case that has been going on for 14 years now before the Federal Food and Drug Administration they were to decide that peanut butter was bad for the school children of America, President Carter would of course know if he had to send out legislation to forbid the use of peanut butter in schools.

I think it is of some value to some hon. members who are businessmen who put their businesses in a blind trust for management purposes.
7.15 p.m.

I would support blind trust in Committee. Whether it might be successful I do not know, but I think that these personal matters and personal opinions should be given weight in the Select Committee and in the Committee of the whole House to which in due course we intend to recommit the Bill after the Select Committee under the provisions of section 62. I think that some of us are afraid of the words "blind trust" because we are a relatively simple country, the principle of trusteeship is not over-abundantly spread abroad in human knowledge and the blind trust is too mysterious but I do not think there is much harm in it.

As far as the spouses are concerned, I share the views of the hon. member for St. George South, and at the same time I share the concern of the Attorney General, and I hope that we can find a formula in the Select Committee or in the House subsequently to resolve any difficulties that may appear. On the one hand one may argue that a person who does not put himself forward in public life should not be expected in any area by reason of marriage to have to be subjected to this Bill. On the other hand, it is known that many people use their wives and families to hide funds they do not want discovered. Perhaps, Sir, we can change the wording and insert a new clause to oblige the person in public life to report any gift or any transfer of funds he has made to a spouse or a child and let such a provision suffice. Perhaps that will be a possible compromise, but certainly I think it will need a Select Committee to deal with the arguments pro and con for such a course of action.

The third difficulty appears to be retroactivity. I cannot understand quite what the difficulty is here. Hon. members do make very different speeches in here from the speeches they make on public platforms. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central at a meeting held recently in Carrington Village said that we have stood so long to bring the integrity legislation because we wanted to help Senator Barrow who was putting up some flats and we did not want to bring the legislation until after he is finished. Senator Barrow had built the flats before he was a Minister and is now engaged in the process of selling them. I can make that explanation in here.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I made no such statement in Carrington Village. *(Asides).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Would the Hon. Prime Minister please continue?

Rt. Hon.J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I don't know if by the hon. member saying he made no such statement in Carrington Village he means that he said it in Bridge Road and that is not in Carringtons Village. Anyway, I don't want to get into that, because although it is not *sub judice* yet, I believe that Yearwood & Boyce has the matter in hand, so I really don't wish to get into that. It is just an example of what we are now putting up with in this country. The hon. member would never come in here and make a statement like that, never! He has to put a clean and decent face to the House, but when he gets out on the platform in the murky dark with Eric and Castro and others egging him on, he will say anything at all.

There is something I will also say about that statement. All of this talk – and I am coming on now to section 45(2) – about the effect of section 45(2), I hope hon. members realise that even if 45(2) were passed, which it will not be in this form, it could not stop the hon. member from doing that. He would still be able to make an unjustified statement such as that. Senator Barrow from his own resources when he was a Lecturer at Cave Hill decided to invest borrowed funds in the flats, and not even the worst construction that you could put on section 45(2) would stop an hon. member from making such a wicked and unjustified statement. The word "retroactivity" was used, I understand, on a particular occasion, that it was now not going back so that Bills such as this could have gone through. That is one of the fundamental reasons, of course, that we cannot afford to abandon the principle of retroactivity, because if a different date from the date of taking office is chosen, we will be open to the irresponsible and malicious and vicious untrue statements by persons who should know better relating to what may happen between 1976 and 1979. That is one of the reasons why retroactivity as far as I am concerned is a principle very difficult to abandon.

Contrary to what has been said by Mr. Tudor and others, it does not affect Mr. "Sleepy" Smith, it affects people only who are members at the date the Act becomes law. Read the Act and repent, O ye ignorant. A good deal better debate would have been had both on the public platform and in here if hon. members had taken the opportunity since July 24, 1979 when this Bill was laid in the House to read it and understand it. A very good deal of nonsense has been talked – I don't want to characterise the speech of the hon. member for St. Lucy as nonsense – but I suspect that a good deal of nonsense which has been talked would not have been talked if the Bill had been read, and that hon. member might not have been able to make a speech at all if he had read the Bill.

Now, the question of section 45(2). I am saying a good deal more about it than I had originally thought I should say. I must admit that. Section 45(2) has two words missing from it, it does not express the wish to the best of my knowledge of any member of the Government in this form, it does not by any means go as far as persons have suggested. I cannot see anything in that section that says

you cannot talk about money a person in public life has, but that part I am not worried about at all. Section 45(2) will be buried by the time of the third reading. It will be amended substantially in Select Committee and it will not live to see the third reading. I think that hon. members on this side who perhaps were aware of this – certainly the Attorney General and his draughtsmen have been aware of this for a couple of months – were mistaken. The amendments have already been formulated, the draughtsman who is in charge of this Bill is at present acting as a Judge of the Supreme Court, and for that reason there was a certain check on movements of this Bill. I think that we have in fact been mistaken, because those of us who know that the section could not stand as it is should not have waited until a misleading public debate had commenced – and we intended to wait until it was withdrawn – but perhaps, Sir, in certain circumstances in which we intervene at an earlier stage. Indeed, Sir, we really are in a dilemma in these circumstances; that is obvious.

The point is that the hon. member for St. Michael South could also not have made a speech if we had come today prepared to do it in all its stages, and with the amendments which would relate to this part, before the House before the second reading speech. He could not have made a speech because he would not have had section 45(2) to talk about. I don't want to reveal what happened in Cabinet, the hon. member for St. George was reminding me only last night of what he said how he convinced me along certain lines and so on and so forth about this matter.
7.25 p.m.

But Section 45(2) will not reach third reading – not as it is and any offensive parts will be removed.

One final point: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central made the question of the Select Committee a point of groundless complaint. The hon. member must stick to doctrine and leave the interpretation of Acts of Parliament to the lawyers. You cannot leave it to anybody else. You can say what you will, but it is lawyers who must decide it. The hon. member is not as familiar with Latin as I thought he was. He opened his speech with the maxim "Quis custodes custodient" – "Who will guard the guardians?" The real quotation is "Quis custodes ipsos custodient." I cannot accuse the hon. member of being forgetful of self, therefore forgetfulness could not make him omit the ipsos if he knew it; therefore I must think that it was ignorance of Latin which made him leave it out. But I heap coals on his head with another quotation known as the *sui generis* rule, and that rule lays down that where in any Act of Parliament a number of words are collected together, the last of those words is to be considered sui generis, that is, as being of the same class as the words that went before. Anyhow, this is a frivolous point. There is one procedural point that I want to deal with finally, and that is the matter of the Select Committee. I have been in this House nearly fourteen years and have never before heard the Select Committee procedure attacked as a restriction on the rights of hon. members. I have always until today heard the Opposition call for Select Committees. A Select Committee can take evidence from members of the public whereas a Committee of the whole House cannot. Select Committees can have frequent meetings, can listen to the views of a wide section of the community. True it meets behind closed doors, but it can hammer out details of Bills in a more intimate and relaxed atmosphere than in a committee of the whole House. It is not bound by words and rules and members can get on quickly with their business. I refuse to accept that seven hundred years of Parliamentary tradition, including Select Committees, have all of a sudden been proven wrong and that in seven members of the Democratic Labour Party resides a truth not discovered in forty-four independent countries and other countries with procedures such as this. The Select Committee remains a concession of a Government to an Opposition; it remains a device which gives a liberal character to the open spirit of Parliament allowing the use of members of the public along with their parliamentary representatives to consider important legislation.

A casual remark by the hon. member for St. Michael South West has given a clue to the Opposition's suspicion to the Select Committee. It seems that they have formed the impression that what happens in the Select Committee is decisive at the Committee stage. A Bill can be dealt with in Select Committee and can be dealt with in a Committee of the whole House and this Bill will be dealt with in a Committee of the whole House.
7.35 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I did not interrupt the hon. member until he actually repeated something which I thought earlier he was suggesting that when the Bill came out of Select Committee that you can have Committee stage on the same day. If he looks at Order 62, I cannot remember whether it is Rule 1, 3, 4 or 5, he will see that there are Select Committees and Select Committees.

An ordinary Select Committee can lay a Report on the Table of the House and that Report any member can move that that Report go to a Committee of the whole House but if you look at the top of the page, I am speaking purely from memory, on the right hand side, you will see that when a Bill comes out of Select Committee the Report is adopted without any debate whatsoever. It is on the right hand side, Sir, in Order No. 62 and there is no further Committee of the whole House on the Bill but there can be a Committee on a Report of a Select Committee dealing with other matters.

Now you will have to rule whether I am right in my memory or whether the hon. member is right. This

is my interpretation of the Rule. The procedure on a Bill is a different procedure than on a Report. That is another matter. I await Your Honour's ruling.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No question of ruling has arisen. All I can tell the hon. member is that I think he is not right. It is simple and straightforward.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think it is fundamental because he is saying he thinks he is right and I am wrong. That surely controls the action of the Opposition if he is wrong and I am right because our attitude would tend to be different if there is going to be a Committee stage in the House. If there is going to be no further Committee stage, then we will have to consider our position. The procedure on a Bill from the time I have been in here is very different from the Report of a Select Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that the Chair has to rule on the point of the Bill. I am of the opinion that the Report of the Select Committee will be considered.

Please continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I read here on 62(3) "A Report of a Select Committee may, on Motion made, be referred by the House to a Committee of the whole House." That is what we have every intention of doing. It says that a Bill reported from a Select Committee together with a Report on the Bill." Did the hon. member hear that? Has he taken those words into account? "Together with the Report on the Bill." The hon. member must understand that. I have been trained in understanding what I read.

I actually helped to write a good part of these Rules far from having to read them. The hon. member is unaware. He does not understand this "A Bill reported from a Select Committee together with a Report on the Bill." He has not paid any attention to my drawing that to his notice. There is no further going to go on.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member will give way I will read it for him because there are ten lines. There are ten lines and he only read two.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Hon. Prime Minister has said that he is not giving way.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But I am on a point of order because it is very important at this stage.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: For what purpose is the hon. member reading the Order?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: For the procedure which is going to tell us what happens when the Bill has had a Second Reading. It is the question of order in the House. That is what I am asking, Sir. I have invited the hon. member to read the whole of Rule 62(4) and he refuses to read more than the first two lines.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that it is not necessary to read the whole of Clause 62(4).

All hon. members have copies of the Standing Orders and they know the contents of Clause 62(4). I have my copy here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir, and what is your understanding of Clause 4?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My understanding is not important at this stage. Will the Hon. Prime Minister please continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is making a point and I am always ready to grant concession. He is making a point. It may be that we have been carrying out the wrong procedure in the Select Committee Report. It may be. Order 62(4) reads "A bill reported from a Select Committee, together with a Report on the Bill," that can only mean a Bill of the whole House. "A report from a Select Committee together with a Report on the Bill" which means a Report from the Committee of the whole House plus a Report. It is my understanding that the Report should be laid on the Table without question put.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. It is the first time I have ever heard that kind of interpretation of anything like this. Now it is true that I might not have been going at this too long but he just suggested that after you look at Section 62 you see "A Report" under Sections 2 and 3. He then says that when it says at 4 "A Bill reported from a Select Committee together with a Report on the Bill" that it is referring to a Report of the Committee of the whole House. Mr. Speaker, he must not stretch the imagination so far.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am finished with all of that, Sir. As far as we are concerned, it is going to be debated in the Select Committee and in the House, if necessary, we will suspend Standing Order 62 to debate it. It is going to be debated. Just let me get it into hon. members heads. It is going to be debated in a Select Committee and in a Committee of the whole House and hon. members must understand that.

I am not arguing about the Rules any more. We know what was intended. We intend to give this matter the widest ventilation and we are not going to be put off by petty fogging arguments about the construction of six words in a Clause. That is alright for the Courts. The House of Assembly is in here to deal with the people's business, not to be dragged down by a lot of silliness about Rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, No. The hon. member must not ascribe silliness to a point of order made by the other side.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am ascribing it to my own part of the argument, Sir. The Rules say you must not reflect on any hon. member. I am reflecting it on myself, Sir. Whatever is necessary to be done to insure that members of the public have an opportunity to make themselves heard and members of the House will be done.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now, Sir, the whole question that we have been discussing which the hon. member has said was a frivolous point (Not the exact words), in 45(2) has to do with the attitude. Now here is an hon. member who said that he helped to write these Rules and who had spent long hours, if we take all the times he has risen on points of order relevant to these Rules, and now he says, "throw them away, those six words, do not let us get confused" when he himself just told the hon. member for St. Michael South Central to take the documents that a Lawyer will interpret them and then he gets up because obviously it suits his personal situation and says do away with those six or seven words and calls them petty.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the greatest respect I submit that any interpretation relating to the Rules of this Honourable House cannot be called petty merely because it suits the Prime Minister in his present state and I will not sit in this Honourable House and hear him, who has been an interpreter of the Rules, talking about Rules now in the context of throwing them away. He chooses to speak on behalf of his side and says he is going to have the Rules suspended. We cannot have that.
7.45 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has not made a point of order because he waited until the moment had passed and then raised the point of order. Please continue.

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Divide). (Asides).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am just going to move that the matter be referred to a Select Committee consisting of such persons.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order to deal with the question of voting and I am just looking for the Standing Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member risen?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will you please state the point of order?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am stating the point of order on the question of when a Division is called and voting on Bills. I am sorry, Sir, if you could assist me on the question of voting on Bills, I had the Standing Order here just now, but I have lost the place. Order 41(2): "At the conclusion of a debate upon any question the Speaker or Chairman shall put that question for the decision of the House. A question is fully put when the Speaker or Chairman has collected the voices of the 'Ayes' and of the 'Noes'. No further debate may thereafter take place upon that question." 41(3): "The result shall be declared by the Speaker or Chairman, but his opinion as to the decision of a question may be challenged by a Member claiming a division." The first thing I wish to draw to your attention is that you have not made any decision as to whether the AYES or the NOES have it. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I could interrupt the hon. member, I was under the impression that I said "The Ayes have it".

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The rule goes on to say, Sir: "When a division has been claimed, the officer then presiding shall direct the Clerk to ring the bell for a division." I called for a Division and therefore the bell should be rung. The point is that the Division was claimed, it is not necessary for a member to say 'six of us voted No' or 'one of us voted no', the rule provides for that, and we have reasons for calling the Division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Could I be heard on a point of order? The Parliament of Barbados, unlike any other Westminster type Parliament with which I am familiar, does not normally follow the full ritual of the giving of an opinion from the Chair.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Normally, Sir, as I have heard in every other one of these Parliaments, the Speaker calls for the Ayes, he calls for the Noes, he says 'I think the Ayes, or as the case may be, the Noes have it' and he then pauses and if there is no response he says 'the Ayes have it'. When he says 'The Ayes have it' it has ceased to be a matter of opinion. Now we have finally come to terms, after many years of Mr. Speaker Brancker and others who have made only one declaration, because customarily it is very popular to say 'I think the Ayes

have it' and you leave it at that unless a Division is called for, but we have finally come to terms now with our own weak form of words. A Division can only be called for, in my respectful submission, after the words 'I think the .....' one side or the other, '.....have it', it cannot be called for after the words 'The Ayes have it'.

Sir Theodore Brancker used to say very elaborately, 'Methinks the Ayes have it' and he never said anything else, and since that day the custom has grown up of entering the results of the vote on the opinion of the Speaker and not the declaration of the Speaker, but there are two separate sentences to be said. The first is the Speaker's opinion and the next is the Speaker's declaration. In every Parliament, except this, you have that. What I do not know is what happens in a situation where nobody votes no, because clearly all of us in here are fully aware that nobody voted no. What I do not know and I really could not tell you this, Mr. Speaker, is what happens in a situation where hearing no Noes the Speaker does not give an opinion, he merely gives a declaration, because that is exactly what happened in here today; no Noes were to be heard and the Speaker declared a result. That is my submission on the meaning of the rules.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, 41(2) of the Standing Orders is quite clear. "At the conclusion of a debate upon any question the Speaker or Chairman shall put that question for the decision of the House. A question is fully put when the Speaker or Chairman has collected the voices of the 'Ayes' and of the 'Noes'. No further debate may thereafter take place upon that question." 41(3): "The result shall be declared by the Speaker or Chairman, but his opinion as to the decision of a question may be challenged by a Member claiming a division."

I sat here, Mr. Speaker, I heard the Ayes, I did not hear the Noes, the Deputy Speaker said 'The Ayes have it' and then I heard "Divide". This is a very strange situation handled by very strange people on the other side, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that when the motion was put and the voices collected there were no Noes to be heard. Since there were no Noes to be heard, any attempt at calling for a Division must be considered as spurious, and further, even when a Division has been called for the Chair is not obliged to take notice thereof.
7.55 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: May we have Your Honour's ruling entered upon the records of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: On what?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On what you just said. I think it is so important it should be on the record that it is spurious under the Standing Orders to call for a division...

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition very well knows that he must not challenge the ruling of the Chair. Our Hansard reporters are always on duty. It is not that the hon. member must request that something be taken down.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I hope I could direct the Leader of the Opposition...

Mr. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. Prime Minister on the Select Committee.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I want to make a motion, Sir that this matter be referred to a Select Committee and I want to include in the motion an indication that subsequent to the Select Committee Report a Committee of the whole House will also debate the Bill in details. I may have to ask the Clerk's assistance in this matter. I am asking if it is possible to combine the motion in such a manner to make it clear that the intention of the House will be to have a Select Committee and a Committee stage of the Bill. In other words, can I move that the matter be referred to a Select Committee and after the Report by that Committee that a Committee of the whole House consider the Bill.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, referring to Standing Order No. 62 which deals with Reports from Select Committees. As you know there is a Select Committee, Committee of Privileges, a Public Accounts Committee, Debates Committee etc. Your Honour is Chairman of several of these Committees. The first three paragraphs of Standing Order No. 62 clearly stipulate that a Select Committee can at any time make a report to the House. Standing Order 62(3) states that the Report of a Select Committee may, on motion made, be referred by the House to a Committee of the whole House. The procedure of a Bill under Standing Order No. 62(4) is different because there is no debate; the Select Committee stage after the second reading is a substitute for the Committee stage of the whole House. You cannot have two committee stages of a Bill. The hon. member can make a motion that the Bill go to a Select Committee and if the House agrees with that you then select the Committee. When the matter comes back to the House the question has to be put, and that is the third reading of the Bill without any debate. Therefore, I submit that the hon. member's request is completely out of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If it is preferred to deal with the rule at a later stage...

Mr. SPEAKER: Don't let us deal with this at this stage. Let us send the Bill to a Select Committee and rest

assured that means will be found to deal with the matter. Do not let these unnecessary complications arise.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of six persons and Your Honour as the Chairman.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I think, with all due respect to you that this is more than one motion. If the House agrees that the Bill go to a Select Committee it is for hon. members to suggest how many members should be on the Committee and so on. That must not be part of the original motion. We may be in favour of Your Honour being Chairman but we may not be in favour of the number of members on the Committee as suggested. So in order to avoid any ambiguity I would prefer a simple motion that the Bill go to a Select Committee and then deal with other matters afterwards.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Many Private Members Resolutions have several parts and yet are considered as one Resolution. However, if it is preferred that the Bill be dissected by removal rather than by amendment by those who wish to disjoin its parts, I have no objections. If it is preferred, I move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.
8.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House may move the actual Motion that it be sent to a Select Committee.

The question that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:–

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Mr. WARD; Mr. SISNETT, Mr. SIMMONS; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. BRADSHAW; Mr. ALLEYNE and Mr. ODLE – 14.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Mr. SANDIFORD; Mr. WEEKES; Dr. HAYNES; Mr. GREAVES and Mr. TAITT. – 6.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Select Committee consist of six persons, namely His Honour the Speaker, as Chairman; the hon. members for Christ Church West; St. George South; Christ Church South Central; Christ Church East; and the Hon. member for St. Thomas to be members of the Committee.

I am leaving two places vacant for members of the Opposition.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will like to assure the hon. member that we have no intention of impeding the work of the Select Committee. He can have all Government members on it and if it is possible to deal with it at a later stage we will deal with it then, but not on a Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I now invite the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to nominate two persons from the Opposition to serve on this Select Committee.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think the hon. member has understood what I said. The Hon. Prime Minister can nominate the other two members as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the Hon. Leader of the Opposition quite well but it is my duty to invite the hon. member to nominate two persons.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thanks very much for the invitation but I will not be helping in any way and I beg to decline the invitation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has declined to name members.

The question that the persons nominated be the persons to serve on the Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the staff of Parliament for sparing us a few extra minutes of their time to assist us with our Parliamentary work.

I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 10.00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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.
8.15 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. Before we begin the business of the day I would like to report the sad news of the passing of one of our Hansard reporters, Mr. William Burke, who passed away yesterday. Mr. Burke served this Honourable House from time to time since 1950 and was a full time member of our Hansard staff from 1968 until now. We very much regret his passing. We think that he did his best while in office and with the concurrence of this Honourable House I will despatch to his immediate relatives the sincere condolences of this House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, we on this side would like to associate ourselves with the sentiments you have expressed and would like to join with you in ensuring that the usual sympathies be expressed to his relatives.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the members of the Opposition I too would like to associate myself with what you and the Hon. Leader of the House have said. On these occasions it is our duty to extend our deepest sympathy to the relatives of the deceased and I deem it my duty on behalf of all members on this side to state that we have appreciated the inestimable service the late Mr. Burke rendered to this House. We do hope that his soul will rest in peace.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Order No. 1 was called – To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of money Resolutions to be considered under Item No. 1 and I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee to consider a number of Resolutions of which notice has been given.

Mr. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979–80
PART I – CURRENT

Resolution to grant the sum of $71,924 from the Consolidated Fund to be placed at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1979–80 Part I Current Head 2, Item 12 – Conferences and Delegations.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is an Item concerning expenditure incurred on the recent visit to China by a delegation comprising Government and Opposition members.

I beg to move that the Head stand part of the Schedule.

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

Resolution to grant the sum of $370,000 from the Consolidated Fund to be placed at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1979–80 Part I – Current – Head 3, Item 2 Public Service Division – Establishments – Personal Emoluments.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This Item arises, Sir, because of the persistence of the large number of officers occupying temporary positions in the Government. The Government has tried its best to ensure that persons in temporary positions can be placed as soon as possible in staff positions so that there is no feeling of job insecurity. But it took us a little time to appoint security Guards to permanent positions; however, we expect this to be done very shortly at the beginning of the financial year. Security guards were kept for a longer period under the previous regime and the further delay is now caused by the additional work load at the extended airport and security services at school. The number of Security Guards in Government service has doubled since this Government came to power and it is only recently that we have been able to appoint a number of guards to fill positions on the established staff.

I am sure the House will be glad to hear that the principle of seniority was used in appointing the guards. Guards with bad records have been dismissed from the service, but all guards with good record, no matter under which regime they had originally been employed, have been appointed to the established staff of Government.

I beg to move that Head 3(2) stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister can tell us the number of guards who have been dismissed. I hope that he is in possession of the fact and that he can tell us the reason why they were dismissed or their employment terminated.
10.10 a.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Before I go too far into that I would say that in defence of any terminations of employment the National Union of Public Workers was consulted and the Guards' records made known to the National Union of Public Workers at a meeting in my office and no objection was raised either by the National Union of Public Workers or the Guards concerned. When I say that and also that the Guards would not want the reasons for their dismissal ventilated in the House of Assembly, the hon. member could perhaps understand. I would just select one of them. One Guard was suspected on evidence given by a number of fellow Guards of having organised the cutting of a hole in the wire at the airport and having allowed goods from a Carib West vehicle on to a Government vehicle delivered through a hole in the wire to a shop in Broad Street where he asked for payment in cash and not by cheque, and as far as I know police

investigations are still underway. If I could give that as an example, the hon. member would perhaps understand that their employment was not terminated unjustly, you will understand that this is something which has been going on for some time and the Government found it necessary to stop all this nonsense, because people were afraid to give statements about bad behaviour on the part of public officers, and took a decisive step to get rid of bad eggs.

We are only talking about four or five really bad ones in the Service, there are over 180 names on the Security Guard list, and I think the fact that none of the Guards has protested the termination of service, not one, not a representative on their behalf, is indicative of the fact that they were not being sent home lightly.

I hope that satisfies the hon. member.

The second item relates to personal allowances to Permanent Secretaries and Senior Officers, and there has been a great amount of leave, and the vote for Personal Allowances was a small one and needs to be supplemented. I really cannot remember the details about the vehicle.

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

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

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

HEAD 4(1) – CABINET OFFICE

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The vote for Conferences and Delegations has proved to be small in this area, probably due to the expense occasioned by holding conferences here. There was a conference related to UNESCO which cost over $300,000 – the Inter American Council for Science and Education, CIECC – there was unexpected expenditure in respect of this and there have also been one or two unusual and unanticipated expenditures in respect of conferences themselves.

A number of biennial conferences fell in 1979, and a full account was not taken of that when preparing the Estimates. There are certain conferences which only happen every two years, like Commonwealth Heads of Government, and there are one or two others, and the Conference Vote normally is related to what it was the year before, and the exceptional expense which arose from having to attend conferences because this is the year in which they fell has occasioned this expenditure, and we are therefore asking for Item 12 to be supplemented.

I beg to move that Head 4(1) stand part.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, in this age it is known that members of the Cabinet will be called on to attend these various conferences on business and in some cases to project the image of Barbados. Secondly, I have no grouse about these travelling expenses, and especially when one considers that in these developing countries, from my observation, it is indispensible to the various countries to try and secure as many loans as they possibly can to run the affairs of the country, and therefore when it comes to voting money in this House for such purposes it has my wholehearted support.

But, Sir, let us for one moment reminisce on the past. It has always been a bitter pill for the former Government to swallow when the members of the Government were members of the Opposition. We would listen to criticism from time to time, some almost unbearable, to give the public the impression that the former Government was spending too much money on travelling. I repeat that the duties of the Government entail travelling, and only a person who is not aware of the obligations which are placed on the shoulders of any Government would criticise the amount for travelling.

It is of paramount importance that if the developing countries must succeed they have to secure loans from various countries to run the affairs of the Governments. What perturbs me, Sir, is to see that there are some Governments in the Caribbean who have to go down on their knees to implore, to beseech, to beg people in the western world for loans, and then it is those very people – fortunately for us we have not reached that stage and I hope we will not reach it in my lifetime.
10.20 a.m.

Then we get those countries running to these various Organisations beseeching people, those in authority, to assist them in the affairs of their country so that the economic condition of the country will not collapse. I find it hard to understand how people can do those things and then when the various ideologies which are being spread throughout the Caribbean, then you get those very people to try and in some cases they are succeeding in misleading the inhabitants of the country.

Let me get back to the debate and to the criticisms which were levelled at the previous Government. Mr. Chairman, it is one thing to be members of the Opposition and another thing to be members of the Government when you have to face the full responsibility that relates to the Budget, introducing new products and so forth so that the people of the country can have certain amenities which are not available to them and therefore when I look at this Resolution I can only come to the conclusion that at the end of the year we will exceed the sum of $1 million. If I am wrong, the hon. Prime Minister and members of that side will give me the necessary information and I am willing to accept the explanation which they will give to this Honourable House.

Mr. Chairman, when you are a member of the Opposition, it is very well indeed to sit and to criticise the functioning of Government and the expenses which Government is obligated to spend but when you are steering the ship, just using my own term, "It is a horse of another colour". Therefore I am glad that the members on the other side have come to the realisation that criticisms which they have been making in the past of the former Government in travelling here, there and everywhere, that they now have got to follow on and with the increased cost of accommodation and other expenses, any reasonable person will expect that from time to time these amounts will increase.

What I am hoping, Sir, is now that we have been given these figures and that the amount in my opinion will exceed $1 million, I can only hope that the members on the other side will not have to come again to this Honourable House to ask for an additional amount. I am not saying that if it occurs that they will not have, I presume, a legitimate claim, but I am hoping that the amount which we are dealing with today will cover the expenses for the financial year.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I have no grouch about money needed to improve the affairs of the country. I am not one who will criticise for criticising sake. I am just here to express my feeling and to say that when you are members of the Government, and especially the Cabinet, you carry a reasonable amount of responsibility and therefore to come in here today and to criticise this amount will not in my opinion, and I am not speaking from a partisan point of view, I am expressing my own feeling, make sense.

I just want to state that regardless of which Government is in power we should use our discretion in not trying to mislead the public that money is being wasted on such tours.

It proves, Sir, that from time to time members perhaps weekly, monthly, daily, members of the Cabinet and Parliamentary Secretaries will be obligated to attend these Conferences, if they want to succeed and to accomplish the necessary funds to run the affairs of the country.
10.30 a.m.

I have noticed recently there are a few members over there who have a style of trying to belittle people who have to speak out on any occasion on any particular subject, but because I was not given the opportunity to go to London University and win the blue ribbons of Barbados, I am the same member as any other hon. member in this House and I did not come through the window, and I think that from my years' experience in here I should be treated with respect, and by those who feel that because they have the necessary qualifications, because they might have won the blue ribbons of this country that is not what being a legislator means, it means in here Government of the people by the people and for the people, and when we were elected in here as representatives of the people and you sit here and certain insinuations are made by certain people who try to belittle others because they did not reach their standard of education, God help Barbados if that is the kind of attitude which is going to exist in this House.

I am very perturbed about that, because I notice on two occasions someone from over there tried to insult and belittle me, and I resent it. Only yesterday when I was not involved in this exercise it occurred. I have no axe to grind with anyone, I come in here to express my feelings, to speak from my conscience, and all who do not like it they can do what they like. I am not going to toe the line when I see something in which I should express my feeling, and therefore this morning I have come here with a clean heart to give this Bill my wholehearted support, but I want to warn you all that if you are going to feel that only professionals who come in here, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. members have the feeling that only certain members who are professionals should be in here, God help that day, this House will have gone down to zero. You look at people who because they have not got your background and take it upon yourself without a cause to say disparaging things, to belittle others. It does not prove courtesy, it does not prove that those people have appreciated the service which others have rendered, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have given out this as a warning, I want to clear the air with that matter here today, because I am very perturbed and upset about those kinds of insinuations.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can understand the hon. member, but please try and come back to the debate.

Mr. WEEKES: I am on the verge of completion. Mr. Chairman, this Resolution has my wholehearted support, and I say this because if any other Government was in power I would also give it my support because the work of the Government must be carried on, and while I have noticed the colossal sum which exceeds $1 million I am not against it, because it is a legal expenditure, and speaking for myself and for the Opposition, I will at all times when legislation come here in the interest of the masses give my wholehearted support and to let others know who have won the blue ribbons in Barbados, Reynold Weekes has not won any blue ribbons but he has been put here by the people, he has more service in here than any of them, and whatever they feel like saying and whatever they feel like doing, that is their business.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for allowing me to make this contribution, and again I say this Resolution has my blessings.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my contribution to this Resolution and at the same time take up a few points that were mentioned by the hon. member who has just taken his seat.

I too am a layman, I too like him did not attend universities, neither did I qualify, like him, for a blue ribbon, but I would just like him to understand that it was the Leader of his party, the now Leader of the Opposition, who on several occasions has made it part of his experience to hurl abuse at the now present Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment. I too have suffered from what I would term attempted humiliatory remarks, but I am not made of that mettle, the Minister of Housing and Lands is not made of that mettle that see people fold up because people who have acquired academic qualifications hurl abuse at them.
10. 40 a.m.

The hon. member must understand that it was the Leader of his party, the present Leader of the Opposition who called him a bum, and I remember in 1976 when the Leader of the Opposition said that there was no use for people like him. So it is people from his party who started that. I am not aware that any member from this side has said anything detrimental about the hon. member. But that is politics and all of us at times try to score cheap points, but we must not show that weakness of character when we get up to find excuses. I do not feel that any member from that side can abuse me that I cannot retaliate.

Now, on the resolution dealing with the conference and delegations vote, it is true that expenses in relation to hotel accommodation have increased. Every day they are going up. Sometimes you get quotations here in Barbados and when you get to the country you find those quotations have skyrocketed and sometimes you are out of pocket. So at times it is difficult to correctly estimate the vote. As the Hon. Prime Minister has rightly said, there has been some unusual conferences – not in the sense that we have embarked on unusual exercises but that we had to host certain conferences here in Barbados and I would say that anyone who followed closely the benefits which Barbados in general has been able to obtain will see that it is not a wasteful exercise but that the expenditure which this Government has incurred is worth it. We have been able to extract from most of these conferences that the Government has been able to participate in several sums of money; millions of dollars have accrued to Barbados, and therefore before anyone becomes critical of a vote of this nature one should look at the result, and the cost benefits, and when one examines that particular factor one must conclude that we as a Government are justified in having this vote supplemented. What this side has been critical of in the past is unnecessary expenditure or expenditure which has shown no benefit to the country. But if the results are such that people can see that their money was well spent I think it is a useful exercise. I give my support to this Resolution.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, just a short contribution on this matter. The hon. member for St. Philip South who spoke on behalf of the Opposition on this particular vote indicated very clearly the Opposition's support for expenditure under this Head. We sitting on this side could easily adopt the position of saying "We told you so," because we well remember the constant attacks that came from the other side when in Opposition about expenditure incurred under this Head. At that time we recognized that independence brings certain responsibilities and that a developing country needs to inter-act with other countries and must spend time and money to ensure that the kind of development which takes place in the country will benefit the country. So we have no particular quarrel with the expenditure under this Head; it is something we initiated in taking this country on to the world scene and it must involve certain expenditure. What we would like to find out from the other side is a breakdown which the Prime Minister should be able to provide. I would like to suggest that the Prime Minister provide us with a breakdown.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to draw your attention to Standing Order No. 9(3) in respect to quorum; there is no quorum in this Chamber at the moment.

(Bell rung, quorum obtained)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a quorum now; please continue.

Mr. GREAVES: As I was saying Mr. Chairman, I would like to see from the Prime Minister a breakdown of this expenditure. As the hon. member for St. Philip South pointed out, as far as we can see under this Head expenditure for this financial year will be over a million dollars, and this is quite apart from expenditure under other Heads which also involve Conferences and Delegations. But for this specific Head we would like to get some indication of how money is projected to be spent under Conferences and the expenditure on delegations which have gone abroad from time to time. We think this information will be useful for us and would like to see this kind of breakdown. I do not think we can just sit down and give blanket approval to money without getting some clear indication as to the direction in which it is to be expended.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other member intend to make a contribution? If not I would ask the hon. Prime Minister if he has anything further to say.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of things that must be considered in relation to this Resolution. I heard the Opposition mention this morning about the increasing cost in the vote for Conferences and Delegations, but as usual we have not heard the opposite side, that is the benefits that arise out of liaising with international organizations through money spent on conferences and seminars, etc.

I want to give the House the benefit of some of the advantages gained by our association with regional and international organizations and from our attendance at various meetings and conferences in the past year.
10.50 a.m.

I have with me, Mr. Chairman, benefits from projects approved by the Organisation of American States for the years 1978–1979 and under Education we have received $444,000 for Curriculum Development in Science and Educational Technology. In Culture we have received $53,000 for Archives and Cultural Development. For Science and Technology we have had $128,000 and this includes the Comfith Project and Agricultural Food Technology and so on and in Economics and social matters we have received in excess of $593,000 U.S., almost like $1.1 million.

I see in a Report here that money has been had for Tax System review modernising and Tourism Planning and Development, Youth Training and Vocational Programmes, Social Security and Administration matters, the Planning Unit for Housing and the Statistical Department and these increases represent almost $2 million in benefits derived from the Organisation of American States.

Now in respect of UNESCO I believe that in the past year, there have been two or three Conferences organised by UNESCO and at which the Ministry of Education was represented. Not the Minister, the Ministry. I have here with me some of the benefits derived from our association with UNESCO, not only by being a member but being able to go to these Conferences and having discussions with Secretary Generals, Director Generals and Heads of Sections and making an immediate impact on them and their needs and so on.

We have been able, for instance, to go to Paris and personally invite the Director General of UNESCO to Barbados. We had a Meeting here in April this year and we put up a long shopping list to him when he came here and said this is what we want and among the things which we had were the provisions of Architectural services.

We have a new World Bank School Building Programme in Barbados and we needed the assistance of UNESCO in providing professional Architects and they have given us $100,000 in Architectural Services.

Now if you have to send six people to Paris to talk with the Director General to get $100,000 for Architectural Services, you would have at least got 10:1 or 5:1 but there were only five people so I think the benefit of that alone more than makes up for all of the expenditure for these type of Conferencês and Delegations throughout the Financial Year.

I see the hon. member for St. Michael South who went on a lot of joy-rides and brought back nothing in return smiling and I am challenging the hon. member for St. Michael South, when he was Minister of Education and therefore responsible for UNESCO Affairs to spell out to this House what benefits were derived from his participation in UNESCO matters. I am really interested to hear. I am throwing this out at him and I believe that he will accept the invitation. I will hold back a few of the things I was going to say in relation to UNESCO until he speaks.

Now concerning the Food and Agricultural Organisation, only this week the Minister of Agriculture has gone with his Permanent Secretary and Chief Education Officer to a FAD Meeting in Rome and I do not care what it cost because the Food and Agricultural Organisation gave over $2 million a year to the School Meals Service in Barbados so when the hon. members can get up and say you are spending a little money on airplane fares to put somebody in a Hotel when at a Meeting it is necessary at the sametime to talk about what benefits accrue. In 1976, shortly after I was in the Ministry of Education.....

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Sir. I think I am the only hon. member who spoke and the hon. member for St. Lucy and as far as I am aware and have listened attentively, I do not think anybody criticised the travelling or anything of the like when it comes to airfares so that while you are clearing the air with the matter, you should still consider that there was no real criticism from this part of the House.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member can feel assured that I am not attacking or criticising anything that he has said. As far as I can remember he said he was in total agreement with the Resolution and that he was supporting it. There is no quarrel with that.

All I am trying to do is to point out for benefit of the House and the public of Barbados what benefits are derived from spending money for civil servants in large numbers and far less frequently, Ministers of Government going overseas to Conferences and Delegations for one reason or another. I was making the point before the hon. member for St. Philip South rose about the benefits we were getting from the World Food Programme.

When I came into the Ministry, and the hon. member for St. Michael South would know this, we noticed that the assistance from the World Food Programme was

granted in July, 1977. There was going to be no further assistance to Barbados from the World Food Programme and Officials from my Ministry went on a mission to Rome and met with the Directors of the World Food Programme and made out an argument which turned out to be persuasive that we were operating a model programme in Barbados which could be copied by any other country that the FAO wanted to consider and showed them the benefits of maintaining this programme as their model. The result was that they extended the programme for two years and that two years resulted in $4 million in aid in that regard.

Now I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has gone off to another Meeting in Rome and he has given a brief from the Ministry of Education in respect of the World Food Programme which assistance is due to come to an end in July, 1980. We have given him a brief to meet with the Directors of the World Food Programme and to try again to persuade them to extend the programme for at least another year because an extension for another year will mean $2 million in benefits to the people of Barbados.

There is something else that needs to be considered in relation to the increased expenditure in this area. Barbados has been hosting a great number of Conferences here at home. Only this year we had the CX and CS Conference which is the Education, Science and Cultural Conferences of the OAS and the Economic and Social Conference of the FAO and this country in September of this year had over a period of a week to ten days over 400 delegates from Latin American and some 19 Ministers from the Latin American countries and all the benefits that accrued from that type of sojourn in Barbados by people of that group would demonstrate to everybody that there is a fairly substantial spin-off in the economy of Barbados.

When these people come in here they spend a lot of money in Hotels and they spend a lot of money in Barbados and therefore one has got to see the benefits accruing.
11.00 a.m.

All the benefits that naturally accrue from that type of sojourn in Barbados by people of that ilk demonstrate to everybody that there is a fairly substantial spill-over into the economy of Barbados. When these people come in here they spend a lot of money in hotels and they spend a lot of money in Barbados, and therefore one has got to see the benefits accruing from the investment made under this particular vote. I mention this, Mr. Chairman, because I hear the hon. member for St. Lucy asking for the type..... *(Aside).* The hon. member said I have not answered his question, but I thought I had. He is perfectly free to put it to me again, but I thought I had given some idea .....

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, it is true that the Hon. Minister was not in the Chamber when I spoke, and obviously he does not seem to be aware of the question I had posed. Just for his benefit I would like to repeat it. I indicated that we would like to find out from this side what amounts of money have been allocated. We want to get a breakdown. We recognise that over a million dollars is being spent this year and we want to get a breakdown between money which was spent on conferences which are held in Barbados and money that was expended on delegations going overseas. This is really what the question is all about. We can recognise the benefits from conferences and delegations because we ourselves have participated in that.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need to pursue this any further, the Minister of Finance will obviously in his winding up give the information that the hon. member for St. Lucy wants.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Just a brief reply, Mr. Chairman. I did not really intend to speak on this particular matter but I was invited by the Minister of Education, he really wants some assistance on the background to his being able to go up to UNESCO and talk to officials in UNESCO. He wants to know how it is he can go. Well, the fact is he can go because of the actions of the Democratic Labour Party in taking Barbados into UNESCO. We took the country into independence and we took it into UNESCO, and he is now benefiting as a result of a positive step taken by the Democratic Labour Party in the teeth of bitter opposition from members of your party.

Now, I do not understand with how many voices the present Barbados Labour Government speaks. The Minister of External Affairs states that Grenada is in breach of human rights in the Caribbean, the Prime Minister of the country says that Barbados is not in the business of naming countries, the Minister of External Affairs states that he is interested in a bi-partisan approach on foreign policy and he would like the co-operation of the Opposition in these matters, including co-operation in the establishment of some joint committee. But while they are calling for that type of co-operation you get the Minister of Education in trying himself to score what his colleague, the member for St. Michael South East, has quite rightly called a cheap political point, says that we went on joy rides when we were in Government but now he is not going on a joy ride, he must be going on a sorrow trip.

So what happens is, he goes up to Paris, I do not know what hotel he stayed in but I am certain that he was well accommodated, he said he got architectural assistance by taking a trip to Paris and he was able to speak with the Director General and Heads of Sections and so on. All the hon. member did, or had to do, was to read the reports which were made by myself and other delegations which went up to UNESCO in Paris and he would

see that we have discussions with the same officers holding the same positions. By our interventions we were able to get the Missions from UNESCO to come down to this country and carry out education surveys in this country, two educational planning missions to this country. We made representations in a number of vital areas, and I am going to identify them, I am not really responsible for that particular portfolio at the moment, but I will list them and I will find an opportunity to present it to the House on some other occasion.

As far as architectural services are concerned, what is so big about that? We talked to the Canadian Government and we had an architect in the Ministry of Education as a result of visits overseas, so what is new about getting an architect or architectural services? We paid visits to Canada, we had discussions and we had an architect in the Ministry of Education as well; nothing new or big about that. I would hardly think that this is the major point the member wishes to make. You cannot score points on that, the foundation has been well laid and you have a good wicket to bat on. I hope you continue to bat, because your time is very short.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I think it is admitted on both sides of the House that it is beneficial to the country to expend money under this Head and that certain benefits have accrued to the country. I just want to make a point that I think has not been sufficiently noticed by either the public or indeed members. We spend approximately $6 million per year on External Affairs proper, and I am not talking about our expenditure on tourism or on the IDC, the actual figure I am trying to get now. If one includes the contributions to the International Organisations the figure is about $8,177,000. Any technical assistance which Barbados receives either by way of services or by way of equipment or by way of grant, we get in excess of $8 million a year, even if one leaves out a number of scholarships which the Ministry of Education gets and which are not included in that figure.

I must point out that these are not loan funds to be repaid, it is either technical assistance grants given by way of cash by the provision of the services of experts, by feasibility studies, or indeed by way of equipment, but the majority of this comes from the Organisation of American States, the United Nations Development Programme and the Inter-American Development Bank.
11.10 a.m.

I am not going to include the Caribbean Development Bank because those amounts are not included in the figure and various donors like the United Kingdom and the United States which have begun to provide technical assistance in the last three years and other donors including Mexico, Venezuela, Argentina and others. I think too it is true to say that Foreign Affairs is costing the country nothing if one balances the amount of money we receive by way of technical assistance against the expenditure we would have had to make otherwise. I have not included in these figures funds which may go to institutions such as the Barbados Workers' Union which on its own has sought funds, or other voluntary organizations, and I think Barbados ought to welcome that its association in these countries can be beneficial and has been beneficial to the country as a whole. I take this opportunity to speak of the success which we have achieved in getting Barbadians in particular and West Indians in general placed in important organizations and in key roles in International organizations. I think the Committee would wish me to congratulate Ambassador Val McComie in becoming the first Barbadian to achieve the second highest office in the Organization of American States. This is an achievement of which we all can be proud and I am sure Mr. McComie will go on to render assistance to the Caribbean as a whole. I am sorry the hon. member for St. Michael North Central is not in his seat because, unfortunately, without the facts he made it appear as though Mr. McComie's candidacy did not receive the full backing of all Caribbean States. If he insists on that view he is totally mistaken. All Caribbean member states fully supported Mr. McComie's candidacy, and we gained support from Suriname, Brazil, the United States, Venezuela, Argentina and Bolivia, among other countries. In fact from every sub-region of Latin America and the Caribbean – whether Central America, the Caribbean proper, the Southern States or the Andean group we got support for the Barbados candidate. This is a point I would want to inform this House and the public about. And I want to say that Foreign Affairs Ministers in the Caribbean went out of their way to write letters to other Ministers in Latin America asking support for our candidate. Now we spent some of this conference vote on sending delegations comprising Ambassador Babb and Ambassador McComie to visit countries in Latin America to solicit their support. I consider this proper expenditure under the vote and as a matter of fact I may well have to call on the vote again to pay for these gentlemen to go back and say thanks to the fourteen States who supported our candidate.

But Mr. McComie is not the only high-ranking officer placed in recent years. The Minister of Education can tell of the fact that we have secured the appointment of his Permanent Secretary as a Director of UNESCO. In addition to this we have landed Freddie Forde, the former head of our Foreign Service, on the Inspection Unit of the United Nations and he has performed so well that he has been elected Chairman of that body and his term extended for another three or four years. We have just landed Mr. Rudder who was at the Met Office in the position of Chief Training Officer of the World Met Organisation. As another example, we have for the first

time landed a Barbadian, Miss Yvette Morris in the Press Office of the United Nations. I cite these cases to show that we have Barbadians in high positions abroad and from these we are able to get benefits from the United Nations Organization and obtain knowledge and information ahead of time.

I want to talk about the UNDP and to say that one of the things I did recently while attending a conference of UNDP was to discuss the possibility of Barbados becoming a location for a UNDP office, and in the new year Barbados will have a regional UNDP office here which in addition to providing employment for twenty Barbadians will improve the programme in the area serviced by UNDP. I can also cite UNICEF as a result of our performance at the United Nations granting us $129,000 for the children of Barbados. And I am sure if the Minister of Health were to speak she would point out the benefits Barbados has got from our association with PAHO. If I give another example, when I attended a Conference for economic cooperation for the first time we got a grant of US$ 250,000 to help with our skilled training programme to train young people under the Occupation Training Act recently passed in this House. We could go on *ad nauseam* citing a number of cases, and I do not think the public should have any doubt that we take ourselves very seriously on these matters.

I just want to make one particular point. Going abroad on conferences is no luxury for those of us on this front bench. I have had the situation, for instance, where I went to a conference and nature paid a call on me and I had to ask a Jamaican delegate to hold on for me; this is because our delegations go abroad with the minimum number possible, although we are servicing committees – which is unusual.
11.20 a.m.

Even some countries with a lesser GNP or GDP than ours, countries like Paraguay or countries with foreign exchange problems like Jamaica or Guyana carry full teams. In fact, I see Ministers of Foreign Affairs of other countries carrying along their Secretaries to take notes and to do letters and to make appointments. Do not let me do that for myself, Sir.

Our Ambassador to the OAS had to be typing my speech. These are the sort of things, Sir. He actually had to do the typing of my speech and the changes to my speech. That is a fact. I do not know of any Minister of Government here who is able to have any of the sort of benefits that I see other countries having. Therefore, I am glad to hear the Opposition supports the Resolution because it is obvious that the money being spent is well spent.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I just would like for the record to note that the Government has not answered the question that was asked.

The question that Head 4(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE – HEAD 15(11) LIBRARIES

ITEM 7 – SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a very straightforward matter. This is for supplies and materials for Libraries. These things happen, Sir, books go up in price, stationery and everything else. It is a straightforward Supplementary.

I beg to move that Head 15(11) stand part.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979–80 No. 10

Item No. 1 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to amend the Note to Item 9 under Head 19 (3) – Ministry of Labour and Community Services; and to grant the sum of $1,061,877 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1979-80, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1979-80, No. 10 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the Government has taken the decision to start a Masters Degree Course in Law at Cave Hill in Legislative Drafting. This decision was taken to meet a very pressing need for Legal Draftsmen both in Barbados and the Caribbean.

It is a tripartite programme funded equally by the Governments of Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, and Barbados. The Course started in October this year, and it was proposed originally for the training of 10 Officers in the public service in each of these three Islands and indeed all the Islands of the Eastern Caribbean.

There has been difficulty in getting positive results from the In Service Training that was formerly done by the respective Governments. We know, for instance that in Barbados there is such a tremendous lack of skilled draftsmen and such an abundance of difficult Legislation that the Senior Draftsmen are finding it more and more

difficult to devote time in supervising and in teaching the skills in training draftsmen.

It is for this reason that the Government of Barbados felt it necessary that a formal course should be instituted in the University of the West Indies, in the Law Faculty, to meet this end. This figure of $49,317 represents a third part of the Course in the area of this programme and the other two-thirds being met by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and the Government of Jamaica.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, of course it gives me great pleasure to second this Head and the Resolution for it, since I have some responsibility for Law although the subject of the University is primarily the responsibility of the Minister of Education. I wish to thank him and his officials for the ready co-operation which they have given to my Ministry on matters to do with the training of the legal profession.

In particular, we have already carried out our Manifesto promise to abolish discriminatory provisions, fee paying and other discriminatory provisions against students in law at the University of the West Indies and the Law School run by the Council of Legal Education so that Barbadian students attending these Institutions are now treated no differently from Barbadian students doing other subjects at these Institutions and the Government is meeting the tuition cost of all of the students. That is another of our Manifesto pledges which has been honoured.

We have had a great deal of problems in providing enough legislative draftsmen or drafters in the Caribbean and we have had during the period of years some courses sponsored by the Commonwealth Legal Bureau of the Commonwealth Secretariat. These Courses did not meet our needs adequately. We had difficulty in placing some of our aspiring drafters in Courses overseas and came to the conclusion that it would be preferable to establish our own Courses at the Universities in the West Indies and Barbados took the initiative in organising for such a Course to be started and we solicited the support of other Caribbean Governments to contribute financially and otherwise to this Course.

The Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, the Rt. Hon. Dr. Williams, when he met with the Prime Minister, Tom Adams, the Rt. Hon. member for St. Thomas, commended this initiative on the part of Barbados and said that he had no difficulty in including his support in the Agreement reached between the two countries because it was a good idea which was being pursued at little cost to the great benefit of the Caribbean.

11.30 a.m.

And so we had Trinidad's agreement to pay one half of the cost if no other Caribbean country agreed. I subsequently had negotiations with the Hon. Carl Rattray who is Attorney General and Minister of Justice in Jamaica and Jamaica has agreed to fund one-third. On the Course we can take ten people at any one time in any one year. At the moment we have seven students, two of whom are from Barbados, one from Trinidad, one from Jamaica, one from the Bahamas, one from I believe it is St. Kitts, and one from some other country, but we are hoping that we will get the full complement of ten draughtsmen and that over the next six to seven years the Caribbean can produce enough draughtsmen to be able at least to maintain some reasonable size, and I think that this Course is going to be beneficial in the long run to upgrading the standards of laws which we receive here in Parliament itself.

Let me say that I am indebted to Mr. Tim Ryan, the legal consultant provided to my Ministry with UNDP assistance for consenting to take on the initial organisation of this Course in addition to the other duties he was doing as consultant in my Ministry. He is with us for a year as Professor but in due course it is hoped we will recruit a suitable West Indian to take over from him when his period of secondment ceases, and that the Course will have a Caribbean content in the future.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Resolution for the sum of $49,317. The objective is no doubt a laudible one, and I would like to compliment the Government on this effort that they are making in order to improve the legislative drafting and the drafting of the other Acts or Bills which may come to this Parliament from time to time. That is as far as Barbados is concerned, I speak as far as Barbados is concerned. Mr. Chairman, you yourself will recall that it was only yesterday when we had draft legislation coming before this Chamber in which we heard a remarkable admission that two words dropped out.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. The hon. member knows that he cannot reflect on a vote of this House in this Session, and he does not even want to give way. That is not his usual style.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am not reflecting on any vote of the House, I am making an observation which is a remarkable observation, that it was a remarkable statement from the front and back benches that in a piece of legislation which went through so many different committees of the Government, including the Cabinet, with all the legal luminaries, that two words dropped out of this piece of legislation and a whole paragraph cannot be found, and it could not be found up to yesterday, because this House today has not been told what that paragraph was and we have not received those

amendments. So I think there is a definite need, I think the point must be established, it is firmly established that there is a need for an improvement in these areas, and I support wholeheartedly the intention of this particular measure that is before us, and I hope that it will lead in due course to an improvement in the area of legislative drafting and general efficiency as far as the presentation of legislation to this House is concerned.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the. hon. member has just spoken, and I think that out of his mouth we now understand why it is that during his regime the situation was so bad in this area. I thank him very much for his commendation of the Government, because for the first time serious efforts are being made to deal with the shortage of an area of legal skills throughout the Caribbean.. It is a great pity that we are now, today, in 1979, having to undertake this exercise.. Had it been done before we would not now have to do it. So I thank him for it..

Rt.. Hon.. E.. W.. BARROW: Mr.. Chairman, the Law Faculty is in Barbados because the Democratic Labour Party Government without any assistance from the other side or from the Bar Association or the Law Society of Barbados managed to secure enough support, both financial and from the other islands, to bring the Law Faculty here.. There could be no legal training until the University of the West Indies had a Law Faculty. This is the first point which has to be made. Before that we had a gentleman called Mr. Ryan, who I believe the present Government called back -- comparatively recently I heard that he was back in Barbados – to assist in setting up a proper drafting section; Mr. Denys Williams who is now Judge Williams, who with other Jamaicans have been trained by a very eminent legal draughtsman in Jamaica, was recruited and brought here; and a lady who I believe is one of the legal draughtsmen now – I do not know whether she is still practising with the Government – was sent on a course to Ireland, somebody else was sent to Australia, and everything possible was done to try and bring the drafting section up to a certain standard.

Drafting is a highly specialised branch of the legal profession. You cannot come out of a criminal court and walk in and draft.. I am no draughtsman, and that is why you will remember from time to time when the now Government was in the Opposition I warned them not to try to draft legislation on the floor of the House, and frequently we postponed consideration of Bills when we saw defects in them and sent them back to the legal draughtsmen when they were trying to stampede us into moving the amendments here on the floor of the House. 11.40 a.m..

The hon. Prime Minister is trying to distort the position taken by the Opposition on another matter by suggesting any analogy between what I am referring to as a historical fact; so don't let us get into that. But there is no point in saying they are now trying to do something we did not do because.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give way, does he not agree that one of the best ways of avoiding legislating on the floor of the House is by having a Select Committee?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Not for legislation as iniquitous from the beginning as this is. I remember one hon. member for St. Andrew saying there is no physician who can write a prescription for everybody. I say there is no physician that can write a prescription for bad drafting. But there is no need to be acrimonious about this, because throughout the Caribbean there has been a sad shortage of qualified draftsmen. The Government of Jamaica were the first people to recognize that they needed proper draftsmen, and Mr. Denys Williams was one of the proponents of the scheme the Jamaican Government initiated, and Mr. Williams assisted in this direction here by bringing Mr. Ryan and sending Miss Bannister on various courses; and other training programmes were set up which showed that we were very conscious of this particular failing in our legal department. I refer to the fact yesterday that to get the Central Bank Legislation on the Statute Books took six years. There has always been a bottle neck in the legal department. Anything they had not done before they had to do a lot of research and consultation, take trips abroad, and so on, simply because they did not have the in-depth experience of persons trained as legal draftsmen. This measure is going to cost $49 000, but it is the only proper method and for the productivity it will bring about we are willing to support. But I just want to point out that until we had a law faculty we did not train draftsmen on the scale required.

The question that Head 15(5) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 19(1) was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are three Items under this Head. The first relates to a housing allowance for the Chief Labour Officer. Although the Chief Labour Officer was given a housing allowance in April, 1976, it turns out that he was never paid it. I do not know how this happened, you put up an argument for a housing allowance, you get it and the person goes three and a half years without claiming it. The sum of $17 000 is needed to pay the holder of the post housing allowance for three years to the end of this financial year.

The next point relates to an amendment to a Note. I am not over-familiar with the reasons why the three in-

stitutions should be amalgamated in the Note, but it is the wish to combine the three things so that the cost can be divided.

The third Item arises out of an announcement made in the Budget re the increase of old age pensions to $20 a week and it is necessary to supplement the vote by almost $1 million.

If I may say so, a good deal of criticism was made for increasing old aged pensions at the time of the Budget and it was said that the previous Government used to increase old age pensions every time there was an increase for public officers. It is no accident that we increased old aged pensions in the off years of salary revision for public officers. It is our view that the year that public officers salaries are increased need not necessarily be the same year that old aged pensions are increased, and it is not the intention of the Government to relate the two to each other. Public officers received increases in 1978 and the old aged pensioners in 1979. I think that the forthcoming negotiations strongly suggest that public officers will receive an increase in 1980 and I expect that the pattern will be followed in the case of old aged pensioners.

I beg to move that Head 19(1) stand part.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak on one aspect of this Resolution, the Head dealing with the Ministry of Labour and Community Services, – Direction and Policy Formulation. Like the Prime Minister I am somewhat flabergasted to think that an officer – obviously a fight had to be put up to get the Housing allowance and then to find three years elapsing before payment. Be that as it may, I would like to make the point when we come to the question of the Labour Department that we feel very strongly that we have a situation in Barbados where serious consideration has to be given to the upgrading of the Labour Department. As to the reasons for this, one finds that there are some departments of Government which are regarded as special departments in that they get special treatment, such as the Income Tax Department and Customs which are largely revenue-earning departments and when they make requests they always seem to get the nod.
11.50 a.m.

I would like to submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Labour is vitally an important Department in this country and that some serious attention has to be paid to this particularly in view of the fact that our country is industrialising and that the major question of conflicts which arise from time to time in the area of industrial relations have to be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Now we have a situation in Barbados where lots of criticisms can be levelled at the Department of Labour in terms of the way in which that Department is presently staffed and is able to deal with the problem which it encounters from day to day. I would like at this stage to say that most certainly the recent appointment of a person to head that Department of the kind of calibre that that person who now heads that Department have, in my view, is a step in the right direction.

I would certainly like to see some improvement being made to further up-grade the Department. This is my own view and this is a view that I have held for a long time. I was just looking through some debates here which go back to 1972 since after I became a member of this House where I made a similar call. I do not think that being a member of the Democratic Labour Party could prevent me from making any particular criticism where I feel criticism should be made.

At that time I made the point that the Department of Labour should have a higher status in terms of ranking and at the same time it should be staffed with people who possess the capabilities in dealing with the ticklish and difficult problems which that particular Department would be called upon to deal with from time to time.

Now to deal with the question of Factory inspection. I think this action is a matter to which some very serious attention has got to be paid. At the present time, as far as I know, there is only one Factory Inspector at the Department of Labour. I believe that this is too important a section in the Department of Labour to be staffed with only one person. I would hope that the Government would make it possible for more people to be trained in this area so that that Department can be adequately staffed in that particular section. One knows, for example, of a number of instances which unfortunately cannot be pursued because of the lack of adequate proper staffing in that particular area.

Another point I would like to indicate is that the Department of Labour should be strengthened in terms of being able to prosecute people who might be in violation of certain Regulations particularly in the area of Factories and I would like to find out from whoever will be responding to this Bill if within the last five years any prosecutions have been made by the Department of Labour for violation of the Factory Act.

I think it is a matter which is of some very important concern and certainly from this side. I am speaking because I recognise we are looking at this matter in a very serious way and we feel that the Department of Labour has a very important role to play in this country and we would like to see some steps being made to up-grade it in terms of the kind of role and function that it should be able to play in the country particularly at this very important stage of our development.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have been very glad to listen to the very reasonable tone of the last hon. member. Of course, I think that he has now recognised that he is pushing a door which is easier to open nowadays than it was during the period of time when his Government was in power.

Now, since this Government assumed office there can be no doubt about it that more and more resources have been devoted to this Ministry. The Government is fully cognisant of the need to expand the range of skills at the advisory and supervisory levels within the Department of Labour if we are to continue to have the type of industrial relationship climate which we now have in Barbados.

The integration of the Ministry of Labour with other Ministries who also perform a function which contributes to this type of industrial relation climate is going ahead with great pace and I think that one of the great contributions that we have made in the short period of time we have been here is to make the public understand that this Ministry of Labour and Community Development is not a Cinderella Ministry. It is a very, very important Ministry.

The role that this Ministry has to play, therefore, will be readily appreciated now that additional resources have been put at its disposal. I do not want to categorise exactly what they are at the present moment because at the appropriate time this will be made known but I think that the public must have recognised the new initiative being taken now in the manpower direction in this country. It is a very, very important area.

I have always believed that the prime labour allocation of job filling should be done through the Ministry of Labour in Barbados. I remember when I was in the Opposition I argued quite strongly that the time had come for the decentralisation of the Employment Agencies in Barbados. I hope it will be very soon.

I know there are objections within the Department, not at Ministerial level, but at a personal level. The other side was never able to get it through but this Government is prepared to insist that these policies are carried into effect.

I cannot see how one can expect in this country that a man who is employed in the North or South of Barbados should have to drive to Bridgetown or have to pay a busfare when a man is unemployed to go and register in order to find out if there is a job.

In addition to that, people do not recognise yet the significance of the policy of this Government that there must be decentralisation of employment opportunities in this country hence our execution of our planning of sub-towns in Barbados. More urgency is needed in this direction not simply because of the fact that if you have to provide the needs of transport at present day cost, not only of capital equipment but also of transport fuel important decisions must be made. Decentralisation of employment must be carried into effect if we are to result in the energy saving that we hope to achieve.
12.00 p.m.

So that when you look at the totality of packages that we have devised, I hope that all those who are responsible for the implementation of particular parts of the programme will recognise and understand that whatever their personal feelings in relation to this matter that they cannot obstruct the Government in the execution of its programmes. I look forward to decentralisation as a matter of urgency. I say both Speightstown and in the Southern area – I don't claim it for Oistins – it may well be that somewhere in St. Philip, or it may well be that St. George in the new town that is going up there it will be more convenient; it may be. (ASIDES). The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is obviously not *au fait* with what is going on in Barbados, Sir, he does not know that a new town is going up in St. George. (Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What about St. John?). The problem with St. John as I understand it is that they have had a lot of attention in the past and the hangover still seems to be in existence, because they are still getting their disproportionate amount of attention now.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member will give way, my point is this, that even in St. John we do have some residual unemployment and I want to know when the new town is being built because I do not expect an employment bureau in St. John but we do not mind using the one in the new town in St. George, so I want to know when the new town is going to be built so that my people would have access.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Around the Glebe in St. George. I am very pleased to say that the Minister of Housing whose responsibility under which that project comes has assured me that the agreement has been signed with the Church, the designs for the specific infrastructure have been approved by Town and Country Planning, and I believe that the award of the contract for the actual execution of the work will shortly take place.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I thought it was already there, because neither the representative for the parish nor I could see it with the naked eye.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well, I am sure that the hon. member does not always need to be able to see with the naked eye, perhaps sometimes he may be able to appreciate it with the naked brain.

The basic position is that the contract for the construction of the road will soon be completed, the acquisition notices have been published in the newspaper for land at Walkers and so for the shifting of the houses to accommodate the immediate road, and the Minister of Education assures me that the school building..... – I cannot give the details of that, I do not want to give the details, but the basic position is that the concept of decentralisation of labour is a very important one. We have a ridiculous situation here in Barbados in which people are trucked from one part of Barbados to do work in another part of Barbados when workmen are available in that area, and it is really costing us a lot. It is costing us a lot of fuel, it is costing us a lot in loss of time on the job and things of that kind, and we really have to have a new concept in Barbados about the utilisation of our labour force, and the Labour Department has a very important role to play in this direction. The hon. member in his organisation has a very important role to play in this organisation.

Another thing that we find in labour management in Barbados as a whole is that there is an acute shortage of Personnel Officers. Both the public and the private sectors in this country, despite their efforts at advertising, cannot get enough people with the requisite qualifications to be Personnel Officers. Everybody is complaining, both the public sector and the private sector, that we do not seem to be producing enough people in Barbados who are interested in personnel management and personnel development. It is obvious that that is a challenge not only to us, it is a challenge to the University, it is a challenge to everybody who has responsibility for training in Barbados, because immediately as you have a situation in which job opportunities are being created now at a rate that in some sectors we have shortages and yet still we have unemployment, therefore what we have to do is to devise a very flexible training programme so as to be able to slot into these positions which are available and hope that our manpower resources and people who are responsible for manpower management will be able at the same time to predict the long term trends for various skills that will be available so that we can continue to train parallel with this immediate problem people to fit those opportunities in the future, and the Department of Labour has a great responsibility in this direction, and the Government has been devoting increasing resources to it, so that when the hon. member speaks of it, I just want to assure him, as he obviously knows, that we on this side are actually doing things which we have been asking for many years ago but did not have a sympathetic ear, so that we are now in a position to implement it.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Item 10 – Old Age Pensions – I should like to take the opportunity to inform this Hon. House not so much in respect of the old age pension referred to but in respect of National Insurance old age pension.

In his budget speech this year the Minister of Finance announced a general increase of 25% on National Insurance pensions awarded on or before 31st December, 1977 with a minimum pension of $25 per week being payable in respect of old age contributory pensions and invalidity pensions. I am not entirely satisfied, and I am a little unhappy that it has taken such a long time for this matter to be processed, but it is important for hon. members to understand that the reason for the delay was – how shall I put it, Mr. Chairman – the reason for the delay started out with the best possible intention.

The wheels of Government grind slowly. The fact is that the effective date of this National Insurance pension increase could have been the 1st April, the first day of the financial year, or the 31st March, the day before. It so happened that in this year of 1979 the 31st March was a Saturday, which is the beginning of the National Insurance pensioner's week, and the argument about whether you would backdate it to the 31st March to give pensioners the extra week, or let them run on then and lose that week simply because of the difference of one day has taken up some time. Anyhow, the matter has been resolved, we have managed to secure the extra week of the pension for the National Insurance pensioners, so that the legislation which is required is expected to go before the Cabinet next Thursday, the 15th November, and those persons will be backdated to the 31st March this year and will get the next two weeks' pension.
12.10 p.m.

I want to say too, Mr. Chairman, now that I have the opportunity to deal with old aged pensioners generally, that these pensioners are to enjoy top priority in the National Health Service. For the whole period of the registration old aged pensioners among other groups are going to enjoy special status and top priority, and I wish to take the opportunity to appeal to old aged pensioners to go along in this enumeration exercise and get themselves registered. This is important to the Ministry of Health because right now old aged pensioners can have several means of identification. If they go to the district medical officer they have one card; if they go to the Hospital Casualty it is another card; for the Out Patient's Department another card. It is important that as many old aged pensioners as possible have the new registration number; for it will mean time, effort and expense if you have to register people on their ID numbers and then register them on the new numbers at a later date, and so I am appealing to these people to go and get themselves registered in this current enumeration exercise, so that when early next year we call upon them to get themselves emparrelled in the Health Service programme they will have had their new numbers and will make it easier for them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On a point of correction I should have called Head 19(1) before 19(3).

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I was of the opinion that we were under Head 19(3).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will some hon. member move that Head 19(1) stand part?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 19(1) stand part.

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

The question that Head 19(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We will continue with Head 19(3).

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I think that if there are two members of this hon. House who have a special interest in the old aged pensioners it would be the hon. member for St. James and myself not that I am saying for one moment that other hon. members of this House have no interest in old aged pensioners. But from the various debates which have been going on from time to time for several years I have at all times tried to play an important role in defending the cause of old age pensioners. I have listened attentively to the hon. member for the City, and while she has made certain points which I agree with, I want to let her know that about 15% of these old age pensioners are unable to go to the various centres and therefore if they do not register it is not that they are unwilling to do so but rather that they are unable to do so. We therefore should not for one moment attempt to victimize them in any way – I am not saying that we will – but those people are just unable to go to register.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I can appreciate the hon. member's term "victimize". It is the same word coined by certain people in this country. But I will never sit in a Cabinet and see any old age pensioner victimized.

Mr. WEEKES: I did not say "will be victimized"; I said I hope they would not be. The old people have contributed to the economy of this country and therefore any legislator who would cherish the thought of doing anything to harm old age pensioners would be cutting the limb on which he is standing and would not be a dedicated servant of the community. Some of us have wrong ideas as legislators, and I want to make it clear that we are not the masters of the people, we are the servants of the people. It is all well and good to introduce legislation from time to time but we must remember that we have to face the electorate of this country and we will be called on to give an account of our stewardship.

Now I want to say that I have been imploring the appropriate Minister from time to time and am tired doing so. I have suggested that the best method of easing the difficulties which these old age pensioners are facing in the rural areas would be to send their pensions by cheque.
12.20 p.m.

I initiated that before I left the Ministry, before the former Government was defeated and what I have noticed is that that policy has only been carried out in the Parish of St. Michael and which I thought was a bad start with all the ramifications and confusion in the Parish of St. Michael with people living here, there, moving tomorrow and all of those kind of things happening and that is why you had problems in St. Michael.

In the rural areas every person in the rural area tries to obtain a small house, even if it is only 12' x 12'. Consequently, he finds himself living there for a lifetime and therefore the Postman would not have any problems like they are having in St. Michael to serve the people in the rural areas by cheques.

This is a matter of paramount importance to those old people. They have to drive 4 and 5 miles in some cases, through rain and they have to be up at 4.00 and 5.00 o'clock in the morning. The facilities are not there at the various centres for them and it inconveniences them greatly.

Now I hope the appropriate Minister, will listen attentively to what I have said here today and will do all that is in his power to expedite the matter by paying all of those people by cheque. For example, you have a Provident Fund for people in the rural areas and from the inception of that Fund the people received their pensions by cheques. You have Government employees who also receive their pensions by cheques.

I do not think for one moment that it will cost the Government a colossal sum of money to introduce this system. It would assist the people from having to travel all around and be up so early to get at these various paying centres with no facilities. Further, there are no benches for them to sit on. They just queue up, some of them 75 years, some leave home without tea, and all of these kind of things are happening in this Island and therefore I hope that we will find it possible in the very near future to clear the air with this matter.

Another point I would like to draw to the attention of this House and perhaps the appropriate Minister can give me the answer. I would like to know why employees who receive pensions from the National Insurance during the year 1978, those pensioners, from what I have been hearing, they are not eligible for the increase. Now I want to know the reason for that.

I think that if we are going to give an increase which has been decided on and unanimously approved by this House, that all employees who are receiving pensions from the National Insurance should be given the increase and therefore I want to know what has caused this cut-off mark. It is one which I would like to hear from the Minister today and I have no doubt he will be quite willing to give this Hon. House the necessary information.

Mr. Chairman, we are giving the National Insurance pensioners an increase. I would think that all employees or former employees who have retired or who have attained the age of 65 should be given the increase. Therefore, I have no doubt, Sir, that that information should be given to this Honourable House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if the hon. member would just give way. I am not quite clear on the question. You are talking about the National Insurance pensioners? You say that they have got the increase, those who were receiving from 1978 or you are talking about the old age pensioners not getting an increase because I understood National Insurance pensioners and now you talk about old age pensioners. I want to be very sure on this. I am taking notes for the appropriate Minister.

Mr. WEEKES: The Honourable Minister has asked me to clarify the matter and I am quite willing to do so.

What I am saying, Sir, is that National Insurance pensioners, I have been told, that there is a cut-off point and that those who were receiving pensions in the year 1978 and have been paid pensions will not be given the increase and therefore I am asking the reason for that.

I think I have tried to clear the air with it and I have no doubt that you are quite capable of assimilating all the facts.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my contribution and at the same time allude to some of the points made by the hon. member.
12.30 p.m.

I must begin by giving my support to some of the points which he raised and state that he is not the only member who is very concerned with the old age pensioners. I too am very much concerned with the plight of these senior citizens who have made an invaluable contribution to this country, and I always feel that it is these people who deserve every consideration of any Government that is in power. It is our responsibility as a responsible Government to relieve the known hardships of all senior citizens, not only citizens, Mr. Chairman, but the indigent and the incapacitated. It is the responsibility of those of us who are fortunate to enjoy the best of physical health.

The hon. member for St. Philip South has alluded to the old age pensioners are experiencing hardship, and he mentioned the question of.....

Mr. WEEKES: I said âpproximately 50%.

Mr. BRADSHAW: He said old age pensioners, I will accept the 50%, not all of them because I know some of them are O.K., but the point that he made must be taken very very seriously indeed, that some old age pensioners are experiencing hardship in respect of their old age pension cheques. Some of them, as he said -- and I do agree with him -- who have got to travel distances sometimes of four miles and even beyond that, and they find that they cannot travel, even when they travel it is costing them great discomfort. This must occupy the attention of this administration, but alluding to the problems which these old age pensioners are experiencing is not all, and I must repeat, one must be able to make suggestions in order to alleviate most of these problems.

As far as the cheques and the non-receipt of cheques, and the problems which old age pensioners are experiencing, especially in the rural areas, what I must say is that.....

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Sir, the old age pensioners in the rural areas are not being paid by cheque, and I am asking that they be paid by cheque.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, even if the old age pensioners are paid by cheque, what I am pointing out is that that would not even solve the problem, that may even create a problem.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order again, Sir, if he will give way, why have they not created a problem for those who have been paid by cheque for about ten years from the Provident Fund? You are not doing your homework. *(Asides).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order! Order!

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that even if the old age pensioners receive their payments by way of cheques there will still be problems, and what I am saying is this, that we must realise that some people who are now being paid by cheque in the urban areas are experiencing problems, because some of them cannot go to the Post Offices and cash the cheques, and some shopkeepers are even reluctant to cash the cheques, so no hon. member can convince me that even if you pay the people in the rural areas by cheque that this will solve the problems.

What I am saying is this, we must devise or think about ways and means of assisting the old people to get

the cash, and getting cash is not the only problem which the old age pensioners experience. Some of them live in their own homes and cannot get assistance which they need, that is, to tidy the homes, help weed around the place and look after them, even feed them, and what I would suggest is that this is an area which could occupy the attention of the Ministry and the Department concerned so that we could have Welfare Officers or Social Workers, even Nurses trained in this particular area who would pay frequent or regular visits to the old age pensioners, senior citizens, so that they would be acquainted with the problems.

That is what I am suggesting, so we must understand that we can see that there are other problems which confront these people. You have the problem of cleaning the old age pensioners, the question of reporting the conditions – sometimes the most unsightly conditions – under which these old age pensioners have got to live. At present we have the postman visiting, the health inspectors visiting, one or two nurses, but this is not enough, because we have seen from experience how many old age pensioners have even died in their homes and remained there for days before they have been discovered, and what I am suggesting is that if we had visiting officers, social officers, visiting these old age pensioners or the senior citizens that many of these problems could be arrested before we hear about such alarming reports and cases, so we have to address ourselves to a more realistic approach.

We know that it is going to call for time, but we must realise that, as I said before, it is the responsibility of a Government that is concerned about the senior citizens.

Let us look at the question of providing homes for the old age pensioners. I do not want to talk about what happened in the past administration, but what I am saying is that the old age pensioners have been given a very raw deal – not in this Government, Mr. Chairman, I want to point this out – when money was allocated for welfare housing to repair the houses or even rebuild the houses of the old age pensioners in 1976 and before, the money was terribly abused, it was not used for the purpose for which it was granted, and I am sure that this Hon. House is aware of most of the facts surrounding that. What I am saying is that this Government has now got a more arduous responsibility in order to correct what was a very serious blunder allowed to go on during the past administration.
12.40 p.m.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Sir. I think that in dealing with the matter of housing the hon. member should take into consideration that helping poor people.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order. Let me tell the hon. member this: I think you should be advised that when the hon. member takes his seat you will have another chance to speak.

Mr. BRADSHAW: If the hon. member wants me to be more specific I will tell him it is not a question of helping poor people. When money is specifically granted for the repair of old age pensioners homes and you find a seventeen year old girl receiving a house out of those funds, that is something to question. There were people – not old age pensioners – and yet were able to have new homes built from the funds supposed to be used for old age pensioners. That is why this Resolution is here before us. If the money had been rightly spent on old age pensioners then we would not have had to supplement this as much as we are asking today.

Now the record of this Government is far better as far as repairs to old age pensioners homes are concerned. We hope by the end of 1980 to be able to build over 112 senior citizens homes and that when compared with the former administration's record far outstrips it. They have never yet in any three year period built as many houses as this administration had, and I would like them to come with figures and statistics, for they have a way of saying that we are not doing enough for senior citizens. So we must make it clear that this Government has a proud record. The former Minister of Housing and Lands was a champion of old age pensioners. It was he who decided to initiate the programme now being carried on by the present Minister of Housing. When he was on the Opposition benches he fought for old age pensioners and when he became a Minister he put his money where his mouth was. So that the admirable feature about the Minister of Housing and Lands, the hon. member for St. Philip South who is now claiming to be a champion of old age pensioners must remember that whereas one talked, the other talked and did constructive work.

Now I have heard criticism of the administration of how many old age pensioners were knocked off the road in 1978. I am going to answer that because the public in Barbados must understand that for cheap political gains some hon. members will go out there night after night and speak untruths. It is a fact that as a result of a few hitches, lack of vigilance in the department concerned, over 700 people were allowed to draw pension. The Act which forbade them from doing so was passed by the past administration. This Government has not devised any new law to prevent people from having pension; all that happened in 1977 was that Cabinet realized that they were empowered under the Act to carry out checks to see that the people were receiving pensions. The Act provides for the periodic monitoring of old age pensions. And when that monitoring took

place in 1977 it was discovered that 700 people were in receipt of pensions that were in simple language illegal. So therefore the Chief Welfare Officer had no alternative but to strike them off. But when the age was reduced from 68 to 65 over 2,500 came on the roll; we have not heard about that. In other words the national cake was now being distributed on a wider basis, yet we are criticised for knocking off something. But that is what their paid hacks have been going around telling people. But if the past administration had been doing its home-work it would not have happened that these 700 people would have had to be knocked off.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt for a moment, Standing Order No. 70.2(a) states: "Three hours shall be allotted on a debate of a Supplementary Estimate of Expenditure containing up to twelve items". I just want to draw this to the attention of hon. members to let them know that the time for closure is coming up.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I want to clear the air on certain points. The hon. member should know that when criticism is made in here some of it can be constructive criticism and he should appreciate that. And I want to tell him something he may not be aware of, that in every parish there is a number of people who have not reached the age of 65 to be given old age pensions but they are given national assistance and some of them are in a worse position than some people who receive old age pensions. I make that point to prove that with the repairs of houses you can get some people at the age of 30 who unable to work and that person can receive national assistance to help repair their homes. 12.50 p.m.

Therefore when he says about people 17 years and all of that I just want to clear the air that people who are less than 65 and are in straightened circumstances that this has been going on from the Vestry system, it continued with Local Government and I hope that this Government will find it possible to help some of those people.

Now Sir, even in my constituency, I want to say this that when old age pensioners' houses were being repaired, many people who had not attained the age, they, too, were given repairs to their houses and therefore I am not ashamed to come and tell the House of Assembly about that.

Now, there is one important point which I omitted and which I want to draw to the attention of the appropriate Minister. I think the time has come when we are asking people at the age of 60 to retire and those in the lower bracket have to wait 5 years to receive a pension from the National Insurance because they are paying them at the age of 65.

With the cost of living rising almost daily, I am saying that Government should find some means of reducing the age from 65 to 60 or if they cannot do that, allow people in the lower brackets to go from 60 to 65 before you retire them.

This is a matter which should be given careful consideration because daily, people are complaining to me, how is it, Mr. Weekes, we have received a pension from Government, we now have to wait until we reach the age of 65 to get the pension from the National Insurance, and I am asking the Honourable Minister to take this matter into consideration. It is a very serious matter.

It is one which should come about to help especially the people at the bottom of the ladder who have done or are doing all the spade work for this country, work which others would not like to do and when those people with families have to go home on only a small pension which they get, I am saying that the time is ripe when the age limit should be reduced from 65 to 60. It is the people's money and if we give it back to the people there is no crime in that. We are just helping those at the bottom of the ladder.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we in this Honourable House are being asked and have been asked to feel a certain sense of pride in the fact that the old aged pensioners are being paid $20 per week at present.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that while we are supposed to take pride in that, when we note that the expenditure in Parliament itself has gone up over 100% in the past three to four years, when expenditure on Conferences and Delegations has gone up by approximately 100%.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, the matter of Conferences and Delegations has already been dealt with and I think the hon. member has been in here at least long enough, though he conveys a degree of ignorance of what goes on in here, he should know that he cannot reflect on a vote of the House already dealt with.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Very, very true.

Dr. HAYNES: I am not reflecting on anything said today. I was not in here. I am drawing a comparison on what we have done for ourselves and what is happening in relation to the old aged pensioners in this country. By any standard, at the present cost of living, the present level of the cost of living in Barbados, $20 is certainly totally inadequate.

However, one always has to balance adequacy against what any given community can afford and I

would like to suggest to the Honourable Minister of Finance that where you are dealing with such marginal levels of income in a situation where there is an ever increasing rate of inflation, whether it would not be a very reasonable proposal to bring before this Honourable House that these pensions be adjusted according to the rise in the Cost of Living Index probably on a three-monthly or six-monthly basis or whatever is administratively possible so that the old-aged pensioners when they get that increase two years later and you take into account the rate of increase in the cost of living there is no significant gain for them.

Now one way to protect old aged pensioners and indeed, may well be other categories of pensioners with the same linkage is to change in the cost of living.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I would just like to get the hon. member for St. Michael South Central quite clear. Is he actually saying that if the Cost of Living Index jumps about say 10 points every three months you adjust the old aged pensions up every three months? I am just trying to get it very clear. I would be very happy if he could just explain that again for the note which I am taking for the Minister of Finance.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the indexation of pensions to the cost of living is no new suggestion. It is done in many countries and the time period in which it can be done and the frequency in which it can be done is largely determined by administrative factors. However this is no new suggestion.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I am not quite clear. I am trying to....

Dr. HAYNES: I cannot help you. I cannot get you to understand what is a very straightforward matter.

Mr. Chairman stands.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is very very unnecessary. We have been having good debates in the past for ever so long. Let us not spoil it. Keep the dignity of this Chamber, please.

The hon. member was on a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I just wanted to get this point straight. Is the hon. member saying that if the Cost of Living Index should jump say five or ten points in the year that you should adjust it forward all the time? That is all I am trying to find out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will get an explanation from the hon. member. Sit please.
1.00 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have made it perfectly clear that I think that persons on marginal pensions as low as $20.00 a week should be protected from the effects of the kind of severity of inflation which we are experiencing and that one way of assisting them in a situation where a country may not be able financially to afford larger pensions is that when you offer them what you can afford, even though it is a small amount, that there should be some indexation in relation to the rise of the cost of living, and that the periodicity with which this is done should be as short as possible to give them maximum protection based on the administrative capability of the Department in relation to the particular area. I think that is as clear and as straightforward as I could possibly put it.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a rather wider look at this question of our senior citizens. There are aspects of the politics of senior citizens, of the politics used in relation to senior citizens that are a matter of great concern to me. Now, we are sitting on a time bomb and we do not realise it. This society has a rather developed social structure although it is a developing society. The kind of problems that faced the United Kingdom in the 1950's and not much attention was paid to the problems of what would happen to elderly citizens in a matter of 20 to 30 years, and it has caught up with a lot of countries. If we look at the social influences today which are altering the parametrical structure of our society, we will find that when you think of the economic expansion within the society, higher incomes, changing attitudes of families towards protection of the elderly within them, the effects of inflation on the productive family unit, when you think even of an effective birth control programme, when you think of the influence of medicine on our particular society, what is happening is that when you extrapolate this to 30 years ago and 30 years hence, you will see that we are developing a wasting of our society where the productive element in the society at any given time will slow down, be significantly reduced, while the dependency load at the upper level continues to expand the influence of this multiplicity of factors involved, and much of what the hon. member for St. Philip South has been saying is just one aspect of this global problem in relation to the elderly, and I think it is most important when we look at our stage of development and the particular social position of this society that Parliament itself should look into the entire question and if there is an area where there is a need for a commission of investigation for constructive purposes it is in this particular area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not only the levels of pensions, the effects of inflation, the problems of indexation, or attitudes to taxation, not in relation to old age pensions but other categories of pensions may well have to be looked at. The whole question of housing and the elderly, the whole question of how we perceive the elderly within the society, the different stratifications of types of care, whether we perceive that in the future we

could go more and more for community based domiciliary type care for the elderly, whether such community based care linked to hostel care, which is a further extension, the extent to which this could be community based, the extent to which the elderly themselves can be involved in the management of the elderly. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, we even have to look at the whole area of geriatrics, and when people like myself who are adult physicians have over the years been doing more and more of geriatrics which is a specialty relating to the elderly, it is important now that we look at this whole question of geriatric care in the medical field, because there are specific areas, specific specialties, specific knowledge which can bring an important influence to bear on the totality of the medical care and the distribution of that medical care in respect of the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to support everything the hon. member for St. Philip South said. What he has been saying, what the hon. member for St. Michael South said in support of some of the things that he said previously, these are mere symptoms of a problem that we have to face, and I can assure you that from the historical experience of developed countries who are still today trying to grapple and wrestle with, the problem that came upon them without effective planning for that problem, that today we have to take this kind of decision. It is an area that is multi-faceted, it is an area that involves a whole range of disciplines, when you begin to consider the facilities and the access to facilities, and the type of specialised care, whether in the home or outside or in other institutions, that needs to be brought for the improvement of the lot of the elderly.

Let me tell you what has been happening. If you go down to the mental institution down there you will find – and this has been so for years and years – many elderly people who have become a little senile, no significant psychotic illness, you will find that from time to time they find themselves in a mental hospital, you will find them in district hospitals, you find that even your acute care facilities are often over-burdened with problems which if dealt with in the community can be saving a considerable amount of money, and it is my judgement that with proper planning millions of dollars now being spent or misspent – and I do not blame any particular administration for this, it is a question of how you plan these things over the years – it has been the experience in the United Kingdom where, for example, to have an elderly person with a stroke for six weeks in a teaching hospital at maybe 200 to 300 pounds a day when that person could be in a geriatric hospital at 20 to 30 pounds a day, so the kind of problems that we are experiencing are universal problems. What I am making a plea for is to recognise that the kind of political input that I hear time and time again in this Hon. House does nothing that deal with the symptoms of a much deeper problem.

1.10 p.m.

I hope members will appreciate the point I am making, because it is a problem that is going to catch up with us at a later date.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time is catching up with you now.

Dr. HAYNES: Yes, Sir, but this is important, and I think this Honourable House might well consider at some stage appointing a Commission to enquire into these various aspects of senior citizens and let it relate to those economic and social factors which I have tried to get across. I do not think this kind of area is partisan, because whether the Barbados Labour Party forms a Government of this country for the next ten or fifteen years or whether the Democratic Labour Party forms the Government, we will be faced with the problem, so this kind of thing should get the support of everyone.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time has expired. We have just three minutes to wind up the debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the speeches I have heard from various sides have related to a number of matters which as they happen to be things being dealt with by the Ministry of Finance and Planning I thought I would offer a few comments.

To deal with the question of indexing. Indexing is not an easy thing to do. The Government has been looking at the indexing of wages and pensions. In France civil servants in the upper levels get 75% of the cost of living increase added to their salaries every three months; the lower level civil servants get the full cost of living. Pensions in Britain are index related; pensions in Germany are index related, and against the promise by the Social Democratic Party in the last election the Government was forced to reduce pensions because the generosity of German pensions proved too much even for that economy to bear. Unless we are very careful in Barbados that is what will be happening at the turn of the century. The geriatric point is also taken and in the last two or three years the trend of the world has not been to reduce the age at which you retire but to increase it, because you are making people stronger and more able to work and at the same time you are telling them they must stop work at the age of 65.– 65 is the general age of retirement throughout the world. We have an anomaly which is becoming more serious in that the retirement age is 60 and people are allowed to retire at 55. This came about at the time of high employment but it must be regarded as an anomaly and it cannot continue. I want to tell the unions that there can be no question of reducing the age at which you receive a national insurance pension from 65 to 60; that is entirely ruled out; you would break the National Insurance Scheme and make it bankrupt by the end of the century, and you cannot do that for what is no more than a few hundred workers, because the only people affected by the hiatus of the five years between age 60 and 65 are a few hundred casual workers and a few other workers who are obliged to retire at age 65 without pension. Government has been working on this

for a year now and the Government's plan would be rather to raise the age of compulsory retirement to 65 than raise the national insurance age. I would prefer to tell a man that he could work until age 60 and retire if he likes or go on to age 65. People are stronger through better nutrition and medical care and are able to work between the ages of 60 and 65. For a very long time the Ministry of Establishments has had this matter under consideration. I gave direction for this matter to be analysed seven or eight months ago and hope there will be some development on this matter. I believe there will be some resistance in some parts of the public service to later retirement, not because the workers want to go home on retirement but they want to retire, get a pension and go and work for somebody else. If this is to be recognized I would not want it to be recognized by early optional retirement. It will be impossible in the year 2000 for Barbados to have a public service whose members retire on pension at the age of 55. The number of persons who are going to be age 55 in the year 2000 will be so large that you can say without any fear of contradiction that the number of children in school now cannot work for enough money to pension them without making themselves paupers. In 1960 there were 7,900 children born, so that last year saw the largest number of persons ever to come on the labour market. We are dealing now in the late 1970s with the worst unemployment among youth as we can have. A problem that we have been looking at for ten years is that in every one of those ten years over 6,000 boys and girls have come on to the labour market and therefore we have been looking all the time for a rapid turn over of jobs, getting people home early to create more jobs. Last year only 4,300 children were born.

1.20 p.m.

In the year 1996, less than 4,000 eighteen year olds are for example, going to be on the Vote Register. Those are children that are already borned. You cannot make any more 18 year olds now for 1996. You can make 18 year olds for 1999 but no matter how hard we in here try, you cannot make them. You will have to bring them from abroad.

Now when the labour force falls, as it will, a number of youth in the labour force will commence to decline. By the year 2000 you are not going to have enough young people to be working to support the proportion of pensioners who would be alive then. By the year 2000 there will be something like 40,000 old age pensioners in Barbados compared to the 25,000 now and the labour force will be smaller that it is now.

The population will be larger but the labour force will be smaller and when that day comes, unless you want to see as in some countries, for example, as in Germany, the health component of National Insurance is 12% of income. Total payments amount to 30%, employer and employee contribution amount to 30% of salary. Now we do not want this. We do not want an unplanned social security development in Barbados.

In the year 2000 I do not want National Insurance contributions to be 15% as opposed to 6% which it is now. I do not want that. I mean it is enough to reach double figures before the end of the century, you can be sure of that. It will have to reach double figures before the end of the century. It will have to go up in the next year or two to accommodate the National Health Service.

In 1982 or 1983 we will already be beginning to feel the pension pressure and we will have to put another 1% on the ordinary amount. As soon as you start pensioning people on $1,000 a month or $1,500 a month, that would call for another ½% but I do not think that we want our pension contributions to take the place of income tax as it is reduced.

We are trying to reduce income tax on a progressive basis. You do not want to take it away from income tax and add it on to the National Insurance and this in many cases is what is happening in many countries around the world.

There is one that used to be held out 40 years ago along with New Zealand as the outstanding country in the world in social insurance and social security and that was Uraguay, which had the most generous benefits in the world. A woman could retire at age 30 on a quarter of her salary for the rest of her life if she had two children and so on and so forth.

The Uraguayan social security system collapsed under its own weight and it brought so much destruction to the fabric of the country in its way that a country that has been a democracy, although one party was in power for over 100 years, winning elections all the way, a country which has been a democracy *(Aside)* 500? Thank you, my dear. I do not want to be in power for 500 years, but a country which had been a model of social democracy collapsed under the weight of the unwisdom of its social planners.

We cannot afford that and therefore we must resist, with all the power in our hands, any question of the reduction of the age for National Insurance benefits. Let the people work longer to get a full salary. Do not let them grasp for the pension because a man who works on the road cannot easily retire at 60 and get a job working on the road at the same old salary.

Indeed, in the short time, we are being deprived of the skills of the masons and carpenters, especially the foremen at MCW, people who have a long history of

doing the Government work and most of whom are excellent workmen, we are being deprived of the skills at a very valuable time.

I hope that this deals with the points raised by the hon. member. I can perhaps see why the work of a Commission might not be necessary at the moment because a lot of it is being done. A lot of it is being considered. I will bear in mind his suggestion. Certainly, we need to move faster on this and move to get the public in understanding the issue relating to retirement.

In the United States the retirement age is going to 65–70 with an option to work until 75 and that is working in weakened and difficult conditions, with the old population not as healthy as ours, in all probability. Yet, the U.S. might very well have a higher morbidity rate of debilitating diseases than we have. I think the hon. member for St. Michael South Central would have a better idea of the statistics. We do live in a healthier climate where it is easier for the old people to be sturdy at the age of 65 or 70 and it would be economic madness for us to ignore the age structure of the population, with generally improve health and the economic necessity of a viable Pension Scheme.

Mr. WEEKES: There is one question which I asked and it has not been answered. I would like to know from the Prime Minister why people who have been receiving pensions from the National Insurance in the year 1978 are not being given an increase.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do know that the Minister of National Insurance wanted to say something about that. I thought she said so in an anticipatory speech. They are intended to have it. *(Asides.)* Do you mean the ones for 1978, why they are not getting an increase? You will have to address that question to the substantive Minister.

I know there is a reason but I really think she will answer it. You can ask the Minister and she can make the information available to you privately if she is not able to give you details during the debate. An increase was given to the pensioners earlier. I think it has something to do with the increase in the level of pensions in 1978. I think from the beginning of 1978 pensions were granted in a more liberal way.

Mr. WEEKES: Thank you very much and I hope she will give me the necessary information.

The question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question was put and resolved in the negative without division.

The question that the CHAIRMAN report progress to His Honour the SPEAKER and ask for leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m.

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

The question that this Sitting be suspended until 2.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

1.30 p.m.

On Resumption:-

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it now reverts.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

The question that Head 19(3) as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 19(4) – YOUTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution for $1,061,877 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979–80, No. 11

HEAD 115 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the Ministry of Education had a van that was written off in an accident some time earlier this year. The Insurance Company is

accepting liability but we need to have funds for a replacement and we are seeking this figure of $8,500 to replace the van that has been damaged.

I beg to move that Head 115 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 119 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, in the Estimates as part of its contribution to senior citizens the Government had voted the sum of $500,000 for the cost of repairs and replacements. At the end of September 1979 $390,000 had been expended, leaving an uncommitted balance of $109,100.

The number of applications for relief in this area is sufficiently large that the Government desires to do as much in this financial year as possible, and in order to keep the momentum of the programme we felt that additional sums should be voted rather than stop the programme and wait until next year's programme was started. Accordingly it is our desire to supplement this sum by the sum of $300,000, so that in truth and in fact this year for the repair and replacement of houses the Government would have voted $800,000 in this financial year. We really do want to keep the programme going and it is obvious that with the rising costs of labour and materials that supplementary provision would have to be made this year if we are to keep this programme going.

I commend the Resolution to the House, and I beg to move that Head 119 stand part.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure at all times when we are dealing with any Resolution which helps needy people, especially those who are not in a position to help themselves when it comes to the repair of their houses. This is a matter which I have no doubt that both sides of this Hon. House will give their wholehearted support, and therefore I am indeed happy to know that the Government will continue to assist these poor people.

But, Sir, I think it appropriate as a member of this Hon. House to pose a few queries which I am confident that the appropriate Minister will be quite willing to give the necessary information to this House. I would like to know, Sir, the number of houses which have been repaired in each parish, and perhaps I would be very happy if the Minister could state each constituency. The repair of these houses for old people should not be used as a political football.

2.40 p.m.

It should be a non-partisan approach, and my reason for making that statement is that all the people of this country pay taxes and when we are elected here we are not elected only to look after our own constituency but to look after the entire country. Perhaps I may say at this particular time that this is not a crucial moment but if not carried out in the interest of the entire country it can tarnish the image of certain members of this House. I want to be very careful in my expression, but what we have to watch in this country is that when the repairs to these houses are done we should be satisfied in our minds to know that some of the credit is given to members of this side. This is a matter which I have no doubt that the appropriate Minister will take into consideration. I can imagine what will be the reply to that but, Mr. Chairman, I am saying that two wrongs do not make a right and therefore if it is alleged – as I presume it will be said – that in the past this was done and that was done, the time has come when we have got to think of the interest of the poor people throughout the entire country. We should try not to be parochial or sentimental in our approach in dealing with such matters. For example, we can get some statements being made by employees or even the Government. This may be irrelevant, but I know you are always willing to allow us to go thus far and no further. Only a few days ago a few people could not get a bus and they tried to enquire from one of the employees when they would get a bus to take them to their homes and the reply from that employee was: "Go and ask Reynold Weekes." These are the things we have to be very careful about and that is the reason why I am saying that in making the various allocations to the various constituencies we have to take all the constituencies into consideration. Human nature being what it is, you expect certain things to occur, but when we consider that we are all here to represent the entire country and that all members of the community in the various constituencies pay taxes – those who do not pay in a direct way pay indirectly – I feel very strongly on this point that we should do our utmost to help the poor people of every constituency. I am aware that with the funds at our disposal it is impossible to satisfy or help everybody in one year, but we have some very needy cases and if we are to improve the condition of those people, we have to deal with all aspects of the matter and perhaps in some cases forget party affiliation.

Mr. Chairman, I am indeed happy to associate myself with the passing of this Resolution for this increased amount, and I do hope that consideration will be given to those people who are in dire need of assistance. We have to take into consideration the rainy season when it comes, and while some of us may not

have the experience of living in such homes, I am sure that we do know what it means to those people. I give this Resolution my wholehearted support.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few observations on the Resolution. It seems to me that it is only now that the former administration is out of power that they realize that the provision of housing for old age pensioners should be dealt with on a non-partisan basis.
2.50 p.m.

I believe on the records in this House during the time when the Housing Corporation held responsibility for these loans, to have recounted what we found in 1976 in November at the Housing Corporation.

Now the Hanschell Commission has reported. The Report is not public, so I think I am entitled to make certain statements. I have no idea as to what is contained in it obviously. There were two copies submitted, one to the Governor General and the other to the Prime Minister. That I know. I have not seen anything. I was not even in the Island and when I came back I ceased to hold that responsibility.

I think that was one of the areas that the Hanschell Commission was asked to investigate and it would have been asked to investigate for the reason that it was clear that the dealings in respect of the provision of loans for old aged pensioners were conducted on the basis of standards that were less than fair and honest. It is well-known and accepted on the other side now that in the build up to the 1976 General Election campaign, known Parliamentarians, but candidates of the Democratic Labour Party were allowed to go into the Housing Corporation and extract from the Files the names of persons who had applied for assistance in this area, then go into the constituency of these same people and assure them that they would obtain a loan for them, using this to get credit for this action and ultimately a vote.

Now numerous scandals were perpetrated in 1976. There was a list which I believe was submitted to the Hanschell Commission and I still have a copy of that list which shows that not only did people qualify for those loans who were not old age pensioners, but there was one lady in St. Thomas who was aged 34 that got a loan when she was not entitled because she did not qualify in terms of age.

There was a lady in my constituency, I can speak of two cases in particular, Mrs. Murrell from Blades Hill and Mrs. Mason in Bayfield where money was voted in the two cases in excess of $2 000. In the one case of Mrs. Mason work was done on her house for 2½ days and the Inspector signed that the work had been completed and the $2 000 or in excess thereof was paid out. Up to now the lady's house is not completed.

It was alleged that the work on Mrs. Murrell's house in Blades Hill had been completed in August and when I checked on the 22nd of November, in 1976 no work had been started but the money had been paid out of the Housing Corporation. A racket was being run. It was an area where a lot of political patronage could go. It was an area where politicians could get a lot of political mileage.

The system was changed during my time and it remained with us for about a year and then it has been subsequently transferred to the Ministry of Community Services *(Asides.)* Nobody has been transferred from St. Philip North. We do not have any Housing area in St. Philip North. Some people in St. Philip North have gone to live in housing areas outside of St. Philip North and if the people want to move from one locality to another, is it the function of a politician to tell a man that he has no right to live in St. George or wherever he chooses to live? Because he comes from St. Philip am I supposed to stop a man from going to live where he wants to live. If that is the man's intention, should I restrict his right?

More than seven people have moved from St. Philip and gone into other housing areas. It has nothing to do with my majority. I have already said in this House of Assembly that the seven, which the hon. member for Christ Church East calls my single digit majority, my single digit majority was a single digit majority on paper as a result of a number of electoral bribes that were perpetrated. I am not getting into that today.

I beat the gentleman by over 277 votes, not 7. You will see that reflected in 1981, if he is willing to compete. I have a gentleman who is so enarmoured of me that the cricket competition which I sponsor he finds himself at every Sunday. All my people are playing but he finds himself there on Sundays. He attended a dance which I held in my constituency in September, a potential candidate for St. Philip South, Mr. Harold Blackman. Mr. Harold Blackman supported my dance.

To get back to this question of the old aged pensioner's housing I would like to think that it should be a non-partisan matter on the allocation of loans, and at least there should not have been loans, they should be allocation of grants because these people can never, as old aged pensioners, be expected to repay what has been lent.

Repairs to the houses should be reflected on the basis of need rather than on political affiliation and it is unbecoming of politicians to take advantage of the fact of old age to try to get loans for old people who are close to them or would support them at the expense of others who perhaps do not have the energy or the know how to get loans but are deserving of loans.

That is why, Sir, I would like to see some system devised. The system that has been in operation for the

last couple of years has been working. I am not satisfied that it is satisfactory. I think a lot more needs to be done to make sure that the system functions on the basis of need rather than politics but the hon. member for St. Philip South need not worry because recently I have been informed that two people in my constituency have got loans and I am not sure that they are necessarily strong supporters of me or of this Party but it seems to me that the Ministry of Labour and Community Services, with the system of Inspectors which they have now I think they are getting to the root of the problem and are having a fairer and equitable distribution of repairs.

Mr. Chairman, the 350,000, if I recall the amount of applications which we had when the Housing Corporation used to look after this area, will only touch the surface.

3.00 p.m.

Mind you, it is to carry through until the end of the financial year, but in next year's Estimates I would hope that the Ministry of Labour and Community Services puts in a realistic figure, something in the vicinity of $2 million to effect proper repairs on as wide a scale as possible to repair the number of old people's houses which require urgent attention. Some of the repairs are not necessarily in the shape of giving a completely new house, there are some cases you find like that, but in the majority of cases you find the problems with the ceiling, the floor and sanitary facilities, a lot of the houses do not have proper sanitary facilities and some survey should be carried out to see to what extent the need for sanitary and toilet facilities is there for old people and attack that as a priority. If we are going to say that we intend to electrify and have running water in the home of every Barbadian by the end of 1980, at the same time we also have to carry out a survey to see to what extent the community is lacking in basic sanitary facilities.

I speak mainly on an empirical basis as a result of an analysis of some of the application forms that have come in to the National Housing Corporation when I was there which shows that there is a very severe need in certain areas. A lot of these people do not own elaborate houses, in some cases perhaps they have one room and kitchen, and you will find that a lot of them are without basic sanitary facilities, and I think we should make a drive in the next two years properly to provide for these people the basic amenities of life.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Philip North has given you a rundown of his view of the Government's housing programme in respect of old age pensioners. In his speech he mentioned Government's decision to make sure that every Barbadian who desire running water should be so provided by the end of 1980. He called upon the Ministry of Communications and Works and its specific department of Waterworks, or what would now be the new Sewerage Authority, to provide water not only to existing homes but to new developments, etc. as we continue our promise for housing every Barbadian.

Now, I know when it comes to election time members usually, as we say in common parlance, 'brek for themselves'. While I was away, on the 10th of last month, I notice that the Hon. Minister responsible for Housing and the member for St. Philip North, who was the Chairman of the National Housing Corporation, took time out to take a dig at the Waterworks Department and complained of the lack of speed in providing water to a development. I want it to be clearly understood that while I am Minister responsible for a Government Department, as far as I am concerned, whenever I am notified work will be done as expeditiously as possible to carry through the programmes of the Barbados Labour Party, and therefore to show to the Barbadian public that what we put in the Manifesto we meant, that these things were not just entered into the Manifesto in order to catch votes at election time, then to be forgotten like as happened in the past.

The particular development which not only the two members but the Deputy Prime Minister spoke about was a development at Parish Land in Christ Church, and I am going to take this opportunity to set the record straight. I am one of the few Ministers who will tell my own officers that they are not carrying out their work, or they are not doing it as expeditiously as they should, and I have no fear of that, I do not care what the officer says or what the public says, I want to know that I have a job to do and I am going to carry it out, but at the same time I am going to defend my officers when they are in the right, and on this occasion they are in the right.

The Minister responsible for Housing and the former Chairman must understand that their departments were in the wrong and do not put the blame on the Waterworks. The Parish Land Development, Mr. Chairman, in May 1979 the Waterworks Department received a request from Richard Gill Associates Ltd., a firm of consultants, acting on behalf of the National Housing Corporation, for an estimate in respect of water supply for that development. On the 24th May, 1979 a reply was sent to the consultants giving an estimate of $58,000. With the estimate, the usual provision of requesting 75% of the money to be paid to the Waterworks Department was made, and the requisite deposit of $43,575 was made on June 19 approximately one month after the estimate was given. On September 18 the consultants requested an amendment to the layout of the original plan and resubmitted new copies of a plan explaining that their request for revision was necessary because of an unauthorised extension of one of the buildings on one of the lots. The Waterworks Department replied on September 25 after surveying the development to say no alterations were necessary.

In the meantime, in order to reduce the cost of installation of water services on developments, the Waterworks Department is experimenting with plastic piping and fittings at Wotton, which we would use in the Parish Land Development. We were out of the fittings because supplies were late in coming, I believe, from Jamaica. Those fittings arrived and we settled on the job for Parish Land, but I want it to be clearly understood that it was the consultants who prevented us from getting through with the work in the first instance. They must not blame the Waterworks, it is easy in cases like this to investigate and find out the real cause rather than putting the blame on the Waterworks Department.

At the same time I would like to say this, that the Waterworks Department has been assisting the National Housing Corporation and will continue to assist the National Housing Corporation wherever it is possible. At the same time, while we give assistance to the National Housing Corporation I hope they will pay their debts to the Waterworks Department which now stand at $109,075.82.
3.10 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, it is a wonderful thing when colleagues on this side can make criticisms of each other and yet work together in harmony. The Prime Minister can sit here relaxing and know that we go back to Cabinet tomorrow in a mood to work towards the welfare of the citizens of Barbados. This is unlike the other side during the period 1966–71 when they could not attempt to open their mouth or be critical of the Prime Minister or vote against the Prime Minister on any measure unless they heard that the Lord Giveth and the Lord Taketh.

The comments which my colleagues made are points well taken. However, what is very important in this Resolution is that no Government which refuses to look after its old age pensioners or senior citizens in the manner they should be looked after can only be considered scandalous and not worthy of being a Government. Any Government that attempts only at election time to house the unfortunate senior citizens of this country is not worthy of getting a vote in this country.

I am going to give you the figures. I heard a lot of talk this morning about what Government should do or should not do. I know Opposition politics – I have been in it for ten years.

In 1974, the then Government repaired 81 houses; in 1975 they repaired 65; they repaired 96 in 1976. But it was in the month of July that the then administration came here for a vote of some half million dollars, and in the records of the National Housing Corporation you see a special programme through which the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was able to get a house that he converted into a pavilion – not for old people; the house that should have been for some old person...

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order Mr. Chairman. Whereas the veracity of the hon. member for St. James has been adequately tested by the testimony put forward in this House by the hon. member for St. Joseph not so long ago, I wish to make it absolutely clear that in making the demands which the hon. member just made he is straying from the strictest tenets of the truth. On no occasion have I been associated with the National Housing Corporation with respect to any house repairs. My sole connection in that matter was, as I have pointed out before, to indicate the need for a pavilion in that area. How that need was met was a matter for the administration at that time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The point I am making Sir, is that a house from the Ministry of Housing which could have been used for a replacement for one of the old people the hon. member for St. Philip South spoke about this morning was used as a pavilion at Lower Estate. The hon. member admits that he intervened and that the then administration used the house which should have been used as a replacement for the home of one of the old people which the hon. member for St. Philip South cried out about this morning. They replaced 51 houses in three years. In 1974 they did not produce a single house for senior citizens; in 1975 they did not build one; in 1976 none. But this is the difference between looking after people, not at election time but looking after people, period. In one year we repaired 155 houses; repairs to old age pensioners houses are under repair at this very moment is an additional 25 houses and in one year we replaced 71 houses while in four years they replaced 51, and that was in 1976. In 1974 no houses; in 1975 no houses; 51 houses in 1976. But that was election year. As my colleague said it is unfair and unreasonable for a politician at election time to go out there and only look after poor people at that time. At election time half million dollars used to give a thirty-four year old girl a house in St. Philip – not an old age pensioner.

This Resolution is to get an additional $300,000 for the purpose of continuing the momentum which the Minister of Development and Community Services started since we came into the Government of this country. I heard earlier this morning the hon. member for St. Philip South say how he had been a champion of the old people. I can appreciate that. You have represented St. Philip South for almost fifteen years and if you look around St. Philip South you will see that nothing was done until we came into power. Go to Six Roads and you will now see it looking like a busy town. In 1974 they could do nothing but in 1976 they were hoping to have some of the money to use as an election stunt to pull wool over people's eyes. Scandalous, that's what it is. We hope, from the brief I have before me, to have approximately 90 more houses repaired and approximately 60 more houses replaced before the end

of the Government's fiscal year. I believe a shortage of artisans has slowed down some of the momentum, otherwise many of these houses would have been done before, and it is nothing short of scandalous to hear hon. members on the other side talking about supporting the Resolution. They have to support it. We do not have to wait until election time to repair old people's houses in order to get votes.
3.20 p.m.

As long as I have anything to do with this administration the Prime Minister can know this in no uncertain terms, at any time at all that such means to win a vote is going to be used, he would have to look for a candidate in St. James for, I, if I am a Minister will throw the Portfolio at him. It is as simple as that.

It hurts me deep inside when you go down into the country and see the old senior citizens homes falling apart, people who gave their blood, their sweat and their tears for this country for the member of St. Michael South Central to be one of the Barbados Scholars. It is the people who worked hard for .6c a week, .24c a day until the late Sir Grantley Adams came on the scene and removed once and for all that vicious system which existed.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, do not believe that I am in a position to give the member for St. Philip South, parish by parish, where there have been repairs because I do not have the information at my disposal but I would hope that if this information was necessary and he would like it to be forthcoming as soon as possible, he can do it by way of a question and I am sure that the appropriate Minister will, he and his civil servants, get this information for him.

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, give this Resolution my blessing and beg to move that Head 119 stand part.

Mr. ALLEYNE: I beg to second that.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it is a good principle in the day to observe a fairly fundamental rule that expression of loud mouthings, bombastic nonsense is best treated by ignoring it.

We have had some insights into the Hanschell Commission and we were told that only two copies are available. We have heard a lot on political patronage and I.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way on a point of explanation, Sir. I think my colleague, the Chairman at that time of the National Housing Corporation was incorrect in saying there were only two. There were really three. One was handed in to the Governor General, one was handed in to the Prime Minister and one to the Minister of Housing. This is just for the records, Sir.

Dr. HAYNES: We have heard a lot about political patronage in relation to the repairs of houses for indigent persons. We know, Mr. Chairman, that such political patronage exist and indeed if we are going to be honest with ourselves to recognise this kind of pressure in a society of the kind in which we live, the difficulty of obtaining total immunity from pressures of that kind and to hope that those of us who are hon. members of this House can look forward to making a further contribution to the public life of Barbados over the years.

It is important that we must not get involved in the kind of tirades which we get from day to day from the outgoing member for St. Thomas.

I am always amazed at this remarkable pledge about electricity and water in every home. You know it is remarkably easy when the vast majority of infrastructural work has been done in services where all the posts are laid, all the mains are laid down then to come and do the connections.

I myself have always said and I will again repeat that one of the major areas for infrastructural development in terms of these services lies in the area of initial cost. There is no point boasting that you are finishing off the last 15% or 10% of a given service when the vast majority of the infrastructure is there.

What is important is that these years should have been spent looking in those areas which require infrastructural development, particularly because of the very rapid installation cost on terms of putting in those infrastructural developments which are very necessary for good housing in this country.

I would not bother even to refer to the question of the pavilion except to say that even the hon. member for St. Thomas, I was not a member of this House at the time, but I saw it reported in the *Advocate* that he himself said that that type of facility might well be the answer, even on a temporary basis, with the kind of problems facing playing fields throughout the country.

Of course, he has objected that it is being done for political purposes and so on but he did not question the basic principle that that kind of facility, as a short-term basis, might well be the answer to the problem of getting a small pavilion on the many playing fields that required them at that particular time and still require them now until more elaborate and permanent structures can be built which might well take a 15 or 20–year programme to meet the entire needs of the youth of the Community.

The hon. member for St. Thomas said that. He did not question the principle, but of course at the time he tried to suggest that there was some kind of political motivation behind it. But you, Mr. Chairman, were a

candidate like me. You were successful in that Election and there is a particular idiot in this country, no matter if you tell him 100 times that there was no formal opening of a pavilion at Lower Estate with a fork, with a stake, with a piece of stick or with anything, the stupid illiterate clown in Barbados still keeps repeating the same thing on political platforms and wherever he is. No matter how often you tell that particular idiot.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Even with respect to the members of the public we must be temperate with our use of language, please.

Order please.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, as you well know there was no official opening at that particular site. After the pavilion was placed there, there was an opening and this was attended by the former Minister of Housing, yourself and myself.

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, when you really look at the amount of the increase in direct taxation which has taken place in Barbados over the past three years, a massive increase in direct taxation, even if you forget income tax.

3.30 p.m.

There is no doubt in my mind that there should be a larger allocation of money for this particular purpose, particularly when you bear in mind the massive increases in building costs and indeed, Mr. Chairman, as far as those increases are concerned, a recent analysis done by a colleague of mine has indicated that there are things like pine and various types of cardboard and a lot of the materials used by poor people, galvanise and so on, have been rising between 75 and 80 percent, so when we look at the increased cost of building and look at the increased allocation of sums of money, then you begin to wonder what is really happening, and I wonder whether the figure of $2 million as suggested by the former Chairman of the NHC, the hon. member for St. Philip North, would prove adequate for an effective programme, bearing in mind the rate of escalation of costs in the building industry.

Another matter that has for some time been occupying my attention, I think that it is time that this Government looks very closely at the question of building costs in Barbados and explores the various avenues, look for any possible techniques which can be used, any knowledge in the technological area and also in the area of purchasing, whether in respect of certain elements of taxation on raw materials for housing, also to look very carefully at the tax relief that is given in certain areas of construction in Barbados in relation to the objectives of that particular sector, for example, the hotel sector, and see whether or not the time has not come where the ordinary Barbadian taxpayer in respect of building, in respect of maintaining an adequate housing stock in this country should not be the beneficiary of some form of tax relief in some form or other, and see whether the cost of building can be helped in any way.

There are many other ideas that have crossed my mind which I am tossing around and looking at. For example, the question of looking, Sir, carefully at the main components of cost of repairs of wooden houses and see whether on a Government to Government basis those countries from which the materials can be imported, whether by a fluctuation on a long term contractual basis, whether we could get those materials into Barbados at a cheaper price. These are areas which I think need to be explored, because the impact of any such price reduction would be felt not only in the area where Government has to bear the burden of the costs, but also, Mr. Chairman, would be of tremendous benefit to the rest of the community who can hardly go in town now and buy a length of deal board.

Mr. Chairman, one final point I would like to make. I have heard a lot about political patronage. The people of St. Michael South Central have been having an extremely raw deal in relation to housing in general, and in relation to getting the houses of indigent persons repaired. I have tried. I myself have been subjected to certain insults in certain places, however I do not wish to call any particular name at this particular point in time, because I did not identify myself at the beginning of the conversation. There are several indigent persons and old age pensioners in St. Michael South Central whose houses are in a condition where I would say almost unfit for human habitation, and I can get no assistance in dealing with these matters, and when you talk about allocation of houses on the basis of political patronage, I would just like to say this. I do not like to bring much into this Hon. House and you will not permit me to do so, but the next time I hear certain types of remarks made in here I will tell this Hon. House and I will call the names and I will tell them the kind of favours that two persons have been asked, what they have been asked to perform in order to get a house. I will do it in due course and I will call the names and addresses when it comes to that, but I will not do it today.

Every person deserves a reasonable chance, even a dog deserves a reasonable chance. I will not do it today. So, Mr. Chairman, we will support this Resolution. We feel that it is in the interest of the public at large, we feel that it is part of a continuation of a programme, however inadequate financially, however defective administratively, that has been going on for many years and we sincerely hope that this one improvement in the administrative machinery which we have been told has been taking place, that we will see the results of this improvement down the years. And so, Mr. Chairman, on that note I rest for the time being.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. member wish to speak before I call on the Minister to wind up?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I thought the member for St. Michael South would have been saying something, because I heard the member for St. Michael South Central saying that certain people had to do favours to get houses. I am really asking him to perform a duty, that is, to submit the names to me and I will assist with the houses for the people, houses for anybody in St. Michael South. I will have a word with somebody, if that is a duty which they have to perform. Only certain words can come out of a warped mind with warped thoughts.
3.40 p.m.

Not much came out from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that needs any reply from this side, so I treat that with contempt. As regards, the information which the hon. member for St. Philip South requested, I am told it will take a little time to get the number of houses repaired in the various parishes, but I have been informed by officials that in every single parish work has been done in the way of repairs and replacements, with a heavier input in St. Michael and Christ Church because the applications there, I am told, are much greater.

I would also like to mention that for the first time there is under active consideration by the Ministry of Housing a plan to attach a water borne system to the homes of aged and indigent persons who own their own plot of land – something they never had before. I am quite sure that in getting this information from officials in the Ministry of Housing all Barbadians will be proud to know that we are looking after our old citizens in such a manner.

I do not know if there is any further information hon. members will like to have and I do not think that there is much more I can say on this Resolution.

I beg to move that the Head stand part.

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. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three money resolutions in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BILL TO AMEND FIRE SERVICE ACT, CAP. 163

The Seventh Order was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Fire Service Act, Cap. 163.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill the purpose of which is to amend Section 2 of the Fire Service Act Cap. 163, to provide a proper definition for the term "subordinate fire officer". The term as it appear in the Act says that it means a member of the Fire Service below that of Superior Officer. On the other hand, "superior officer" can mean the Chief Fire Officer or any person above a Subordinate Fire Officer, and it is not clear what category of officer "subordinate Fire Officer" means. We are therefore proposing to amend the Act by specifying the categories of officer denoted by the term "subordinate officer".

I would take this opportunity to say that this House would have been aware of the implementation of some of the plans for upgrading the Fire Service in Barbados, especially with the admission of women into the Service and the outstanding performance they have been giving so far. The House is also aware of what we are doing with the expansion at Worthing in order to bring women into the Service in the Worthing area, an important part of the Island.

In terms of training we have been training officers overseas this year and we expect in the next year an additional eight officers to be trained overseas. This will be in addition to the normal training being carried out here and in Trinidad.

In terms of physical surroundings, in addition to the expansion at Worthing, and work already completed at the Fire Service Headquarters, we are developing plans for the siting of a fire station in St. Peter, near to the Police Station. We hope to develop the whole complex by upgrading accommodation there, making it the headquarters for the Police and Fire Service for the northern area. I hope within a couple of weeks to make detailed visits to other fire stations and perhaps during the period 1979–81 to develop a fire station at Six Cross Road.

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, the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.
3.50 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the

passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION ACT, 1979

Item No. 3 was called – to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the more effectual prevention of corruption in Barbados and related matters.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in moving the second reading of this Bill, let me state quite early, that it is the Government's intention to seek to refer this Bill, as it did yesterday with the Integrity in Public Life Bill, to a Select Committee of this House.

We would hope that both sides of the House will participate in that Committee. We would further hope that the public, if it has any ideas to contribute to the improvement of the Bill, would be forthcoming in their criticisms and we trust that these criticisms would be more constructive.

I think it cannot be gainsay, despite even the empty fulminations of Mr. Cameron Tudor that the Corruption Laws in Barbados are outmoded and need to be brought up to the 20th Century standards. The Prevention of Corruption Act, Chapter 144 which at present governs by and large the Law of Corruption in this country is based largely on the English Legislation, their Public Bodies Corruption Practices Act of 1889 and their Prevention of Corruption Acts of 1906 and 1916.

Our Bill which has been in operation since 1929 has never been amended. Since that time the State has intervened more and more in the commercial matters and indeed the guise under which corruption within corrupt practices took place has widened considerably. In the United Kingdom in 1974 the Royal Commission on Standards of Conduct in Public Life was set up and this Commission reported in July 1976. The Report is known as Lord Salmon's Report on Standards of Conduct in Public Life and that Commission had no difficulty in finding that the English Acts on which our Legislation was based were outdated, out moded and were in need of drastic revision.

On page 24 – 25 of that Report he made certain substantial suggestions for improving legislation dealing with Corruption. I need cite only a few of these which are contained in paragraph 88 of the Report. It states:–

> "Legislation should be framed to apply in a uniform way to all transactions involving Crown Services and members and employees of public bodies.
>
> Public bodies for this purpose should be defined as broadly as compatible with certainty. The Legislation should specifically catch intermediaries and situations in which considerations are made to a third party.
>
> Proof that a public servant has accepted a consideration from an interested party should raise the presumption that it was made corruptly whether or not contracts are involved in the alleged offence.
>
> All corruption offences should be triable summary or an indictment. Conviction on indictment should attract the maximum penalty of seven years imprisonment and an unlimited fine.
>
> The maximum penalty on summary conviction should be six months imprisonment and a fine of £400. The present powers of the Courts to order forfeiture of pension entitlement and disqualification from voting should be repealed but the power to order the surrender of corrupt gifts should be extended to all cases."

That is important, Sir,

> "All convictions should render the offender liable to disqualification from Election or appointment to membership of a public body or from an Election to Parliament. The Attorney General's consent should continue to be required for prosecution. The offence of knowingly using misleading documents should be retained.

4.00 p.m.

There are certain other recommendations contained at pages 101 to 105, including the necessary powers which should be given to the police to enable conviction to be determined and corruption to be detected, because as I said yesterday, Sir, Lord Justice Hamill and his Commissioners were convinced, as I remain convinced, that corrupt dealings are secretive, and few crimes, if any, can clearly be proved and in those circumstances it was necessary to make certain terms of law to apply and in some instances to reflect the balance of proof in cases of this nature. No one will accuse Lord Justice Hamill and his Committee – with the prestige which Lord Justice Hamill carries in London – of bringing recommendations such as these before the English public in order to curtail freedom of speech, but I am not surprised at the nonsense of Cameron Tudor, Sir, because he is rather scared..... The hon. member for St. Michael South Central can put his hand up as much as he likes, but when I see circumstances in which Cameron Tudor is going to be intellectually dishonest for political gain in misleading people three times in the newspaper and getting it repeated by lesser minions than he on public platforms that this Government is for the first time committing an

offence in order to make bribery by Judges an offence in law, then I know we have come to the gutter of politics in Barbados, because Mr. Tudor has written that one of the reasons for this Bill coming down has something to do with a judicial officer who made a decision, and that nonsense has been repeated on public platforms by Eric Sealy and his crowd.

Now, Sir, I think I should cite this passage from Hillsbury Laws of England, 4th Edition, Vol. II, at paragraph 921 of page 541: "A person who offers or gives a Judge, Magistrate or other judicial officer, and any Judge, Magistrate or other judicial officer who takes any gift or reward to influence his behaviour or for anything done in the conduct of his office commits an offence at common law. Any such offence is punishable by a fine and imprisonment on the discretion of the court.....loss of office."

That is the common law in England, the common law of Barbados, the common law of every democratic country. All we have done in the Corruption Bill in relation to that offence is put it in Statute as declaratory of the law, but Mr. Tudor in his corrupt, depraved mind is going to be so vicious in politics in this country to find the time to write that we are for the first time subverting the independence of Judges in this country and cannot find the Constitution as being satisfactory and making Judges liable to bribery. One should not prevent newspapers from printing anything they want to, Sir, but I wish sometimes that Editors when such nonsense is written would exercise their own editorial discretion and just tear it up, because that could only be a mischievous and wicked article, it is not only ignorant, it is mischievous and wicked. That is what the article is and he should really hold his head in shame. He is claiming to be a member of the Democratic Labour Party, I hope the other members do not share the same view.

He should also hold his head in shame for trying to misuse the Bill which seeks to update the law well within the terms of a Commission set up in England and in terms of legislation that has been passed in other Commonwealth countries like Singapore, for instance, in order to use this for political purposes in order to make people believe that this Government is tampering with the Judiciary.

I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South Central when he was talking about the old age pensioners' houses make the point that there are certain types of duties, but there is a type of duties that I think he should dissociate himself from on the PPM platform.

Sir, I speak very feelingly on this because if there is one institution that I will never play around with or try to destroy in any country, not even my own, it is the Judiciary, because in the long run each one of us has to rely on their interpretation of the law, particularly where we have a written Constitution, in order to defend fundamental rights in this country and in order to make sure that between citizen and subject everything is done already. Let me say that the Bill takes into account modern Commonwealth developments and it makes an offence of corruption to receive or give any gift or reward in return for certain considerations.

The provisions in the draft Bill should widen the prevention of corruption.

4.10 p.m.

The Bill also seeks to provide special powers of investigation to be made to the Police for the purpose of inspecting financial records of suspected persons or organizations before the institution of criminal proceedings, in cases where reasonable ground exist for believing that offences under the Act may have been committed. I pause to say that although we are given these powers of investigation to the Police, in all sections of the Bill we have ensured that all powers of search or enquiry can only be exercised after a judge or magistrate has had an application made to him or her, and we will see that the Director of Public Prosecutions if he wants to get hold of the records must first make an application to a judge, and the Police must make application for a warrant before any search. Nowhere have I heard people who have spoken on these bills mention these safeguards being built into the legislation. When we do something good there is nothing said for it. We have gone out of our way to try to balance that sort of investigative power against the rights of the individuals so that fundamental freedoms are not violated, and I believe we have succeeded in large measure in this Bill in keeping that balance. The Legal Department and myself are opened to any suggestions that may come from the public or the Opposition on the Bill, but what we are not open to is to carping criticism without substance; that gets my goat, to use common parlance. The power we are giving for investigation is heavily circumscribed by the department that the Director of Public Prosecution must make an application to a Judge.

It would also be an offence for an official to use for his own advantage or the advantage of another person information coming to his knowledge by virtue of his position. Inside knowledge and information is one of the very well known devices today by which corruption can be brought about in public and private life and we are trying to deal with this by making it an offence to use information that would give an undue advantage in this way; and indeed we can say that at present we are updating company legislation and will be placing in the Companies Act a similar provision to deal with people

who use inside information about a company for their own gain, so as to stop officers or companies using their financial position for their own benefit and to the detriment of the public at large. This is a modern concept of legislation to deal with corruption which one sees in truly democratic countries like Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Britain, United States, Singapore and others. The Russians have a heavy handed system that I read about in my studies but I find it difficult to take their suggestion seriously when it comes to fundamental human rights.

I want to stress this Bill because it is easy to make fun about people who are serious about integrity legislation, and I believe that as the person having responsibility for the maintenance of the Constitution I have a duty to ensure that the legislation complies with the Constitution; and if it does not we have a duty in those circumstances to ensure that the courts strike that legislation down. I do not believe that people realize that the Attorney General as *amicus curiae* can strike legislation down. I am not saying that whenever legislation is made it will always be within the four corners of the Constitution; not even the greatest judges have ever succeeded in maintaining every aspect of the Constitution in all they did; but what we are all devoted to is that where there are infringements these infringements are to be remedied, and we take serious objections to accusations of subverting people's rights.

I believe anybody would want to support a Bill of this nature and I cite approval from the Salmon Report which I am willing to make available to both sides of the House. When I hear people say that the Corruption Bills we are bringing to Parliament are Bills designed to curtail freedom I get a pain because I do not think they have studied the legislation we are bringing down.

This Bill has 38 sections which I think are basically very modern and up-to-date. We may not all agree on how to go about dealing with each section and we are prepared in Select Committee to improve the legislation if necessary. No special position is being given to Parliamentarians by this Bill, and no undue burden. The Bill applies equally to Parliamentarians, judges, John Public at large and catches certain types of dealings never before brought into the law – tendering, for instance. People would offer rewards to an official for him to give them inside information on the tendering for contracts, and we have deliberately followed Singapore and other countries in this regard in making such Acts of criminal offence subject to the laws of this country.

I would close by saying that it is never easy to prove corruption, but that is no reason why we should not set about to improve the legislation in order to stamp out corruption and bribery in the public and private life of this country.

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

4.20 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, apart from an attempt to attack Mr. Cameron Tudor – a distinguished historian and a distinguished legislator who has served this country in some of the highest capacities, a diplomat, among others – a man who seeks by his article in a particular newspaper in this country to give the public the benefit of his wide experience and his depth of knowledge, I have found, Mr. Speaker, that the presentation by the hon. member for Christ Church West has been without the kind of comparisons to which we were subjected to in all other presentations. It was also without the characteristic supratutorial rarefaction et Betz cell depletion which is characteristic of the hon. member for St. James.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was one further error in his presentation in the suggestion that we saw this particular Bill which sought to revise or to reform the law relating to the prevention of corruption in Barbados in the sameway as we saw the Bill which sought to preserve the public confidence in the integrity and honesty of persons in public life as set out in the Statements and Purposes, etc.

Our fundamental objection of that Bill was because it contained a clear infringement on the rights and freedoms of the people of Barbados. Members on the other side not only conceded that our position was correct but we have had the benefit of a further legal luminary on the other side, the hon. member for St. Philip North and a luminary of the younger members because of a more recent association with the professional capacity and more accurate in determining certain aspects than his older colleagues on the front bench and I believe that many judgments made in the Court recently would suggest that this situation has rapidly developed.

However, Mr. Speaker, the point is that as it stood it was unconstitutional, therefore we took the position that we would not participate in any Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member now debating?

Dr. HAYNES: We are stating our position in relation to the particular Bill before the House. These two Bills have to be seen to some extent in association.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is only one Bill before the House.

Dr. HAYNES: Yes, Sir, and the point I am trying to make is that our position in relation to this Bill is the same as our position in relation to the other Bill but since that forms part and parcel of a package of legislation, we

will take in our voting pattern the same position, that is, that we will not sit on any Select Committee or participate in that exercise. Let us get that clear from the start.

We welcome, as we said yesterday, legislation of this kind. I accept, I am not a Lawyer, the presentation of the hon. member for Christ Church West that it represents an improvement on the Bribery and Corruption Act, Chapter 144 of the Laws of Barbados commencement date, I think it was June 29 or something like that. We will accept that.

I would also like to say, and I do not wish to introduce any partisanship material in my presentation, that in the Interpretation Section, 2 (4) (a) which refers to the protection from any penalty or disability incurred or from any action or proceeding from disclosure later entered into, etc, I would hope that that would cover that most disgraceful episode relating to a member of the Truss family and that those who were involved in the exercise where he was not brought to justice before the Courts of Barbados would not be able to repeat that kind of action again.

On the matter relating to Judicial Officers, as far as I am concerned I think the experience of the Judiciary in this country is one as far as I am aware that the tradition has been that our Judiciary has been completely free of corruption as far as I am concerned.

If members on the other side, many of whom are Lawyers, feel that they need to put this in legislation, I have no objection to that but I would like to see included and I want to put this on the record, that not only the question of rivalry of Judicial Officers but intimidation of Judiciary Officers and I hope that we will never see it in this country again when any member of the Executive would go on a political platform and attack a member of the Judiciary in the execution of his duties. I hope, Sir, that that will never happen again. Many people are subject to lapses. Anyone can have a lapse and I hope it will never happen again.

I would like to make a remarkable suggestion, as a layman, that I think it should be an offence just as an offence to attempt to bribe a Judicial Officer, it should be an offence to intimidate a Judicial Officer. (ASIDES.) You have asked for suggestions. You have talked about existing criticisms. You have asked for suggestions from this side and now you are getting suggestions from this side because if you put in intimidation in there it might in some way reflect on some statement made by some person on a platform in Fairchild Street in relation to the Magistrate, Mr. Keith Simmons, a Statement made by the hon. member for St. Thomas and you should become concern about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to stop the hon. member at that point. The hon. member, I am sure, must by now have known of the Standing Orders and I have received no written information from him that he had intended to make any reference to Mr. Keith Simmons or any Officer and in the absence of any such notification to the Chair, I am submitting that the hon. member will not be allowed to continue in that way.

Dr. HAYNES: Thank you very much for your guidance. I do appreciate it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please get on with the debate, that is all.

Dr. HAYNES: I have just expressed my appreciation in a situation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Kindly get on with the debate.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on the question of inciting information we support any legislation that would curb activity in this area where people would incite information whether it be in the public or private sector who can use that information to their advantage. I can see no reason why we should not support that.

Sir, there is one particular area, I believe if my interpretation of this Act is correct, that in some cases in respect of some offences I would like some clarification on this, that proceedings will be initiated in the Magistrate's Court and the person dealt with at that point in the first instance and in other instances before a Judge and jury.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that in many of these instances, particularly where politicians might well be involved, and where perhaps a Magistrate, as I understand it, does not enjoy the same security of tenure as a High Court Judge – I speak subject to clarification on this one – I would suggest that persons accused of offences under this Act should at all times go to the High Court before a Judge and jury. This is the position that seems to me as a layman bearing in mind again the totality of the circumstances of a small society, and also bearing in mind the suggestion by the hon. member for Christ Church West that when you pass legislation you think not only of a particular point in time at which the legislation is being passed, but you are looking further down the line, and one never knows what can happen in a situation where there can be some influence consequently on that security of tenure.

I cannot make any suggestions, all I am saying, it has been suggested, it has been brought to my attention, but I thought that this calibre of individuals should

probably be tried by a Judge and jury, but again the lawyers are in a better position to deal with that matter.

Then the question of bribery and so on. This is a matter that is of some concern to this country, and I believe that it is a very difficult thing to eradicate, and the only reason why I would not launch out on a different path is because of the verbal and intellectual competence of the hon. member for Christ Church West in his presentation.

One other section that worries me, Mr. Speaker, and one other area I would not like to be strictured in giving the kind of speech that is not suitable in second reading, but remember that Cabinet may by order of regulations exempt from the provisions of this Act, an offering and accepting of certain gifts or kind of hospitality to or by members of Parliament, holders of judicial office or otherwise. I would imagine that what the Government may have in mind is the acceptance of gifts say from another Government or gifts say from a visiting person and so on, maybe it is this kind of area that they may have in mind, but it is not specified in the legislation, and when we get this enshrined we hear of the desirability of retroactivity in legislation and one wonders whether it may not be possible, not of course by this Cabinet, but for the Cabinet in the future in order to retroactively give exemption to someone who had accepted a particular gift, or if in the future there was a corrupt Cabinet in this country, whether they could not use this provision to exempt their yard fowls, etc., etc. It is just a question of the lack of definition, the question of the broad application.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that this is the intention of the present administration, I am not trying to suggest that this Bill is corrupt, the Bill relating to the reform of the law relating to prevention of corruption in Barbados. What I am saying is that as a general belief there should be some tightening up in this area in which the Cabinet may be able by order or regulations to exempt from the provisions of this Act an offering or accepting of certain gifts.

These are the grievances of the Act which I perceive, and I take issue with the hon. member for St. Thomas, who unfortunately is not here, who suggested on some occasion that the question of legislation should be left to the lawyers. This cannot be right. As a professional myself, I know how very frequently inputs from non-professional sources, very often inputs from your junior staff, can be very helpful in coming to good conclusions, so I hope that whereas some of the remarks I may have made may not be in accordance with the most recent legal thinking, nevertheless, this is not a society only of lawyers. Whereas it is true, Mr. Speaker, that there is some bad representation from a destructive point of view in respect of principles of lawyers in this Hon. House, that is the will of the people, but all of us, the total community, have a right to contribute to and make suggestions in respect of legislation, and when I hear a remark which suggests that non-lawyers should not get involved in these areas, and at the same time inviting the general public to make contributions before a Select Committee, it makes me wonder, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that you share my concern in that regard.

Mr. SPEAKER: Having to listen to all of this from time to time.

Dr. HAYNES: Indeed, Sir, your patience is remarkable. And so, Mr. Speaker, in winding up I would say that we in the Opposition would support the general principle of legislation to prevent corruption in Barbados as set out in the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, and for the reasons outlined we will not participate in any Select Committee. Thank You.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, my contribution on this Bill is intended to be short. The Bill seeks to formulate as part of the package which was led off yesterday with the integrity legislation – and I had quite a lot to say on that – but, Mr. Speaker, the justification for the Bill is undoubtedly when an examination is made of political events in Barbados prior to September 2, 1976.
4.40 p.m.

The rumours and allegations carried on, culminating in the presentation of photocopies of the cheques in July 1976. I have such cheques written in the name of Cameron Tudor, but I do not want to do further damage to the gentleman's feelings – the hon. member for St. Michael South Central said he was a diplomat and a Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of Government Business and all that. He was a lot of other things too. That person who has held these high offices within and without Parliament, has failed to provide up to now the public with any solid justifiable reason for his receipt of these various funds totalling over $20,000. Some he said, helped with expenses for health foods. I am not in a position to challenge the accuracy of that defence, but I say that the public confidence suffered a shattering blow in July, 1976, as a result of the discussion concerning the presentation of these cheques from Sydney Alleyne to various members of the Opposition. I was in here at the time and I recognized the air of disbelief, the sense of change and the atmosphere of disquiet that pervaded the mind of the then Government with the disclosure. I know the members on that side did not feel happy to concede, far less to know as a fact, that some of their own numbers may have been involved in dealings where the standard of conduct of those members was less than above suspicion. We all remember well Mr. Frank Walcott on the night in question dressed in white, when making a motion for the adjournment said: "Not me, I

clean." That alone Mr. Speaker, is enough justification for the preservation of this Bill today.

The Bill has very stringent provisions. It aims at those who would be recipient of gifts painted with corruption, as well as the offerors of such gifts, and I would like to say at this stage that it is to my knowledge that the Opposition would look for every available opportunity to find the slightest thread of evidence with which to smear the present Government. Two Sunday nights ago a member of the Opposition spoke to a friend of mine asking him if that person had made a gift of $28,000 to the Barbados Labour Party. The person asked what he was talking about, the other one then said $17,000, then $13,000 – just fishing for information. *(Asides)* I am not calling anybody's name at this stage; the public at some future time may be the recipient of my knowledge but not today. But I want that person to know if he is in here today that such cheap, open attempts to implicate my friend who went to China with me, such cheap methods to accumulate evidence will not succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly please with Section 7 of the Bill which seeks to discourage persons or politicians generally from using intermediaries or political activists in trying to have them murder the reputation of innocent people, such as my colleague the hon. member for St. Michael South East who has endured much in the past year. Under this section to pay somebody to make false and corrupt statements about other people would be an offence and we may be on the road to cleaning up the level of political debate in this country and I believe that short of any immediate political gain to be reached, both sides of this House would have an interest in seeing the political climate on public platform clean up. *(Asides)* Mr. Speaker, I have not been afraid to call people's names in here, and the time will come again, but I will not be cajoled or prompted into doing so now.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that there is a short-coming in the Bill which I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Attorney General, and since it is going to a Select Committee on which I will not be sitting, I may have to write a memorandum. It seems to me there is a fault in the Bill so far as Part 2 is concerned, the Bill seems to limit bribery in respect of tenders to the Government. Now the "Government" is specifically defined in the interpretation section as meaning the Government of Barbados and Her Majesty acting in right of Barbados, and Part 2 Clause 9(1) states: "No person who has made or intends to make a tender to obtain a contract with the Government shall (a) give, offer or agree to give to another person..." and it goes on to list various stipulations. Now to my mind this is far too restrictive.

4.50 p.m.

It is not only the Government in the sense of the Central Government or as you find in the Interpretation Section, "The Government of Barbados and Her Majesty acting in right of Barbados." It is not only the Government that is open to the possibilities of abuse.

I believe that the structure of Government in Barbados with a wide variety of Statutory Boards which carry out and implement Governmental policies and are vehicles for the execution of that policy, I believe that from my experience at the National Housing Corporation, Boards themselves have a very important role to play and are sitting ducks for the possibility of bribery and corruption and therefore I feel there is clearly a loophole in the Bill as presently presented.

If a Tenderer offers to a Chairman a bribe, the Chairman would be liable in his public capacity. That is covered but I think to put the issue beyond doubt, I feel that, Mr. Speaker, that in a Section of the Bill there should be an explanation by some kind of words either in the definition for Government to include Statutory Boards. I think that is the way around it rather than by tearing up each Section and putting in a lot of words. There should be one composite definition rather than "Government" including "Statutory Boards" or whatever and I think that that perhaps would remedy and fill the present loophole that I see in the Bill.

The Attorney General in his introductory speech on the Second Reading said that criticisms did not mean that the Bill will in some way curtail freedom. These criticisms, if they have been made, are obviously without foundation. The only freedom that this Bill curtail is, as I can see, the freedom to corrupt but the freedoms enshrined in Chapter 3 of the Constitution are in no way abrogated or affected by the Bill before this House.

If it does not affect the freedoms I cannot once again understand the position relating the decision not to serve on a Select Committee. Grant it, they might have thought that it goes with the Integrity Bill. The Government explained its position on it and members on this side, including myself, said we did not agree with every Section. We are making certain concessions to the Opposition and they still refuse to serve.

Now they have refused to serve on this which hold for them no great matter or principle. There is nothing more offensive of the democratic processes in Barbados and they refuse to serve. Once again I am going to suggest that the Opposition does not want to come face to face with the issue of corruption and integrity. They do not wish to face that.

As persons presently sitting, many of whom were not tarnished by the Elections of former years, one would have thought and expected that the present lot would have availed themselves of the opportunity to come and share in something which can lend legislative approval

and to at least ensure that the public life of Barbados in future should as far as possible remain unsullened.

In so far as there has been a suggestion about intimidation of the Judiciary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that there are many aspects of intimidation. There can be physical and there can be oral intimidation. I do not know what the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was asking but I would like to say that I have heard from a Judicial Officer recently that sometimes Judges are subjected to threatening phone calls in the middle of a case. That is something that astounded me.

I thought it was only politicians who would receive nasty telephone calls and threats like I did a bomb threat last year and the Attorney General but I did not know that Judges also received these types of communications. But obviously there is currently legislation on the books which deals specifically with that kind of thing. The difficulty is, that every hon. member appreciates the detection of the person who is intimidated or threatened but that I believe is already covered in a number of offences which are on the Statute Book.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to those members who are not Lawyers and who may be given to bear the author or publisher of the motive statement, it is but fair to let them know that Judges, and Magistrates, like anybody else can be legitimately the subject of criticism. If any of them could read the Legal Journals they would see the point well taken. Every issue of the Modern Law Review or the Law Quarterly is critical of some judgment of a previous Judge, Judges, of course, criticising themselves.

I am not talking only about Judges alone because there is a recent book by Lord Dennin himself, it is called The Discipline Of The Law in a style for everybody. It is written in a very simple style, a beautiful book, and in that Lord Dennin is highly critical of Lord Simmons when he was in the House of Lords. *(Asides.)* He could not be related to me. He was a Conservative.

I think that so long as criticism are at the intellectual level rather than criticism of a Judge for a decision which he has given, how he has given the decision and the reasons why he came to a particular decision, those can be attacked. That is what you do. When you go and appeal that is what you do. You are attacking. You are in fact criticising but within the confines of the Court. You are in fact criticising a judgment and the public is free to go and hear it. Criticism of a Judge in public is a different thing. That is a simple thing, Mr. Speaker, so that you can be making criticisms of a Judge in the presence of the public. That is a different thing from the kind of invective as distinct from the criticism that was levelled against the Judges in 1974 in the Constitutional Debate by the then Prime Minister. That was a different thing. Now nobody wants to tolerate that because it weakens the bulwark of freedom. It weakens the independence of the Judiciary and to that extent we would want to outlaw that kind of criticism, if you call it criticism. I do not know about that kind of slander and invective upon Judges.
5.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I said in so far as this Bill is going to a Select Committee I will make whatever recommendations I have to that Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wants to exercise his right to make a contribution?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Just a brief intervention, Mr. Speaker, and I merely want to underline that the Opposition will not be sitting on the Select Committee because we are considering this Bill and the one which has already been disposed of as part of a package, and we are maintaining a common position on these matters although the measures in this particular Bill will not offend in quite the same way as the other measure.

Mr. Speaker, I just wish to ask one question. I wonder if the member for Christ Church West, the Attorney General, will tell us in his reply whether this piece of legislation which is part of law reform, whether in accordance with other law reform measures it has been circulated to interested bodies such as the Bar Association, and if not, why not. My understanding is that in matters relating to law reform – and I believe that principle has been laid down in here – that the appropriate interested bodies would be consulted, and I would like to know why that distinguished body has not been consulted on this particular piece of legislation. I am certain there must be some explanation, if they were given reasonable time in which to reply and why they have not been consulted, and indeed any of the other bodies, whether the Judiciary itself has in any way been consulted on this particular piece of legislation, and if not, why not, because I think I have heard the principle enunciated here that where matters affect interested bodies consultation is a principle which will be followed undeviatingly.

I do not wish to say very much on this particular measure, I consider it one in which the legally trained people would speak, but I would merely state that to the best of my knowledge the 1926 legislation – and I have had the benefit, I have not looked at any brief today or yesterday for that matter – the 1926 legislation to the best of my knowledge was as a result of some attempt to get common form legislation for the colonies, but the question of the prevention of corruption as a result of some international convention or meeting in London, or rather the society was sitting in London – let me just refresh my memory here – the International Congress on Bribery sitting in 1926, meeting in London, attended by representatives of a number of countries, over 30 coun-

tries represented at that particular congress, and as a result of that and of representatives sent out to the Colonies from the appropriate society the Bribery Prevention Law was legislation introduced in the various colonies and that is why we have the 1926 legislation here before us.

Again, my researches show that our legislation is quite similar to that in Trinidad. I do not know if Trinidad has updated their legislation since that time, maybe the learned Attorney General will tell us about that particular matter. But since that time there have been a number of developments, the whole scope of Government as has been pointed out has changed, and it is right, if there have been further changes, if reports have been submitted, that we should update our laws where necessary. Just as our predecessors as legislators did something to upgrade the law as it stood then following a learned investigation of the subject, we are now about to do the same. So our position on this is quite simple. Because of the position we have taken and for good and sufficient reason we will not be participating, but we think that the Government will be able to improve its own legislation and we will await the results of their work.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, if I may reply very briefly to points made by hon. members, in relation to the points about consultation, I am afraid the file which I have does not show that there was any consultation with the Bar Association. If my memory serves me right, I believe there was some consultation with some member of the Judiciary, but unfortunately I have not got the working papers of the drafter with me on this matter, but I see that the Bill went through four different drafts before the final one which has been brought to this House, and apparently I know from some notations of my file that there were suggestions coming from various people, and I realise that the Director of Public Prosecutions would want all this. I rather suspect that this particular Bill did not go to the Bar Association but it would be part of my intention of suggesting to the Select Committee that the Bar Association be asked to give any comments which it may want to make.

Let me say that I have been sending quite a lot of legislation to the Bar Association. I would like to say that they have been responding promptly but unfortunately I get very little out of that august body by way of constructive comments. It is usually preferable for me to select one or two members from the Bar who have a special interest in this type of legislation or a particular type of legislation and get their views. For instance, at the moment we are doing the Companies Act and we have lawyers, accountants and tax experts working with us on Saturday mornings to try to finish that particular bit of legislation.

The hon. member for St. Philip North made the point concerning a wider definition of Government in section 2 of the Bill to catch tenders made by Statutory Bodies, and his point is well taken and it is a point we shall certainly look into in the Select Committee. I think that was a very constructive criticism of the Bill and would certainly help to improve the Bill.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central made some general statements and I wish to deal with one in which he suggests that the Bill should contain provisions dealing with the intimidation of Judges. We already have in Barbados in common law sufficient provisions which the court themselves may exercise in their own discretion, or which the court may refer to me as Attorney General. To deal with any instance of intimidation of any member of the Judiciary, let me state that the court has not referred to me any case involving intimidation of any Judge or Magistrate in this country since I have been Attorney General.
5.10 p.m.

I have had no statement either by way of information or complaint from any of Her Majesty's judges or magistrates or judicial officers that there has been any interference by way of intimidation or otherwise in the discharge of justice. If therefore the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is referring to particular instances which he says constitutes interference, I would advise him to write to the Director of Public Prosecutions or to me and I would be delighted to pass the papers on to the Director of Public Prosecutions. I think the hon. member is mistaken in thinking that a person of this House cannot criticise a judge for the way he discharges his duty; it has been done in democratic circles while not undermining the judiciary. I have been in this House and have heard the judiciary being abused. I have heard the Rt. Hon. member for St. John the present Leader of the Opposition viciously attack a former Judge of the High Court; and I also heard that hon. member in the Constitutional debate made a suggestion about my jogging with a judicial officer as to suggest we are guilty of some malpractice; so I find it a little distressing when I heard of the Democratic Labour Party today making on the guise of "holier-than-thou", because they have attacked every institution of Government in this country – the Church, the Judiciary and the Civil Service – all this by the Rt. Hon. member for St. John. He suggested on one occasion in the Constitution debate that I used to jog with the Chief Justice in order to influence his decision. That is why I lost my respect for him as a man. Let Mr. Cameron Tudor, when it comes to political power, if he wants to destroy you he will try to do so. It is an example that I strongly advocate to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that he should not follow, because I do not believe the people of Barbados will in future select for the high office of Prime Minister persons who adopt such an attitude towards people. That is why I

am annoyed when I hear people say that I do not like freedom and the democratic traditions, for I have suffered more than any other person in this House from the tongue of the hon. member for St. John in his desire to think that he was going to run me out of public life because I refused to accept Senatorship from him when he offered it to me as Deputy President of the Senate. I was opposing him on Federation and he thought he could buy me off by offering me the Presidency of the Senate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think it is imputing improper motives to an hon. member of this Chamber, the distinguished former Prime Minister and hon. member for St. John, to suggest or imply that he tried to buy off an hon. member of this Chamber by the offer of Senatorship and Deputy Presidency of the Senate. I think this is imputing improper motives to the former Prime Minister and Present Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member who made the suggestion will be able to prove it if called upon to do so.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I can do so Sir. If we went back to those days the hon. member who just spoke shared the idealism of Caribbean unity but unfortunately our ways bifurcated in terms of political parties but I think our goals and ideas remained the same, and that is why in spite of our difference in politics we find it easy to get on. But the hon. member for St. John never understood that you can differ in principle without having that sort of personal differences.

But to move back to the Bill. In relation to the Bill, let me say that I regret that the Opposition having conceded in principle that this is a very good Bill, having found nothing substantial in the Bill to criticise, having found nothing contrary to the freedoms of the people of this country, and being offered an opportunity to improve the Bill in the interest of the people of this country have declined. What can be any sound reason for the Opposition to get up and tell people that they do not want to improve legislation for the benefit of the people of this country? All they want to do is to be carping critics. If you make a typographical error, the Opposition will take to confrontation – particularly the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, if a word is left out in legislation, if there is a grammatical error he would call out people even if you say that you intend to make changes to the Bill. He does this simply because he sees a little political crack through which he can squeeze his way to power. But when he is given an opportunity with the biggest form of statesmanship to contribute to the genuine upliftment of the country in a Bill which he says should be presented on a non-partisan basis, he ducks out; he doesn't want to go into it by doing something constructive; he thinks his only duty is to oppose the Government willy nilly.

Now, Sir, opposing the Government on this measure means not contributing to the improvement of government, and history will record that this Bill which has been praised by the Opposition, together with the other Bill which was passed by this House, will be a substantial improvement in the legislation of this country and will perhaps be a watershed in making sure that standards of conduct in public life have been established on a sound basis forever. Regardless of what carping criticism has been made of Section 45, the point remains that this legislation is valuable legislation and I regret to see an Opposition that does not want to assist in improving legislation in this country. Here is an Opposition ducking out of its responsibility. They do not have any quarrel with the Bill.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker, I have been searching for Section 45; I wonder if the hon. member can assist me.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of elucidation.

5.20 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In moving, Sir, that this Bill be read a second time, I am glad to have the Opposition on record as supporting the Bill saying that it is a good Bill. I feel ashamed to see the Opposition, having said that it is a good Bill and coming on the Floor, yet ducking out of going on a Committee to improve this Bill.

Each Committee stands on its own and there has been no legitimate excuse given or satisfactory excuse given by the Opposition for not serving on a Select Committee on this Bill. Now if I get on that Select Committee, Sir, I would hope to persuade whoever is the Chairman, if it is Your Honour, Sir, to write to each member of the Opposition in their personal capacity and ask them to give us any suggestions they have for the improvement of the Bill.

I believe it is a shame when an Opposition cannot come to make a contribution that is valuable and worthwhile to legislation which they say they have no objection to, but duck out on some flimsy excuse about some package. Why do they not come in and do something, Sir? We never ducked out of any opportunity to serve on any Select Committee because we brought our skills in order to help improve the position.

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

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

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Mr. WARD; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. SIMMONS; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. BRADSHAW; Mr. ALLEYNE and Mr. ODLE. – 14.

ABSTENTIONS: Mr. GREAVES; Dr. HAYNES and Mr. SANDIFORD. – 3.

No Hon. members voted "No."

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

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

The question that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Mr. WARD; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. SIMMONS; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. BRADSHAW; Mr. ALLEYNE and Mr. ODLE. – 14.

NOES: Mr. GREAVES; Dr. HAYNES and Mr. SANDIFORD. – 3.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the members of the Committee be Your Honour the Speaker, as Chairman; the hon. member for Christ Church South Central; the hon. member for St. George South; the hon. member for Christ Church East; the hon. member for St. George North and myself and two other members from the Opposition which we would expect if they agree to nominate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do we have any nominations from the Opposition Bench?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we did declare during the debate that we would be unable to serve on that Select Committee on this Bill.

The question that the persons nominated be the persons to serve on the Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
5.30 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 5 be the instant Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 5.

THE LAND TAX (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1979

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to implement a budgetary measure which gives relief to owners of agricultural land from the increases in land taxes. It also seeks to implement the rebate which will be given to companies or individuals who construct for sale permanent houses as defined in section 9(a) of the Act.

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

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I will be relatively short in my contribution on this Bill.

We notice that this is the implementation of a budgetary proposal. I would like to deal with section 8(a) firstly. Some time ago I had indicated that this Hon. House should probably direct its attention to the question of incentives in the area of agriculture. In the course of preparation for that particular discussion I came across an interesting bit of information which may have some bearing on one's attitudes to land rebates on taxes on agricultural land in Barbados. Of course, we are a very heavily taxed country and we welcome any tax relief in any area, but when one looks very closely at where the bulk of such relief would go, one has to look very closely at certain statistics relating to agricultural land in Barbados.

For example, in 1971 94.5% of all farms in Barbados were less than five acres, 0.6% over 100 acres. When you look on the other side and you look at the total proportion of the area of farms by size you will see that 11.6% of the acreage is actually owned by that 94.5% whereas 83% of the acreage is owned by 0.6%. Therefore, if any tax rebate or any incentives are forthcoming you will see exactly the direction in which the rebate will go and who will be the chief beneficiaries. Of interest, Sir, is the question of intensity of land use, because when you look very carefully at the intensity of land use, in other words, those who should benefit most from any incentives or tax rebates, you find a remarkable position contrary to what you believe, that it is on farms that are less than five acres in size where you get the intensity of land use of some 66.1%, and that progressively drops to about 40% as you get to farms of 100 acres or about.

I will not get into other areas that might have a relation to the question of tax rebates or incentives, but what is very interesting is that it is a tremendous fallacy that the deterioration in the contribution of agriculture to the GDP of this country started with the Democratic Labour Party. In point of fact it started in 1946 and from 1961 it drop-

ped to the figure of 142 to 28%, and that was the general pattern. If you drew a graph you would see that in point of fact the steepest arc of the graph was under the previous Barbados Labour Party administration. Having said this, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to give the impression that I am opposing the tax rebate, but it is important for all of us when we consider incentives of tax rebates in relation to agriculture to bear in mind this statistical data, and I never suspected that one of the fundamental problems in agriculture in this country, and what we are going to have to look at in the future is the whole question of land reform in Barbados, because these figures, well researched figures, are extremely startling.

The second point I would like to make is on section 9(a) where you get a tax rebate for a company or an individual who constructs for sale houses of stone, brick, or concrete, etc., etc. We have no quarrel with any incentives that might be given to people involved in the construction exercise, but what I would like to know is that any tax rebate would result in cheaper housing for the purchasers of those houses and not necessarily greater profits for the people building and selling those houses.

5.40 p.m.

I am also very interested in knowing whether this relates to condominiums as well as houses because this would be a matter of considerable interest to me. I presume the term "house" would apply to condominiums, but I am not sure and I am asking the advice of the Hon. Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To deal with the second point first, I could not possibly say whether the price of houses would be affected by a tax rebate to house builders. What is intended is an incentive to build and thereby people would have more houses. I do not believe house rents are excessive by world standards. I lived in Atlantic Shores and paid a rent of $120 a month for twelve years. I doubt such a rent is now available in such areas. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central is much more an authority than I on these matters since he has a large number of houses which he rents out I would accuse him of many things but not on the basis of rates and taxes made out on rents when it is considered what it cost to build the house. And I believe that examples of prices obtaining in Trinidad should make us thankful that house rents are still relatively low in Barbados. In Barbados young married people with both partners working have no difficulty in meeting the rent. They might rather be house owners than renters, but here you see that $300, $350 or $400 is the normal rent for a newly built unfurnished two or three-bedroom house, and that is not too bad when compared with Trinidad where you have to pay $700 for a room.

To deal with the other part: The hon. member's point unfortunately is derived from possibly the worst statistics to be produced of any aspect of Barbadian life in this century. Those figures that 96% of the farms in Barbados are less than five acres and that 83% of the acreage is owned by 0.6% of the farmers are based on figures collected during the 1970 census for which I have absolutely nothing but contempt and have warned the Minister of Agriculture that they must be disregarded as any basis on which to estimate the farming needs in this country. It is simply not true that 96% of all farms in Barbados are less than five acres unless you assume that half of all the farmers in Barbados live in St. Michael. Unless you believe that you cannot believe the other things, because those figures included people in Bank Hall who keep two sheep that graze on Empire pasture and a few pigs and are described as farmers while in fact a man might be a clerical officer in the Civil Service. Those are the sort of figures at which planning for farming was done by the Democratic Labour Party. I could not believe my eyes when I saw that there were ten times as many farmers in St. Michael as they were in St. Philip, the biggest parish. The most agricultural constituency in Barbados is St. Philip North and yet St. Michael is described as having ten times as many farmers as the whole of St. Philip. The figures are not worth printing and cannot form basis for farming in this country. They have been used for all sorts of purposes that have distorted personnel pattern at the Ministry of Agriculture. It is only now under the guidance of an enlightened Permanent Secretary and Minister that we are beginning to straighten out some of the mistakes and understand the true direction of farming patterns in Barbados.

Something that we have got to appreciate is that livestock rearing is becoming the prerogative of the small man, the landless farmer or the farmer with a very small acreage. We are therefore trying to shift a little from the extensive amount of extension assistance given to vegetables in the past. The production of vegetables in this island is overwhelmingly done by plantations – don't let anybody fool you about that – and we are therefore trying to shift some attention to livestock because that is where the small people are involved in over 90% of what is done and they are the people that have a need. So we have to restrict our approach to these statistics. My chief regret is that it is not only people like the hon. member for St. Michael South Central who have been misled by these nonsensical statistics in which people in Bank Hall are compared to plantations like Bulkeley. I also regret that these figures go abroad. There are things like the ownership of Agricultural facilities in this country that we ought to be proud about. We ought to be proud that the people who own the land in this country are Barbadians and not foreign companies, as is true of many other parts of the Caribbean, particularly the larger Caribbean Islands. We will presumably never have the difficulty that Guyana has had where the overwhelming majority of the agricultural land was owned by foreign companies. There are very few absentee owners in Barbados. It is true there

are many large family property which derived from social systems abominable to all of us, but the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has done what he could to put an end to that and shift ownership in the direction of different families. I am fully aware of the fact that the majority of people who will get a benefit from Section 9(a) of this Bill are the owners of larger parcels of land, because if hon. members will recall, the taxes were increased on parcels of land worth $100,000 or more – or whatever the figure was – and you are only dealing with about 100 or 150 individuals. But I make no apology for saying that agriculture should not have to bear increased taxation at this time. You don't need to go into statistics to know that this is a tax relief measure designed to help large agricultural units, because the increased taxation was put on such units. Now I do not wish further to penalize agriculture at the expense of other sectors of the society. Tourism has very great tax breaks; manufacturing has very great tax breaks, but agriculture has not, and a viable agriculture in the end is a greater saviour of foreign exchange than anything else, because the value added in agriculture is over 90%.
5.50 p.m.

The import content of a ton of sugar is only 7% or 8% of its value. The import content of cabbages is .1% per pound. It is no more than that. The importation of fertilizers and the cost of pumping irrigation water in the development of Agriculture is a true foreign exchange saver.

As I told the Manufacturers Association this afternoon, there are actually some manufacturing enterprises in Barbados that are foreign exchange losers because they import more in raw materials and use more imported fuels than it would cost to buy what they make from outside. This is not true in Agriculture this is why they run-down Agriculture and the encouragement indeed to cut up the big estates was such a very bad policy in the previous regime.

The hon. member has done some very pretty juggling of figures and out of respect for the juggling he got them wrong because he considered that Agriculture contributed 14% to the GDP in 1946. *(Asides.)* He actually said 14%. Suppose it was 46% – I am surprised it was so small in effect and it declined in 1961 to 7%. I do not know about that.

In 1965 20% of GDP was still generated by Agriculture, according to my information, except for the bad crop of last year. A part of it is because the rest of the economy has expanded but under the Democratic Labour Party taking the acreage of land into account the acreage of sugar fell to 40,000 for the first time in our history since the 17th century. Remember that there was an absolute loss of quite a large proportion in a short time.

In 1956 when I first got into the House of Assembly there were still 20,000 people employed in Agriculture. In 1976 when I became Prime Minister there were something like 20,000 people. Our entire unemployment problem had been occasioned by the run-down of Agriculture. Of the 15,000 unemployed, 12,000 of them were the lost jobs in Agriculture and that was the inditement and exceptionally the policy of cutting up Plantations under what was ostensibly peasant lands but which were never believed to be peasant lands from the word "go".

All of that was nothing but speculation of our land which has done our country quite devastating harm. This measure is designed to penalise those who under the Democratic Labour Party put the Plantations in grass in the hope that they would be able to cut them up and make a profit and by selling them to middle-class people who wanted to build a half acre of lawn and a big house with a long drive-way.

I do not hide that the tax measure is meant to penalise persons who have taken a productive piece of land out of agriculture in the hope of speculation and Section 9(a) is designed to assist those who did not submit to those conditions to run down their properties in order to make it appear that it is a losing property and to cut down plantation property.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill be now 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. B. St. JOHN, 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.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am not too very familiar with the new legislation relating to condominiums and so on. The point I am trying to get established is whether from the sale, if you build condominiums rather than separate houses and you sold those Condominiums whether or not those tax incentives would apply to the developer of condominiums in the same way as it would apply to the builder of an individual home.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the incentive, Sir, as I understand it is for people who build units of houses for sale and whether housing is for what one would call detached houses, semi-detached houses or

condominiums, the basic thing is that the incentive is for that.

The incentive is for the purpose of people who build houses for sale. A condominium is only a house which is on a vertical base as opposed to one which is on a horizontal base where the division of land is horizontal and a town-house is a semi-detached house whereas with the condominium you have land divided horizontally and vertically but you still own with a condominium this is something Barbadians do not know, but you own a particular piece of the air suspended.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I see no reason why the tax relief would not be granted. I really cannot think that it would not be. We really wish to encourage the building of condominium properties.

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 13th November at 12.00 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.
6.05 p.m.