
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th October, 1979.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P. (Speaker); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.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; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry) (Leader of the House); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW and Mr. L. L. SISNETT.

Prayers were read.

Mr. SANDIFORD, Mr. JOHNSON and Dr. CHELTENHAM entered the Chamber and took their seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 2nd October, 1979.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and subject to any observations by any hon. member as to the accuracy thereof, I beg to move that they be confirmed.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Just two observations, Mr. Speaker. On page 4 of the Minutes about two lines before the caption "Resumption", the Minutes read: "D.

A. C. Simmons Esq. resumed his speech." but nowhere in these Minutes is it indicated where he began his speech, and I am suggesting that there must be an error here and what was intended was that "D. A. C. SIMMONS, Esq. began his speech."

Secondly on page 5, at the top of the page, the first line reads: "Hon. L. S. Craig spoke" and the second line "Mr. Speaker spoke". To the best of my recollection he was not just speaking. Mr. Speaker ruled, following upon the intervention of Mr. Craig, that Mr. Greaves did not have the right to reply. I think that would be an accurate reflection of the proceedings, and there is good precedent for that because a little later in the Minutes there is an indication that the Speaker ruled on some matter and on that occasion Mr. Speaker did rule that Mr. Greaves did not have a right of reply. I draw these matters to attention.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am not trying to make a mountain out of this, but Mr. Speaker at times does speak without ruling, and I remember on that occasion Mr. Speaker did intervene and at that particular time did not necessarily make a ruling. We have seen this on more than one occasion. Mr. Speaker may say that so and so be the case, but not necessarily rule, and I am wondering if the Hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition is not getting a bit confused at this moment. It is no big thing, but I just wanted to have it clarified.

Mr. SIMMONS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw attention to page 4 of the Minutes, two lines above the word "Resumption". "D. A. C. Simmons, Esq. resumed his speech." I do not see it in the Minutes that I began to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South has drawn the attention of the Honourable House to the omission.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am grateful to Your Honour.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, just one other observation, on page 5. I believe it is a matter of accuracy in typing. On page 5, just before the words "The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows", the Minutes read: "Hon. H. B. St. John spoke on a point of order and moved, seconded by Hon. L. S. Craig, that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed, but the Order Paper has it that the motion was seconded by Hon. H. deB. Forde. I think that from the point of view of getting this accurate we should have this matter put straight.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank hon. members for these observations and the Clerk will take note. However, on the second point raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South with reference to the entry "Mr. Speaker spoke", hon. members must know that it has not been the custom of this Honourable House to go beyond this where there is a ruling or merely an intervention from the Chair.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on that I should like to draw to your attention that on page 4 we have just above "Resumption" where Mr. Speaker ruled it a fraudulent point of order. It is recorded that it is a ruling of Mr. Speaker. It is recorded that "Hon. L. S. Craig rose to speak on a point of elucidation and Mr. Sandiford did not give way. Hon. L. S. Craig then began to speak on a point of order." Mr. Speaker ruled it a fraudulent point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I see the observation made by the hon. member.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: In the light of the observations, I beg to move that the Minutes as amended be confirmed.

If there is no objection, these Minutes, as amended, have been confirmed.
12.25 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: During the last sitting of this Honourable House, in the debate on Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business, I made a ruling in relation to the interpretation of Standing Order No. 29(1) and 29(2).

That Standing Order provides that, in some circumstances, the mover of a motion will have a right to final reply to a debate. In that case paragraph 1 alone will operate, without the application of the exception therein. In debates to which that exception and paragraph 2 apply, a Minister will have a right of final reply.

I am satisfied, however, that when paragraph 2 operates, paragraphs 1 and 2 are to be interpreted conjunctively and not disjunctively and that the reply to the debate by the mover of a motion is independent of that which a Minister may finally make. In this respect Standing Order No. 29 is exceptional in giving two separate rights of reply, for different purposes.

Consequently, I propose to reverse my ruling so that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy may reply to the debate and, thereafter, a Minister, as we have had the assurance from the Honourable Leader of the House, will exercise the right of final reply to the debate on the motion which is critical of the Government.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1979.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to give notice of a Resolution to appoint a Joint Select Committee on External Affairs to consider and report on foreign affairs generally.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the use of the sum of U.S. \$1.5 million to be borrowed from the OPEC Special Fund for the purpose of assisting in the provision of local cost funding of Community Health and Polyclinic projects.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Land Tax Act.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN the Bill to amend the Land Tax Act was read a first time.

Mr. TAITT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Order No. 11 is the first Order of the Day.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this item relates to the vesting of Government lands in the National Housing Corporation. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this item will lead to much debate today. I think we had a full dress debate and a rather successful one on Housing last week and I went to bed that night, and I should daresay, with a degree of happiness and joy of hearing members of the Opposition bench congratulating the Government on its Housing Programme.

I must confess, however, that the former shadow of a doubt Minister of Finance and Planning was not in his seat. I welcome him after the long recess, Sir. I note that he has taken, I think, the lead now from the North rather than from the South, Sir. I would have thought, had he been here, that we would have had an even more interesting debate with his economic theories. I regret, Sir, that when I have to act as Leader of the House that I would not be any longer in a position to have consultation with my friend from St. Michael South West, but these things happen in life. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. I think he is a shadow of a doubt Minister of Housing. Am I right? I am not quite sure but I just want to be able to put across my story and be able to shadow the shadow of doubts on the other side.

However, Sir, this is primarily the vesting of land at Eden Lodge, Belair — let me get these papers here together since there is a new team — in the parish of St. George, Eden Lodge in the parish of St. Michael. All of these are owned by the Government and we are vesting them. Also Pleasant Hall, which is a low income housing district, Wotton and Sion Hill in the parish of St. James. The land was bought and the whole infrastructure was put in. These were utility poles in the middle of the roads; that was in 1975 and the Government was saddled with that problem. However, the residents of Spring Head are now happily resided on a quarter acre of land at Sion Hill in St. James.

There are also lands in Free Hill in the parish of St. Michael and Wildey in the parish of St. Michael. Those are the lands which I am seeking Government approval for vesting in the National Housing Corporation. I do not expect much debate on this but if there is any I believe I am quite willing to stand up to the test of the shadows of doubt on the other side.

12.35 p.m.

I have no doubt and I would be very disappointed if the new Shadow Minister of Finance and Planning who has found his way again — of course there are some

people who have backs like crocodiles, who never mind what you do with them, but he found himself in Valery asking the people if they see that down there is a gully where we are going to build the houses. However, that is a matter entirely for this Minister and this Government. At National Housing today we have a qualified architect — as a matter of fact, Sir, he is considered to be the best in Barbados — from the prestigious Architects Association in London, and we have Mr. Louis Redman who was once hidden away in the Ministry of Housing and was supposed to be a consultant to the Government, and he is now Head of the Technical Division of the National Housing Corporation where there is also a Surveyor, Mr. David Butcher, a Barbados Scholar just qualified as an Engineer. He is also in the National Housing Corporation, so the member for St. Michael South Central has not got to worry if we are going to build houses in a gully or if we are going to build them in the sea, our planning is good enough, and when we acquire land we make sure it is land where we can carry out our housing programme.

I do not know if the member for St. Michael South West, who looks a bit deflated in his sky-blue suit today — no longer do I see the green Army uniform, but I always warned him it was only a matter of time. Don't tackle the big fish, they will eat you. You are playing you want to expel a whole former Prime Minister, moving an expulsion notice against an old Prime Minister of a country? A former Prime Minister? Man, when the Hayneses and the Caddles and the Sandifords come together, that is a trio that will eat you raw. I warned the hon. member for St. Michael South West. We have no room in the inn, I can assure you of that, we do not need any assistance because the Ministry of Trade is very well taken care of by the Deputy Prime Minister and therefore we would not need that assistance, but I am happy to see that I have my old Chinese travelling partner with whom I can now have consultations. There will be no argument during the Budget about who is going to speak first or last. On the last occasion I had a battle with the member for St. Michael South West who told me he was the Leader of the Opposition on that occasion.

Anyhow, Sir, with those few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. The National Housing Corporation can move freely around. It has taken us a long time — Bel-Air, the Bay Land, for example — people have paid in their money over the years during the former regime and nothing has happened, but we are working towards that. We have now in the Ministry a housing planner, Mr. Allan Jones, former Deputy Town Planner — some class horses — to give us advice while we make our final decision, and I know that the No. 1 Acting Leader, because there are two, low gear and second gear, the Acting Leader of the Opposition will be happy to know that I have even taken it upon myself to see what I can do about the Bayland to relieve the

people after fifteen years that he was a Pope out there to relieve the people out there of the wells that he complained about and the problems. I spoke to Mr. Carlton Barker, his good old friend, former driver of the Transport Board, one of the top people, a very good friend. He told me he likes Mr. Sandiford but he does not see how he can help him on the next occasion, he would rather have a word with Dr. Blackman. Well, I don't know, the Dr. Hayneses and the Dr. Blackmans and that doctor crowd I really cannot help you with, Sir.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second this Resolution, and I would like to make a few points, in seconding the Resolution, on a number of matters. One relates to the lands that are being acquired. I notice that a large amount of this is in the Second Schedule, some 4,221,000 square feet of land is being vested at Parish Land. I recall, Sir, that when I was a member of this House in the Session 1966-71, I requested the then Government to do something about Parish Land in Christ Church, and it shows you, Sir, the tardy way in which the machinery of Government then operated, that up to 1976, after ten years, no effort was made by them other than the commissioning in their last stages in 1975, I believe, of a plan for the area. It took them all of that period from 1966 to 1975 to do it.

Now, we have had to evaluate that plan and execute it, but what I would like from the Minister of Housing is the assurance that now that the roads are in that all of those people who would like to get spots — because this is basically as I understand it, a sites and services project — I would like to get the lease arrangements settled now that the land is vested in the Housing Corporation and the water put in and a speedy allocation of the lots. There are a large number of people in that area who want to rely on self-help. That is a good thing, Sir, that is a good thing about the people in the parish of Christ Church, they are willing to rely on self-help, they are willing to meet the Government more than half-way, they are not asking the Government to build the houses for them, they only want the spots and it is very important that there be not this tardiness, that they be relieved of their frustration, because many of them are frustrated. The roads are in, and I hope that the Waterworks Department will get ahead and put in the water. I understand that the Housing Corporation has paid the money into the Waterworks Department to get ahead with the water, so therefore the land will be vested now and the legal luminaries at the Housing Corporation will be able to draw up the lease arrangements for the land. Until the land was vested it could not be done. The roads have been put in, the applications for the spots are in,

and I hope that in a very short period of time the water will be in and the spots will be allocated.

I also want to draw to the attention of the Minister of Housing that there is still a large amount of land there which has not yet been serviced. I know he is going to get difficulty with some people in that area, who will tell you that they have been renting two acres for years and they want the two acres, but the point is they are not cultivating it any more because it is rockstone land. Anybody who knows Parish Land will know that it has always been rockstone land. It is up on a hillside, it is next to where the Balls who were the former owners of the place, the Balls plantation historically, where they put a tenantry, and anywhere you see a plantation, in the old days, put a tenantry you knew that was the worst agricultural land. That was one good guiding rule, and I hope that a larger number of people will be serviced in the future in respect to this area. It is situated in an area in which the demand for house spots is very very great.

12.45 p.m.

Our problem in Christ Church is that before we can meet the legitimate interests and demands of the people we have people from other areas coming in. But the basic thing is that I want to see this speeded up and let us have a model development there. It is the first of our comprehensive site projects which we are implementing, and it should be implemented with much greater despatch.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, in joining in this Resolution vesting these large parcels of land in the National Housing Corporation, I must express my concern over the fact that it has taken three years or more before this Resolution has come before Parliament, before the people of Parish Land, Christ Church can look forward with any certain hope to be moved on to these lands. Up to this morning I was checking with the manager of the Housing Corporation and I found that the water has not been put in yet. So it seems to me we can still look forward to further delay before the many persons applying for these lands since 1975 can move on to them. The situation is uncomfortable for us representatives because every now and then there are emergency cases where people's houses are being dismantled and put beside the road, and when these other people have to wait for so much to be done they become restless.

I just want to say that we are not going to be able to realize the goal of making Parish Land a model settlement unless we take possession of the land south of the Methodist Church for the purpose of a community centre and playing field. It makes no sense putting 200 additional houses in the Parish Land area without giving the people these facilities. Between the Airport and Oistin there is not a single playing field. There are two industrial

estates within that area — the Grantley Adams Industrial Park and the Newton Industrial Park. A large number of young women, many of them with two or three children, work on these industrial estates and they have nowhere to take their children during the day. There is no playing field in the area that covers Coverly, Parish Land, Fairy Valley and Gibbons; nor is there any community centre, and it is three years and more since I have been urging the Government to acquire land to the South of Providence Methodist Church. The land is not being used for agricultural or any other purpose for a number of years, and I do not see why a playing field and community centre cannot be put there.

Mr. ODLE: Mr. Speaker, I was inclined to challenge the Hon. Leader of the House when he remarked that Christ Church was the number one parish, but I believe he means after St. George.

I must congratulate the Minister and those responsible for bringing this Resolution before the House. This is a move with which nobody can disagree and I am very happy to think that the same energies that have been exercised in getting the land vested in the Housing Corporation will be used in getting services rendered to the people in the area. I would like to suggest, however, that when the Housing Corporation does its business in Bel Air it takes a look at the need for a playing field in that area. At the St. Augustine's Girls' School there is a playing field which serves the young girls in that area, and I believe that some two and a half or three acres of land around that area should be acquired to make it a bigger playing field and much more suited to the needs of the community. If that is not feasible, I believe there is another area west of the St. Augustine church yard that might be suitable and I invite the Minister to look at this.

One further point. There is one other area where there is a watercourse leading into a gully and I believe our engineers could be invited to look at it with a view to making it a catchment area so that people who have their gardens could use it for that purpose. It would be of great assistance to the conservation of water in this country. Again, I congratulate the Minister on this Resolution.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I know something of the history of this Resolution and I crave the indulgence of this House to explain some of the ramifications.

There are nine parcels of land that are the subject of this Resolution. What is being sought to be done is to vest the legal ownership of these various parcels of land in the National Housing Corporation, as it is important to allow the corporation to deal with the land as owners.

I also note that the Addendum to the Resolution says that the parcels of land vested in the Corporation are

to be developed for housing purposes. The Addendum is inaccurately worded. All of these parcels of land are not to be developed — the majority have been developed already; you already have existing housing estates on some of them — Wotton and Bel Air, for example, and I have to place the blame where it lies; it lies in the former government which had acquired these various parcels of land and then did not see that the final documentation to vest the land in the National Housing Corporation was done; and I challenge anybody on the other side to deny this. I know these things take a long time — we have been agitating since 1976 when we took over. The fact that the Government has come with this Resolution today is because it was felt that it would be more appropriate to bring the whole matter of this acquisition at one time and get it out the way.

12.55 p.m.

I have to be honest about this. The significance of some of these is that the Housing Corporation has been receiving rent, for example, in Pleasant Hall, without being the legal owner of the property. Of course they may have been the person in law entitled to possession; but they were not the legal owners of all of these parcels of land. In those areas where there has been commercial development, such as Wotton where houses have been built for conveyance to the general public, those conveyances could not be drawn, because the vendor would have to be the National Housing Corporation; and the land was not legally invested in the entity called the National Housing Corporation. Therefore they could not pass a good title to a prospective purchaser.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat scandalous that we have these areas knocking around from 1968-1969-1963, I am informed — without the legal formalities being done. I do not see many of these areas which are the subject of the Resolution today as even having anything to do with the land bank. The land bank is a separate issue and these cannot be considered as part of the land bank because they are already in existence. They have been built on spots and there are people who are paying rent for them.

The land bank envisages the purchase or the acquisition of land by the Ministry of Housing and Lands so that in the future the Corporation itself as the vehicle for the implementation of the Ministry's policy, will have an area of land or areas of land available from which they can move from one area to another; but these are already existing estates.

Some strictures have been levelled against the National Housing Corporation in respect of Parish Land. Mr. Speaker, Parish Land, until today, is still vested in the Ministry of Housing and Lands. Plans have been prepared for the development of that area. In the course of the planning, roads were put in and the contractor was paid. The hold up has been in the area of water because there

were one or two cases including a wall structure where a man was running some discotheque. The question of re-alignment has been sorted out. As of today the water has not been put in. Now the facts on the water are these: the cost of the installation of the water in Parish Land is \$58,100. The National Housing Corporation has to pay, taking it from one pocket and putting it in another. This is something that I do not understand about Government.

The Housing Corporation has to pay the Waterworks Department 75 per cent of the cost. That \$43,575 was paid by the Corporation on the 4th day of May this year; and now, today, October whatever it is, the water has still not been installed. I do not as former Chairman of the Corporation accept that there was anything dilatory on the part of the Corporation in respect of the installation of water. I said that before I came to the House I would have the exact figures; but the problem of water, Mr. Speaker, is one of a series of problems that needs to be properly sorted out; and I believe that the Ministry has adopted the correct approach by having a planning unit within the Ministry; because in our development the Ministry of Health is involved. The Ministry of Communications is involved. Town Planning and other subsidiary areas of activity, perhaps the Ministry of Education from time to time.

If you could have representatives of these various Ministries functioning on a committee or a unit within the Ministry of Housing I believe that a lot of the problems which bog down the speedy completion of developments can be got out of the way because it will be dealt with at an early stage; and all of the Departments likely to be affected will know at an early stage what is the position.

The Housing Corporation people may not be pleased; but the Housing Corporation has as much trouble with the Town Planning Department in getting certificates of compliance as the average individual in the society; and that is an area again that holds up the speedy delivery of conveyances to prospective purchasers; and the only way that we can get rid of it is to have one planning unit which could co-ordinate and take cognisance of the representations of all the various departments or ministries likely to be affected by developments.

Mr. Speaker, in respect of Wotton, I know that there has been some concern that Wotton has shown itself even recently liable to some flooding. Last year before construction of houses was started at Wotton, a number of additional wells, additional to those which had been charged for in the original scheme of things by the former Government — a number of additional wells were put in with a view to taking off the water. Since I have returned from abroad I have learnt that during my absence there was some planning at Wotton. I have asked technically

what was the reason. I have been told that a substantial part of the reason is that additional wells need to be built to the south, higher up, to take the water as it comes off from the rocky land to the east or east north east of the development.

I am assured that the Housing Corporation is looking at that matter with a view to alleviating the flood problem with which the area has found itself haunted. I hope, Mr. Speaker, assuming the passage of this Resolution, that many of these have been vested in the Corporation; and that a number of people who want to purchase their own houses will no longer be held up by administrative and legal difficulties which have presented themselves in the way of a much more speedy development such as this which, perhaps, even now still affects the Bay Land area. The Bay Land area also involves surveying problems; and it is probably known to all members of the House that the Corporation had the Surveyors' Association to do a collective effort to survey or re-survey the Bay Land development.

It cost the Corporation \$240,000 and it has not yet been completed; but I believe that as soon as the Corporation finds itself with enough funds to complete it, it will be done. It will be done to the satisfaction of the hon. member for St. Michael South. But it has not yet been completed to the satisfaction of the Corporation.
1.05 p.m.

I do not think anyone could quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with the notes to this Resolution. They are full and all the various representatives of the people who are affected by these various schedules should be familiar with the square footage which relates to the area. I say that because recently there was a debate in here on Valery, last week Tuesday, and the member of Parliament for that area in the company of the former secretary of the Democratic Labour Party, Mr. LeRoy Brathwaite, went to the area of Valery trying to claim that it was he who got that Resolution brought before this House, and of course he went back last week Friday afternoon, and he showed himself ignorant of the extent of the 16 acres at Valery, because he complained to the people that he only saw gully for building of houses in. Of course that was last Tuesday and by Wednesday I had the terms of his visit and what he had said, and the people I must say, Mr. Speaker, are only now laughing to see that their representative does not even know the area which was the subject of debate in this House two weeks ago and cannot inform them properly, but rather is in the classic position of being able to mislead his own people.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, there are one or two comments I should like to make. In the first instance on the question of Valery, you may recall that I raised the question of whether an assurance could be given to the people in that area that those who already lived on

Valery would be able to remain there and would have priority in respect of any distribution of that land. I just want to get that clear and that I was talking about lands that do not already have houses on them. That was the issue. I agree with you not to concern myself with that kind of nonsense, if I may say so. However, basically the impression I think is being given that what has taken place here represents some fundamental change in the philosophy or policy from the previous administration. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, for example, Belair in St. George was acquired by the previous administration and the major policy factor was that Government had a right and a duty to intervene in situations such as existed in Belair which was previously a tenantry, and that that land should eventually be made available to the people of Barbados.

There have been many obvious constraints which have been explained in many instances. I think in Belair it was the question of surveying as well, the question of getting the transfers done which the previous Government as well as this Government must have been encountering difficulties of this kind, seeing that delays have taken place over a three year period. I would not imagine that any Government past or present would want to encourage a situation where having acquired a given area of property there should be any delay in the transfer of title to people already on that property, so the basic policy remains the same. What we are seeing here is an administrative arrangement where it has been suggested that by vesting these lands in the National Housing Corporation it will represent for the time being and in the present situation a tidier and perhaps speedier administrative arrangement for the transfer of these lands. If this is the case, I hope so, but as far as I am aware many of the problems of transfer have related to the difficulties in getting professional staff at various levels, getting surveys done and getting various legal problems sorted out in respect of sub-division and so on. So indeed it represents a continuation of a policy which was the policy of the Democratic Labour Party and has to be the policy of any Government in a country like Barbados which is interested in the development of housing and the development of land ownership by the masses of people in Barbados. So the only essential difference here is that land previously bought by a previous Government is now being vested in an agency of Government for the purposes as outlined of expediting the transfer to the people for whom it was intended, because as the hon. member for St. Philip North has pointed out, the most of these lands are already occupied by people and indeed I go further, Mr. Speaker, to say that they are not only occupied by people, but if you take a place like Belair in St. George there are many people who have wall structures or partial wall structures already on those lands, so it is only a matter of time before these transfers were done.

I think it is most important not only in these areas, but there are many other areas even in the private sector,

for example, within St. Michael South Central where there have been problems in getting conveyances and surveying done, where people have built homes on land for many years and indeed what has happened to these people is that they have never had the benefit of a title to an important asset which could have contributed to their further development in life, for example, in making a further loan or making a further investment. So it does represent serious constraints on the people already in those areas and to recognise that they have properties there, and that it was the intention of the previous Government and it has clearly been stated that it is the intention of the present administration to continue with the same policy, to do it through the National Housing Corporation and that speed is essential because there has been a significant retarding effect on people with properties in these areas not only from the point of view of the insecurity which they must feel when they have houses on land which they are paying rent for and which they have been told they would be able to buy, but nevertheless have not been able to buy over the years, and I doubt very much whether you would not find that the blame both in the past administration and in the present administration for delays can be apportioned to a wide area of activity, professional, Government, corporations and that kind of thing. This is certainly not a matter for any significant dispute, and certainly all I can see here is that the fundamental policy of the Democratic Labour Party in respect of providing lands for people is being carried on and that in 1979 the present administration feels that they can do it more effectively through the present mechanism.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I intervene in this debate to make a few points which I think ought to be made and which should help the House in future not to waste time on this sort of Resolution. It is a point which should have been taken a long time. The first thing is that it is necessary to review the Crown Lands Vesting Act. It is no point having two exercises of a Resolution by way of compulsory acquisition to vest land in the Government and then a second Resolution to convey that land from the Government to a statutory corporation which is after all owned by the people of Barbados in their entirety. When I became Attorney General I wrote to the then Minister of Housing & Lands suggesting that the Ministry should formulate their views on reviewing all of the legislation dealing with land transfers in this country, and the present Minister has started to consider this submission and has assured me that he will shortly be putting up his concrete suggestions to Government on the matter. But a simple amendment to this Act could avoid us having to come into Parliament on two exercises except where an hon. member may want to raise a matter specifically.

1.15 p.m.

It is possible for the Minister, by Order, to transfer the land and allow the Order to be subjected to a negative resolution.

The other thing is, Sir, it seems to me that at the time when some of these acquisitions took place, the Government of the day did not know in its mind whether the land was going to go to the Housing Corporation or remain in the Government. I think they should have had their plans more clearly defined. It would have saved a lot of time and more important, it would have insured that the persons who wanted to purchase lands from the Government whether by way of house spots or by construction would by now have had titles vested in them.

I must differ on this point with the Hon. member for St. Michael South Central when he assumes that it is a mere administrative matter because the consequences of an administrative delay would have affected the people who should have benefited long ago by having titles transferred to them and indeed the Acting Leader of the Opposition, if he is really in control of his team, would let the member speak on his subjects rather than run his mouth all over the place and would have told him, for instance, that in the Bay Land, although the Bay Land was acquired by the Labour Party sometime in 1959 or 1960, that even today in the Bay Land title has not yet been transferred to the people of those spots and many of them have not been able to go ahead with plans for building or improving on their houses because of these difficulties which have occurred.

I think firstly, I would like to submit to this Honourable House that there is a strong case for improving the legal machinery in which matters such as these took place.

Secondly, I should like to inform the House that the Minister of Housing made submissions to us for improving the Housing Corporation Act and we have drafted amendments which are now in his Ministry and soon will be before Cabinet simplifying conveyancing and I would hope that as a result of these changes in the Law, and I am sure that both sides of the House will support these changes, the cost of conveyancing to people purchasing land or houses or house spots from the National Housing Corporation can be reduced by 50%.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, since we have become the Government, we have made the General Law dealing with conveyancing matters and I hope that from the first of January, 1980, that the new legislation will be brought into effect and the result of this will be to simplify conveyancing for the general public, not merely persons purchasing from the Crown or Quasi Governmental Corporations and I use this particularly to say to the profession that my advisors, including Professor Roy Marshall have advised me that because of the simplified procedures conveyancing will now be much easier and the time spent will be less and I would expect the profession to respond by recommenda-

tions to the Rules Committee a reduction in the Tariff Fees by at least 30% so that the cost of conveyancing to the public will be less and I am hoping that the profession will act favourably rather than force me to give serious consideration to recommending to the Government and Parliament some statutory provision in fixing the tariff and fees on conveyancing as a whole.

The final point I would like to make is one specifically in reply to the Hon. member for St. Michael South Central when he spoke specifically on Belair. I do not think he does his Party any good by advancing the argument that this is purely an administrative matter and is merely a consideration of policy.

As a person who was born in St. George, although he never paid any particular regard to St. George until he became a candidate, but as a person who was born in St. George he should have been conscious since 1971 at the time when Belair was acquired that no proper roads had been put into Belair. There is still a mud road there so it is not an administrative matter due to a professional delay and lack of planning. The fact is that there was no proper planning and the majority of the problems certainly in this decade in Barbados, certainly the decade of the 70's as well as the 60's is due to the fact that integrated planning has not been carried out efficiently and effectively and we cannot either one of us hide behind the officials. We must take the blame.

The Ministry of Housing under the last Government was an example of how not to run a Ministry. I think everybody should be satisfied on that and let us hope that we have improved on that position and that future Governments will run the Ministry of Housing properly and effectively because it was a classic example of incompetence, corruption and everything that goes with that and hence you find all these problems that occurred.

I want quite clearly to say that I disagree respectfully and I would hope that now that the concept of integrated, rural and urban development is one well known to everybody that we should be able to get on with proper planning from the beginning so that the comments made by the hon. member for Christ Church South Central, the hon. member for Christ Church East and indeed the hon. member for St. George North, that those comments would not be necessary and that people would know from the start that a proper integrated service in water, lights, electricity, the whole lot, house spots properly laid out so that we would not have Parliament to spend its time on legislation of this nature and there will be greater benefits for the people for whom these lands are being purchased in trust.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I did not really intend to get into this particular debate but I would have to make a few points, particularly because the constituency which I have the honour to represent has been mentioned,

one area of it, the Bay Land, on a couple of occasions. I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that I did not hear anything about Rose Hill in St. Peter or any other area in St. Peter for that matter which would get some type of benefit out of this particular Resolution but I know, Mr. Speaker, you can take care of yourself.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have every confidence in the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Legal Affairs and lastly, the Minister of Finance.

Mr. SANDIFORD: We are relying on that confidence. We hope that it will materialise. Mr. Speaker, the first point I will like to make is that I think that this House should be grateful to the hon. member for St. Philip North for indeed putting this Resolution in its perspective and pointing out that it would not necessarily need any great addition of building land to the Land Bank, so-called, that what we have here is merely one in a series of measures that have been taken by this Honourable Chamber over the years to vest lands in the National Housing Corporation or its predecessors.

Sometimes when we try to squeeze political advantage out of something that is basically non-political, I think we see how very far down the road or the gutter — not the gutter in a tutorial sense — but I am speaking of “off the road” because we can get off the tract. This is not the first time that land has been vested in the National Housing Corporation or its predecessor. Since such measures have been taken before so this is in fact one in a series of steps that have been taken or that are taken from time to time to vest land in the appropriate body.

Now when we look at the schedules here, some 9 of them, I believe that the majority of them, probably about 5 or 6 of them relate to areas which the previous administration initiated action on either by constructing well planned developments, such as the one at Eden Lodge or in other areas with actual areas laid out and services put in and some of the services as at Sion Hill in the parish of St. James. (*Asides.*) I am talking about the ones I know. 1.25 p.m.

I believe the member for St. James knows about that one as well at Sion Hill, so these are developments that have taken place, and indeed as the member for St. Michael South Central said, in a sense it is a tidying up process, and we all know about the law's delay. I believe Shakespeare himself, it must have been in Hamlet or in one of his plays, it must have been Hamlet, spoke about the Law's delay, and if there are legal problems involved in either the acquisition of land or in the vesting of land in the appropriate authority, these things take time, and I hope the Attorney General, the member for Christ Church West, will use his considerable powers to see that these matters are speeded up, and I certainly hope that when the Democratic Labour Party gets back into power

in 1981 that we would not have to be coming back to tidy up these matters that have been left undone by this Great Combination.

Let us make the position clear. The Democratic Labour Party administration improved tremendously on the first Barbados Labour Party administration as far as housing matters are concerned, a tremendous development. Indeed, may I say, a tremendous filip was given to housing in this country by the Democratic Labour Party administration and it is now for this present administration to point out that because of the groundwork and the framework that have been placed there by the previous administration that they can now come and get a better housing record than the Democratic Labour Party left. We will be examining that record very closely, we will be counting it not in terms of what happens in any one year out of a report by the Central Bank, but in terms of the total number of houses completed, or you may talk about housing starts, whatever it may be, that is what we will be looking at, not an isolated selection from a report comparing things which may not be comparable in their very nature.

I would like to point out also that as far as Bayville is concerned, there are problems there which I would like to draw to the attention of this Chamber on behalf of my constituents. For instance, the land there is vested in the National Housing Corporation, to the best of my knowledge. The problem there is one of housing, whether the land is vested in the National Housing Corporation, it is Government land, and there are particular problems of persons who have houses which are in need of repair now and there is a decision facing the owners of those houses. They cannot get permission, some of them — this is what they tell me — they cannot get permission to construct substantial structures because of approval or lack of approval from Town Planning or whatever may be the factors involved, and they have — I know of particularly one case which was drawn to my attention — and the problem there is that they have to make a substantial investment in the repairs of homes when that money could go towards the construction of a new house altogether, and this is part of the problem. There are problems involved, and whether it is in terms of the legal problems or of the surveying problems, there are involved, and as I indicated I certainly hope that when in a few years' time we have responsibility for administering the affairs of this country, that we will not have any of this tidying up work to do, but I know the process of the wheels of Government, they turn very slowly, and I am confident that we will have the task of doing some of the very things that you have accused us of not doing.

I will leave the question of Wotton for another occasion, and Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to this particular Resolution coming from this side of the

Chamber, because as I said, this is something of which we are aware and it is something which each succeeding Government will have to deal with.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a small point for the attention of the Hon. Minister. It is nice to hear of all the wonderful housing plans he has for the housing and lands of the country, but I am drawing to his attention that there is an area to which he should give his attention, and that is the area of providing land for those people who want to rent it. In the parish of St. Michael especially there are some people who find it difficult and more difficult as time goes by to obtain a plot of land on which to put their houses. They already have the houses, they are renting the plots, then they are given notice and they go around from place to place seeking land and finding great difficulty. In some cases the case goes to court, judgment is given against them, and sometimes you will have seen houses being put by the wayside on some occasion or the other.

Now, this is a rather difficult area, we find that there are not many private people in Barbados nowadays interested in the renting of land on any long term basis for such purposes, people are more concerned with developments or selling their land to other developers or building on it themselves, and something has to be done. As time goes by you will find that this will become more and more the responsibility of Government and Government must face up to that, and I hope that the Hon. Minister with all this plans and with all his wonderful ideas he has for housing and lands will make some preparation for making provisions for those small number of people, I hope, it is not a large number of people, who still require to rent a plot of land on which to place their houses. One may say that it is better for them to buy, that the Housing Corporation is prepared to make land available for them to buy, but some of those people may find it not attractive to buy for a number of reasons and will still need to continue renting land for some time, and I accept that it is the responsibility of Government regardless of which Party is in power to meet the needs of the people, and this is one of the areas where I feel something should be done, and I am throwing it out to the Hon. Minister for his consideration. 1.35 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this Resolution today I never thought for a moment that the discussion would have taken this long. I must agree that Parliament can be like a sleeping river or like the raging Atlantic. Let me therefore deal with the necessary statements and questions.

The Deputy Prime Minister made reference to Parish Land. That was aptly answered by the former Chairman of the National Housing Corporation. The former Chairman of the National Housing Corporation also gave

the necessary answers to the hon. member for Christ Church East. My colleague, the Attorney General, dealt with the legal aspects of the Act. The acting Leader of the Opposition in his contribution dealt only with 1981; that was his contribution.

Then we had the hon. member for St. Michael North Central showing how interested he is in the debate. I made it very clear that it was not Government's plan only to build houses but also to provide house spots, and I went even to the North, to St. Lucy and made reference to house spots there — Sion Hill has house spots. I also made reference to Atwell Land and Wavell Avenue. It only shows how they come in here not understanding one single thing about the matter. That is why I said it was not necessary to have a full-dress debate. And the hon. member for St. Michael South Central made no contribution at all; he displayed his complete ignorance of the matter before the House.

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

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) ORDER, 1979

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there are three Civil Establishment Orders that are on the Order Paper today, Nos. 2, 3 and 4 of 1979. I propose to proceed with Nos. 2 and 3, but for reasons which I made apparent during my speech earlier I do not propose to proceed with No. 4 today.

Mr. Speaker, this is a major Civil Establishment Order covering areas in many Ministries. It covers the Governor General, the Police, the Prison, Central Purchasing Department, Treasury, Defence and Security, Ministry of External Affairs, Ministry of Education, School Meals, Ministry of Health and National Insurance and the Electoral Department of the Prime Minister's Office.

I will not deal at any great length with all the matters covered, although I am sure that if there is any matter on which any hon. member is requiring information there will be no difficulty in getting it from me or the Minister responsible.

To deal with the matter seriatim; in the case of the Governor General, new arrangements have been made for the administration of the Governor General's office. The expression "Private Secretary" tends to mean a different thing when you are dealing with Government than in ordinary business, but this distinction has been lost sight of over the years and persons who are secretaries are described as Private Secretaries. We want to adopt a standard nomenclature.

In future the Governor General's ADC will be drawn from serving officers of the Defence Force and the office of Government House will be run by a Private Secretary who will be a senior officer of Government, I think with the rank of Senior Assistant Secretary. I think there is already an officer acting in the position, and there will also be an Executive Assistant. The Civil Establishment Order confirms the temporary arrangements which have been in operation for some time.

The next Item which relates to the Police Department is perhaps a major one in this order. For the last twelve months or longer the Government has been in the process of reorganizing the administration and establishment of the Royal Barbados Police Force. The posts here being created represent the first phase of that reorganization. The Government has decided to abolish the post of Corporal in the Royal Barbados Police Force and to phase this out in an expeditious manner after full discussions with representatives of the Police Association and the Commissioner of Police. These talks have gone a long way towards completion, and recent communication has been made to the Commissioner of Police indicating Government's intention in this matter. Broadly speaking, what will be done is that a formula will be found to phase out the present line of corporal. There will be no reduction in the combined ranks of corporals and sergeants; in other words, the number of promotion opportunities will at least remain the same, but the final details are not yet settled.

In passing I would like to say this to the corporals and sergeants of the Police Force with regard to the recent salary negotiations when their claims for improvement of the salary scale for Corporals were not granted. I think it can now be understood that you could hardly improve the salary scale of a post which you intended to abolish and where most holders of such post would find themselves in a better position by promotion.
1.45 p.m.

It will also be understood that the bottom post of sergeant could hardly be abolished if you are abolishing the post of corporal altogether. I will return to the question of regrading in a moment. Dealing with the matter of corporals, Sir, I find that the Commissioner of Police has written on the 20th of September to inform me of my agreement to the phasing out of the rank of corporal in such a way as to ensure that the combined establishment of the ranks of corporals and sergeants would not be decreased.

Now before I go on to salaries, I would like to say something about Establishments generally. For some time, I think for some years, there has been before the Government a series of proposals for an increase, or rather the size of the Police Force. I think that on all

sides we can agree that the expansion of our economy, particularly in the last three years, and particularly the increase in the number of tourists — I only have to say, Sir, that the number of tourists in Barbados up to the end of August had increased by 18 per cent over the previous year; and provisional figures show that this is being anticipated for the month of September.

Hon. members will understand that the facilities, which include the facilities for law and order have to be made available to deal with the tourists, means that the Police Force is being pressed harder than ever; but this is not the only basis on which the Police need, and in my opinion, deserve an increase in the establishment, but also an improvement in the establishment.

By the standards of many Police Forces our Police Force is under-officered; and many of the senior officers do not in my opinion have salaries commensurate with the responsibilities which they have to execute. In our Police Force there is only a relatively small number of Inspectors and in the ranks above that, even smaller numbers. I am satisfied that a modern Police Force cannot be properly administered with the relatively sparse number of senior officers available to the Royal Barbados Police Force; and Cabinet will very shortly be asked to consider an increase in the senior ranks of the Police Force.

We hope, that the combination of removing writ serving from the police, the combination of removing immigration from the Police and the increase in the senior ranks — which will have an automatic increase in the senior ranks — you will have an increase in the senior ranks without reducing the over all size of the force — will have the effect of producing a Force which will be better able to carry out the responsibilities of law and order in Barbados.

On the rank of corporal, the only thing that I would say in conclusion, that this is a rank more appropriate to a military force than a Police Force. Very few Police Forces indeed, and as far as I can see, nearly all of them in ex-British colonies no longer carry the rank of corporal. If you go to New York, you will see constable, sergeant, station sergeant and from lieutenants to captains and commissioners. If you go to London you see constables, sergeants, station sergeants and then a whole hierarchy of ranks, but not corporals. The rank of corporal is long outmoded; and perhaps it is only because of the innate conservatism of Barbadian life that the mettle was not grasped at an earlier stage.

I am not making any promise that the legislation will have an immediate effect; but the policy is that those who can supervise must supervise with a better rank and pay than they are getting at the present time. Now, Sir, as to the question of pay, I think that although this

resolution is not immediately concerned with pay, it will be overtaken very shortly by another resolution which relates to this. I am telling hon. members this because it is necessary in the short term to assist the Police Force with the current series of promotions.

The effect of this resolution is to introduce six additional posts of Station Sergeant, plus 16 additional posts of sergeant which means that you are immediately promoting at least 22 members of the Force to the rank of Sergeant or Station Sergeant — or to put it this way, you can add 22 people to the Force. While this agreement is being worked out in the over all establishment, we think that the phasing out of the rank of corporal should start as soon as possible by the promotion of as large a number of corporals as possible.

For this reason we want to have the resolution passed so that promotions can be made at the earliest possible stage. I do not wish to suggest in any way that the Police Service Commission will be holding meetings more quickly than any other that we held with them. We are making it possible to hold a meeting to carry out a series of promotions. I am very glad to be able to announce that the Government has been able to reach agreement with the Police Association over salary scales of the rank of sergeant or above. No alteration is being made to the salary scale for obvious reasons. An alteration has already been made in that they have already been given an increment of the maximum from April 1 this year; but no further alteration is being made; but as from the 1st April 1979 there will be a new salary for the Commissioner of Police, the Assistant Superintendent, Inspectors, Station Sergeants and Sergeants.

The Commissioner of Police will go to an annual salary equivalent to that of a Permanent Secretary, and will be paid an allowance accordingly. The Deputy Commissioner of Police — his grading will go to \$25,044 a year. The Assistant Commissioner of Police will be raised to the level, it seems to me, of a Senior Assistant Secretary. The police had a half scale above or below, whichever way you look at it, corresponding the scales in the Public Service — to the three top scales. We are putting them on the same level as ranks which broadly speaking, correspond in the Public Service.

Senior Superintendents will have a scale going from \$20,592 to \$21,636. I do not want to go into all the other scales. Going right down to the rank of sergeant, top of the scale will be raised as the Police Association has asked. In addition to the ranks for which new scales have come into operation on the 1st April, the ranks of Assistant Commissioner, Senior Superintendent and Superintendent will also receive increases from the 1st September.

1.55 p.m.

The reasons for the different commencement dates are these: the Police Association did not ask for any increase in the salaries attached to these ranks, but the Government considered that it is time to improve the general position of the senior officers. Perhaps they did not ask for them because they might have thought they would not get them and were saving them up for another time. I do not really know; but I am not one that believes in doing things by halves and trying to bite a cherry four different ways. If you give yourself a little room to pay people properly by improving the position of the man at top, the people at the bottom and in the middle must also get a little lift, and therefore a general regrading of the Police salary scales for senior officers has been carried out. Those persons for whom a request was made since April have got theirs from April, and those persons for whom no request was made have got theirs since September.

I am announcing all this in advance of Cabinet approval but the Cabinet has been kept fully informed of the negotiations and I do not think my colleagues will punish me too severely on Thursday or next week if they hear these things for the first time in the House of Assembly. The position therefore is that by the end of the year we hope to be in a position to let the House know exactly the numbers, the ranks and the salary scales of the new improved, I hope, streamlined police force. In addition to these steps which are being taken, I have accepted the recommendations made by the Attorney General on the advice of his Ministry and with the assistance of a Mr. Gay, an adviser from overseas who has examined the force and its readiness in modern conditions and the duties which it has to carry out, and its need for training, and I have approved training courses for a number of police officers to go overseas for training at senior level. I think it very important to put an end to the training starvation that has affected the Royal Barbados Police Force perhaps for as much as ten years. There has not been a sufficient number of senior policemen being given the assistance and exposure to overseas methods as is suitable in this day and age, and I hope very soon that this will be rectified by the institution of a long term training programme which can stretch over a period of years to improve the quality of the men who are going to be promoted into the new and senior ranks.

Now, Sir, if the House will allow a very brief word on the question of the immigration service, I had hoped to be able to come to the House with this related matter which is contained in the Civil Establishment Order No. 4 and deal with it today. It does however seem to me that we are not altogether ready for a Civil Establishment Order establishing all the posts in a new immigration service, because the transition from a police to a civilian service does carry with it certain new possibilities that may be better met by the establishment of a number of temporary posts alongside the permanent posts, and it is my intention to come back to the House as soon as

possible with an Establishment Order which will establish all the top posts in the new immigration service. We will be providing the post of Chief Immigration Officer at senior assistant secretary level and an establishment to suit that, Deputy Immigration Officers in suitable positions, but there is a great deal in my opinion more work to be done, I think we were a little hasty with it — before we can be sure that we have got the number of junior posts and intermediate posts exactly right because we have to integrate the present staff of the Immigration division of the Department of Defence and Security into a new Immigration Service, so that some of the present officers are going to be made immigration officers, some policemen are going to be made immigration officers, some members of the public will be allowed to apply to become immigration officers, and some persons who are already in the public service in other departments may also be made immigration officers, and I think we would like just a little more time to consider the staffing implications unless we go wrong, that we do not saddle ourselves with 62 posts of immigration officer when in fact we may need more seniors and fewer juniors or as the case may be; so a new Order will be coming to the House very shortly to deal with that. Hon. members may have noticed that the newly trained temporary immigration officers are already beginning to work at the airport, and I very much hope that we will soon have an immigration service at the airport capable of dealing with this great influx of tourists.

There were 37,000 tourists in this country in August, the greatest number ever achieved, a number that astonished me. I thought it would be unusual if we went to 35,000 and that is a lot of people when the Saturday afternoon comes passing through immigration.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must now...

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have not finished my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you be finished in ten minutes?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, Sir. My speech can be finished in ten minutes; certainly in less than that. Prisons is the next. The situation with the Prisons is broadly speaking as found in the Addendum and there really is very little that I could add to that. I beg Your Honour's pardon. We are trying our best to facilitate the implementation of the five day week which was promised some years ago and we will in fact need the additional new posts at the top. Much of this takes the place of a temporary establishment which has been working for some years. The Prison service has now examined its position and the Ministry of the Attorney General has made these recommendations which I think have to be accepted in order to provide the same conditions for

Prison Officers as exists in other branches of the uniformed service.

The next Resolution coming up deals with the Fire Service. It also goes without saying that there will be a new Order dealing with salaries in due course for Prison Officers to take account of the new salaries being granted to senior police.

The Central Purchasing Department: this represents the mechanisation and computerisation of the activities of Government. We do not any longer need people writing columns of figures in books; we need machine operators to reflect the use of accounting machines and the use of computerisation in Government accounts. We are therefore getting rid of the post of clerical officer and replacing it by the post of machine operator. This applies also to the Treasury.

Defence and Security. Sir, there will also be new arrangements for this relating to immigration, but in the meantime we are seeking to establish the temporary posts that are set out in the Order. Very soon after taking office I asked for a study of all temporary posts in Government with a view either to abolishing them or making them permanent. The wheels of Government grind slowly. We try our best, but we cannot always do everything overnight, but they are grinding at least with some of these departments and we are getting some of these temporary posts made permanent so that the holders may have a little job security, and persons who get up on political platforms telling a lot of lies about dismissals and so on will have to eat their words in due course. How a Government that has established more temporary posts and made more permanent jobs for people within the public service than any other Government in history can be accused of discriminating against public officers and sending home people really passeth human understanding, but perhaps some of the people who make the accusations are not totally and entirely to be embraced within the definition of human, and I do not necessarily mean the hon. member for St. Lucy.

2.05 p.m.

In the Ministry of External Affairs, Sir, there is a change in nomenclature. In the Ministry of Education again a temporary post is being established.

In the School Meals, Sir, I must confess that the School Meals Department is not one over whose arrangements I have ever been able to achieve any mastery from the Establishments point of view. I know that I have been trying to get out of the School Meals Department recommendations to establish the posts of all the people of whom Mr. Cameron Tudor was speaking, to put them on the permanent posts, who had been working in the School Meals for so long and who were given jobs on a certain political basis.

I have been trying for two years to get recommendations for servers in the Schools and workers in the Centres to appoint them so that they will have no fear of being dismissed for partisan political reasons and I cannot get recommendations by the same people who were put in by the previous Government to run the Department. I have had to take matters in my own hands. I think I can disclose to the public that I had to call for a list, set down criteria, and I would tell the public what the criteria are.

Everybody who is a server, and a School Meals Server, who has been working in the Department, I think the period is eight years or more, will be appointed to the Unestablished Staff barring two out of two hundred against whom there is some allegation of misconduct and indeed one of them is a person I know well from my own constituency. Two out of all of those people will not be established.

We have had talks with the National Union of Public Workers about this matter and we are working towards criteria of qualifications rather than personal criteria. As far as the workers in the School Meals Centres are concerned, I am urged not to have too generous an attitude towards appointments because many of them have very bad records. I am saying this out quite openly and I am trying to press the School Meals Department to produce recommendations and reasons where they did not advise Establishment of an individual for not so advising and of course the post of a more serious level, appointments have already been made and I think appointments have been made to the positions of Van Driver and Labourer.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say this in conclusion, because I am not going to deal with Ministry of Health and National Insurance. I very sincerely hope that the hon. members opposite who make false, wicked, dangerous, malicious and untrue allegations, if any of them do so, about victimisation of workers in Government, will hang their heads in shame when they see the political complexion of persons who are appointed to Unestablished positions in the School Meals Service. That is all I have to say.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, that concludes what I have to say on this Resolution and I will not in the ordinary way be offering any speech on the succeeding Resolution which relates to the Fire Service because most of it is embraced.

I beg to move that this Resolution be now passed.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second the Resolution and reserve my right to speak.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, before the Resolution is put I beg to move that the Sitting be now suspended until 2.45 p.m.

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. It is Question Time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There are no answers to Questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that there are no replies to Questions so we automatically go into Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 under Private Members' Business be taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 1 of Private Members' Business.

RESOLUTION CALLING ON GOVERNMENT TO EVOLVE A SCHEME TO AID LOCAL POLICY HOLDERS OF THE FIRST FEDERATION LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, when this matter was last debated, I think it must have been some time in July, the Deputy Prime Minister being the only member from the Government side who spoke on this matter did not really give any clear indication.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. What is now before the Chamber? Is the hon. member winding up? I thought the hon. member would wish to know what the Government's situation on the matter was. The record here says: "Mr. E. E. Greaves rose to speak. Mr. Speaker spoke." (*Aside*). I know I wasn't here, I can only go by the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: The position is this, that the Hon. Leader of the House gave an undertaking at the last sitting that a Government Minister would make the final reply on behalf of the Government, the debate having been critical of the Government. Consequently, the mover of the Resolution is now exercising his final right of reply.

Mr. GREAVES: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when the Deputy Prime Minister spoke on this Resolution one did not get any clear indication from him as to how the Government felt about this particular Resolution. I want to just reiterate that it is the view of the mover of this Resolution and the view of this side that this a matter which has got to rise above any partisan political approach for the simple reason that there is a large num-

ber of people, as I indicated in the Resolution, over 3,000 policyholders who could be affected if their policies are just allowed to go into abeyance by any kind of inaction on the part of the Government. We feel, and certainly I feel, very strongly that the Government owes it as a responsibility, as I said in my opening statement on this Resolution, owes it as a responsibility to this large number of policyholders to ensure that the contributions which they have made — at least some of these contributions — are regained by the Government initiating some scheme to rescue this.

I pointed out, Mr. Speaker that the Government had set up, at least they had asked a firm of actuaries, Amit De, to look at the entire First Federation Life Insurance Company operations in Barbados to find out what recommendations could be made to ensure that something be salvaged, and we are aware now what the recommendations of that firm of actuaries were, and as I pointed out, the actuaries did point out and did suggest to the Government that the Insurance Corporation of Barbados which was established could play a major role in salvaging the policyholders' contributions. So that what we would certainly like to know from the Government is what is going to be done in this particular regard, and we would certainly like to urge on the Government that they should initiate some action without delay on this particular matter.

We heard last week, just by the way, from the Deputy Prime Minister that the Government had intentions of acquiring the area of land below Purity Bakeries in Collymore Rock which is owned by the Insurance Company, and one would certainly like to know when this is done and what price the Government proposes to pay for this area of land, and what is going to be the final result, because presumably if the Government is moving in to take over the area of land, then it would indicate that the Government proposes to do something in this particular area, and we would certainly like to urge upon the Government that it is a matter of utmost concern, it is one which they cannot shy away from in terms of being able to demonstrate in a statesmanlike way that they have the interest of these policyholders at heart, and we would therefore suggest to the Government, and certainly I would like to urge the passage of this Resolution on the Government and hope that we can have some very clear indication about what scheme they propose to evolve to save this particular situation, one which is obviously of utmost concern to all of us.

I beg to move, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution do now pass, subject of course to the right of the Prime Minister to speak on this matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really very amused when I come in here and I hear the tone of sweet reason with which hon. members

pressed in the Gallery or addressed from the floor of the House, and when I also hear what the same hon. members have to say to 62 people at Mount Gay, St. Lucy, on August 12, 1979 about the same matter. I wonder if I am listening to the same person, I don't think I could be. I hear in here that it is not a matter of party partisanship, but I read and I hear also a voice that sounds very much like the voice of the hon. member for St. Lucy down at Mount Gay taking a turn in the Government over First Federation. That it is the first Government who is responsible for the people not getting their money, but in here we are regaled with a comment on how mild the Resolution is, how it is not a partisan matter and how the Government should listen to the firm of actuaries, and so on and so forth.

Now, I can agree with most, if not all, of what is in the Preamble to the Resolution, and indeed much against my will, Sir, I believe that the hon. member although late has a good idea in the Addendum clause when he says that the Government should evolve a scheme.
3.00 p.m.

Both Governments have been seised of the matter of First Federation Life Insurance for some time. As long ago as 1974 this company failed to meet its financial responsibilities and was unable to register as an insurance company under the Insurance Act of Barbados. The then Government was made fully aware of this at the time. The company tried out a tricky scheme to borrow money from the Bank of Nova Scotia on the security of its own debentures which were already encumbered and were perhaps worth nothing, in order to get the money to pay into the Treasury to fund itself. The then Government did nothing about the shareholders, nor was the voice of the hon. member for St. Lucy heard at that time seeking to protect the shareholders.

About the middle of January, 1975 Sir John Carter, a former Guyanese Ambassador in London who was Chairman of this company, came to see the then Prime Minister in his office and told him that he was going to bring the headquarters of First Federation Life to Barbados and that he was trying to evolve a means of satisfying the requirements of the Insurance Act, and he set out all the matters of which the hon. member spoke to the then Prime Minister. That was in January 1975. The Central Bank by that time had refused to allow First Federation Life to borrow money in Barbados to satisfy its liabilities here. This was subsequent to Sir John Carter's visit to the hon. member for St. John.

Another meeting was held at Mount Gay at Checker Hall, St. Lucy, with or without Mr. Cameron Tudor, and with or without their assistance the shareholders of First Federation Life went on suffering. You know who is one of the suffering shareholders? Senator O'Brien Trotman, the acting Minister of Communications and Works. Not a

word was heard on behalf of these shareholders at that time; but now after the Insurance Act which was introduced by the former regime and which exposed First Federation's infelicities, and the Government changes and a new Government comes in with entirely clean hands in the whole matter — I could do like the hon. member for St. Peter in the case of the Sydney Alleyne cheques and say "I am clean" — it is now that the hon. member for St. Lucy discovers that the shareholders of First Federation Life are suffering.

The Government is doing its best to ameliorate the lot of the shareholders of First Federation Life. We have considered the actuarial study to which the hon. member has referred, but I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention that the actuaries concerned were retained by First Federation Life in order to get advice on how to pull themselves out of their difficulties. The actuaries have made certain recommendations in other territories relating to First Federation, but I am not aware that any of their recommendations have been bringing any results. They came to Barbados, meetings were held on the situation and Mr. Amit De represented basically that a scheme should be put up which would involve the injection of \$500,000, the company being allowed to write new business in the meantime. Neither Government of Barbados — not the one led by the hon. member for St. John, even to please Mr. Carter, nor this Government — ever held itself as an insurer of insurance companies. We have to insist on maintaining the deposits of policy holders and we have to protect the public. The actuarial survey appeared to me to be a very straightforward matter of trying to put the hands of the company into the pockets of the Government to replace the monies that should never have been taken out of the company in the first place. First Federation Life was one of those companies where the promoters took the money of poor people of Barbados and the Caribbean and paid themselves large salaries, took out large sums for operational expenses and in the end found they had done so well out of the policy holders that they had no money left to give them. This is in broad terms what happened.

Now I am sure that the hon. member for St. Lucy did not mean to say on August 12, 1979 that in Antigua and Jamaica those Governments had incorporated the company's business into the National Insurance Scheme. This kind of insurance is different from National Insurance and would be difficult to place in a National Insurance Scheme. The question remains however, is it possible to deal with the matter outside the National Insurance and outside the Government's sponsorship. The hon. member then said that the Government should take responsibility for the business done by the company, otherwise the company would collapse. I want to refute that. I must say that I do not think it is the

treatment pure and simple of the company by the former Government that has put the company in this position; I would not be so wicked as to say that it was the hon. member for St. John who by passing the Insurance Act was responsible for the closing down of that insurance company. He might have been the agent, but First Federation Life had already made itself unviable as an insurance company.

But although I do not think that the Government was responsible for closing down First Federation Life, the Government must still have a thought about the policy holders. The statements by the hon. member for St. Lucy did occasion some comment on how First Federation Life has been handled by other Governments in the area. First of all it is quite untrue that in Antigua and Jamaica the Government has incorporated the company's business into its own. In Antigua in 1976 the Government enacted legislation for State insurance for its business and this department had acquired the assets and liabilities of the local operations of First Federation Life. But I should tell you that in Antigua the actuary recommended that a moratorium be placed on the debts of the company. In Jamaica it is altogether untrue that the Government has taken over the company. What happened is that life insurance companies in Jamaica have voluntarily undertaken with the Superintendent of Insurance to set up a fund to meet the obligations of the company.

3.10 p.m.

I also understand that this voluntary fund is supported by an obligatory levy and that three insurance companies have gone out of business rather than pay the levy in all the circumstances; but it is again not true that it is a Government operation. The best that can be said about Jamaica, and this has been said, is that the policy holders of First Federation are expected to receive some ex gratia compensation in due course.

In Guyana there has not been the same case because First Federation had a large portfolio of local assets, and their liabilities were not so great; and a mutual company has been set up in Guyana. In fact, the company was not bankrupt in Guyana for reasons which I do not have to go into now, Sir. In St. Lucia, apparently, another private insurance company took over the affairs of First Federation; and the company that did the taking over is now in very serious difficulties itself. In St. Vincent the actuarial valuation — the same actuaries — conducted an assessment of the deficit and the Government is considering the matter.

I will tell you what the Government of Barbados is doing. First of all, we have examined the state of assets and liabilities; and we intend to make sure that the proceeds of the sale of the real property owned by First

Federation in Collymore Rock are applied for the benefit of the shareholders. The Government of Barbados is ready to assist with legal advice to any shareholder of First Federation who wishes to take steps before the court to wind up the company and seek a realisation of its assets. If it becomes necessary for the Government itself to intervene in any proceedings as *amicus curiae*, the Attorney General has given me the assurance that he will make Crown Counsel available for the purpose; and if it becomes necessary for the Government to purchase the property with a view to making funds available for distribution, the Government will do so.

The Government has also held meetings with private insurance firms; and I am very happy to report to the House that private purchasers have indicated a very strong interest in the purchase of the property. The Government has also held meetings with private insurance firms in Barbados — and this was before we knew what had been done in Jamaica — to set up a genuine voluntary fund to meet the liabilities of insolvent insurance companies, and negotiations are still going on at the present time in this area.

Private insurance companies have discussed the matter with the Government, and the Government is pressing strongly on private insurance companies that such a fund is desirable; and it is desirable over and above the provisions of the Insurance Act. The private companies are considering this matter and they have submitted various recommendations. The first recommendation made was that the United States Government should be approached to extradite the Directors of First Federation Life, the absconding Directors, who are in the U.S.A. I really do not know what has happened to that. I think that by now that is in the hands of the Supervisor of Insurance or the Attorney General. They have also recommended that the Government should set up a funding scheme by developing the land at Collymore Rock and setting up offices and giving the insurance companies tax concessions for taking part in such a scheme. All of this is under consideration by the Government, and the Government's views are also under consideration by the present insurance companies.

The private insurance companies have also commented that the entire area of industrial life companies should be examined, with the types of policy being sold, being analysed and the stability of the business assets studied in depth in the future. The Insurance Corporation of Barbados has been asked — we cannot give them instructions — has been asked if it could handle First Federation Life's portfolio; and they have indicated that they would like to be asked this question in another two years when their funds increase and they could have a staff and when they are in a better position to consider the possibility of taking over a bankrupt company for goodwill.

The hon. member has asked for a copy of the actuarial valuation. I do not think that he will need to see a copy; but I hope that he is satisfied that the plight of the shareholders is not being ignored by the Government. There is the offer of legal advice, the realisation of the value of the company's assets in Barbados, the bringing in of other insurance companies to take up the burden of the insolvent company and the possibility of the existing portfolio, such parts of it as may be viable, being handled as a last resort by the Insurance Corporation of Barbados — although this is a last resort to be considered only when the other matters have been fully considered.

I think that the hon. member should be commended, notwithstanding his intemperate words on the 12th August, for bringing this matter to the attention of the House (*Cheers*) and it has been under consideration for some time in the Ministry of Finance; but the incompleteness of the information on the position has made it impossible for any ministerial statement to be delivered on the matter.

I have given the House what I think is a progress report and an assurance that the plight of the shareholders is not being ignored by the Government. I do not think that the hon. member wants to press the matter to a vote in these circumstances; and certainly I think that the tenor of my speech will have indicated that the Government in no way resents the hon. member's interest in bringing this matter before the public for airing at the present time.

The question that the resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. (Cheers).
3.20 p.m.

What I am suggesting to the hon. member is that the present action will continue. Perhaps if he would indicate if there is anything else. Do you want a new report or anything?

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am under the impression that the House has approved the Resolution. Now it is left to the Government to do what it wants to do on this matter. If the Prime Minister wants to report to the House on any future progress, that is entirely up to the Prime Minister, but I cannot tell him what to do. The Resolution is there which I hope the Government will act on.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Resolution standing in my name, I should like to have it postponed until next Tuesday. At that point I would hope to be ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is seeking a further postponement of consideration of the Resolution standing in his name, and I take it there is no objection. Further consideration is therefore accordingly postponed.

This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business. Government Business is the instant order of the day.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the Hon. Prime Minister had spoken on the Civil Establishment Order and moved the passing and the Leader of the House seconded the passing of the Resolution and reserved his right to speak. The question is.....

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, as the Prime Minister indicated in his introduction, this is a very important Resolution in terms of what it sets out to do relative to a number of Government departments, and we on this side cannot let this Civil Establishment Order pass without making some comments on some of the changes and indeed some of the departments which are incorporated in this particular Resolution here. It is a Resolution for staff adjustments in various Ministries and departments, and it will be at an additional cost of over \$547,000; so that as I said, this must occasion some debate.

Now the Prime Minister in his introduction referred to the position with the police and with the abolition of the post of corporal in that establishment. Now I should like to think that he would be in a position to give us in his reply some more details in terms of, for example, how many corporals there are at present in the force, and when these posts are abolished whether there will be the same number of positions created at the position of sergeant to take up these, because it is a situation where I believe there are a number of people who are on the threshold of being promoted into the rank of corporal and they would want to know something about their future, whether or not they would be in position and what they can look forward to, and I think he should be seized with that information. I hope the Prime Minister will be able to do so.

In addition to this, as far as the Prisons Department is concerned, we note that there will be the creation of a number of posts. As a matter of fact it looks like 43 from my quick calculation among which is the establishment on a permanent basis of 26 temporary posts, and I would think that the Prime Minister needs to explain. I am not too sure whether it is a situation where the total establishment cannot accommodate any more and therefore you appoint on a permanent basis temporary posts; but that seems to be incongruous, and I wonder if the Prime Minister would give some indication about this.

Our comment on this is that we notice that the Prison Service is being expanded and we would like to know the justification for this where you are increasing the force by 43 or 47 people. I believe that we cannot just let this pass without some explanation from the Prime Minister. Why is it that the Prison Service is being expanded?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member would give way, perhaps I might just answer that. The numbers as I see it here that are being increased are 17 and the reason for the increase is the five day week which was introduced by the previous Government. The 26 temporary posts will be deleted when the 26 established posts are created. That is what is meant by establishing temporary posts; you put a man in a temporary post while you see if the post is needed and when you discover that the post is needed, you abolish the post as a temporary post and make it a permanent post. I know the hon. member wants to make his sport, Sir.

Mr. GREAVES: Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to one which the Prime Minister for one reason or another did not seem to want to touch, the Electoral Department, and I wonder why it is that he skirted around this department; but we are not going to skirt around it, because we are going to want to deal with this department in terms of what is happening at this present time. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, there is at present being conducted in Barbados an enumeration or registration, and we would like to get from the Prime Minister some very clear indications as to the whole purpose of this present registration scheme.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I do not want to keep interrupting the hon. member, but I would almost make this a point of order. Is he not anticipating the answer to Question No. 40? I have given instructions this morning for a reply to be prepared to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition on this exact same point. The reply may very well take seven or eight minutes to deliver and it may cover all the matters the hon. member is raising. He can raise them now but I do not intend to anticipate my answer to the Leader of the Opposition on this matter.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the question of enumeration is one which is of utmost concern to the people of this country and we have heard and the public has heard a number of explanations being given, explanations which do not coincide with one another, but one which is of vital importance, Mr. Speaker, which we will want to deal with, and since we are looking at a proposal to upgrade the post of Chief Electoral Officer and replace the post of Senior Executive Officer by a post of Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, we must look at the department in the way in which it functions and the way in which it goes about its business.

3.30 p.m.

For this enumeration registration which was going on there was a selection process for the Enumerators throughout the constituencies. Now this process has caused some very serious concern among the people because of the fact that the Enumerators have been either not going to peoples' houses and when they call upon them are operating in a very difficult way.

Let me give you an example. I had an experience where an Enumerator came next door to me, went at the next house and left me out. I was only able to get registered and my family when I called the Chief Electoral Officer and asked him what was going on because I was aware that the Enumerator for that area had already turned back in to the Chief Electoral Officer all of the documents that he had completed in the district.

This is a situation which has been repeated all across Barbados and one which I see as of utmost concern to each and everyone of us and I believe that if we are going to be serious about our political situation, if we are not going to encourage a situation in which people are left off of the Register for one reason or the other, then I think that these matters have got to be ventilated here.

We are very concerned about the way in which the Enumerators have been selected in all of the constituencies in Barbados. I, for example, can give an indication of St. Lucy where you have 12 Enumerators and 5 of these Enumerators are direct relatives of the previous Candidate of the Barbados Labour Party in St. Lucy and who is now a Senator.

Now I think that this is a matter which we of the Democratic Labour Party and certainly we as a Parliament must address our minds to and I recall in looking at the Debate which took place in this Chamber on Friday, 14th March, 1969 when the Debate centred around the Register of the Electors List and on page 4 of that date one reads the following statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House as he then was, the hon. member for Christ Church and part of what he had to say on page 4 reads as follows:

"Whether you are trying to manipulate the system on this occasion or not, let it be known that we are watching extremely carefully. We are going to watch all of the enumerators, because one of the best means of seeing that you get your people on the list is to appoint your 'yard fowls' as enumerators. If you appoint people who are well known to you as your political supporters, they go from house to house and try to indulge in political discussions, and when they find out the sentiments of the prospective electors they do not put them on the list."

Now I read that into the Records, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that we of the Democratic Labour Party are very concerned about the people who have been appointed as Enumerators in this exercise. The experience, certainly the complaints which have been made to us by our respective constituencies indicate very clearly that the Enumerators have not been doing their jobs in the best way and have not been acting impartial in this particular matter because of the fact that they have been picking and choosing people whom they should register and it is some cause for very serious concern.

When you further look at some of the people who have been appointed as Enumerators, I wonder what kind of criteria was used other than that of Party affiliation or relationship. I really wonder because there is one instance right in your constituency, Mr. Speaker, where one of the Enumerators could not even spell the name "Victor". He went to a fellow named Victor Scantlebury and could not even spell his name.

I believe there should be some proper criteria established to ensure that people who are doing this very important job are capable of doing it as efficiently as possible because it is something where the future of this country is bound up and one if it is not properly done could lead to a whole set of problems. We of the Democratic Labour Party had indicated that the public would have been serviced best if the names of the Enumerators could have been presented and publicly known and one wonders why it is that this was not done. This is a matter as I said which should be above board and therefore we feel that the Enumerators should have been officially noted.

Now still on the Electoral Department and the matter relating to the whole question of Registering Officers. I was under the impression that Registering Officers in the various constituencies used to be appointed directly by the Chief Electoral Officer but I can give an example of a very ludicrous situation which obtained in St. Lucy soon after the change of Government in 1976 where there was a very stormy meeting of the constituency branch of the Barbados Labour Party over who should be the Resident Officer for that parish.

One group of people voted and was lining up their forces behind the present Electoral Officer and another group of people were lining up behind Rupert Phillips, our good friend. That is a fact so that the Branch was split right up because the Prime Minister told them that the Resident Officer for St. Lucy would be elected on the recommendation of the Branch. Whomsoever the Branch supported the most should be the Electoral Officer. This is a fact. This is further cause for concern when such an important post can be rooted about as it

were in a political arena whether it is at the national or constituency level.

There are some other factors, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to draw the attention of the House to on this matter of the enumeration exercise at present. I am sure that you are aware, because I noticed in the papers that you were recently down in the area, of the confusion which took place at All Saints Girls' School last week where the Police had to be called in because the Registering Officer there, one Mr. Timothy, was very selective in giving out numbers.

As you know you have to have a number and he was picking out people and giving them numbers in preference to people who were waiting there a long time. I believe the Police would have a record of it. The Police were called in because people were dissatisfied in the way in which this was being done because they felt they were discriminated against and particularly people who were not known to be supporters of the Barbados Labour Party.

In Crab Hill over a month ago, over 25 people were turned back on the second last night when the Camera Centre was out there through what could be termed as Administrative inefficiency thereby really showing up the Registering Officer as a person who is not really capable of handling his job for the simple reason he did not have enough stationery there. The people left because they could not get registered because he did not have the presence of mind or commonsense to bring along in his car additional stationery so that if he ran out he would have enough.
3.40 p.m.

We of the Opposition are very concerned about these things. We would like to know what is going to happen in future when the registration is completed, what is going to happen with those people whose names are not on the list. Will they be given an opportunity still to be registered? I think that these are matters, as I said, which must be dealt with and must be of some concern because we do not think that we should let it go like that.

Moving to the area relating to the Ministry of Education and Culture, School Meals Department, we notice from the notes that a decision has been taken to reorganise the school feeding programme as a result of a recommendation made by an interim evaluation mission of the World Food Programme which undertook an examination of the programme, and we would like to think from this side that we can be seized of the recommendations and of the report. I think that it is a matter which would enable us to look at this matter in as broad a sense as possible, and so we hoped that some indication could be given to us about what this

reorganisation is all about. This seeks to create posts at the higher level and it seems as if there is some attempt to streamline particularly the executive and administrative arm of the School Meals Department, and I think that this is something which we would support.

We would just want to say that we would like to think that persons who are going to be involved should have some orientation to the area of industrial relations and human relations, because that is a matter where a lot of problems can arise, and if you are going to be dealing with people, particularly people who are handling food, you would want to ensure that their grievances and their problems which they have from time to time will be dealt with expeditiously and that they will feel comfortable in the Service.

I am sure that the Government is aware that a recent publication — I think it was from the FAO — indicates that particularly in Third World countries it seems as if this whole question of mal-nutrition is rearing its head much more, and a lot of it is attributed to the kind of food which young children are fed, and we would therefore like to hope from this side that the quality of food in this service — because we recognised the very important need for this ever since it was established — that the quality of food which is served in the service is such that it would make some very important contribution towards the question of eliminating or at least preventing any threat of that disease amongst our young people. I don't think we have that as a problem, and one would not like to have that responsibility.

On page 4 under Queen Elizabeth Hospital, there is a note here that the abolition of the post of Senior Consultant, but no clear reason is given for it except to say that the post is being abolished in accordance with the policy of disestablishing medical posts at this level when they become vacant. Again, I am wondering if there could be any further ventilation of this point.

The last point I would like to make is on page 5 under Other Adjustments, the Archives. I notice that the note says that the Archives will be transferred from the Ministry of Education and Culture to the Prime Minister's Office. I somehow got the impression that some time ago — and I checked with the Clerk and he informed me that on the 16th July it was stated in here that the Archives Department was transferred from the Ministry of Education and Culture to the Ministry of Information, and I wonder if it has gone a further point now into the Prime Minister's Office. I do not know if this is a typographical error or not or if the Prime Minister has decided to take over this very important Department of Archives.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member for St. Lucy with his very disgusted and very

disjointed tone of debate, and I want to take up this aspect of the electoral system. The member for St. Lucy complained about people's relatives working as enumerators; this is nothing new. If the person is my brother or your brother and he is qualified to do the job, I see no reason why he should not do the job. I recall a man by the name of Mr. Cardon Tudor, the brother of James Cameron Tudor, the former Deputy Prime Minister, who was an enumerator in 1971, and he was doing the Carringtons Village area, and so ignorant was he of the boundaries that he was in Haggatt Hall putting people on the list and was supposed to be doing the Carringtons Village area, and the member is now complaining in here about somebody's brother and somebody's sister.

The whole of St. Lucy is a mother and father affair. You are in it too, they are your cousin and nephews and uncles, the Greaves and the Clarkes and the Brathwaites are a whole big family, so what are you complaining about? Do you want to put on Hog Pen? He complained about a man who could not spell "Victor". What sort of complete ignorance do you really hear in Parliament? I had a girl who spelt "Barbarees" B-a-r-b-i-s-e and she went to Queen's College up to Fifth Form. The correct procedure would be for the enumerator to ask the person how to spell the name. Some people spell my name C-r-a-i-g-g while I spell it C-r-a-i-g. How would the person know that the man does not spell his V-y-c-t-o-r? On that can you really condemn the man for being an enumerator? Does this profound ignorance have to go on in here all the time, Sir? The same nonsense you hear on the platform. He goes to a political meeting to listen to what they say, because he can't get into the big league — you can't get into it either, so do not look at me — he can't play in the big league so he goes out there at night like a parrot listening to hear what is going on. So you all are talking about victimisation and the enumerators and he comes in here and talks about the enumerators, and listen to the type of argument he puts up, a man can't spell "Victor". Now how do you spell "Sheila"? Some people spell it "S-h-e-e-l-a" "S-h-e-i-l-a" or "S-h-e-l-a" so what would that be? Would that be "dog"? Wouldn't that be Sheila too? Do you see the sort of arguments you get from that side?

I would say this, Sir, that even in St. James I have people who come and complain to me that they cannot get registered. They complain to me too, my own supporters, people that I know believe in me, saying that they cannot get registered, and you always have this problem whenever a registration is going on.

Now, as I understand it, the member for St. Lucy wants to know what is the purpose of the registration. That only shows you how completely ignorant he is of what is going on in Parliament. He is too busy in other fields. I am sorry that Rev. Fairweather is dead, otherwise you would be a little better off, he would help you a

little more. I have with me, Mr. Speaker, an identification card and a national insurance card; two cards.
3.50 p.m.

As I understand it there is to be one card for national identity that is what I am told. Instead of having a national insurance card and an ID card you will have one card. Isn't that simple? You want to go to Eton College to understand that? The man in the street knows why, he has been told why. You have old people losing their ID card, or their national insurance card. And to put matters straight, I recall that in discussing this matter the hon. member made a subtle remark about wanting to find out whether the prisoners will have a card too. He cannot say he was not in here asking if the prisoners will get a card too, — that St. Lucy bird. Pardon me, Sir, but he is neither fish, fowl nor pork. I have these problems in St. James too. I know the acting Leader of the Opposition — boy, you have come a long way; you had to sit down in the shadows but you are there with them now.

As I understand it if you are getting problems, I don't care who are the enumerators, when it is coming on to election time you find long lines of people queueing up to be registered. I remember you all had enumerators in 1966 and in 1971, and what happened? If the enumerator missed you and a man is prepared to exercise his constitutional and democratic rights he will go to the Chief Electoral Officer and get on the list. But you need something to say at night on the platforms. I want to hear you talk about the country's economy. I can't hear you say how the IMF and the World Bank said that Barbados should be given a medal for its handling of the economy of the country. I want to say too how you look into the newspapers every morning and see advertisements reading general workers wanted, carpenters, etc. There is a shortage of these workers and sometimes when these people are out there working there is so much work to be done that they cannot get time to register. But I know that the Registering Officer in St. Michael North West went to Mr. Cameron Tudor's home on two occasions and Mr. Tudor looked through the window and asked what he wanted, and when the man told him he had come to register him Mr. Tudor said he was going into the bath. I will call the man's name, Mr. Albert Oneal Hope, a man of high Christian principles. So the hon. member's argument falls down about enumerators and tampering with the system. What system are we tampering with? Letting everybody get one ID card and you have to choose people to do it? We give your family work and you quarrel. You give Chris Sobers stones to bring down in his truck and you want marl fill. Why not go to Holmes Williams church? And every time my Chinese Great Wall work opens his mouth it is about 1981. But you have a long way to go to 1981.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Don't say 1981, let us say 1980.

Mr. SPEAKER: I don't know what point of order that is.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I hope I have at least tried to answer the only sensible question — what was the purpose of this registration. And it is very simple, as I understand it, to have one card which will be your national identity.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand what has generated all this heat. As I understand the debate so far, my colleague got up and said that there were serious problems in the enumeration exercise. The hon. member for St. James agreed that there were problems involved and pointed out that he himself was experiencing problems and that his constituents had been pointing out their problems and were saying that they could not get enumerated. So Mr. Speaker, when we take away all the sound and fury, the hon. member for St. James is agreeing with the hon. member for St. Lucy that there are problems involved with the enumeration.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. I agree that there are problems, but the hon. member is actually saying that because we have chosen certain people to do the enumeration they are side-stepping his supporters, and I drew the name of Cameron Tudor as an example of the kind of problem that was being encountered.
4.00 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that there would be general agreement coming from both sides of the House indicating that there are problems with this enumeration. I myself have been made aware of certain problems. Some of my constituents have told me that they live near to certain enumerators, and the enumerators have not yet found it possible to carry out the necessary exercise in respect of them. I cannot tell you what is the reason for that; but I believe that it is not a simple matter to get the enumeration done. May be the Government will explain. I understand from the Prime Minister that it would take about seven minutes to reply to a question by the Leader of the Opposition; and I believe that we on this side as well as the country as a whole will be awaiting this expansive reply to the question. We cannot anticipate the reply, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that you will be correct in your ruling that it would be out of order to anticipate such a reply.

I would like to address some remarks to this question of the Royal Barbados Police Force in as much as that all of the matters in this Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order of 1979, the Prime Minister and member for St. Thomas did spend a considerable amount of time on this particular matter. He told us how Cpl. Jerry will soon be a sergeant — or rather how corporals will stand a very good chance of

being promoted, if they are fit. He spent a considerable amount of time on it.

I really listened with rapt amazement to the very unctious words which came in respect of the Royal Barbados Police Force. I would like to offer my congratulations, not to the Government or to the Minister responsible for the subject of police, but I would like to offer my congratulations to the negotiating team of the Police Association for the very excellent work that they have done in forcing the Government to grant the just and legitimate requests that have been made by that association, and which have been pressed for by that particular association. I think that it is a tribute to the solidarity of the Royal Barbados Police Force and the support that they have given to the negotiating team, that today the Prime Minister has been forced to come to the floor of this House and grant the type of requests that have been demanded by the Royal Barbados Police Force.

We on this side had been giving support to the claims by them in this Chamber and on public platforms with no attempt to deprive the Royal Barbados Police Force of any of its just requests. I listen to the speech of the Prime Minister in an entirely different way from which any other hon. member perhaps had been listening to it; and I saw the drift of that particular speech. I am sure that members of the Royal Barbados Police Force who know that the Democratic Labour Party re-organised that Force, and has seen to it that the standards in the Force were raised and that the living standards in particular and the conditions of service have been tremendously improved over the years.

It was a very brilliant attempt on the part of the Prime Minister to try to put himself now on the side of the Police Force. That was really the whole drift of the debate today. I am certain that members of the Royal Barbados Police Force can see what has been said and the reasons behind what has been said; and they will know who their true friends are.

We on this side support any measure which is in the interest of the Royal Barbados Police Force and which the Police Association has been pressing for. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from St. Lucy has dealt in a brilliant and wide-ranging address with this particular order which is before us. I myself well remember the occasion of the Estimates when he dealt with the question of Archives and the removal from the Ministry of Culture of the subject of Archives.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Something is either wrong with the loud speaking system on this side or with my ears. Did I hear the hon. member say that the member for St. Lucy was himself in the Archives? I am not sure what I heard, Sir.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Of course not. He is not in the Archives although he is a very cultured man, Mr. Speaker. In as much as we are now waiting for an explanation of these things, maybe a definitive explanation can be given on this subject of Archives which is a cultural matter *par excellence*, and why that particular subject has been taken away from the Ministry responsible for Culture and put in another Ministry. (HON. L. S. CRAIG: The same way that Taitt was taken from up there.) We need not worry about 1980 or 1981, whenever it is. We are now ready; and the Democratic Labour Party and this Opposition is a fighting force of which you will be feeling the weight in these matters. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Henceforth, you will realise our analysis of public affairs, including this Civil Establishment (Amendment) Order that is before us; and we will continue to examine public affairs with a great deal of scrutiny, and will be explaining to the public the problems as we see them, and will be articulating the problems to the people of this country.

4.10 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I could not allow this occasion to pass without replying to a few of the inaccurate facts that the hon. member now occupying the place of the Leader of the Opposition has just made. The following are the facts. When this Government came into power it found that there were many outstanding issues between the Police Association and the Government in relation to pay, in relation to conditions of service, in relation to amenities, and what is more important in relation to the size of the Force. As the Attorney General has repeatedly said, systematic attempts are being made to solve some of these problems. I believe that the record will show that in respect of salary scales this Government in the last three years has settled a number of outstanding issues with the concurrence of the vast majority of the police. In addition the Government has gone on record as being in favour of the implementation of a review which has taken place of the manpower requirements of the Police Force in Barbados. Let us not forget that for the last ten years or more the establishment of the Barbados Police Force remained constant. It was this Government that took the decision to systematically over the course of the shortest period as possible free the police of some areas of activity thereby releasing additional posts to increase the establishment of the police.

The whole of the reorganisation of the Writservers' Department resulted from that; the reorganisation of the Immigration Department will result also from that, but there is probably something that hon. members and the public do not appreciate and that is that in accordance

with our process of consultation it has been agreed that where people have been carrying on a job for a large number of years and the jobs are being reformed, the first option that is granted is granted to the police who hitherto worked in those departments to take up the new civilian jobs. In the Writservers' Department a number of police opted to continue in the civilian department; so too at the Immigration Department, so that the position will be in fact that a number of additional posts will have been created because of the fact that people who held these posts formerly have now gone into the civilian department and some period of time will be taken to train people to fill those posts. So that this Government was the one that created additional police force despite the fact that for some ten years efforts were made by successive Commissioners of Police to ask for a reasonable increase in the establishment of the police having regard to the fact that a great degree of sophistication had arisen among criminal activity in Barbados, the demands of the tourist industry had also necessitated it, and a rise in drug traffic had also created a degree of additional work. So I cannot sit down in here and hear the hon. member for St. Michael South making these statements.

Now Sir, we have to go further. When the Attorney General went to District "A" and saw the physical conditions in the form of the beds that police in this country had to sleep on, he immediately had to issue orders for new beds to be ordered. In addition to that there has been a decision taken that police stations not only in Bridgetown, in Christ Church and St. James and other areas would be improved, the physical conditions, the buildings and things of that kind. As a matter of fact the only record Government has in relation to this is the squandering of thousands of dollars at District "A" Police Station until the present Minister of Agriculture come into office. The Minister of Communications had to halt that drain, that wastage that was taking place up there. A little later today another Resolution will be passed permitting a variation of a note to permit the building of a new police station at Oistin, so that this attempt by the hon. member for St. Michael South to distort the record by inaccurate information is one which cannot bear examination. Normally I do not intervene in these debates dealing with this matter, but I just wanted to make it clear, and I had the opportunity of discussing with the Commissioner of Police many of these matters and listening to the explanations given by him about the difficulties he faced because of the fact that I as Minister of Industry and Tourism was being besieged by many people about the problems which had arisen in those areas, and naturally I discussed it with the Prime Minister and the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Police after many meetings, and we found out that representations had been made ten years ago for an increase in the manpower and an improvement in the promotional opportunities, and Mr. Speaker, for amendment to the criminal law

in this country to deal with questions like petty trespass and things of that kind, but the previous Government turned nothing but a deaf ear to all the pleas of successive Commissioners of Police.

Mr. Speaker, this attempt to try and curry favour, we do not have to curry favour. Every person who is involved in his own conscience would know that under this administration a far better deal in a far shorter period of time has been meted out to the police in Barbados than ever before, and it has not been done in the manner in which the hon. member's Government did it, that they only did it around election time for the purpose of currying favour temporarily. We do not deal with them in that way; we deal with it in the way we feel it should be dealt with, that is, that it is an important service and that law and order is a very important matter in Barbados and reasonably proper consideration should be given to those who are the prime agents in the maintenance of law and order.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, listening to the presentations from the other side one would assume that an election was around the corner. I should like first of all to comment on the abolition of the post of senior consultant. This is a continuation of the policy of the Democratic Labour Party to abolish these posts when they become vacant, because of the kinds of problems which were created not only professionally but in administrative terms. Professionally you are either a consultant or you are not a consultant. The term "senior consultant" really is in a sense a bit derogatory to those persons who are consultants in their own right, and seniority is really determined on a professional basis. This post, Mr. Speaker, existed I think, in the early Fifties or thereabouts, and at one stage there was a very embarrassing situation where after the abolition of the post of Superintendent at the old Barbados General Hospital a post of Chief Specialist Physician had to be created in order to by-pass the posts of senior consultant.

4.20 p.m.

Generally speaking, the problems created were those where the occupants of this post had a primary responsibility; that of administering a particular Department when in fact he may have no aptitude to do so or when his colleagues, at some point in time preferred among themselves to be in a position to be Head of the Department and so it was on this basis that when I was myself the Senior Consultant and Chairman of the Medical Staff I had recommended that this post be abolished in this matter so that as soon as they become vacant they should be abolished and that Heads of Departments should be left to the discretion of their colleagues in the selection of the Heads and change them as they see fit.

On the question, Mr. Speaker, of the Police, no amount of rhetoric, no amount of gifts can ever eliminate from the minds of the Royal Barbados Police Force the tremendous change in their lot which took place between the years 1971-1976. Not only in terms of expansion of the Force, not only in terms of promotional opportunities for each and everyone irrespective of his birth, irrespective of his colour, irrespective of a whole lot of other factors which were vital to the development of a healthy *esprit de corps* within the Police Force took place within the Democratic Labour Party and I must join with the member for St. Michael South in congratulating the Police in their success in their struggle to achieve the objective which we heard outlined here today.

I believe that there is need for a tremendous expansion of the Police Force in this country. I, myself, and it is my own view — I hold a personal view; a view put forward very elegantly in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party that there is no need for a permanent Defence Force in this country and I feel that a lot of the money that is being wasted in the Defence Force that that money should be spent on the Police Force and probably there should be a special branch of the Police Force to deal with civil unrest etc., etc.

I feel it is most important that the Police in this country should feel that they can perform their duties in an environment in which they are accorded proper status and in which, Mr. Speaker, that status and the work they have to do is reflected, Mr. Speaker, in the salaries which they earn.

I think there is need for increased specialisation in the Police Force to cope with the kind of problems which will be facing this society now and in the future. I think and I agree with the suggestion that because of the increased sophistication of certain types of criminality in our society that this kind of specialisation is very necessary indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other aspects of this I would like to have a look at. One is the question of this enumeration that is going on at the present moment and I would like to draw to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister's attention that there is a considerable amount of concern in this country as to what is actually going on. What are the problems?

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, the public at large would like to know whether the current enumeration is for Election purposes or not. A clear statement. Is it for Election purposes or is it not? There have been statements made from time to time where there seems to be some element of doubt and I believe that a statement clarifying the position would relieve the fears of a lot of people in this country.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, as we look around the Caribbean and we see what is happening in Guyana and elsewhere in relation to the rights of the people of this area, we have to be more than careful, not only those on the other side, but those on this side. We have to be very careful that at all times we project to the public that those of us who are in public life, those of us who are hon. members of this House, believe in the process of free Elections, fair Elections, and believe that the people should always have the democratic right to change Governments as freely as they wish because I believe that the survival of this country and the survival of the Caribbean resides in this acceptance and the feeling by the people that there is no possibility in being cheated in respect of exercising their right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many complaints about the process by which people were selected as enumerators. There have been complaints about the behaviour of such people in relation to others of different political persuasions. There have been complaints, Mr. Speaker, of enumerators going into the homes and canvassing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is important that people should feel that their democratic rights reside with them. If there is something wrong, if there is unrest within a community because of what is going on, it is the Government's responsibility to come out and make a statement.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am a Minister in this Government and I am particularly concerned to know what unrest is going on in here and I would be very grateful if the hon. member for St. Michael South Central could draw to the attention of the Government and the Prime Minister in particular any unrest which is going on in Barbados because I am particularly concerned about any unrest in this country.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the English language does create some special difficulties from time to time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I am not concerned about the special difficulties. There is unrest and I would like to know what is the unrest. That is all I want to know from the hon. member because I am concerned about my life and my family's life and the country at large. I want to know where is the unrest. All I want is two Police dogs to sniff your bags when you come in at the Airport. That is what I am going to surge upon my colleagues to do, where you cannot bring in any more dope. I am going to sit outside and I am going to prove it too.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order. I would like to draw your attention to Rule 28(7) "No member may impute improper motives to another member." I am submitting that to suggest that any member of this House who brings in or attempts to bring dope into this country or as dope peddler is imputing improper motives to the hon. member and I will request that it be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not agree.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is pretty well known in this country where on Bay Street dope is peddled and has been peddled for many years. To continue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you are speaking now under the Head of Police.
4.30 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, to get back to the whole question of the general feeling of unrest, feeling of concern for those who do not necessarily appreciate the niceties of the English Language, in this country — and this is a serious matter — about what is going on at present in relation to the enumeration, I believe that it is the duty of the Government to come out boldly and state what is going on, what is their objective, what is the cause for delay. For example, Mr. Speaker, there are many people who have to go to camera centres, many spend half the day, I know of persons who have spent as many as six hours on three occasions to get photographs and cannot get photographs. Now these are problems because of the queues and so on, and I repeat my final plea to the Government not to ignore the concern being expressed on this side in the areas of selection and of behaviour of the enumerators, and the general concern among the people of Barbados that something might be going wrong with the electoral processes in this country. I make no specific charges, I am making no charges against the Government, those who have listened to me and who have tried to listen would understand that I am not making any specific charges in this Hon. House against the Government. What I am saying is that the concern and the unrest is out there and it is vital that at this stage the Government, if they know precisely what their objectives are, should state their objectives.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as an hon. member of this House that my censorial is no less acute than anyone else's in being able to identify areas of concern within this community at large. All of us receive many telephone calls, many hon. members on the other side I am sure would have received telephone calls from their constituents probably complaining that they have not been enumerated or that their houses have been by-passed, or

that there have been problems, and in their own constituencies I am quite sure that they must have been getting these same complaints, and at least one member, not of this Chamber, has expressed the view that he is concerned about the attitudes and the reaction of people within the constituency in which he has an interest to what is going on. This is the legitimate concern of every legislator in this country, and this is the concern which I express. I have no personal problems in this regard, because I have no doubt that I will be returned with a double majority in 1981 or whenever you choose to come. I have no problem at all, none whatsoever. (*Aside*). I am not fooling myself, I am absolutely sure, and all the tricks of cutting up the boundaries, no matter what you take off from the left side or from the right side, I know whatever is being calculated. I also know, Mr. Speaker, that when I hear the doctors and some Blackman being referred to I understand the true significance of the whole lot. My censorial is very acute. I have learnt to listen and listen well over the years.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would once again urge the Government to recognise that the policy initiated by the Democratic Labour Party in respect of the Police Force was in the right direction, urge them to continue in that direction with regard to the Police Force, urge them to look very carefully again at their Manifesto promises in relation to the Defence Force, and if they could stick to their Manifesto, right here in the back in the right hand corner at the bottom, and definitely finally, Mr. Speaker, once again to ask the Hon. Prime Minister to recognise that there is some concern about the enumeration, the various areas I have mentioned, and perhaps that the country as a whole would benefit from a clear statement from him as to objectives and reasons, and what is the cause of the delays and so on in respect of the present enumeration. Thank you very much.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to take part at all in this debate because I thought it was of the nature that it did not need much discussion, but so much has been said on the question of the enumeration that I thought I would add my small quota on this matter.

There is something which has escaped most of us here this afternoon, and it is the question of the boundaries arrangement. I heard it said by the hon. member for St. Lucy that his home was by-passed by an enumerator, but what is not understood by many people, probably including the hon. member, is that on the basis of the question of the electoral arrangement by way of your polling station, it is not impossible to find that an enumerator might pass on one side of the road enumerating that side but cannot cross on the other side of the road because that is within a different district from the point of view of enumeration, and therefore another person has to be there. I myself have encountered this as

a problem in my own constituency and when I set about to discover what was involved I discovered that this was the problem.

The Government is accused of trying to gerrymander, trying to register its people as against other people, all types of red herrings have been brought into this debate, unnecessarily so, and I do not think it makes any point trying to do this. The Government is setting about to have a form of registration which would lead towards one number for each person, rather than as the hon. member for St. James put it when he was speaking, to have different types of registration. For example, the hon. member who is on my right, the Hon. Minister of Health, will shortly be bringing into operation the National Health Service Programme. That in itself is going to need some form of identification, and the number which you get as a result of this type of enumeration which is now taking place will serve the purpose for your identification card, your national insurance card, as well as your medical health card. That is the purpose for which we are now carrying out the registration, but what the other side is not saying and what I can charge them for is this. It is said that the memories of people can be short, but I am sure when you remind them they are quick to remember. In 1966 when I first went to St. Andrew I remember then that the whole registration system down there was so completely rotten and chaotic, not only in St. Andrew but throughout the length and breadth of this island, that people who were living in the same house found that certain people were lifted out of the house and registered and others were not, and all the enumerators were well known members of the Democratic Labour Party, and I tell you further, Mr. Speaker, they did not conceal their hostilities to members of the Barbados Labour Party, they told them in blunt terms that they were not going to register them.

I will tell you more. An instance was drawn here about Mr. James Cameron Tudor, that when the enumerator went to him on two different occasions, and each a Sunday, very significantly he was going into the bathroom each time.

4.40 p.m.

He is not the only example. I can quote several instances of people who were positively hostile to me on several occasions, and each time the enumerator went to them — including public officers that you would think should know better — they refused to be registered telling the enumerator to come back another time. The enumerators had to go two or three times and still they bluntly refused to be registered. Finally the enumerators had to report the matter to the Chief Registration Officer. This is a waste of human resources; time is too precious to waste in this way. It is all well and good to get in here and charge the enumerators with failing to do their duty, as being spiteful and politically motivated,

without going out there and seeing the problems the enumerators have to encounter from people motivated by political spite. We went throughout the length and breadth of the country and begged people to be registered. I have not heard of the Opposition benches going out and appealing to the people to do the things that are right. For example, when we were having the cane fires the Opposition benches never went out and asked the people not to burn the canes. In the same way I have never heard them ask the people to register. I did this in St. Andrew and I asked the Opposition benches if they have done this. If they did, I would applaud them. The hon. member for St. Lucy was well answered by the hon. member for St. James when he referred to the family relationships in St. Lucy. Everybody in St. Lucy is one; even the animals are family. So when you attack one, you attack all.

This Government has no control over the attitude of people one to another. We would hope that people would live in Christian love and unity, but this seems impossible when you have people motivated to do evil, as seems to be the attitude of the other side. We on this side are willing at all times to assist wherever necessary. It is in our interest to see that every single person in this country is registered, and if the hon. members on that side can tell us how we can proceed to have every single person registered without any problem, this Government is willing to accept the suggestions put forward by them.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any candidate who ran in the general election of 1976 suffered in the way I did in the City of Bridgetown in respect of registration. It became clear to me on a day in July 1976 — and I marked it in my diary — that they were more people registered as living in Bay Street than Bay Street had houses. At that stage it was too late to challenge this. I suffered a serious decimation of my majority in September, 1976, but I am satisfied without a shadow of doubt — because the Prime Minister had an investigation carried out within weeks of the election, which made it very clear that improper practices had obtained as far as the City registration was concerned. There were people brought in from St. John and St. Peter to have themselves improperly registered in the City. So there is nobody who would welcome this registration process more than I.

I want to say this too: Very soon after we came into power and I went into the Ministry of Health and talked in terms of a National Health Policy, I made it clear to the Prime Minister that I could not deal with a system where a person had to have one card for National Insurance, another for Income tax, another for dog licence, etc.; and it was clear that we had to have a universal style registration in this country. My understanding is that this one card will show many things.

The cards will have various numbers and colours, and the colours will tell at a glance various things. It is important to me that in 1980 the National Health Scheme should be able to tell us at a glance whether the person is an old age pensioner, is eligible for various services, or will enjoy certain exemptions in the National Health Service. All these things will be shown at one glance.

There are other areas within the administration of Government for which this registration card carries great importance. There cannot be any politics in this. When people come to us we do not ask them what their politics are. What we want to know is whether they are diabetic or hypertensive and so on. That is why it is important for me that as early as next year this information must be available to the Ministry of Health.

Things are falling into place. We plan more district hospitals; we plan new health centres; more staff will be established. All of this is part and parcel of a plan, and things must fall into place at the time we plan. Services are being extended; care is being taken into the community to the people. We do not subscribe to the policy where people must go to the health services; we take the health service to the people.
4.50 p.m.

I think that we are wasting a great deal of time here this afternoon trying to put a political complexion on the whole business of enumeration. We cannot expect that with a population of a quarter of a million people, Mr. Speaker, that an enumeration programme can be carried out without some problems and hitches. The enumeration officer only came to my house a night last week. I have not had the time yet to go and get my photograph taken. I will take the time to do it this week.

It all takes time and it will fall into place in the fullness of time. So let us have none of this talk about political considerations. I believe that the Opposition now finds itself to be the victims of their own propaganda; because when this enumeration first started there were murmurings and rumours from the Opposition quarters about various motivations for the enumeration procedure. Now that the majority of people see clearly what the enumeration exercise is all about, the Opposition will become victims of their own propaganda because their own people, according to them — this is what have been falling out of their mouths all afternoon — it is their own people who are now complaining; but in my investigation of this matter in my own constituency, I have found that enumerators have gone to people who say "I'm not in that, man;" and when the camera centres were opened and they saw their friends and their relatives dressing up and going down to get their photographs taken, then they were breaking down the enumerators by the side of the road asking: "Why you don't register me? How is it that I cannot get my photograph taken?"

Many times in the City of Bridgetown — and I can testify to this from my own knowledge — an enumerator has been able to hold up his documentation and say “I visited your house on X day and Y day and Z day, and you chased me out on A day and B day. It is not in their mouths now to come and complain that you have not been properly registered when that kind of behaviour flowed from the propaganda that they put out.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I did not for one moment intend to speak on this Establishment Order; but after hearing certain speakers, I feel that I should make my contribution on the Electoral Department, Item 1, Prime Minister's Office. Now, Sir, as you might recall, I am on my way out; but, Sir, I would like when that time comes for the stability of this country to grow from strength to strength.

Consequently it is my duty to tell this Hon. House of Assembly any of the problems which people are facing at this particular time concerning the registration which is a new system; and I do so in a non-partisan way; because I consider it my duty as a senior member of this House and not only a politician, but a statesman (*Cheers*) to let this Hon. House know the various problems and complaints which have been drawn to my attention.

Now, Sir, a major point is that this is a new system; and I have no doubt that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister will clarify the matter and clear the air on it. The point is, will people who are registered under the old system be eligible to vote if and when an election is called? As you will be aware, Sir, there are several senior citizens who are registered under the old system, but who are unable to go to these various centres. Yet, there are eligible under the old system to vote. This House should be told if those people who are unable to go there, and their names already have been registered on the list, if these people can vote. I think that this is a most important point, the answer to which should be given as members of this House of Assembly in no uncertain terms. If they cannot vote under the old system, let this House know.

Mr. Speaker, we have been watching and reading here what is going on in certain islands in the Caribbean; and therefore it is the duty of the Government to divulge any matter which they consider of vital importance to the stability of this country.
5.00 p.m.

I am one, Sir, who for one moment would never associate myself and I do not agree with those who think that when Governments do wrong things they should be overthrown by force. I do not contribute to those views because, Sir, I must let you know that I must commend the Minister of External Affairs on his press conference last night, I was very impressed with the way in which he

dealt with himself and represented this Island, because I have just returned from a CPA conference in the Bahamas and I have expressed similar views, and therefore when it comes to the point of dealing with the registration of voters, it is a most sacred issue which we have to face in this Island, because, Sir, there are only two things which are shared on equality and that is one man one vote regardless of colour, race or creed and regardless of your income; regardless of if you are a millionaire or a pauper, you have one vote. And the other one which I should not even have to draw to your attention, but I should just remind you, is death. These are the only two things; and to get back to the point of the sacred gift which has been handed down to us by our ancestors and which we are proud of, Government of the people by the people and for the people. Therefore we as members of this House of Assembly must uphold the high tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. Under the old system the members on that side of the Assembly have become members of the Government, and therefore if any person tells me that there was something wrong with that system, I would tell them without any contradiction that it is a misleading statement. And not only did they capture the Government but with an overwhelming majority. Therefore the time has come, Sir, when we as legislators, must put our house in order and must let the people of this country know the reason why this system was introduced and if they can vote without being registered under this new system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position clear. I am a law-abiding citizen, consequently regardless of who governs this country I am prepared to carry out the instructions which suit the Government of the day. So long as it is legal I am prepared to comply with everything; but I must let the other side know that I too have been hearing complaints. The hon. member for St. Andrew attempted to clear the air by stating that the various constituencies have been divided into certain areas and so on, and therefore it is possible for an enumerator to take one side of the road and another enumerator to take the other side. I associate myself and agree in toto with the authenticity of that statement, but when it comes, Sir, to an enumerator omitting certain houses which he is responsible for, it would be a horse of another colour. And therefore we as representatives of the people must be in a position to tell the people why this new system has been introduced. Daily people are asking me why it has been introduced and as a legislator I am not in a position to explain to them because the air has not been cleared in this House concerning such an important matter. Therefore if the Rt. Hon Prime Minister would take into consideration all that I have said and would accept my advice and would also take into consideration what is happening in the region at this particular time, he would take it upon himself to tell us in this House whether people who are registered before under the old

system are entitled or eligible to vote under the old system.

5.10 p.m.

I would also take into consideration what is happening in the region at this particular time. He took it upon himself to tell us in this House that people who are registered before in the old system that they are entitled and eligible to vote under the old system because, Sir, we do not want to wait until an Election is called then to create chaos, confusion and rebellion that may lead to bloodshed in this Island through not being informed along the right lines.

I speak as a member of this House with no ill-will but I too as a citizen of this country would like to know the ramifications, the pros and cons of the whole matter and therefore it is my duty regardless of who feels that it is not necessary to explain to this House, I feel that the time has come when it should be told because, Mr. Speaker, of the tranquility which exists in this country and exists regardless of which Party is in power and we should never cherish the thought of introducing any kind of legislation which will create in the minds of the inhabitants in this country that we are doing the wrong thing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that with the way in which I have expressed myself that the hon. members on the other side have listened attentively and will come to the conclusion that the time has come for the Government to clear the air on this most important and delicate matter. Thank you, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it really only seems to me that I would have to say something about the Police and unfortunately about this matter which the other speakers have dealt with. I really thought the Opposition would abide by the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition for which in reply I am going to thank him for giving me the opportunity to clear the air but since evidently hon. members cannot wait I will have to deal with some of them.

First the Police. I cannot grasp at the burden of any of the speeches which were made on the Police as I cannot quite see what the complaint is, if there is a complaint with the Government, as far as the Police is concerned. I have the numbers asked for by the hon. member for St. Lucy. I would first of all set out what the situation is.

The situation of the whole Police Force is this. The Establishment has over 890 persons including the Band. That also includes the Writ Servers and the Immigration Officers. The Civil Establishment Order effectively increases the total Establishment of the Police by 12

because we have deleted 10 posts of Corporals and we have added 16 posts of Sergeants and 6 of Station Sergeants. Previous to this Order there were 131 Corporals. This Order reduced the number of Corporals to 121. Previous to this Order there were 35 Sergeants. This Order increases the number of Sergeants to 51 so that the position of Corporal and Sergeant, previous to this Order, there were 166 Corporals and Sergeants and there will now be 172.

You can see that we have not reduced the number and I can give a pledge that not only have we increased it but there will be no reduction from that figure of 172. If you look at the Station Sergeants, there were 25 Station Sergeants previously and they will now be 31 so that the total number in those non-gazetted grades amounted to 191 and when I made this Order I increased that number to 203.

As far as the question of promotions and so on are concerned, 22 promotions will be made to the rank of Sergeant or Station Sergeant without any further step. The next step that we expect will be taken is that the rank of Corporals and Sergeants will be bracketed. It can be expected in future that Constables will be promoted to Station Sergeants. I am not planning any long transition in which when you are abolishing Corporals you are still going to have Corporals holding on for a year or two waiting for promotion.

What has to be anticipated is that perhaps, I do not know, Sir, I am just speaking on the theory, but perhaps this is a matter for the Police Service Commission on the appropriate recommendations which in theory a present Corporal will now have the opportunity to become a Station Sergeant and a present Constable can go to Station Sergeant. This will be in the immediate period while the gaps are being filled up and we probably will bracket the Corporals to Sergeants but that is still subject to final Cabinet agreement and discussion so any Corporal can be promoted to any Sergeant and any promotion in this area from Constable can be made.

That, I hope, answers the hon. member on those points. He has got the numbers. He has got the assurance that the number 172 for Corporals and Sergeants is not going to be reduced.

The Commissioner of Police has submitted that we have to re-organise the Station Establishment. The Stations are divided into three eight-hour shifts and the present system is for a Station Sergeant to be at some Station; then you have a Sergeant under him who is in command of one shift but the other two shifts are commanded by Corporals. That will come to an end.

A Sergeant will be in command of each of the eight-hour shifts. The largest Station from being

commanded by a Station Sergeant it is submitted that many of them should be commanded by an Inspector and that you have a Station Sergeant. All of this is under analysis at the present time. The Attorney General is in charge of the Police and I have even discussed the possibility of the creation of a new rank of Sub-Inspector. I do not think you will be able to swallow it up all in one stroke but nevertheless it is a matter of do you wish Station Sergeants or do you wish Sub-Inspectors and how would you inter-relate the two. The final submission of Police numbers are now being examined because new submissions were made over and above those which perhaps were being prepared when the last Government was in power.

5.20 p.m.

It is not true that there was any plan for any increase in the number of policemen when we came into power; it is not true that there was any plan to pay any duty allowance to policemen, the previous Prime Minister had specifically refused to pay a duty allowance to policemen and we gave it to them, it is there in writing. Specifically there has been no question of regrading or increases when we came in. We feel that a need has been demonstrated, Sir, we are giving an increase, the first in many years — no increase has been initiated, I think, for over 11 years — so we will be giving an increase in the Force, we have given some regradings, of course there will be some new salaries as from April 1 next year and I don't know, perhaps the Police Association will ask that the duty allowance be incorporated in the new salary structure as well as having an increase. All of these matters are going to be the subject of yet another round of negotiations when these Establishment matters are dealt with.

I don't know if hon. members opposite are worried, they don't want us to help the police, they feel that we should not help the police and that any help given to the police must be attacked by them. I don't know if they are attacking out of sincerity, but as far as I am concerned, I am sure that a policeman, knowing that he has an easier chance of putting on khaki, that the number of positions in khaki is going to be increased by at least 25%, and that he will get a better salary then, he is not worried about the foaming at the mouth and resentment on the part of the Opposition, he is glad for his opportunity and for his money.

There is another thing I want to deplore, and I only have to deplore it in one hon. member here today, that is this continual attack by members of the Democratic Labour Party on the Defence Force. This country cannot expect to maintain its stability if members of the Opposition persist in trying to drag down the Defence Force and destroy its image with the public. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central has again joined with Eric Sealy and the likes of Eric Sealy in attacking the Defence

Force. I have to appeal to hon. members to hearken to the words of one of their numbers, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who I do not now see in his seat, when he called on the Opposition to refrain from these attacks on the Defence Force. One of them, not normally a person who is known for his adherence to traditional beliefs of sound conservative principles, or indeed law and order, one of them can see clearly enough the necessity for understanding that small Third World countries have to have a Defence Force and that the Defence Force must be supported by the politicians. All should see it.

I heard while I was away there was some criticism of the Defence Force assisting the police in connection with a matter to do with marijuana, or some matter of that sort. What do we want in this country? Do you want a situation where the police have to be given guns and where the police have to be an armed police with all that that implies? Or do you want a situation where you can have a Defence Force that they call on for certain dangerous duties, a Defence Force that they call on in times of national emergency, a Defence Force that they call on and is specifically requested by the police that they can call on to defend the shores of Barbados. At the time on an earlier occasion — I will not state specifically what occasion it was — the Attorney General and I were specifically told that there is nobody in the Police Force to defend an airport, nobody in the Police Force has a mastery of the use of automatic weapons, nobody in the Police Force can fire a mortar, any aeroplane can land at the airport and take on the police, a man getting out firing a repeating weapon will mow down every Immigration Officer and every policeman up there before they can even get the old rifles unlocked from in the woodshed or wherever it is there it is kept. These are matters for a Defence Force, and the situation has proved that the Defence Force is necessary.

It is not even as if this is an imposition coming from the Barbados Labour Party and put upon the country. To some extent we are speaking as proselytes at the gate, because we have not always shown the same enthusiasm for the Defence Force as the events of the last two years have now inspired in one or two of us, the proposition for a Defence Force came from the hon. member for St. John, assisted by the then hon. member for Christ Church North Central, Peter Morgan, who now writes letters to the paper saying he is against it, and we have come around to the idea and we believe that the Defence Force deserves the same support that the Police Force deserves. They have different roles to play and they must be given support in exactly the same way. A policeman must be a citizen in uniform and a soldier must be a citizen in uniform as well, and any effort to try to divide the country in partisan lines where the forces of law and order are concerned is a mischievous act perpetrated only

by persons whose interest is seeing the destruction of the social fabric of this country for their own evil purposes.

Now, the question of the electoral reform. Nobody has taken the opportunity to say that the Civil Establishments Order mentions the Electoral Office only to regrade the position of Chief Electoral Officer, and in passing — Oh, I am sorry, the hon. member for St. Lucy — but in passing I would just like to praise the Chief Electoral Officer for his coolness of head in the very difficult circumstances in which he has sometimes had to operate for a number of years. I think that he thoroughly deserves the improved position.

I had intended to reserve my full reply on this matter for Question No. 40 in the name of the Leader of the Opposition. I will have to give some of it and I'm afraid I am going to be a little personal, Sir, in my approach to some of the speeches. I have never seen the hon. member for St. Michael South so excited with himself since he has been in Opposition. You know, he was so thrilled when he was talking about this, that and the other, and then a key remark came out, henceforth you will realise how strong the Opposition intends to be. Henceforth of what? Henceforth of a recent announcement? Henceforth because the member for St. Michael South West he thinks has been reduced in the ranks? Henceforth from what? Let me tell the hon. member he must listen to Eric Sealy's speeches. The Democratic Labour Party is going to press us in here? In his platform Eric Sealy made the point that all the Democratic Labour Party is doing in Parliament is following what the Barbados Labour Party tells them to do and say. Eric Sealy does not agree with you that you are giving opposition to anybody, but anyway, we are talking about the Electoral Department.

When the hon. member for St. Lucy was talking you were trying to get him to keep quiet about the Electoral Department. When the time came you let the whole team jump on the bandwagon with the honourable exception of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, who now that his ambitions have been effectively quelled and his great talent systematically ignored and cast aside is able to allow commonsense to rear a head that is ugly on the Opposition benches and sit down in silence where silence is called for. (*Asides*) The hon. member for St. Philip South should really be ashamed of himself, but until I heard his speech I was turning through the pages of my Gideon Bible to find the quotation relating to generations of hypocrites and casting beams out of their own eyes rather than casting motes out of the eyes of others, but the patent sincerity of the hon. member's speech — and I know that the Rules of Parliament forbid me from saying compared to some of the speeches that went before — the patent sincerity of the hon. member's speech made me shift my approach. Instead I have to say to hon. members, and particularly the hon. member for

St. Philip South, Oh ye of short memory where this matter of electoral reform is concerned. The hon. member can say what he likes about who introduced the electoral systems into this country, no new systems have been introduced by this Party, I tell the hon. member as a fact that there are people living in St. Thomas now who voted in the election of 1966 and have never since because they are not electors now.

5.30 p.m.

There are people living in his constituency who were deprived of the right to vote because for one reason or another they did not go and get an ID card. It was the Democratic Labour Party which limited the electors of this country by a system of ID card for the 1966 election. Let me say that there is a sub-stratum of persons in this country who have never voted since the ID system came into existence. I think the first enumeration was in 1960 and under that system everybody got a chance to vote. But the Dems made it necessary to have an ID card to vote. There was an enumeration in 1966 and at the last moment in a bye-election in 1969, hon. members who were in the House then will remember how people were given eighteen days notice for enumeration. Boundaries were changed at the last minute — twenty five days before the election. The hon. member for Christ Church South Central lost 1,000 voters three weeks before the election. Mr. Joy Edwards cut up Sion Hill with 700 voters just three weeks before the election. This was election gerrymandering, coming to the House of Assembly with these changes at the last moment. But we have to say "Vox populi vos Dei," because although they "tief," the electorate still approved them at that time.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister having reached such a stage of eloquence could find a better word than to say although they "tief." However, I would say that regardless of the statements you make, you won the elections and you are now the Government.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I accept the hon. member's reproof, but I think it can be safely assumed without any doubt that the electoral fiddling in 1971 saved Joy Edwards his seat. It was so intended, otherwise the hon. member for St. Andrew would have been in the House then.

There is no comparable record on the part of the Barbados Labour Party that can in any way be related to the introduction of the ID card system and the effective disenfranchisement of many people who did not go to register or have conscientious objections to having a photograph taken for an ID card.

I heard the hon. member for St. Philip South asking about the new system. But I would ask, "What new

system?" I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South Central talk about uncertainty. The only uncertainty is politically motivated mischief emanating from the fertile mind of Mr. Cameron Tudor. Rumours grow in his mind as quickly and as efficiently as neoplasms in a cancerous lung. Mr. Tudor started all this by talking about St. Lucy and the enumeration. But do you know, Mr. Speaker, that at the time Mr. Tudor tried to lead astray the hon. member for St. Lucy and said that enumerators were only going to certain people, St. Lucy had the best enumeration record at that time? (I believe St. Michael South West now has the record).

There have been 149,000 persons enumerated under this scheme which is supposed to be depriving people from voting, and only 100,000 people voted in the last election.

Honourable members are asking questions about voters, and it makes a good point because so far I have allowed myself to be led into talking about voting and I have specifically avoided trying to trespass on the answer to be given to the Leader of the Opposition. I would just say there are all sorts of people honestly misled; the hon. member for St. Philip South was hopelessly led astray; he does not understand what was going on. There is a Permanent Secretary in the Government, with advanced degree qualifications, who has refused to cooperate with the enumerators and has failed to learn two fundamental things — that this is not an enumeration carried out for election purposes but for population purposes, and the population is being enumerated for a number of purposes. The enumeration is not being carried out under the Enumeration Act but under the Statistical Act under which you can be prosecuted for not cooperating. The Act places a legal requirement on people to cooperate and assist.

5.50 p.m.

Hon. members who suggest on the other side that we do not want people registered, and that the registration is a political partisan matter — a political partisan matter for what purpose? It is a matter of desperate concern to the Government that we register the population. We want everybody registered; and very shortly we will be opening registration facilities at the camera centres as it had to be done in 1966–69 by the other Government and this is not the first time that you have got people complaining that enumerators did not come to them. An enumerator came to me last month. I have not found it possible to have a picture taken yet; and I am complaining too. I am a citizen like anybody else and I was complaining as to why I had not seen my enumerator yet.

It is not a political matter. It is a matter on which all of us have to try to get together on instead of bandying about a lot of mischievous accusations, and

try to understand that we are, all of us, not just the Government alone, as a political entity trying to take Barbados into the 21st Century, trying to take steps that will enable us to.....

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way on a point of elucidation. It is precisely what I was asking the hon. member, and not out of mischief, but in order to get a clarification on the object of the registration and an assurance as to whether the results would be used for electoral purposes; and a further assurance that there would be no amendment to the Representation of the People Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: What are you trying to elucidate?

Dr. HAYNES: That it is not a matter of mischief. There has been no amendment to the Representation of the People Act for electoral purposes.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Representation of the People Act already contains provisions relating to the use of enumeration that the hon. member's party put into it. What does he want me to do? Repeal them? They put them in, and he is asking me to give an assurance that I am not going to put them in. I do not need to. They are there.

Let me stretch myself a little further. It is intended that in the fullness of time everybody who works, everybody who has a number, a National Insurance number, the number will be made the same as the national registration number. Far from cutting down on the electoral list, we plan to put into the computer everybody — the day that they are 18 years old, the computer will print their names out on the electoral list in the correct alphabetical order. You will not have to rush to see the register. You will get an identification card when you are 16, and when you are 18 the computer will print your name on to the electoral list. Far from taking away the chances of registration from people we are trying to make it easier for people to get on the electoral list.

I cannot believe that in this country there is so much suspicion that hon. members have put out; and indeed I am fortified in my disbelief of the sincerity of suspicion when I read the speech made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and hearing what he says at Quakers Road and what he says in here. In here he talks all right because we are right here to answer him. In Quakers Road he will drag in any red herring before the public, any piece of mischief before the public as long as he thinks that it will give his ego some of the polish that it has evidently needed for the 42 years of his life. I really wish that all of these debates could be exposed to the crowds that attend political meetings in this country.

I have nothing to fear. I do not speak any differently on the platform from what I speak in here. You will not find statements on the platform that I would be afraid to repeat in here or vice versa; but I am sick to death of hearing in here people who are afraid of the lash of parliamentary debate toning down their utterances, and pretending that they abjure views which they have expressed so freely on public platforms when there is nobody to answer them.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West — he contains a certain consistency which is unfortunately absent from the speeches of some of the others. I can only speak of the speeches of those who go on the platforms. I am appealing to the public to assist with the enumeration. I am appealing to the public to register. Look, you must register for National Insurance. How are we going to give people a free health service if we do not know who they are, and cannot identify them? How are we going to relate the free health service to National Insurance? How can we do away with the numbers of persons who were once voters in this country and who are no longer voters because of their unwillingness to take photographs or what have you? How are you going to deal with that in the future unless you have a valuation of registration proceedings and let the population understand that we have to work in a small area, and we can therefore carry out certain obvious procedures more conveniently than in a large and irregular country.

We are moving into an era of computerization, Mr. Speaker. We are moving into an era where children will carry calculators into the classroom. We are moving into an era in which when you leave the Island you will put your I.D. card in a slot and the computer will register when you left the Island; and when you come back in and punch it, the computer will register that you have returned. So you will not have any difficult position with the electoral situation. How will we know who is employed or unemployed unless you have a registration and you ask the computer to check National Insurance figures of who worked last week and the number of those who did not work last week. It is a matter of an afternoon's work for the computer. You can get practically all the daily employment statistics by this system. All of this is what is involved in the enumeration exercise.

All you can see is Cameron Tudor wandering through his political life and now that he is in his political dotage, and trying to search for issues on which — I cannot even say to drag down the Government, because the chief lamb that Mr. Cameron Tudor has carried to the slaughter is the hon. member for St. Michael South West, a man who has given him unlimited support on occasions and has taken advice from him, how he changed sides, advising Ritchie —

obviously I am not referring to any hon. member by name. It is always dangerous to praise your political enemies above all; but honest to goodness when I think of what the people in St. Lucia and St. Vincent are going to say when they see that the hon. member for St. Michael South West has been relegated to — somebody told me in St. Vincent the other day that there were two politicians that he admired. One, I will not tell you who he said was the first one. Modesty forbids me; but he said that the other one was the hon. member for St. Michael South West.

At any rate, Sir, this is in passing. A studied answer will be given to Question No. 40 when I have the opportunity. I cannot promise next week, but at a very early opportunity.
5.50 p.m.

I hope that the air has been cleared sufficiently to satisfy the hon. member for St. Philip South that those who are telling him that the Labour Party is trying to stop people from voting are telling him absolutely unadulterated nonsense, and that he like others like all the old people in St. Philip, all the children in St. Philip who will need medical care, who will need the sort of analysis that the Government can give and who will press on everybody to cooperate with the enumerators and register at the earliest possible opportunity. We have some months left and I sincerely hope that the figure of 149,000 registrations which was the figure at the beginning of this month will soon be swollen by the provision of registration facilities at the camera centres and that you will go over the 200,000 mark very shortly. (A VOICE: You need more centres.) All that is agreed. I know we need more centres. In 1966 when it was for election you had to expand the centres; in 1969 you had to do it all over again. I do not know if you had to photograph in 1966, but in 1971 it had to be done. 1966 was enumeration; 1969 was ID cards when people began to go on to the electoral register.

I think, Sir, I have covered all the points. I cannot deal with Archives.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)-(AMENDMENT) (No. 3) ORDER, 1979

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 8 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister and is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1979.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I believe that nearly everything that can be said about this has been

said by inference if not explicitly already. This just deals with positions in the Fire Service.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO
CLAUSE (C) OF THE SCHEDULE TO
RESOLUTION No. 66/1978

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 12 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands and Environment, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve an amendment to Clause (c) of the Schedule to Resolution No. 66/1978 of 13th November, 1978.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this comes out of an error which was in the original document as presented before Parliament. The word should have been "renewal" and I would consider it was a typographical error and it came out as "removal". We are therefore asking for that amendment to (c) of the Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. I do not think there should be any problem with this.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that. Hon. members will obviously appreciate the reason for the difference between "removal" and "renewal". I just want to make one point on this Resolution because it is a convenient point to make it. Of late many people have been concerned here in Barbados about certain statements made in connection with the airlines and the movement of headquarters. The Government of Barbados would like to make it clear that the Government's position on this matter is well known. The Government has signed a memorandum of understanding in relation to a joint cargo company and it is the policy of the Government of Barbados that the facilities at the Grantley Adams Airport in relation to the leasing of cargo space will be reserved for — existing operators and that joint cargo venture, and that no new operators will be able to enter into the cargo storage at the airport, B.W.I.A. and others. This lease relates to the lease of a small maintenance facility. I just wanted to make that positively clear and in order to clarify in the minds of others who listen to propaganda apparently in Barbados. Barbados is not the only country in which rumour-mongering takes place.

Our position is very clear. We know exactly and precisely what we have in our minds and we feel that it is time that cargo handling at Grantley Adams Airport is reserved for an operation which is necessary for the

industrial development of this country and for other countries in the Caribbean, and it must be given a fair chance, and the way a fair chance can be given to it is to ensure that some of the cream in associated operations also comes to that new joint company.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this particular Resolution that is before us mentions British West Indian Airways Ltd. and it does give this Honourable House an opportunity to probe a little to find out what is the position in respect of that particular company that is mentioned here, British West Indian Airways Ltd. and Caribbean Airways. I believe there was a large publicised visit of the Prime Minister of this country and a delegation to Trinidad and Tobago and discussions at the highest level took place. I do not recall that this Honourable Chamber has been given any details of the discussions that took place on that occasion, any agreements open or secret that result from those discussions, and I am wondering if the appropriate Minister would make a statement on the particular discussions as they relate specifically to this new company that was supposed to come into operation or some new arrangement involving Caribbean Airways and British West Indian Airways. If I am stating it incorrectly it is because I am not fully seized of the particular matters and if he can tell us how developments have gone since that particular visit to Trinidad. Members on both sides of the House, I believe, would be interested in being brought up to date on this particular matter.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, a memorandum of understanding...

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member winding up?

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: It is not my thing; it is the Hon. Minister for Civil Aviation. I spoke already; I know that.

Mr. SPEAKER: You could very well wind up for the other Minister, but the point is that other hon. members may want to make a contribution and I would like to know in advance.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: As I understand it, there is nobody else who wants to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is another hon. member who has expressed a desire to speak. 6.00 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it seems that for the next 20 years in this House I would not have to put up with some of the hon. members. I would not be here for the next 20 years, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I raise a simple question there is a point I want to make on this Resolution and it is on the reason for the Resolution being here. Now the Hon. Minister when he was introducing this Resolution said there was a typographical error in which the word "removal" replaced the word "renewal".

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that on another occasion and I have indeed on more than one occasion drawn to the attention of the Attorney General the cost it is to us as a country because of a policy which he announced very early in his time as Attorney General, a policy which I think the reasons and the intention are admirable but I really think that it is clear that when there is a typographical error that the Attorney General should free himself of his self-imposed policy which cost us each time there is the slightest error in a draft legislation to have to come back to this Honourable House and go through the cost.

Mr. Speaker, you know the cost of printing today and the cost of having legislation of this nature comes back to this Honourable House merely because the Hon. Attorney General feels to make a typographical error is to interfere with substantive legislation is, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, a waste of taxpayers' money. I understand his motivation and I understand what he has said about it but I think that each time it comes up it is incumbent on me to draw it to his attention as I have done so before.

Mr. Speaker, on the substantive Resolution, since we are dealing with the Airport, I wonder if the appropriate Minister will tell us what are the real reasons for the delay in the change-over at the Airport. I am told, I do not know, that there have been a number of problems, technical and otherwise connected with the change-over from the old terminal to the new terminal. I have heard it said from people who ought to know that the conveyor belts were installed and the baggage was going in the wrong direction. I have heard this and I wish to know. I have been told that when baggage comes off the planes it was going in the direction of the Fire Service or something like that.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that I think the Hon. Minister ought to tell us what are the reasons for the delay in the change-over from the old terminal building to the new facilities and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Government owes it to the community to make a defensive statement as to the use to which the old building will be put. I have not spoken to anyone who is connected with the Grantley Adams International Airport who has been able to give a comprehensive statement as to what is the policy for the use of the old building as well indeed as for the allocation of the new building.

I am told from persons who claimed to know that there have been miscalculations in the amount of space to

be allocated. I am told that no provision was made. We have dealt with the Immigration Officers earlier today and I am told that no provision has been made for an office for the Immigration Officers in the new terminal building.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is so, I heard earlier today people were talking about planning but that would be a failure in elementary planning which is unacceptable. I would really like to hear the Minister give us — the hon member is signalling to me whether I really believe it. It is not a question of whether I believe it or not. This is what is being said. The Customs Officers have said to me that no place has been set out for them.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, Sir, I am told that no provision has been made; for either the Immigration Officers or the Customs Officers. I do not think that it is both. I think that the space that has been allocated for the Immigration Officers that then the Customs Officers will have none. I did not get this from a gossip as the Hon. Minister said or a rumour-monger. I got it from someone who is a substantial member of the community and who is familiar with the operations at the Airport.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that anyone who has been to the Airport in the last few weeks must agree that the cargo-handling operations at the Airport left a tremendous lot to be desired. There is a bottle neck in almost every direction. There is no movement of cargo and indeed they are persons who have sometimes to wait 10 to 15 days only to discover that they just could not find the item because of the size of the item.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you have travelled recently or if you have met anyone at the Airport, and one can understand this, and one can only hope that when you move over that this will change but what I am really asking for is what are the plans which we can hear that would indicate a change in it. It is wrong for us in Barbados with such a small Airport and notwithstanding the 37,000 in August, it is wrong for us to have to go to the Airport and wait for two hours when someone gets off a plane that is a 120 yards away two hours before you can find your baggage.

Now someone may tell me that when you go to New York you have to wait long. When you go to Timbuctoo you have to do a lot of things. I am not a legislator for New York. I am a legislator for St. Michael South West in Barbados and the things that concern Barbadians are things which concern me and what I wish to know is that if we are spending \$34 million on a new Airport Terminal that notwithstanding the technicalities

of new Airports that by the time one Airport is finished it is also obsolete. That is well-known. All of that notwithstanding we wish to know that if people go to the Airport and use the new facilities that they can expect an improvement in the service. I would wish to know from the Minister to what extent his forward planning has reached the situation where he can tell us in this Honourable House what to expect.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one other small point. There used to be a lot of concern expressed about the cleaning of the Airport and I woke up one morning and saw that the Government had decided to take over the cleaning of the Airport itself. I wish to invite the Prime Minister and the other Ministers and as a matter of fact the Hon. Attorney General was there the same night I was there and he would verify that at half past one in the morning it was the filthiest place I have ever seen. It was very filthy.

Now it was immediately after the Government took over the cleaning. I am not trying to cast any aspersions on the cleaners. I am talking about the Government saying they have taken over and if they have taken over it is their duty to see that the Airport is cleaned and on that morning, the Customs Officers who had worked long hours and also the Immigration Officers who had worked long hours were also complaining about the quality of the environment within which they had to work during the long hours when airplanes had been delayed for whatever reason.

It seems to me that when Government takes over a service that the Government should make sure that it is ready to take over the service before it does so. I have not been back to the Airport but I look forward to the Minister getting up and telling me that that was during the hiatus of the changeover but I hope that steps are being taken that when the new Airport is opened that the quality of the environment in that Airport would be something which all of us as Barbadians could be proud of.

I hope that steps will be taken to see that the conveniences, especially at the Airport, are not only first-class in their initial operations but that steps are taken as are done in a number of advanced countries to see that they remain at that high quality.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that I have touched on the points I wanted to touch on and will not delay the House any further but I hope the Minister will give us a few points in this regard.
6.10 p.m.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, now that we are talking about civil aviation and travelling facilities generally, it is quite appropriate for me to mention that

within the last few weeks our promotional efforts in industry in Barbados have been greatly lamed as a result of the fact that Carib West was not functioning. It is not widely appreciated that a good investment climate such as we have been trying to cultivate in this country in our efforts to woo foreign industrialists involve among other things good internal transport and external transport. If industrialists cannot get in their raw materials and cannot get out their finished product, your efforts to attract new industries are immediately severely lamed. And external transport has been one of the constraints under which we have been operating in this country.

When Caribbean Airways started to fly out of Boston and out of Washington, the situation appeared brighter somewhat, but after a year they terminated their services and we were relying to a large extent on Carib West flying out of Miami and the gulf port of Houston to bring in the raw materials and carry out a large amount of the finished product. But Carib West has been in and out of difficulties and I do not think that it has been accepted by this administration that it is necessary to give a subsidy to industries in the form of some form of assistance to your industrial cargo airlines. Recently after Carib West had stopped flying for about three weeks they got something approaching \$1 million in assistance, but it came three weeks too late, and it is not widely known in this country the extent to which industry has been lamed and our promotional efforts have been lamed. There is one company in particular that has had to lay off virtually all of its people — I am referring to a company called Clairex — they had very good prospects in this country and they will not be able to get into production, if indeed they do get into production again, before some time in the New Year.

Many people have called me from as far afield as California, persons with investments in this country, complaining, and I think myself that that situation has been very unfortunately handled. We were looking forward to the joint venture arrangement between Trinidad & Tobago and Barbados coming on stream some time about now, and I would like the Hon. Minister to tell the House precisely when this arrangement is likely to come into being and whether it is going to result in an expanded service as far as the bringing in of industrial cargo and the carrying out of finished products are concerned. Right now Carib West only comes in from Miami and from Houston. Are we likely to have an enlargement of the service involving additional gulf ports? Is there likely to be a flight out of New York? Is it possible to have this arranged? Because there is a lot of industrial cargo for Barbados which comes through New York and industries here experience considerable delay in getting cargo out of New York, and the situation is not helped because of the fact that recently airlines have taken the decision that there will not be any limitation on the number of pounds that passengers can take, and

since passengers have priority almost all the cargo space is taken up with passengers' luggage so there is really no room for industrial cargo. In fact, I am still of the view that we should make some attempt, the Minister involved should make some attempt to approach the airlines coming into Barbados out of New York and ask them whether they would be prepared to reserve some portion of their cargo space for industrial cargo.

Now that we are talking about the airport and transportation, you will permit me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, just to touch very briefly on the domestic transport situation. I am not happy myself that enough planning and thinking ahead has gone on in relation to the situation that is arising in Christ Church. The new airport will mean some 3,000 people working there. It is true that they will have three shifts, but at any one time you can have 1,000 people going into the Grantley Adams airport to work. In addition to that, you have a growing industrial park at Grantley Adams airport, you have Newton Industrial Park which has grown quite dramatically within the last three years, you have a situation where some 1500 people are likely to be going into Sergeants Village as from another 18 months to two years, as soon as the Intel Factory is finished. We are talking about very vast numbers indeed which will involve a diversion of resources and I would like to have the assurance that already great thinking and great thought is being given to the question of how to get those people there and back. That has nothing to do with the likely secondary school at Wotton, it has nothing to do with an expanded Foundation catering to some thousand children, it has nothing to do with the development of Oistins, we are going to have large numbers of people concentrated from day to day in Christ Church and we are going to have an internal transport problem if as early as now we do not plan for it. It would be a pity indeed if in addition to the difficulties that we are having in relation to external transport those difficulties were to be compounded with problems arising on the domestic transport front.

So I hope that in the course of the reply I could be given some assurance that these matters are being given some urgent consideration and that we could look forward to the days ahead with much more hope that we have been able to do in the immediate past.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, just one brief point I would like to make in support of the member for St. Michael South West. I travel through Grantley Adams airport quite frequently — travel has been my major hobby over the past 20 to 25 years or so — and something has dramatically gone wrong in respect of cargo handling within the last six to nine months. It is difficult to say exactly what the problem is, some people say that it is the cargo handlers not employing enough people, the airlines say that because of the changeover in the arrangement for handling cargo it is no longer their responsibility. Now, I do not know what the problem is, what I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister responsible is that this is a problem, that the answer to the problem probably lies in something that

may well have happened within the past year and that as from my own personal experience you can come into Grantley Adams airport from time to time and you may have to wait for anything between two to four hours to get your baggage.
6.20 p.m.

One afternoon after being there for about two hours I went and peeped through the little opening and what I saw was one cart going to one aircraft and then to another and one or two people removing the baggage from the aircraft when it came in. If that kind of thing is transferred to the new airport, you are just creating further problems and spending money and not creating the kind of image the airport should have for Barbados seeing that tourism plays such an important role in the economy of this country. So I am inviting the Minister to look at the contractual arrangements and objectives and make sure that that particular difficulty is not transferred to the new airport.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very glad that these points have been raised, because it gives us an opportunity to explain to hon. members what is the real position in connection with the matters raised.

I will deal first with the hon. member for St. Michael South who raised the question about air cargo. The Memorandum of understanding which has been made public by two or three newspapers in the Caribbean which published verbatim the whole agreement — under that agreement the Government of Barbados and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago agreed to the formation of a Joint air cargo company. As to whether the instrument that the Government of Trinidad uses is BWIA or more properly, Trinidad and Tobago Air Services Corporation which has just been proclaimed — or whether they use the Corporation Sole in the form of the Minister of Finance, is a matter for them. The Government of Barbados is quite clear as to who will be its agency, and later on a resolution will come to this House to approve the Minister of Civil Aviation as the agency.

Now it was contemplated that a 707 would be available on lease from BWIA as the means of transport by the new air cargo company, but unfortunately a number of things have happened in the aviation world lately. First of all, the delivery dates of all of the big new aircrafts — whether DC-10's, 1011's or 747's — have been pushed back two or three months, so that none of the airlines who have ordered the new generation of fuel efficient aircraft have been able to get delivery at the specified delivery dates. As a matter of fact hon. members will recall that we would have expected by now that 1011's would be flying for Caribbean Airways. My latest

information is that the DC-10's will be coming into service some time in December but it will not be the long range DC-10 series. We will not get that deliver until March because of the fact that MacDonald, Lockheed and Boeing are presently over-filled with orders; and as far as Tri-Stars are concerned, many of them have opted for Rolls Royce engines. And if hon. members have been following what is happening in the United Kingdom, further delays are likely because there have been strikes in the United Kingdom for a long time, and although Rolls Royce itself is not on strike, other factories supplying components were on strike. So it is still a question of when we will get delivery.

Now the legal documentation has been exchanged. We drew up the document here in Barbados and it was sent down to Trinidad. Their men came up, and I am informed that on Saturday the final comment from the Attorney General's office will come back down. We are scheduled to have a meeting of Ministers to put the final touches to the agreement.

In our planning we also wanted to bring the company into operation as soon as adequate cargo space was available, as there was no point bringing the company into operation until there was adequate cargo space at the Grantley Adams airport and at the Piarco Airport, because under this plan we will be handling up to 85,000 pounds of cargo at one time. Trinidad has commissioned a company for the interior design, and we were hoping that the airport would have been finished, but I understand that it will not be finished until January.

Honourable members will appreciate that the congestion at Grantley Adams Airport in respect of passenger congestion was greatest. We did have some cargo congestion, but we were able to put up additional cargo space and members will see that transshipment cargo in a new building has relieved the situation somewhat. One reason why the congestion was sometimes acute was because the facilities in Trinidad had backed up so much that companies were using Barbados as a transshipment point. There has been an embargo on cargo in Trinidad since October last year, so there has been acute congestion. The long and short of it is that the legal structure of the company will be ready very shortly. I think we should have a ministerial meeting some time this week if convenient, and we are hoping then that the plan will be available.

Another point in relation to cargo: Between October last year and October this year there has been an over 100% increase in the price of aviation jet fuel. Only

on Sunday certain airlines drastically cut their services. British Airways cut out 23 services in the United Kingdom. We received notice not long ago that American Airlines are thinking of cutting out air cargo service between the United States and Barbados, and the company with which we were negotiating to bring air cargo from Miami to Barbados has not taken up the option because they are looking for routes on which they can make maximum profits having regard to the fact that aviation fuel has again gone up in price. We also have an antiquated law in relation to the collection of freight rates. Hon. members will be astounded to know that in the US a freight forwarder will pick up a forward cargo but the customer has 45 days to settle the account. That means a cargo company has to give credit for 45 days. That was all right when the price of fuel was \$1.10, but now that the price has gone up hon. members will appreciate the cash flow that is necessary to run this kind of business.

To deal with the next point about the airport. It is the aim of this Government that some 40,000 square feet of cargo warehousing will be made available by the adaptation of part of the present ticketing hall from where American Airlines are to where Eastern begins. The area where Eastern is will be a Police Station; the Police will have proper accommodation in that building.

Secondly, at the back of the area between American Airlines down to Eastern, a steel building will be extended to cover the area where you now pick up baggage. The rest of the existing air terminal going towards the present arrival area will be used for the maintenance unit at the airport. The balance of the area will be kept in reserve for special users, e.g., air-sea transfer; for these there will be special arrangement where they do not have to go through Customs. Trucks will be allowed to go to the aircraft in the presence of customs officials, the baggage will come from the hole of the aircraft on to the truck and then be taken to the Port while the passengers go around the Island or even go abroad; and when the passengers go to the Port the baggage will be there. Hon. members will also recognize that with the special charters such as farm workers, etc, when they return it is necessary to have a closer customs check than is ordinarily necessary. It is also my view that very soon progress will be made towards a CARICOM travel document whereby there will be a speedier process and it may well be that the airport will be used as a transfer point.

Now I hear talk about the airport being too small.
6.35 p.m.

This airport was designed in 1976, and it is five times as big as the existing one. The existing one has a capacity for 1.2 million passengers. This airport is designed for 2.8 million passengers. It may well be true that we have reached 1.2 million faster than we anticipated in projections up to 1995; but the basic position is that, rather than convert all of the old air terminal into uses which will be inconsistent with its uses quickly. We have to take a decision that part of it will be used for cargo sheds which are necessary because Barbados is rapidly building up a position as a transshipment cargo centre for the simple reason that you have to go to bigger places and because of the cost of fuel, you have to carry more freight. That is the position.

Now on the question of package handling and things of that sort, we had a monopoly situation at the airport. Seawell Air Services has a monopoly. That is correct. The position that we had was that Aircraft Services International were there and Seawell Air Services bought them. One of the prime things we have discovered is that a similar situation relates to other airports in the Caribbean. You have one or two operators who used to own the warehousing in the past; and having got the warehouses, they then got hold of the spare parts and then the push back machines and things of that kind.

What we have to ensure is that the joint cargo company gets into that business too. You will have more warehouses, because, as I said earlier, no more new space will be rented to any airlines coming to Barbados. If they want to be handled, they will have to be handled by the cargo company or by Seawell Air Services. That is our position and it is a very important point that hon. members must appreciate.

Now, this is a capital sum that hon. members will have to vote on later; but it is a very vital point that you cannot allow a monopoly situation to develop there, because what it means is that — and this is our view — that we have had a lot of complaints on that and we had to deal with these problems. We have had a phenomenal increase in traffic here. What we have discovered is that everybody used to take off people between November right up to April. They used to lay them off; but this year, as the Prime Minister has said, in fact so far we have had more visitors in August this year than we have had in our peak in February; and Barbados really has now a seven month to eight month season.

I am glad, and I am sure that hon. members will be very glad to see it. I know that the hon. member for St. Lucy is very glad to see it because he knows that this year more workers have been kept on for a longer period of time in the hotel industry than ever. I

would like to see that at the airport too, Mr. Speaker, and that is the position in relation to that.

Now we will grant additional resources to ensure that there are adequate transportation services. None of us can sit down and plan now as to what is happening in the airline industry, because none of us know what the airlines are going to do.
6.40 p.m.

For instance, I understand it is very clear now that a strong group is meeting and saying they want a price rise again, and one of them is sufficiently strong that if they cut back their production then we will run into another problem because this is also another problem that is developing around airports in the world.

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

This is another problem that is developing around airports in the world where fuel companies are subjecting various airlines to quotas. In other words, you have to be in a position to be certain that the volume of fuel you want, never mind the price, to carry out your existing schedule is available, and I believe that the competition for the volume of fuel is what has helped to raise the price. We have done a review of all of our fuel that we use here and we are conducting a review on the availability of fuel in respect of the airport to see whether we can make every step possible within our limits to ensure that given the volume of traffic that we have there will be fuel here for the refuelling requirements of the airlines which use Barbados. As a matter of fact, if you have access to fuel now to supply fuel you will generate more traffic, because a number of countries are suffering because they cannot get fuel for the airlines. That happened particularly in Europe last year and many countries lost traffic because the airlines only have a certain capacity and when they reach there they must get fuel, but this is an international credit card system between five companies, and we are taking all steps possible to ensure that this happens.

Now on the question of the transportation industry, I am fully aware of it. The Government has committed reserves. A subsidy has been approved by Cabinet and it will come before the Legislature. As far as Miami is concerned, Carib West has enough money to carry out two flights. New York is now raising problems because American Airlines used to bring cargo. From about September they used to bring in an all cargo service. Last year they brought in DC 10s. Because of the limitations and the cutbacks they have, I understand there is a severe shortage of cargo space available coming in. It is true about the unlimited baggage. Some brilliant sales manager in the airline industry came up with this idea of

unlimited baggage, and the airlines because one did it, decided they wanted to do it, and then of course they did not reckon with the ingenuity of the passengers because one passenger I think has the record for carrying twenty-two packages coming along on a visit. They originated the unlimited baggage and people are coming along with 22 packages and this is what has developed, until you can get the larger airlines which have a minimum of ten tons of cargo capacity. The 707 that was designed to carry 156 passengers are now carrying 189 so as to get in more passengers, and there is no space for cargo and this is the problem. But we are working as fast as we can, and the situation in the airline industry is such now that I am firmly convinced that all of us in the Eastern Caribbean should say "let us forget the past". What we have to look at now is that our economies are dependent upon industry and tourism. We know that the bigger countries are taking steps to re-equip their fleets with the most fuel efficient carriers. One of them cost up in \$70 million for a DC 10. We know that the three manufacturers, because this is a monopoly too, in the United States and the airbus are the only two countries in the world that can produce these planes. We know that everybody in the airline industry are fighting to get delivery as fast as possible, so that the time is coming when there is a need for a meeting of the aviation and transport Ministers in the Eastern Caribbean in particular so that we can study the impact of the fuel rises, the impact of de-regulation in the United States and what is going on in Europe. I understand there is a court case going on in Europe where certain Governments are being sued to allow de-regulation. So all these developments are taking place, and while these people are looking after themselves, we down here are not even studying what is happening. Of course we are trying our best to see that we have an urgent meeting to evaluate what is the role of LIAT, cargo facilities, passenger facilities, handling, things of that kind, and this is what we hope will take place very soon.

I believe I can say this, this is known now; the Government of Barbados and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago initiated a start on cargo handling. At least two other Governments in the Eastern Caribbean who are just starting to industrialise and who understand the need for cargo have already expressed interest, and just as we get the legal documents finished and each of us put up our seed money, we will be able to get them, and I have absolutely no doubt it is going to be like when you had the three signatories originally to CARIFTA. You will remember the ink did not even dry fast enough before you had a lot of people lining up. I have absolutely no doubt that that is going to be the situation.

The facilities at the airport are very good. The cleaning service was only taken over by the Government after the contract expired on 30th September. Carpel

enterprises, a man called Vere Miller who used to pay girls \$40 a week and operated out of the Democratic Labour Party Headquarters. George Street is his office address.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the Hon. Minister I think is misleading himself. As far as I know, and I think I ought to know, there is no cleaning place operating out of the Democratic Labour Party headquarters as far as I know.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what point of order has the hon. member risen?

Mr. TAITT: The hon. member said that the proprietor of a cleaning operation was operating from Democratic Labour Party headquarters.

Mr. SPEAKER: And you said he is misleading himself.

Mr. TAITT: And the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, it is now a serious matter. To say that an hon. member is misleading the House is a much more serious matter than some members seem to realise. I have had an occasion, I believe, to have warned the same hon. member on this matter, and I would advise that he resorts to doing a bit of research before he again accuses another hon. member of misleading the House.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, I rose on a point of order which I considered in my opinion to be reasonable. I rose on a point of order within the terms of the Rules of the House. I was under the impression that the hon. member was misleading the House. Now, Sir, I am fully aware of the implications of suggesting that a member is misleading the House and I was not saying that he was deliberately misleading the House, and that is the reason that I rose.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I was only referring to the business address. I thought now that the headquarters were expanded at the Democratic Labour Party headquarters that it was quite likely that it had such good conveniences that it could also be used as the business offices of people paying rent of course. I see the Church is now renting out the former St. Gabriel's School, and I believe we have tenants at the Barbados Labour Party headquarters, so I do not think there was anything that I intended to suggest. It may very well be that the hon. member has some knowledge of the directors of the particular company and he may not want it to be known that they are associated with the Democratic Labour Party, but the fact that they may rent their offices there does not mean that the Democratic Labour Party are

shareholders or anything of that kind. But the basic position is that the cleaning staff has been appointed.
6.50 p.m.

We have been advised by a Canadian expert on this matter who is now in Barbados and in the last month training has been taking place for the new service. The equipment has come in. It is now being assembled and we are confident. We have seen a great improvement in the quality of the cleaning at the Airport already.

We agree with the hon. members who have raised the question of the very bad condition but we have tried our best to persuade the previous concessionaire to improve this service. As a matter of fact, my Ministry was so dissatisfied with the service that we even asked the Attorney General's Office to give us a legal opinion how to get rid of him. We got an evaluation of his work done by some gentleman, I think it was someone from Auckland Enterprises and we had an evaluation done on his work but in view of the fact that we knew that his Contract was going to end in September, contrary to the view over there, my Ministry does not hound down anybody so that his Contract came to an end and that is the end of that.

Now I think that that covers all of the points. As to the question of the facilities for Customs and Immigration, my understanding is that there is more than adequate facilities. Some people would like facilities that when they are supposed to be working they are playing draughts or when they are supposed to be working they are doing something else but I would say that the facilities that we have are adequate. There are adequate facilities for all of these things.

I am going to deal with one final point about the opening date of the Airport. The Airport will be officially opened on November, 29th. Hon. members know that this is a joint project with the Government of Canada and the Government of Barbados and that they have to give lead time notice for a representative of the Government of Canada to come down here.

It will be operational from the 30th October/1st November because we have been advised that we cannot open an Airport and do not have an operational trial period beforehand because people know that when you put in new baggage conveyors, air-conditioning and things like that, things might not go alright. At the present moment a lot of the systems are working. Some of the Airlines did not take our opening to be serious. American Airlines are finished completely. Seawell Air Services who are agents for a number of them are finished. Air Canada is nearly finished but Caribbean Airways, British West Indian Airways, Liat and one or two others were a little behindhand but they are working. If hon. members pass there at night they will see lights. The Airport air-conditioning is working.

We also have some problems with containers loads coming out of the St. Lawrence because the equipment had to be bought from Canada because of the fact that there was a certain provision on disbursement of the money and because of the Contract more Barbadians were successful. In the end all the equipment had to be purchased from Canada to make up the 60:40 ratio so that we had some problems with the containers but everything has arrived in Barbados and great progress is being made.

I have been assured by the Project Manager that definitely the Airport will be operational on the 30th. I am going to invite hon. members before November 29th because they will be invited to the opening on November 29. Now I do not know if they will come. I know that the hon. member for St. Michael South is going to come. He has never refused an invitation from the Barbados Labour Party yet. After all he just went to China. I know the hon. member for St. Philip South is going to come because after all he will be able to see how many people are working there who come from St. Philip South.

As a matter of fact the question of transportation raised by the hon. member for Christ Church East is a very serious one because you will notice in some advertisement by an Airline they are saying that they only want people working within a certain perimeter of three or four miles from the Airport. If we are now in the 20th Century going into the 21st Century we have to operate a 24-hour or at least an 18-hour service and I hope the hon. member for St. Lucy agrees with me on this. If we are a big centre we have to move cargo at night and we do not wish to be driving down the road in the day competing with lorries and big trucks moving cargo. I would like to see the time when those containers can only be moved at night. I know what happens in other countries. We have to change our attitudes. We have to have a 24-hour Immigration service and a 24-hour Customs. Everybody has got to be working on a shift system. That is the position.

Cabinet is going to have a preview of the Airport next Monday. I am willing also to extend the invitation to any other member of this House. If an indication is given through the Clerk and if we can get a sufficient number we will arrange for you to go and visit the Airport so that you will see before hand what is going on before the people see it. The Airport Manager and the Project Manager are conducting tours. I would like to tell hon. members that anytime they want to go and Mr. Speaker, you too, Sir, if we can get a time that would be convenient for us I will be very glad and I am going to extend the invitation through you in a formal manner. The Cabinet is going on Monday but anytime between then to October 30th I would gladly if members, wish, give them a preview tour before the official opening on the 29th November. This is a joint matter and the Canadian Government is quite proud of the achievement and as a matter of fact they are now becoming the Air-

port builders of the whole of the Caribbean and they are doing quite well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, an invitation has been extended to all hon. members. They should give an indication to the Clerk because time is not on our side. The sooner the better.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SALE OF LAND AT BRIDGE ROAD, ST. MICHAEL

Item No. 13 was called to move the passing of the Resolution to approve of the sale of land at Bridge Road, St. Michael, to Misses M. and E. Gooding.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is not one which I hope would cause any controversy. It is a piece of land which Government is selling to the Goodings. It is at the Corner of Bridge Road and Welches Road by a lady who carries on a school. It is 813 square meters of land and it will be at the price of \$1,638. I do not think that this will pose any controversy. I see no reason why we should have any debate over this.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This Meeting stands suspended until
8 p.m.
7.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Item No. 10, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 10 is the instant Order of the Day.

RESOLUTION TO VARY THE CONDITIONS GOVERNING THE PAYMENT OF GRATUITIES TO OFFICERS APPOINTED ON CONTRACT

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Resolution. Housing Allowances, although

they are called such, in many ways form a part of pensionable emoluments under our present system. The Housing Allowance paid to senior public officers are taxable and pensionable and at the end of their service can attract the appropriate gratuity by way of reduced pension but by an anomaly the housing allowances although also taxable and pensionable for contract officers do not attract a gratuity. This is really an anomaly, Sir, because the gratuity is the substitute that a contract officer gets for a pension. He gets paid a gratuity because he is not going to get a pension and there really is no point giving a man a housing allowance on which he has to pay tax and which to all intents and purposes forms a part of his salary and then tell him that is only an allowance, you can't get your gratuity on it, and we are satisfied that this is an anomaly which should be corrected, and this Resolution seeks to correct it.

I beg to move that this Resolution do not pass.

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Item No. 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 5 is the instant Order of the Day.

THE PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1979

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this deals with two anomalies in our pensions legislation. I could not pretend that this matter is an easy one to grasp.

The first one relates to the situation of a public officer who leaves the Government Service and goes into what is classified as Other Public Service, the best known example is the University, and he finds himself although he has service with the Government, he has lost the right to pension on that service because of the transfer, and he may also find himself without the right to be pensioned from the second service. Now, our Pensions Act speaks, I believe, of supplementary pensions, and therefore if a man transfers somewhere but can't get a pension it can't be supplementary.

Effectively this will allow the Governor General, acting on the advice of the Public Service Commission, to grant an appropriate pension, gratuity or other allowance to the former public employee. It is a little bit complicated, Sir, but I am told that there is an urgent and pressing case which has lent some weight to this. It has been in the pipeline for a year or two.

The other matter is perhaps even more complicated. It relates to Local Government Service. If a man or woman had broken service in Local Government and thereby forfeited the pension right, under the old Local Government Act it is very difficult for both of the periods of broken service to be taken into account in granting a pension for former Local Government Officers who now work with Central Government and it has definitely caused some hardship. I believe there is more than one case to which this refers, Sir. It definitely has caused some hardship, because it means that somebody who has actual service say of seven or eight years with Central Government, twelve, or fourteen years with Local Government but broken can only get the last part of the Local Government service plus the Central Government service, and it does prejudice people's pensions. Submissions have been made to me, I have accepted them. There are really very few people involved but there is really no reason why we should mistreat the few persons by administering these extremely harsh pension rules.

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

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, having served in Local Government for several years, I am wondering if the Prime Minister can tell this House of Assembly how many people are involved in this exercise.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister is finding the information to reply, I would just like to make a brief observation that he has introduced this particular Bill in very general terms, although I think he did refer to one particular body, the University of the West Indies, but I would have reason to believe that it could also apply to certain Statutory Corporations, and I know that amendments of this nature do not arise necessarily or solely out of a need to reform the laws. I do not think this would necessarily fall into the category of law reform, it might be to deal with specific cases, and I am wondering if the Prime Minister would like to be a little more precise in terms of the immediate cause for this particular measure.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that this amendment has come down, because as the hon. member for St. Philip South will appreciate we still have a number of these people who are working and who at first could not be fitted into the public service, but after some considerable period of time were fitted into the public service.

There is one other problem I would like to draw to the attention of the Prime Minister, and this is a convenient time because I do not believe it is anything to do with politicians, it is something to do with the people

who administer the laws. We are still finding that people in the lower echelons of the service retire and it is taking over four months for them to get their gratuity and their pension. How are they to live? In my constituency I am constantly plagued with people who are in the Sanitation Service and others who are retired and instead of the relevant departments doing like what used to be done before in some efficiently run Local Government Offices, that is, have a list of people who they know by their birth dates are going to retire and start the computation of their pensions early so that the Accountant General or the Auditor General would certify the pension early so that the month after they retire they can get it, there are still these people — and the first people, as you will appreciate, Sir, that they come to in this four month period are the politicians, and we are being besieged all the time as politicians, and you know that we cannot afford to be welfare agencies, Sir.

The basic position is that I do hope that all those who are responsible for the computation of pensions would have a list of people who are due to retire, have the dates of retirement, and start the computations early, get them certified by the Accountant General so that when they retire they can get their pensions within a short period of time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the query as to how many former Local Government Officers now employed in Central Government have breaks in service and who will benefit from this, but there really is nothing on the file which can assist me in this matter. I have another pensions matter that may be coming to the House within the next few weeks and if you had asked me on that matter, I am in the fortunate position of having a list of everybody who has mixed service, people whom I didn't even know were still alive, drawing pensions, like Mr. Howard Hayden, a former Director of Education, Sir John Rankin who must have been Colonial Secretary here when I was a boy and old retired Officers of the Police Force who must be 90 years old, I believe, and really I had no idea they were still drawing pensions, but I do have a complete list of them and when that comes to the House I might be able to help you with that, but there is no list of Local Government Officers with broken service.

8.15 p.m.

In the nature of things it would be very difficult to estimate the number. As far as I am concerned there is a particular officer whom they had in mind who is working at the University. The situation has not yet arisen where we are legislating for one man at the University, which is the query raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South, but he asked if it applies to other organizations. The hon. member would be aware that the

Governor-General has powers to declare service in certain approved bodies to be public service for the purpose of transfers, and the Governor-General has made an order to allow public officers to go to the University to work and if they then acquire pensionable eligibility at the University, their previous government service can be considered. This was referred to the Attorney General in June last year and the Attorney General gave his opinion in February this year to the effect that Mr. So and So's previous service can only be computed as pensionable if he was eligible for pension from the UWI on retirement; without the latter he cannot claim the former; the two are interdependent. This will also be true of such Statutory Bodies as the Governor-General has declared as public service for the purpose of a mixed pension. Does that help the hon. member? Is the person we are talking about a high level person? The person whom we are talking about has been working at the University from October, 1969. I believe this having come to the House on October 16 this year, he has now done the ten years at the University and therefore the issue which was raised has been overtaken by effluxion of time. So he would get his two pensions because he joined the public service in 1955; he would get his two pensions whether or not we pass this Bill. But I do think the hon. member will wish to make allowances for persons who join a Statutory Board and can only do six years before retirement; I do not think you would want them to lose their public service entitlement because they did spend enough time with the Statutory Board to get a second entitlement.

I wish I could help the hon. member for St. Philip South but I really cannot; I cannot tell the number of people involved. I know there is one urgent case and I know he would not want this old lady to suffer because of the lack of a provision which was in the public service but not in local government.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, if you would allow me a question of the Prime Minister, who is the old lady he referred to?

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

The Schedule to the Bill was called and passed.

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. B. St. JOHN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE \$1.5 MILLION (US) FROM OPEC SPECIAL FUND

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there was a Resolution introduced in this House earlier today relating to a loan from the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). There is some urgency about the matter and I have raised it with the acting Leader of the Opposition.

The date for the disbursement of this loan should have been August 31, 1979, but there were some legal difficulties relating to the agreement. It was not possible to complete the agreement by August 31 but it is absolutely essential that the Resolution be passed before the end of October so that the money can be disbursed before the end of October. The acting Leader has given his approval for the matter to be dealt with. I made a copy of the notes of my speech on the matter available to the hon. member of the Opposition and his colleagues and I would ask leave of the House to deal with the matter in all its stages.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection leave is granted.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, arising out of the visit of President Perez of Venezuela in October last year application was made to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries for a loan to Barbados on soft terms to assist in the development of the country.
8.25 p.m.

On October 21, talks were held with Senor Hector Prada who was then the Minister for the administration of the Venezuela Special Fund. I am sure that my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central will remember these talks. He will recall the speed with which they acted at that time. An application was made at an OPEC council meeting in November last year. An application was made to support the local costs of polytechnics and the Bridgetown Sewerage Scheme, the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic etc.

In March this year OPEC agreed to lend us a proportion of what we applied for, and the loan is to provide for balance of payments on capital for the Agricultural Industry etc. The loan is for the sum of \$US1½ million.

The interest rate is 4 percent a year, which is a very generous loan, and there is a half percent service charge. There is a five-year grace period in which the loan does not have to be paid in cash; and this means that it is a very generous loan indeed.

Negotiations have proceeded. The Agreement was signed on 25th May in Vienna by the then Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of External Affairs. We had some difficulties with OPEC as we have had with some other agencies. Our success with our developmental efforts which have increased the per capita income of the Island which was beyond a higher level of a developing country, was apparently very strongly considered. But it seems that Barbados has friends that we do not even know about, Sir, because someone of the oil-producing countries apparently expressed themselves very strongly in favour of helping Barbados — not a regional country — but a country in the Middle East has expressed itself very strongly in favour of helping Barbados in forwarding various loans; and the Director of OPEC has indicated that although there were temporary cash flow shortages, no doubt alleviated by the increase in our prices, should Barbados renew its request for assistance in the other areas. The OPEC policy of lending was flexible enough so that we hope to receive this first loan from OPEC; I am asking Parliament to approve the borrowing of this special loan under Cap. 111.

I think that I should take this opportunity after a very long time of negotiations, and making requests that the Canadian Government will be making an announcement in the Canadian House of Commons tomorrow which will be of considerable assistance to Barbados' developmental efforts. The Minister of External Affairs has asked me not to anticipate the Canadian announcement, but I think that honourable members will understand what it will be. I have given this outline of this matter and if the acting Leader of the Opposition wishes to see the Agreement, here it is.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now stand part.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: I have not seen the outline to which the Prime Minister has referred. I believe that he made it available to another member of the Opposition; but there are just a few things that I would wish to make comments on on this particular matter. I was very pleased to hear from the Prime Minister indicating the statement of the OPEC countries that arose out of discussions last year between the then President of the Republic of Venezuela, Senor Perez and the Prime Minister of Barbados.

I believe that quite recently, not in this Chamber, but elsewhere, the Minister for External Affairs and member for Christ Church West, was heard to state that he was not satisfied with the state of relations between Venezuela

and Barbados; and twenty-four hours thereafter we heard the Prime Minister indicating that a loan of U.S. \$1.5 million is being made from the OPEC Special Fund, and that this arises out of the state of relations existing between Venezuela and Barbados. There seems to be some conflict here.

We have heard from the Minister of External Affairs that the state of Affairs of relations between Barbados and Venezuela may not be satisfactory; and then we heard the Prime Minister today indicating what good results have come out of that state of relations. I am hoping that steps will be taken by the Government to clarify this position.

First of all we would like to know about Venezuela, which is a member of OPEC what exactly is the state of relations between these two countries; and then when we pass on from that matter — I am not going too far down the road on that matter — there is the question of the local costs of funding of polytechnics and community projects. 8.35 p.m.

I am not aware of the specifics of this, which of the polyclinics and the community health projects will benefit from this particular loan if it is approved, what constitutes the local cost and over what period of time it is proposed to disburse these funds. Thirdly I would also wish some information as to exactly what is the state of the fund. Let me see if I can find it in the Addendum. Oh yes, it is within the authorised limits given to the Government by section 2 of the said Act, and I am wondering if the Minister of Finance could tell us what is the state of that particular matter, how much more leeway he has in terms of the borrowing limit. I believe it was sometime either earlier this year or late last year, I do not recall the exact time, that the limit was raised, but may be he can tell us what is the difference between the limit and what he has borrowed so far.

I do not propose to speak any further on this particular matter. It is good to know that Barbados is able to draw down what is I think a very modest amount. I must say that it is a very modest amount when you take into account the very high charges that are made for the oil that we have to purchase from the oil exporting countries, and we do hope that we would be able to benefit more substantially from this particular source of funding. I recall that recently the President of the Caribbean Development Bank made some statement, I believe I read that in the newspapers or heard it on the radio or on television, that the funding from OPEC tended to be given in terms of certain religious criteria, but I see here that we are benefitting from this particular special fund, and I do hope that while the door is open just slightly that we may be able to push it ajar a little more, and I hope that the skilled negotiations as evidenced by my colleague and friend the hon. member for Christ Church

West would bear greater fruit to the benefit of Barbados, because you know with the up-coming change of Government by constitutional means it is this present Opposition which will have to be no doubt conducting the negotiations in the future with OPEC and with other lending and funding agencies.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. The hon. member wants clarification on one particular point. I think I understood the Prime Minister to say that following discussions with President Perez that an application was forwarded to the OPEC Special Fund. I did not understand him to say in any way that Venezuela made a loan to Barbados of \$1.5 million; but I would wish to point out that the discussions about the approach to OPEC started some time in 1977 and the Prime Minister himself on his visit to Nigeria spoke to the then Head of State of Nigeria and we are indebted to the Government of Nigeria, Algeria and Venezuela for supporting the application which we made to the OPEC Special Fund for assistance in helping us with local cost funding, and we hope with any cost over-runs, but we will expect that cost over-runs will be kept to a minimum.

I should like to say that this is the first of several loans which we will get from OPEC Special Fund and I can assure the hon. member that we have recently forwarded to the OPEC Special Fund another application and which will be considered by the governing body of the Special Fund at its up-coming meeting in November. When I was in Washington earlier this year attending the Caribbean Group for Economic Cooperation, I had talks together with Mr. Emtage and Mr. Charlie Skeete with the Managing Director of the OPEC Special Fund and without committing the fund he did promise to give very favourable consideration to our application. This is very soft money. It is for twenty years, a five year grace period, interest at 4% and one half of one per cent service charge. It is almost on terms approaching what IDA, the International Development Association, gives.

The problem that Barbados has had in getting grant loan funds or soft loans has been its high GNP per capita, speaking in relative terms. We have a reasonably high GNP per capita. It has increased during the last three years under our administration. I am sure my honourable friend on the other side would like to hear that. It shows that the country has become richer under us and I would like to think that the distribution of growth in the country's wealth has become equal equally under us, and whether he thinks this is a sign that when the constitutional elections occur at whatever time that maybe the country will welcome an opportunity to return us again and he considers that a change in Government, it may be that there would not be the same people on the back bench and the front

bench; there may be few changes of places and I am sure there may not be the same people on the other side, but the Government looks forward to having its record in this country approved constitutionally by the people in 1981.

The hon. member should know that we have had problems in our relations with Venezuela. The Rt. Hon. member for St. John when he was Prime Minister went to Venezuela and tried to negotiate a special regime for oil on a government to government basis. Nothing came of that other than fair promises. We ourselves have followed up certain negotiations and other again than warm statements, nothing much has come to them. There are two areas in which we have had some success. One is the establishment of the Venezuelan Cultural Centre here; this is functioning now, and the second area has been in some increase in the sale of produce to which is a housing corporation looking after Government housing in Venezuela, and we have managed to sell that corporation about \$4 million in goods this year. Those are the areas in which we have had some success, but I cannot say we have had success in other areas. Let me hasten to add that we are at present negotiating with the Government of Venezuela about its contribution to Barbados proposed figure under the Caribbean Group for Economic Development on the second instalment, and I have some reason to believe that we may be successful on this occasion in getting Venezuela to put up more money. The terms of trade between ourselves and Venezuela are adverse to us and very favourable to Venezuela, and with the 700% increase in oil prices between 1973 and today, the transfer of resources from us to Venezuela has all been to Venezuela's benefit and at our expense; so we have a strong case to negotiate and indeed we have a strong case for Venezuelan support on these sorts of applications that are made to the OPEC Special Fund.

8.45 p.m.

I welcome the hon. member's assurance of his support. I notice he takes a very statesmanlike and bipartisan approach to this aspect of our affairs. I am hoping that we can, on foreign policy, at least put the nation first at all times.

Let me take this opportunity to welcome you as my shadow on the other side, Sir, on External Affairs and look forward to this House having an example of very good learning and inspiring material on matters of External Affairs during the period in which he holds the Portfolio and I have the honour to represent the Government side in that portfolio.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: All I would like to tell the hon. member is that the nominal value of loans raised under the Special Loans Act is just over \$200 million as at December 31st last year of which

\$108 million were outstanding. I think we can take it that some has been repaid during the course of the year to bring it down under the line.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AN INCREASE IN
THE ADVANCE MADE BY THE ACCOUNT-
ANT GENERAL TO THE POST-MASTER
GENERAL FOR THE PAYMENT OF
PUBLIC PENSIONS

Item No. 14 was called to move the passing of the Resolution to approve an increase in the advance made by the Accountant General to the Post-master General for the payment of public pensions.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is a very short matter, Sir. It relates to the payment of Government pensions by cheque. In 1968 the system of paying Government pensions was changed from payment by voucher to the Treasury to payment by cheque cashable at the Treasury, Commercial Banks or District Post Offices.

The system taken by the Attorney General as far as these were concerned was to make an advance of funds to allow the Post-master General to cash the cheques. The amount authorised is \$50,000. Since that might have been alright in 1968 when the pension payments being made by the Post-master General was only \$22,000 a month, however they are now \$111,000 a month and for an example in March of this year they were \$126,000 and probably more than that since the minimum pension has been raised to \$150,000. We are therefore asking for the Post-master General to have an advance of \$135,000 monthly at a time instead of \$50,000 so as to enable him to pay the pensions.

It is very difficult, Sir, because Government pensioners do not spread it out over the month. Ninety-five percent of the pensioners are paid in two days and it is in those two days that we need cash money and when there is only a limit of \$50,000 you really get difficulties sometimes with the Government pensioners coming and there is not enough money to pay them in the Post Offices and so on. I am therefore asking the House to approve an increase in the amount advanced which the Accountant General can make for the payment of pensions.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we will of course support any measure which will mean that the Government pensioners receive their pensions as speedily as possible and so we are not raising any objection to this particular measure. We know that there are pensioners who live considerably on a reduced income and so they will wish to get those funds as quickly as possible and certainly we welcome any provision for the increase in allowances which maybe made from time to time.

I recall that it must have been sometime in June or so of this year in which I believe certain increases in allowances were promised to pensioners and others in this country and there was, as I recall it, a promise by the Minister of Finance that there will be an income tax free month or some such promise was made I believe at some time in the Budget or subsequently.

It is my information that the Government pensioners have not to date benefitted in anyway from that promise and while certain persons who may draw salaries from the Treasury or indeed from private sources may not have had any deductions in terms of income made during certain months of this year, I am wondering if the Minister of Finance can tell us what is the position in relation to Government pensioners.

I have reason to believe that some correspondence went out from one of his Departments to the pensioners referring to some personal allowance so generously given by the Prime Minister. The wording did not seem to me to accord with the sort of mutual language that we should get from a Government Department when corresponding with clients of those departments and especially when in circumstances it might be considered that the wording could be considered to be favourable to the Government in its political capacity of which it unwittingly and I am not saying that any Government official would deliberately send out correspondence which would tend to favour a particular political party, but you know sometimes in some unwitting moment it might be that this can be the result.

The wording does sound to me a little infelicitous, if the members did have an opportunity to consider this matter and I wonder inasmuch as it is one of the major Departments relating to the responsibilities and Portfolio of the Prime Minister whether he would care to comment on this particular matter, whether he approves this kind of wording and whether he can inform this House and indeed the Government pensioners as to when the benefits which were expected to be derived from the increases in allowances, when the pensioners would be expected to benefit from them.

8.55 p.m.

I do not know if the computer has yet been programmed, or whatever the problems may be, but there are Government pensioners who are certainly raising some queries on this particular matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You can't always deal with matters that come by way of rumour even if you believe that the person concerned has really heard, who is obviously the hon. member. I really have no idea if any letters went out from some public officer so overwhelmed by the achievements of the Government that he found himself unable to contain his admiration of what the Government is doing for pensioners, but I have not seen such a letter. If the hon. member would care to send me a copy I would find out who wrote it, I might even discipline him if that is what the hon. member wishes me to do. I cannot discipline anybody but I might even refer him to the proper quarters, but I don't really believe the pensioner is losing anything from getting a letter of this sort.

I would also add, Sir, that I don't compute the pensions, I don't make the tax deductions, and I know it can take a long time for hon. members on the front bench here to get an income tax deduction or to get other matters dealt with expeditiously. It is not as if we can expect Ministers to be *au fait* with the nature of every letter that is written by the Government, to be *au fait* with the computation of pensions or the length of time it takes. If a specific complaint is made that a specific pensioner has not got an increase or he had to pay tax during June or whatever, I can deal with that, but when it is raised in the House of Assembly across the floor of the House, I could as well ask the hon. member to deal with the student at the back of his class who says she can't hear him properly. It may be so, it may not be so, but we can't deal with it on rumour. We have done our best for the pensioners and I think that our best is a good deal more than they got before.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

THE REGISTRATION OF JUDGMENTS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1979

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. Its purpose is simply to amend the Registration of Judgments Act so as to make the designation of parties to actions more accurate than they are at present.

When the Act was originally passed parties to actions were normally limited to plaintiffs and defendants. However, we now have applicants, correspondents, petitioners and respondents and judgments

involving money may be given against them even if it is limited to the payment of costs, and it is necessary to record those judgments, and therefore the Schedule to the Act should be amended to reflect this accurate position.

I am much indebted to Mr. Colin Williams of the firm of Messrs. Hutchinson and Banfield, Attorneys at Law, for drawing this situation to our attention. The Chief Justice has been consulted on the proposed amendments to the Act and considers that the present form of registration is inappropriate where defendants have succeeded in obtaining judgment, or when the party entitled to recover is the petitioner or respondent in the court proceedings.

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

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now the moment of interruption and I take it that the matter before the House is non-controversial,.....(Asides). So we may proceed.

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

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, 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.
9.05 p.m.

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

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.

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 of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1979-80 No. 8

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution relates to two projects which will be beneficial to the Police Department and is part of the Government's overall plan to make sure that the Police get not only better conditions of service of which we heard so much earlier today in this Chamber but also better physical conditions under which to carry out their work. The first part of the Resolution involves the sum of \$995,000 and this is to continue work at the District A Police Station and to complete the training of the Mobile Division as part of Phase 1 of the reorganization of the Police Department. We intend to continue this project into next year when we hope that the building presently being constructed will be completed and then we will move on to the building of an administration block.

The other part of the Resolution for approximately \$105,000 is for the new Police Station and Divisional Headquarters at Oistin. Again the Police Station at Oistin is outdated and will be demolished as part of the development of the Oistin area. The total cost of construction of the Police Station is \$1.185 million and the first part of the construction is hoped to be completed by the end of the year or early next year.

Part of the Resolution also changes the note to the Resolution for the construction of a Magistrate's court at Oistin under this Head, so that we can spend money for this new magistrate's court. The expected cost of this will be something like \$379,000. We have provided an amount in the Estimates for the magistrate's court and we are in a position to begin construction ahead of work on the Supreme Court. We are however presently planning the construction of the Supreme Court. The overall estimated cost is \$15 million, but I do not anticipate the construction on this can begin earlier than June 1980. However, construction of the court at Oistin can begin right away.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to second this Resolution, particularly as I have just returned from a visit abroad and enquired about the state of funding for the Fisheries terminal at Oistin and have been assured that by the end of October the authorizing Committee will authorize the spending of the necessary funds. Earlier today we passed a Resolution approving an agreement with OPEC for the loan of US\$1.5 million, so that I am sure the acting Leader of the Opposition will join with us in voting for this Resolution now that the totality of funding for all of the Oistin projects will receive the requisite approvals by the end of October and we can

look forward to seeing the work completed by an appropriate date in 1981.
9.15 p.m.

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

Head 116, Ministry of External Affairs, for the sum of \$90,000 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks a supplementary vote of \$90,000 to enable the Government to purchase a house for the Consul General at New York. You will recall that the house at New Rochelle was purchased some time in 1976. The house has proved unsuitable; but on the 18th of March, 1977 I gave this Committee an undertaking that I would not sell that house if it means selling it at a loss. We have had this house rented, but even then we could not keep a tenant in it; and we are in a position where we have had to purchase an alternate house which is nearer to the bulk of Barbadian residents.

I have not yet made up my mind as to whether we will proceed with the sale of New Rochelle or have it available for one of the people on the United Nations staff, although reports have been made that the travelling time from house to office is so much that it is probably very arduous to have officers living at this house; and I propose, after consultation whether to proceed with the sale of the New Rochelle house and replacing it by a house in another area.

I will say that the policy of the Ministry is to continue to purchase houses so that all of our officers who have to live overseas in different capitals will find that they have available housing accommodation of the requisite standard. At present I am faced with the position that every year there is an increase in the rental of premises which we have to lease for the accommodation of our officers in the Foreign Service; and indeed the Government some years ago set out on a course of purchasing houses every year. I believe that we would have saved a considerable sum of money rather than more and more proceeding with the leasing of houses for officers. We propose to consider whether in London, in Canada and in the United States of America where we have been maintaining leases for a long time, if we cannot acquire certain premises in order that our officers can be properly housed.

Mr. Chairman, I am also giving the House an indication that the Government will lay down guidelines for the purchase of houses so that the former practice of people choosing a house and the Minister not being informed of what is happening will cease. I have got these guidelines

available and if any hon. member of the House wishes to see them, I will be only too happy to make them available. Indeed, if hon. members want me to make the guidelines a document of the House, I will be prepared to do so; but there is a set procedure now for the purchase of any house on behalf of the Government. The criteria have been laid down, and in each case we get a proper report an inspection is carried out by someone in the foreign service and someone in the Ministry of Finance or the Ministry of Housing. In this case the house has been inspected by Sir Carlisle Burton, head of the civil service, and an engineer's report has been obtained, Mr. Maycock, the Charge d'Affaires at the United Nations also inspected the House; and we have also had a technical opinion from Mr. Webster who is an expert in the Ministry of Finance.

I am satisfied that the price is reasonable and that this purchase will meet our criteria. As I have said, I am prepared to make available the guidelines which have been worked out by the Ministry. Therefore I now beg to move that this Head stand part.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

Head 22 Item 1 – was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this is a recommendation of the Debates Committee. There are no funds in the vote to allow it; and the Debates Committee has concurred in the recommendation to grant these facilities, Sir; and it is necessary to approve this Order.

I beg to move that this Head do now stand part.

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that we do now report the passing of two resolutions in Committee.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the Resolutions were agreed to.

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, 23rd at 12 noon.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you put the motion there is one announcement that you omitted to make earlier in today's proceedings. I have received copies of the Accounts and Statements for the month of August 1979 as prepared by the Accountant General.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 23rd October, 1979 at 12 noon was put and agreed to without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.25 p.m.