
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976-81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 7th October, 1980

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock, on Tuesday, 7th October, 1980.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Q.C., M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. 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); and Mr. L. L. SISNETT.

Prayers were read.

Mr. TAITT, Hon. L. S. CRAIG and Dr. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 16th September 1980.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that these Minutes be deferred, I do not believe that Hon. Members would have had enough opportunity of dealing with the matters.

I beg to move that they be deferred.

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

The question that the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 16th September, 1980 be deferred, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 30th September, 1980.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move, Sir, that these Minutes be deferred.

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

The question that the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 30th September, 1980 be deferred, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to lay:

Report of the National Insurance Board on its Operations under the Sugar Workers' (Provident Fund) Act for the year 1979.

The Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the years 1976, 1977 and 1978.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Education, I beg to lay:

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Community College for the year 1st September 1978 to 31st August 1979.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1980-81 NO. 9 —
RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE SUM OF
\$6,000 FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$6,000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates

1980-81, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1980-81, No. 9, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Mount Tabor, St. John, for the construction of a Primary School and also a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Husbands and Oxnards, St. James, for the provision of recreational facilities and also a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bank Hall, St. Michael, for housing development.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken and that Item No. 3 be the Instant Order of the Day, Sir.

I am also to advise Sir, that the Chairman of Committees, the Hon. Member for St. George North Sir, is out of the Island and I beg to move Sir, subject to.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You are advised that he is absent.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes Sir. I am advised that he is absent and I beg to move Sir, that the Hon. Member for St. Philip South be appointed to act today, Sir, for the remainder of this Sitting.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING OF LAND AT PRESCOD BOULEVARD, ST. MICHAEL IN MILL REEF CO. LTD.

Order No. 3 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve of the vesting of land at Prescod Boulevard, St. Michael in Mill Reef Co. Ltd.

His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE entered the Chamber and took his seat.

12.30 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is seeking to lease a portion of land of some 1466 square

metres along the Harbour Industrial Park on Prescod Boulevard. It is for the purpose of vesting a portion of land of 1466 square metres in Mill Reef Co. Ltd. It is somewhere there in the area where for some time we have been allowing places like the Nation and H.B. Niblock to lease the land and these places of which the hon. member for St. Michael South West was complaining and on one occasion spoke about the beautification of the area.

The purpose of the land, Sir, is for another extension and is part and parcel of the very interesting aspect of the Government's developmental programme which no doubt each and everyone can be justly proud of on this occasion. I do not think that the hon. member for St. Michael South West will turn a blind eye to the improvement in the country's development, including the country's economy, the expansion in its work force and so on, and this is just another attempt rather than leaving the land as it is which he complains about, which I think is very close to his constituency, we are seeking to have this vested in the company.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that, and in seconding it I just want to point out that this is probably one of the few remaining pieces that are left. As we explained originally, the Government after consideration with Town Planning Department as to the best use for this piece of land, and having regard to this situation, arrived at the conclusion that the lands were too narrow to permit industrial development but that there was nothing objectionable in development going along there provided that no exits or entrances were permitted on the Harbour Road side. Consequently, all the land owners whose lands are situated on Fontabelle and on whose lands this abuts and bounds were offered on the same terms and conditions the opportunity to lease this land on the clear understanding that the lease would go with the owner for the time being of the plot on Fontabelle.

Now that we are widening Fontabelle it is the consensus that that would be the best way of dealing with this area of land which from the Cabinet Papers it is clear that as long ago as 1962 some thought was given as to the best use for this land. Some of the leases have already been granted with this Legislature's approval, and I am very pleased to say that some activity is taking place on one parcel and that we hope to clean up the whole of that area.

Hon. members will have noticed that in respect of the area of land aback of Herbert House, which is Government property and which the Civil Aviation Department of my Ministry occupies pending the building of a new building next to the Tourist Board, we have

created a very nice pathway connecting Fontabelle with this area so that people who work along that road in the future will not have to walk from midway in that area right up either next to Motor Services or go right around Manning, Wilkinson and Challenor. We hope that another pathway will be created along the area by the new Civil Aviation building so that people who work on this side of the harbour will be able also to go through there. So with the two pathways connecting Fontabelle to Prescod Boulevard and the existence of entrances and exits along that area, I think that we can have that area cleaned up and it would redound to the credit of all of us in Barbados if we have a nicely landscaped area there being fully utilised in conjunction with the plots on Fontabelle. Thank you.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that we on this Side will not be contending or contesting this Resolution, but I wish to take the opportunity on the Resolution once more to draw to the attention of the hon. member who has just spoken....

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be some order, and an hon. member must not be discourteous to the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I do not know if you are making reference to the other members about being discourteous to the Chair. I know, Sir, that you are well *au fait* with the House of Commons' standards and when you go into the House of Commons in London you see them lying down sleeping, and if I am speaking to my colleagues I think I am entitled to speak to them in undertones, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is for the Chair to show its coolness under all stress, but the Hon. Minister will not be allowed in this Hon. House to back the Chair whether conversing with his colleagues or with anyone else. This is the House of Assembly, the ante-room is there and the members' Lobby. He can roll up, he can sleep up, he can jump up as he likes, but in here he will sit only as hon. members are requested to do by the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not hear the hon. member on this matter.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I shall be very grateful if you will explain to me how I should sit, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He with his old stupid ideas). I will not hear the hon. member now about any stupid ideas. I am not going to be dishonest, if I hear the hon. member I will deal with the hon. member. Please!

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was saying that I would like to take this opportunity to draw once again to the attention of the hon. member, the Minister responsible for the environment, as well as his colleague, the hon. member responsible for industry, that while their efforts coincide with ours in the context of how this area should be developed — and I think the hon. member who just sat down acknowledged that it is an ongoing exercise — I think it is necessary for the Government to draw very forcefully to the attention of those persons who are leasing this land their wish, the Government's wish and the wish of all of us, to see that land utilised in the way which the Government has indicated it will be utilised.

12.40 p.m.

It is ironic that as I was passing by that same area earlier today I saw some works going on aback of the lumber yard where apparently they are laying some, I do not know if it is a foundation or they are hardening the surface for a parking area or whatever, but the manner in which it appeared to me as I passed, it appeared to me the amount of care which would normally be exercised if it was the front of the building was not necessarily being exercised. I am not casting any aspersions on the particular establishment. All I am saying is that there should be rigid standards of landscaping required by the Government for that particular area, because while it may form the back of the business, for us who have to pass there it is the front, and I think that all sides share this particular view.

I note with a certain amount of pleasure that the hon. member for Christ Church East in another capacity has indicated that at long last some steps are being taken to create a building on that part of the Harbour as one exists from the gate of the Harbour and that this building will be fulfilling the functions which had been discussed I believe as long as six to seven years ago. The idea was that we would have a three or four-storey building on that area which would provide office space not only for Government and quasi Government agencies, but for a number of other companies whose business is connected with activities in the Port, and I hope that the plans will still include a major area for handicrafts and other similar business both by the Government, the Government's Handicraft Centre, and the other agencies connected with handicraft development in Barbados, because there are other private and quasi private agencies that are dealing with handicraft development which I believe will require more space than the present emporium provides if we are to develop industries along the right path. So that all I am saying on my feet is that I am asking the Government to take particular pains to make sure that entrepreneurs along this route do not offer lip service to the conditions of the lease which they have indicated to us while in fact allowing the area to go to waste.

One recognises that recent rains would have contributed to the present condition in which the whole Harbour area appears to be, but I hope that soon and very soon it will be returned to an environmental approach, an environmental picture similar to that which we are accustomed to both along Trevor's Way and on the other side which I believe is maintained by the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation. I do not believe, Sir, that the question of the environment in which we function should form the basis of any controversy between political sides. I think that all persons of goodwill in Barbados wish to see that these areas that are public areas serve the people of Barbados not only in the utility value, but in their environmental capacity to make life a little easier to all concerned.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, let me assure the hon. member for St. Michael South West that in respect of the lands which we have leased to these persons, I have been given the assurance by many of them to whom I have spoken privately and it is a wish of mine to see that whole area which is a highway kept in a very clean and beautiful condition. Along the Spring Garden Road which is now under construction you would recognise that there is a divider in the middle of the road. I am not sure what the landscaping architect in the Parks and Beaches Division's plans are, whether he is going to have trees along there as along Trevor's Way, or if he is going to have flowers, but it is my whole dream as long as I am Minister of the Environment, to see Barbados as a beautiful garden. I may not be able to tell you exactly how I see it, but it would be like a flowering garden. I would like to see all the bush that you have along the highways cleaned up, and I believe that we are small enough that with a bit of education in the schools whereby people will be able to understand that the nicer they keep the entire place, the more pleasant it would be for them and for all visitors. That is why, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the history of Barbados such a rare field as a landscaping architect was brought into the Ministry of Housing.

Along the route to Grantley Adams International Airport, we have already put in, I think there are hibiscus or oleander on the side of the road. I know one of the problems we have is that we are trying to get the people living on the other side of the street to lend a hand and allow us where they may have grass to put flowering plants along there for the purpose of giving a nice blend. That is how I am seeing the whole country and its highways, and I would like to thank the hon. member because I think we share these things. There are a number of things we want shared, but there are only a few things we do not share now and that is the increase in salaries; but there is nothing wrong with that, because some of your colleagues do not share that. I will try my very best to make sure that Barbados is a pleasing place to the eye along the Harbour Road where the Bowen's car

museum is. I know many people see it as an eyesore. This is in your constituency, and we are negotiating with Mr. Bowen who is quite anxious himself to move from there and to have his car museum somewhere else. We are trying to make sure especially now it is raining that the country is kept beautiful. I believe in looking at the lush green pastures in Barbados.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LANDS AT WALMER LODGE, PARADISE, DANESBURY, SPRING GARDEN, BRIGHTON AND EXMOUTH GAP, ST. MICHAEL FOR THE PURPOSES OF ROAD DEVELOPMENT

Item No. 7 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of lands at Walmer Lodge, Paradise, Danesbury, Spring Garden, Brighton and Exmouth Gap, St. Michael for the purposes of road development.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I think that we are well aware of the fact of the Spring Garden Highway or whatever it is going to be called. This is a matter of acquiring such pieces of land so as to move into Phase II of the Highway. There are a number of persons involved and there are titles involved such as Paradise Beach Club Limited at Walmer Lodge, at Danesbury, etc., etc.

I do not think that I would need to say much more on this since one can see the actual construction of the road. It has been in use already although it is not entirely completed yet and if there are any questions which may be necessary to be answered, I am quite sure that since I am the Minister of Housing and concerned with the acquisitions, that the Minister of Communications and Works would probably be able to answer any questions if need be.

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

Mr. M. C. C. WARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, just a few questions on this Resolution. I wonder if the Minister and/or his colleagues is now able to tell us precisely where the road will exit on to Highway 1. I recall that when it was being planned the Town Planner and other persons concerned had indicated that there would be a round-about at or near the corner of the road leading to the Cave Hill Campus.

Subsequently, I heard there had been a revision of the plan so as to deal with the established hotel which is at the top of the Paradise Beach Gap and at one point the road was scheduled to go through that hotel and then subsequently I believe it was diverted to go around it in some kind of a circular route.

I think it is very important that we have some idea as to how the traffic flows are going to be functioning for persons coming from the north and going on to the Highway to by-pass the Eagle Hall area and conversely persons coming from the South going North who would wish to return via that route might wish to know what are the proposed plans.

I wonder if the Minister is able to indicate what exactly will be happening, if anything, with the Deacon's Road part of that general area. I recognise that Deacon's Road does not form a specific part of the road but is a feeder road. One might get the kind of problem which now occurs as persons come towards Eagle Hall coming from the North tend, in order to beat the traffic lights, to come through smaller routes which were not designed for such heavy traffic. The result is that a road like Bridge Gap and Fourth Avenue, Goodlands, those roads have now become virtually Highways in terms of the number of vehicles that pass on them whereas from the service point of view they serve nothing more than secondary and tertiary roads and I suspect that with the coming of the Highway that the entire area of Deacon's Road and its surrounding areas would be subjected to much heavier traffic flow.

I am wondering if the Government is in a position at this stage to indicate how they propose to deal with that additional traffic flow which would come out of the secondary roads.

Going back to the acquisition itself. I note that Danesbury and parts of Paradise and parts of Spring Garden will be taken and again I am wondering whether the opportunity will be taken to deal with the Spring Garden Road which now exits just below or about, depending on the point of view, the Farm. If there is going to be any change in that area or whether there are going to be a few roads running off the main Highway that will criss-cross what would become an Industrial area.

I should like, if it is possible at this stage, to see what the relationship will be between the Industrial area and the main road as it affects the environmental area below Paradise Beach.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, I must observe that recently the sea or the beach area stretching from just at the bottom of Spring Garden, and going by the way of Batt's Rock has been taking on an increasingly changed picture, not necessarily for the better as one looks at it.

I note with some consternation that Paradise Beach in an effort to deal with the security problems have found it necessary to encompass their property with what we in Barbados call palings. In setting up the palings of the Paradise Beach, however, they have not shown any assiduous eye towards the beauty of the beach and even though it is a temporary measure from what I understand, there is no question that the whole beach area now takes a look which I am sure the hon. member for Christ Church North Central would agree is far from what the Paradise Beach is accustomed to looking like.

Also, Mr. Speaker, arising out of the changing use of land up on top of the hill at Paradise Beach waters that are cascading down from the old development area are now apparently finding their own paths the result of which is that the whole physical features of that very large ridge just before Paradise Beach is changing very rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, only persons who are accustomed traversing this land would recognise these changing features and I am not saying that it is the fault of anyone. I am merely drawing attention to the Government that there needs to be a total plan for this area if we are not, in 20 or 25 years from now, going to see it change completely.

A considerable amount of building has been going on by the Paradise Beach people and they are in fact putting a large quantity of population per environmental square metre. A substantial large population is now being imposed on that service area and I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, as an amateur observer of the environment whether we might not have to restrict the actual per metre occupation in that whole area going from Spring Garden up to Batt's Rock because the service area is made up of entirely different rock structure as far as one can observe than that which can be found higher up say in the White Hall/Cave Hill area and whereas that area has been able to absorb more punishment I think than this relatively young rock just on top of the Paradise Beach area is being subjected to some fairly harsh treatment.

I would like the Minister at the same time to take the opportunity to enlighten us as to what plans they have for the kinds of industry which will be going on in that broad area of Spring Garden.
1.00 p.m.

I recall, that there were tentative questions about the placing of a Petro Chemical Plant, in that particular area and my inclination, Mr. Speaker, is that any Petro Chemical, or similar plant, any chemical industry plant, which is being placed in that area ought to have, if it must be placed there, the strictest and the most far reaching restrictions on the expulsion of its effluent because Sir again, because of the movement of the tides in that general area, when once the Brandon, Paradise Beach,

Batts Rock area starts to deteriorate, it will only be a matter of time before it swings around, for want of a better word, promontory.

The West Coast is literally exposed from there, almost up to the top at the North, so it will be extremely important and very necessary, that we have literal beach management, along that area and so, while this Resolution deals with the transportation aspects of the development of that area, I would imagine that the Government has a total Plan for the development of that Black Rock, St. James area. If that is not so, I would encourage the Government to seek technical assistance, by way of Beach Management advice, on how we should develop that area, without any loss to the community, as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are areas in Florida which, over the last 20 years have shown substantial deterioration, in such a way, as to render those areas almost unfit for human habitation, in a very short time. Arising out of that, there have been a number of studies done on the management of beach property and while resources of Barbados might not permit some, of the extent to which such studies have been carried along the Florida Coast, we, in Barbados, should still be able and ought to make sure, that we do take serious steps to ensure that whatever development we have, whether it is transportation, whether it is for tourism, that whatever development we have, will be development which will enhance the country's resources, the beach resources especially, not only for our use and for the next generation, but for many generations of Barbadians to come.

Mr. M. C. C. WARD: Mr. Speaker, within the last one year, or so, numbers of Resolutions have come before Parliament dealing with the buying of land North of Bridgetown and you can quite see that Government, or the people of Barbados really have no alternative, but to move in that area where development can take place, such as below Spring Garden, and going right down, as far as, Batts Rock, as the former Speaker said.

It is undoubtedly an indication, that the country is progressing very favourable. I am sure that when people, from other countries come to Barbados, especially in the Caribbean, that they are astonished at development which is going on here. But, I would like to make a few remarks now, Mr. Speaker, and the first is that I hope that the Hon. Minister responsible takes advantage of the fact that Hanschell Land is going to be sold out because of the Act just passed and buys land in an "L" shape surrounding the Eagle Hall market. That is the most unhealthy area, perhaps in St. Michael. If you pass there, Mr. Speaker, it is atrocious and the land in the "L" shape coming from the Roxy and right around by, I think Sir, Electro Sales and Service should be bought in front of Mr. Searles service station and all that property should be made a

parking area and proper hygienic conditions where people can go and buy from that market. Anyhow, that is one point which I want to make.

With regard a few comments which the Hon. Member made about the sea coast. Mr. Speaker, I think that every Barbadian is aware that within the last few years, for reasons not related to the people of Barbados, the sea coast has been making a change and these are just natural conditions. It is true that the recent extension of the Deep Water Harbour has put a magnificent beach behind Brighton and the beach towards Paradise has been reduced.

I would just like to draw the attention of the Hon. Member who just spoke, that the fences which he referred to — I have not anybody to defend, Mr. Speaker, but I am just putting the facts — were built maybe 15 years ago. But, what has happened is that the tide had suddenly started to move and the people had to put the boulders there, just to protect the buildings there. They would prefer not to have the boulders because it is a very beautiful beach for people to swim, but there was no alternative, but to protect the buildings.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of elucidation, if the Hon. Member would give way. I am not concerned with that aspect of the development. I am dealing more with the ridge on top of the Paradise Beach, not with the beach around the corner from Spring Garden, and I was dealing more with what has been happening, as a result of the developments higher up.

More water is coming up, at greater speed, *et cetera*, *et cetera*. I was not too concerned about the boulders around the corner.

Mr. M. C. C. WARD: I am not aware of these fences which the Hon. Member referred to, Mr. Speaker. What is there, is a temporary fence which was put down by a construction company, which will remove it shortly, as soon as, the building under the hill is finished.

But, as to drains, the Hon. Member who just spoke, knows Black Rock as well as, I do, and the Government is at present improving the drain which runs in front of the property where the Hon. Member lives in Stanmore Crescent, running under Kentucky Fry Chicken. They are now improving that drain going to the sea, so that takes up all of the water from Free Hill, as well as, Stanmore Crescent and the gutters which were built 20 years ago, drain the water all afront of Black Rock, going down in a natural dry drain, at the bottom of the University Hill. So, I am a little surprised to hear about this water going down at various places because those two drains adequately drain the entire Black Rock area and indeed, all of Free Hill and much of Cave Hill. So, I do not know what he is referring to, Mr. Speaker.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise as Hon. Minister responsible for Planning in this matter because the very thoughtful speech of the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West raises so many questions, that I am wondering if he is thinking of changing constituencies, Sir.

I am not competent to deal with the Geological matters which he raised, as to the younger rocks at Paradise Beach Club, than the rocks in the Cave Hill area which I believe he is familiar, from the titular point of view, even if not the residential. But, the Ministry of Planning had to address itself to nearly all the questions which he raises, the industrial questions, as to the types of industry, the drainage questions, the traffic problems, as well as, the technical assistance in beach management. All of these are regularly discussed at the Planning and Priorities Committee and regularly dealt with by the Ministry of Planning.

There is no Plan, so far as I know, to increase the density of occupation between the present Highway I and the sea. There is a Plan to increase the density of occupation in the next ridge, West Ridge, which is a little to the North, the great, new Housing Scheme in West Ridge which has recently been opened.

We are very aware of the undesirability of overcrowding a beach, but I think that the population, along the beach will be reduced, rather than increased, as a result of the Spring Garden Road because the Brandon area will be restricting.

1.10 p.m.

There are no plans to have any residential development of any sort between the ridge and the sea, the Brighton area, the present swamp. There is no question of draining the swamp for residential purposes. Recreational purposes are going to occupy the southern edge with light industrial warehousing has been identified for various parcels of land along the northern edge but there are no plans for raising population densities along the ridge itself, between Highway I and the edge of the ridge itself or between the rest of the ridge.

The road will take off from where it has reached now and go through the western edge of Brandon, through the swamp, across Brighton Road, go to Spring Garden and begin to climb. There may be some excavation of the western edge of the cliff to allow the road to climb. The roundabout design has now been abandoned, and the design allowing for ordinary exit on to Highway I between Paradise Gap and University Drive, I believe, has been finally adopted, a slip design.

Now the hon. member asked for planned subsidiary roads in the alluvial plains of Black Rock through Spring Garden. Again, I do not know of any plans to add to the

existing road pattern. The problem really is how to prevent the existing roads from discharging traffic in such a way on to the new major road as to interrupt its use as a high speed road. Hon. members may have observed that already Westbury New Road effectively will only by a left turn out of it, because a traffic island is being built across the glacier to Westbury New Road, so that when you drive along Westbury New Road you will have to turn left, you will not be able to turn right to interrupt the flow of traffic. The same is true of Thorne's Gap, and all of these are measures designed to prevent those roads being used to interrupt the flow of traffic on the main road.

The Minister of Communications and Works no doubt has the whole plan, but I believe that an intersection is planned for the Brighton Road. I am not sure if it will be traffic light controlled in the early stages but it will be a minor road into major road intersection, because it is recognised that this road does carry a good deal of traffic to the west of the new highway and therefore a road for it is still envisaged. We are having a little difficulty with Beach Path, but I believe that Beach Path will probably be blocked at the road. Beach Path will become a road, not an access to "Piley" by which name the hon. member will know the facilities that are now there, it will become a road of access to two playing fields, because we are planning to level and grass over the area immediately to the west of the Farm Housing Area to provide a very large playing field. It will be an adequate size for a full size cricket ground, and the other side of Beach Path we are also planning to put into recreational space. At the moment we are looking at the possibility of having one of the horse paddocks which has been associated with Brighton for so long sited there.

We think it is a very nice site, it is surrounded by trees, and there really is no other use, we have been advised that the subsoil is inadequate to support any use other than a large playing field, without great expense, so we are planning a very large recreational area there. Indeed, I am saying that we are planning, Sir, I had wished that we had gone further than the plans, I had hoped to see the new playing field on the western part finished by Christmas, but perhaps I will hear from other Ministers how far that has gone. This is one of these multi-Ministry things, Sir, in which you never know what is going on until all of you get together at planning meetings and discuss it.

The hon. member asked about the kinds of industry. We have had a study which was prepared -- I cannot call it a master plan, I will have to call it a master proposal -- that has parcelled out the different lots along the line of the new road through the swamp and the present unused areas and it indicates different uses that it has recommended to the Government.

The Industrial Development Corporation does not see the need for an industrial park as such along the road, and in that I concur, so we are offering some of the areas for warehousing and light industries associated with warehousing. Hon. members will see that a very large warehousing scheme is going up in the Exmouth area, even though the road is not finished. This scheme is now being put together. There is, I believe, another proposal for a rum bottling and warehousing unit on another part of the road and we have received many applications, Sir. We have received applications from people who want areas to park construction vehicles, in other words they want a large construction yard along the road; we have rejected that one. We have had other suggestions that properly fenced and secluded part of this road would be suitable for an, if not the, old car museum, the wrecks and car park business. We have received applications for factory space as such, people that want to do furniture manufacturing and other things, and all of these are under consideration.

It will be observed that the whole area is very rapidly moving into industrial use, because I think it is the CIEL and associated companies have gone a great distance already with warehousing. When we reach Spring Garden, this has been identified for heavier industry. Already there is a power station, I believe there are plans to expand it, there are also a number of petroleum operations, places where the storage, where gas is bottled, and so on, and I believe that it is intended that this continue, and the hon. member is quite correct in saying a chemical plant has also been identified, a spot has been identified for a chemical plant. He may be absolutely assured that the Ministry of Health will pay particular attention to the problems of effluent. I will say this, though, Sir, the Rum Refinery, the Electric Company, Texaco are already contributing a fair amount to the problem of effluent in the area. There is a very dirty river with a bad smell and a lot of bad looking organisms in it, the Rum Refinery's effluent over the years, it seems to me that it has sterilised — I wouldn't like to say sanitized — the water where the effluent is discharged, because you cannot even find a black sea egg in that water, you really cannot find anything there so much. I do not know what the Rum Refinery pours out, fusel-oil and whatever the by-products of the alcohol business are, Sir, but so much has been poured into the water that marine life just at that particular point it seems to me to be totally entirely dead, and indeed I think that just north of it whenever that river comes out a great deal of unpleasant effluent is also discharged. However, Barbados is fortunate that the current sets to the west and things that you throw into the water very rapidly go out to sea, they do not seem to disperse themselves along the coast.

The question of a swimming around the promontory is also under consideration. The Government has

paid a lot of attention to these matters. We have had an OAS study, we had a study by a Mr. Deane which pretty well covered the coastline of Chancery Lane to the Hilton, and we now have a Dr. Chambers who is dealing with aspects of the coastline from the Hilton northward. Those of us with an interest in Brighton beach, Sir, are certainly not standing by and seeing the clear waters of that as yet salubrious bathing place destroyed by industrial waste.

1.20 p.m.

We have sought technical assistance in the beach management and we are getting it. The road, Sir, we believe will make a major difference to the northern part of the parish of St. Michael now so thickly populated that it is clear that the representational needs of the people require some expansion as far as this Chamber is concerned. We are sure that the traffic problems now met on Highway 1 can largely be solved by the road, although it should not be believed that Eagle Hall will cease to be used. Our traffic study has indicated that 40% of the present Eagle Hall traffic at least will still pass through Eagle Hall, and indeed with the improvements that are being planned for the junctions at Eastmond Corner, Belleville, Culloden Road and the Garrison that even more traffic may pass through than at present. I see the hon. member for St. Michael South Central pricking his ears up when I mention Culloden Road. He can rest assured that we are paying attention to the roads in Bonnetts and in Brittons Hill as well. It is intended that a lot of the north south traffic that is not meaning to go through Bridgetown will still go through Eagle Hall, but we do hope that the traffic that comes into Bridgetown from the whole Cave Hill complex as well as the north of Barbados will use the new road.

There may be just one slightly inadequate link which arises out of the fact that the spine road was abandoned in previous times. If a spine road existed, there would not be the same need for a bypass of Bridgetown whether an inner or an outer, but in the absence of the spine road some bypassing is still required. Now the inner bypass will ultimately use Westbury Road. Indeed it will run very largely along the boundaries of the hon. member's constituency: Country Road, Passage Road, Westbury Road and so on. This will be the inner bypass. The linkage between Westbury Road and the new highway will still have to continue to be President Kennedy Drive, but I do not think that would be a great inconvenience to motorists to have to go down Westbury Road and turn left to get on to the new road. I do not think that in the end would be a great inconvenience. Certainly it would be less inconvenient than some of the journeys which at present they have to make to get around Bridgetown without undue holding up.

Perhaps the more spectacular effect of this new road will be the arrangements made to conduct the

traffic into Bridgetown and I do know, I have been asked outside the House, whether the Government intends to pull down all the buildings in Cheapside, the galleried buildings and so on. I am glad to be in a position to give an assurance that out of the seventeen buildings which the National Trust in a representation that they made to Government asked to be preserved due to their historical and traditional importance, in only two cases has it really proved quite impossible to preserve them, and in one of these cases the building was in very bad condition anyhow. It may have had architectural importance, but it was virtually an abandoned building. There really is only one of the valuable buildings in Cheapside that I understood might have to be sacrificed, but I see it is still standing. On the western side of the road the existing galleried buildings will be preserved. The Church wall of St. Mary's Church yard, amicable arrangements have been made with the Church to set the wall back to accommodate the new buildings, so that for example you do not have to knock down the Town Hall or that group of buildings next to the old Town Hall. The group of buildings without too much architectural merit right next to the Cheapside Market will be demolished, I hope, shortly, and the businesses which are carried on in them relocated, but it is not intended to remove the facilities that certain street vendors have for selling their wares over the weekend. I am glad to see that hon. members opposite appreciate the Government's concern that the traditional open-air Cheapside market as well as the closed one will be available to persons for their Saturday morning shopping.

As far as I can I have answered the questions that the Ministry of Planning has responsibility for arising out of the hon. member's speech.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems facing this country in relation to its development of roads and houses is the drainage of the entire country. The new Spring Garden Road has brought to light problems which were existing for quite a long time which would have to be tackled at this stage if we are to relieve some of our annual problems with flooding. I do not believe it is generally known that most of the water coming from the area of Warrens, Cave Hill, Spooners Hill, Oxnards, Grazettes, finds its way into the Bridgetown Harbour, and the hon. member was talking about the increased problems which might be present with the new Spring Garden Road. The consultants carried out a survey and it was necessary that certain drains be placed across the new Spring Garden road to remove flood waters. What has been discovered is that there was no proper survey done for drainage works which were attempted in previous years. You will note on the new Spring Garden road that there is a section between the Westbury New Road and the junction of the new road which has been created next to Berger which is unfinished. This is left for proper culverts to be placed;

but we have a problem which stretches back into the Goodland area. We have had to redesign the drainage; we are still looking at certain suggestions to remove the water from the Goodland area, Holders Land in particular in the area of Lands End and Smittens area. We are hoping to relieve flooding which normally takes place in that area by the new design and construction of the drain which passes through or used to form the river at the bottom of Lands End.

In the early Seventies, I believe a drainage study was carried out in this country, and unfortunately it was not implemented. At that time it was estimated that it would cost some \$30 million to remedy the drainage problems which were facing the country. I believe this year is the first year that any serious attempt has been made by Government to look at drainage. In the Annual Estimates we have \$11,399,507 specifically for drainage. We have had to go back into places like Oxnards and sink wells, around the Bank Hall area, and we have been sinking a number of wells in the Haggatt Hall area. We have had to sink numerous wells in order to trap the water before it gets into the Bridgetown area where it accumulates.

1.30 p.m.

I would say that Barbadians in their urge to acquire land and construct suitable housing have paid little respect to natural drainage which existed with the result that you have housing built in the water course and this has been part of the problem.

In the Freehill area for instance, the Ministry has had several complaints about drainage in the bottom of Freehill around the Black Rock area passing across the same area that the hon. member spoke about. It literally passes right through a woman's yard to find its way to the sea.

The Ministry has travelled the whole area and we have traced that water coming from Warrens on the new water course that used to take that water and divert it down into the St. James area. It never came down into the Black Rock area. That water flowed over the hill down to St. James through the fall near to your Honour's house and found its way to the sea but because of serious housing development it has taken a different course and now we have the problem of remedying the water to get it back to its natural outlets in St. James.

You have a similar thing in Goodland in Christ Church. A housing development went up and every time it rains you get a complaint that the area is flooded out but what we have to do is to sink as many wells as possible if we are to remedy the situation.

The Ministry recognises the problems that are existing but here again it is unfortunate that well-digging is

now one of the premium positions in this country. It was possible years ago, Mr. Speaker, to refuse well-diggers applying at the Ministry of Communications and Works. As a matter of fact, if you check the Personnel Division they had a long list of well-diggers they could call upon at any given time. With the housing boom that list is there, but the manpower is no longer available. We have found the problem that well-diggers would come in and they would dig down to probably 8 ft. or 10 ft. and you miss them. You cannot find them anymore.

We have been fortunate that we have a Contractor who has stuck to the Ministry and we have been able to relieve, I believe, some of the problems which are not large. We are working on the drainage across Black Rock Road. We are trying to remedy that now and we are hoping in the near future to be able to create a system across the new Spring Garden Road which would relieve most of the back-up water from the Goodland area.

The hon. member asked about the area in Brighton/Spring Garden. The Planning and Priorities Committee of Government has agreed that we should investigate a further break-water system to the Harbour which will fall somewhere in the Spring Garden area. It was recommended when the Harbour was extended that we should look at another break-water but that was not scheduled to come into operation before 1990. With the expansion of the Harbour, the new Spring Garden Road, and having seen what happened in the inner basin during the last Hurricane, the Cabinet decided that we should look at this break-water now and it will probably take another two years before we reach the construction stage but the feasibility study is being carried out for the construction of that break-water.

Along Brighton's Beach we have recognised that the new road would prevent persons who traditionally crossed that beach to the sea and my Ministry has instructed the Consultants to look at an over-pass. There are three or four roads which come over the Deacon Road/Goodland/Brighton area that give access to that Beach. There are in most places cul-de-sacs. You drive down to the end of the road and then you walk down the beach to the sea. We do not wish to deprive persons who have been enjoying their morning sea bathes along that beach for so long as I can remember.

I, myself, grew up in that area and I regret that now when I visit my mother's house I would not be able to cross the road to get into the sea because I understand that the Customs has insisted that we expand that whole area down to the Flour Mill. You can walk along the road but we will provide an over-pass which would facilitate persons to get into the sea and at the same time facilitate traffic that would pass that way leaving Bridgetown travelling towards the North.

Mr. Speaker, basically that is the condition in that area. As I said, drainage will present a problem. My Ministry has planned to cover the drainage works not only in the Bridgetown area but throughout the Island. As I understand, they have lifted certain sections out of the original plan. It would need up-dating as we go along and for my own sake I would be happy if plantations as a whole in the country that have covered over a number of suck wells that used to exist in the canefields, if they would re-open those suck wells.

I recognise that the modern means of cultivation would make it difficult to avoid suck wells but any persons travelling along those streets on a rainy day can now see water flowing out the main falls running down the road. Not only that it causes flooding in the collection areas but the water has been responsible for most of the damage done on the large major Highways over the past three years.

Up to 1976, I believe, the rainfall never exceeded 50 ins. or 55 ins. in a particular year. Between 1976 and especially last year St. Lucy alone had 98 inches of rain and this in itself causes a lot of problems where roads are concerned. I believe those persons who observe what is happening on our roads will notice that the Ministry has just introduced small compactors, the size of lawn mowers. We have been advised that with the rainy season and with the poor quality of the road-making material available to us today, that we have to attach new methods for our road construction. We have been able to acquire six of these road compactors. Preliminary Reports indicates that they are doing a very good job.
1.40 p.m.

It is going to be a national effort, if we want to control flooding and if we want to control road repairs. If persons would take greater care in the construction of houses, observe waterways and probably find designs which can accommodate both the houses and the flood waters and if the plantations will look at the number of suck wells which previously existed and either re-open them, or help to control the water. I can call names of many plantations, where you can see water coming through what we term, as cart roads. There does not seem to be any effort to control this water flowing on to our main roads. If something can be done, I believe that all of us could be happy in the long run.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item Number Six is the Instant Order of the Day.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LANDS AT ST. BARNABAS AND MOUNT FRIENDSHIP, ST. MICHAEL AND UPTON, CHRIST CHURCH FOR THE PURPOSE OF HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this Resolution, takes a similar slant to the other Resolution. It is for the purpose of highway improvement, along the St. Barnabas area. I am told that is supposed to be part of the ring road, Sir and this sets about to acquire those parcels of land which are necessary to make this aspect of our road improvement also possible.

I do not think that I need to expand on this, in the light that those persons, the Hon. Minister, or Hon. Ministers who are responsible for such part of the development of our country, Mr. Speaker, would probably answer whatever questions are necessary. I am only the Hon. Minister having the acquisitions carried through and therefore, I beg to move Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. Members in favour please say.....

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Resolution, which I fully support deals with lands to be acquired in part of my Constituency and therefore, I feel that it is my duty to speak on this particular Resolution, for a number of reasons, Mr. Speaker.

The road which is supposed to be improved, stretching from the Wildey junction, right on to the Highway 5 will be some 1.9 kilometers in length, with a width of some 7 meters and the reason for this road improvement is mainly to facilitate the traffic which would be using the road, which will connect persons on to the Polytechnic which, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is situated in the Wildey area. It is therefore, part of a Government's responsibility to have an access road made, which would ease the flow of traffic and at the same time, alleviate some of the problems which are currently experienced in the Chapel Gap area.

The acquisition will see some of the properties acquired and it would mean, that some of the residents living in the St. Barnabas, Mount Friendship and the Chapel Gap area will have to resited. As the Parliamentary Representative of this area, I will wish to see the resiting of these people in the immediate area east of the St. Barnabas Road. That will be at the back of Mount Friendship. My reason for asking the Ministries concerned to resite these people, on these lands is that one would not wish to see the people out of that environment because they, themselves would not wish to be resited in an

area let us say, two or three miles from where they presently live. At the same time, it will give reasonable access to those parents who have got children attending school at the Parkinson, or the Pine Primary. They will still be in the area and it will not in any way dislocate the children, or the families.

There is one thing which concerns me, Mr. Speaker, and it is the number of complaints which I have been receiving and some of the problems associated with this land acquisition. Not all of the persons who are supposed to move and to be resited have been given a thorough and satisfactory explanation and they have been asking me a number of questions, as to where they will be sited, or resited and in one particular case, there has been an approach, by the Ministry of Communications and Works to acquire a portion of land and the portion of this land will be a portion of a house.

Now, the person who owns the property has expressed concern, in that she does not know if it is Government's intention to acquire the entire property because as they argue and as one can see the correctness of that argument, that if you are going to acquire part of a property which would divide, or take off part of a dwelling house, it is obvious that you cannot take part of that house, but rather, one would expect the entire property to be compulsorily acquired. I am referring to the house owned by Mrs. Hackett. There is a question and she has, in actual fact, approached an Attorney-at-Law, with a view to having the matter resolved and I feel, as the Parliamentary Representative, I should draw this to the Hon. Minister in question, draw this to his attention, so that this woman will not have to resort to the Law Court to have this matter resolved. I think that this Government has been settling things in such an amicable manner, that this particular situation need not go before a Tribunal, or let us say, the Law Court for settlement.

Now, this particular development means a great deal to me and the people of St. Michael South East because I have been hearing from Opposition platforms, criticisms that the only thing the Representative has been doing for the Constituency is building hard courts, but what the Opposition detractors and my detractors and detractors of the Labour Party Government must understand is that hard courts are not the only things which are sited in the St. Michael South East Constituency. I am happy and proud to say that Government, realising that the Pineland, Wildey area is an area where you can safely put Government buildings, that there are no vagabonds, there are no vandals, to the extent that people have been for years, ignoring the Pine and not putting buildings up there, accusing the people.

1.50 p.m.

At one stage one Magistrate was reported to have said "P" for Pine, P~~a~~ for Perry and P for prison," and

that was the sort of contemptuous attitude that people in the society had for the people of Pinelands and the surrounding area, and I am happy to associate myself with a Government that thinks quite differently, and it has not only found it fit to site the polytechnic in that area, but it has gone as far as to site a new polyclinic in the same area. It means that there has been confidence by this administration in the people, and I would like to say that I have confidence in them and I know that they also have confidence in me and my administration. I am sure that my detractors will not be able to convince them that we have not been doing a wonderful job for them.

Mr. Speaker, it is on occasions like these that one must restate some things that have been said from time to time. I have said that the people in that environment need to be assured that there is confidence in them. They have natural talent and no doubt that is one of the main reasons why the Government had decided in the first place to resite the polytechnic there. Now, there are a number of projects going on in that area, my understanding is that the police station will be sited in that vicinity, and that too will help to prove that the siting of the road which will now be built in that area will be a worthwhile thing. As developments continue to go in the area, it is necessary to have a back-up road, and that road which will be built will be timely.

I do hope that the Ministers concerned, the Departments concerned will do everything in their power to resolve the question which now remains an outstanding one, one which is causing a lot of concern, one which is causing the people to ask a number of questions, and I would hope, as the parliamentary representative, that this matter is given the necessary attention as soon as possible.

I would like, since the road is expected to be started on January 31 — I think that is the correct date — and it is hoped to be finished in twelve months, that the acquisition and the resiting of these people will be done with great speed. I would like to see the people in a new area with proper services and proper roads, so that when the day of reckoning comes my opponents will see that the people are well satisfied and will return their representative once again to the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, with that I thank you, Sir.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that this administration has shown it is that we treat everybody fairly. Another thing we have shown is that we do not intend to disrupt established communities. When the sewerage plant was to be erected we moved all the people from that area of town and put them in one area in Clapham. We moved the entire community because we believe that you should not break up communities unless it is not humanly possible to keep them to-

gether. The breaking up of communities brings with it problems, disputes, ill will, everything you can think about. We did not do it when we first came into office, we will not do it now. I believe this administration will go down in history as the administration that thinks about the people and has consideration for the people.

Certainly a number of people will have to be moved from the area of St. Barnabas where the proposed road will pass, but the Ministries concerned have already identified an area of land not far from where the houses are in close proximity to the Pine Hill Dairy on which the chattel houses can be relocated. There are at least two wall houses in the path of the proposed road. Government does not intend to cut off part of a wall house and leave the other part standing. In one case it was pointed out by the technical officers that it might be possible to take off a part of the house and then extend the remainder of the house to reconstruct a proper building, and my Ministry has said that the new road will pass so close to the man's home that it would be uncomfortable for him to live there. If he desires to stay in the house, we will still offer to acquire the entire house at its current value. There is no reason for anybody to fear that this Government will do anything that will cause them dissatisfaction or discomfort in their present circumstances.

The St. Barnabas Road is part of a great plan for road improvement in this country. We are tackling the area between the Cable and Wireless building at Wildey and the St. Barnabas/Haggatt Hall junction as this point in time, Mr. Speaker, primarily because of the polytechnic which is being constructed in that area. Anybody who passes that road will find problems. To pass the junction between St. Barnabas and the Wildey junction and Cable and Wireless, it is a problem to get across that junction. There have been numerous accidents at that junction, several schemes have been put forward, but none of them seems appropriate today. I believe that when the new strip of road was being constructed between Cable and Wireless and Courtesy Garage Limited more consideration.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Minister complete his address within ten minutes' time?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Certainly, Sir. More consideration should have been given to the two junctions, because the proposed road will start from Top Rock, it will come through the Graeme Hall area, it will stretch through Rendezvous Hill, it will cross the main road between the Cable and Wireless junction and Courtesy Garage, possibly come along that new stretch of road, and we are taking out the numerous bends that you find now between the new polytechnic, C.B.C. and the Pine. 2.00 p.m.

There is also flooding in that area and we are seeking to straighten the road and relieve the flooding and make it easily accessible for those persons who will have to use the new Polytechnic.

On the Haggatt Hall end we are shifting the road completely. It will move away from the Church and it will take an easterly direction and come out east of the shop at the junction of Haggatt Hall/St. Barnabas Roads, it will go through a portion of land belonging to the Haggatt Hall estate and will cut across the ridge of the hill over in the main road, the Bulkeley/Belle Gully Road which comes down to Bridgetown. The road must be completed for the opening of the new Polytechnic. I can see the problems which will occur if we do not create this new road. Already without the pressure which will be brought to bear in the area now, there is difficulty in moving off St. Barnabas Road at either end. The new road, we hope, will have a clean flow of traffic and connect on to the existing main highway; but I can assure the residents in that area that the acquisition must be done, and there will be no need for anybody to employ a lawyer because they think that Government will cut off part of their property without looking at what is a justifiable situation.

I have said it before and I will say it now that if any part of any stone structures would be affected, the Government is prepared to acquire the entire property. If people feel that the new road will be too close to them for their comfort, they are entitled to make representation to the Ministry of Housing or the Ministry of Communications and Works and favourable consideration will be given to the acquisition of the property.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I am advised that there are no Replies ready to Questions.

Automatically we go into Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There is one item under Private Members' Business standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution taking note of the Report of the

Commission of Enquiry on Gambling and calling upon Government to end the operation of one-arm bandit machines in Barbados.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on and in due course formally move the passing of a Resolution to the effect that this House should note the report of the Commission of Enquiry on Gambling and call upon the Government to end the operation of the one-arm bandits in Barbados, this beloved country of ours.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that those of us who have had the benefit of a christian upbringing, those of us who have had the opportunity to absorb those ethical codes which formulate certain distinctive patterns in western civilised communities, should find that they should have to run in an august Chamber of this nature to put the case for the elimination of one of the major social curses which has been imported into this civil community of ours.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this situation has become so tragic that with the information which I have managed to pick up over the past six months or so, it is necessary for me to moderate to a significant extent my disclosures on the floor of this House, because I think that I would be putting the lives of several persons in jeopardy should I do so. Mr. Speaker, it also saddens me that not so long ago a spokesman from the other side sought to mislead this country into the belief that members of the christian community, members of the churches in some way gave support to the existence of the one-arm bandits in Barbados.

I wish to refer firstly, and I will be referring frequently to the report of the Commission of Enquiry on Gambling, July 1979, which was tabled in this House some time ago. Now Mr. Speaker, if you look at the positions of the churches as clearly established in that report, you will see that the Commission gave adequate consideration to public statements made by church leaders and representatives of various denominations, and I am reading from page 5 of that report. "Despite the fact that some members of the Church take part in gambling activities — members of the Churches, not the Church's position — it is fair to say that gambling as an institution was deplored and sometimes outrightly condemned as contrary to Christian belief."

Later on at page 8 it goes on in Chapter 9 "Opinions on Slot Machines — it is stated that on page 9.3 a breakdown by religious denominations showed.....

Mr. SPEAKER: At what page?

Dr. HAYNES: Page 6. I have moved from page 5 to page 6. "A breakdown by religious denominations showed that all denominations thought that slot machines were

bad rather than good for the country". On page 7, and here again we find the position of the Church:

"Gambling stimulates and fosters love of money and as the habit grows, the petty gambler becomes more and more a compulsive gambler with the winning of money. People are encouraged to see life in terms of easy money and stupid spending. A gambling mentality is being cultivated and nurtured by the fantastic increases of gambling practices in Barbados. At a time when the people of our country are being challenged to produce more, the Methodist Church entertains fears for the effect which the proliferation of one-arm bandits and other forms of gambling will produce on the character of our citizens especially our young citizens."

On page 8, Mr. Speaker, the position of the Jehovah Witnesses is clearly stated. "Gambling is also a very serious social evil in personal life for it is frequently a form of addiction as powerful as drugs or drink of addiction."

Then, Sir, the Bishop of Barbados who is speaking on behalf of the Anglican Synod is the only spokesman for the Church, and I emphasise the only spokesman for the Church as a whole. He said:

"There is nothing creative about playing one-arm bandits and to say the least it is hard to see how anyone can contribute to his own personal development or the development of anyone else by this form of activity."
3.00 p.m.

"The machines easily attract people and very quickly take their money.

Playing these machines represents an irresponsible use of time and money. Revenue which Government derives from the presence of such machines does not balance the negative human activity involved."

Page 10 "The Barbados Council of Evangelical Churches opposes gambling and calls upon Government not to set up the proposed National Lottery," and so the story goes on.

Every single denomination in this country has condemned the existence of the one armed bandits in this country as being contrary to the public interest and harmful to the entire community and in particular, the youth of this country and yet this Government.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I would be very grateful if the hon. member for St. Michael South Central could also make reference to what the Roman Catholic Church has to say in the very same Report. I shall be very grateful because I myself cannot

remember. I know he is reading from the Report and I shall be very grateful.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I will continue with my speech. I will get on to the Roman Catholic Church in my time, not in your time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Kindly address the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is a policy by persistent lies being bandied out by certain persons particularly in telling lies in this community to the effect that these machines were brought into this country by the Democratic Labour Party. One of the positive findings of this Commission is and I refer to page 82. It goes as follows:—

"The Commission was satisfied from the evidence given by the Customs Authorities that machines were imported illegally as early as 1973 and were being operated without licences. This was without the knowledge and approval of the government."

This was without the knowledge and approval of the Government of the day, the Democratic Labour Party, at page 82. Mr. Speaker, I go further. There has been.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Will the hon. member deny that he was the landlord of premises where the machines were operated illegally during the Democratic Labour Party regime time?

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, to continue, There has been another major life.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Will the hon. member ask the hon. member for St. Michael South West if representation were not made to him in his office as Minister concerning legislation of the machines?

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am quoting what the Report says. It is a Report by a Commission set up by them and the Report totally exonerated the Democratic Labour Party as far as that was concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Press in this country did not take the trouble to carefully analyse this Report which in no way by any majority endorsed the continued existence of the one armed bandits in Barbados. There were eight people on that Commission.

(Certain remarks made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central were ordered to be expunged from the records by Mr. SPEAKER, at this stage.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I have always understood that an attempt to reveal the information of individual parties of a Royal Commission is improper. I have always understood that if they do not sign a Minority Report that they stood by the Report. I have always understood that you cannot go into who voted and who did not vote. As it happens my information is not the information of the hon. member on the matter but I do not wish to have to be put to the trouble which I would consider contrary to the Rules of the House of contradicting him. It is only his say so and of contradicting his say so perhaps with my knowledge.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central. I would like the hon. member for St. Lucy to cease being a co-pilot. He might find himself in difficulty with the Chair. He has an opportunity to address the Chair at the appropriate time. There will be no prompting.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the way this Report is constructed I will be able to establish to this Honourable House that there have been substantial Minority Reports not as such but contained within the body of the Report itself.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is either a Minority Report or there is no Minority Report.

Dr. HAYNES: I will read from the Report in due course. Now the point I was trying to get across is that those people with a Christian conscience clearly disassociated themselves from that particular position. I would just like to get on with the debate and I will like to just make one comment and I will like to go to page 152 and I believe that I can read from the Report exactly. In further evidence that there was substantial divisions of opinions I read exactly on page 152. It says "Those Commissioners who favoured the banning of the machines did so for the following reasons", reasons which every decent citizen in this country must endorse.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You cannot come in here and read from a Minority Report and say that the reasons of the Minority Report are those which every decent citizen can endorse therefore implying that the majority are not decent people. You cannot reflect on the majority of the Royal Commission by saying that the minority views are to be preferred because those are the only views that people would endorse. You cannot abuse the majority of a Royal Commission in that way in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central said that he was reading exactly what was in the Report.

Dr. HAYNES: A percentage of it and then when I continue my speech and I revert back to it I will inform you when I am reading. I continue to read now, Mr. Speaker,

- "(1) The very unsatisfactory nature of the accounts submitted and the devious explanations given at the interviews.
- (2) The importation, in very unbusiness-like terms of \$340,000.00 in machines while the Commission was sitting."

I deviate from reading now, Mr. Speaker.
3.10 p.m.

Those machines came in I presume under licence. I would be interested to know who showed greater contempt of the Royal Commission, than giving licences to people to bring in machines whilst the Commission was sitting. If you want to start talking about contempt and disrespect of a Royal Commission, which you, yourself set up.

I continue to read, page 153:

"The known links between gambling machines and crime in countries where they operate, the corruption that has already begun in Barbados, Customs officials suspended for complicity in the illegal importation of machines, Police raids on premises where the machines were being played illegally because of information leaks in the Police Department, the false statement about receipts being always given to hotels and other operators, known cases of people stealing in order to play the machines, incidents relating to prostitution, the unsavoury competition between owners for operation locations and premises, the conflicting statements given to the owners with respect to tampering with the machines, the significant division among hoteliers as to benefits of tourism and the hotel industry of the gaming machines, the fact that already the arcades are being broken into and sometimes the machines smashed, in one case fire arms were used, the evidence that unlicensed machines were being operated, thereby evading the Licensing Fee, the highly addictive nature of the gaming machines, gaming machines are an integral part of the casino gambling and despite Legislation, may attract other forms of casino gambling in back rooms, representatives of both employers and employees have made public appeals for the removal of the machines because of the effect they have on workers and their families, savings and their attitude to work and productivity, the fact that industrially developed countries and wealthy countries like France have thought it

necessary to ban their importation while the majority of the States in the United States have not legalised them, the very unfavourable and almost hostile attitude of those who conduct other gambling activities because of the nature of the machines and the inability to ascertain the extent of their takings, the public called on church leaders to reduce the amount of gambling in the community because of the moral and social ill-effects it has on community building, family life and personal growth."

Mr. Speaker, I can continue. It goes on, I skip a bit. I go on to page 155-and they particularly - the machines are not being used for amusement purposes for which they were designed. One Commissioner witnessed a player put \$280.00 in one machine without receiving one coin in return. They go on to quote from the one Authority that they had access to, showed clearly that this kind of activity shall not form part of any society, such as Barbados.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, if you go now, to what Father Taylor had to say, Father Taylor himself said, that four Commissioners, page 161, there were eight, one was fed up and he left and he was replaced by a Barbados Labour Party tout.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. (ASIDES).

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for St. Michael South Central kindly withdraw the remark and further than withdrawing the remark, you will turn and apologise to the Honourable House.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, that is no problem. I not only withdraw the remark, but in the circumstances, I am happy to apologise, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are apologising to the Honourable House.

Dr. HAYNES: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank You.

Dr. HAYNES: I am very happy, in these circumstances. I continue, Father Taylor himself and I am going to quote from the Report, if there can be any doubt that there was substantial division. Four Commissioners accepted that the machines should continue to run for private gain, four. This is from the actual Report, Mr. Speaker.

The Catholic Church's position, Mr. Speaker, was that they felt that the criminality and the social disadvantages associated with these machines could be

minimised, or to some extent circumvented, by having it run by Government, or by a Public Trust.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are now reading from the Report.

Dr. HAYNES: I have finished reading from that Section of the Report. I am saying what was the Catholic Church's position. They felt that to minimise the social consequences and the criminality associated with the operation of one-armed bandits, that this could probably be done, if Government run it, or some charity run it. Not that the Catholic Church had in any way supported this kind of thing.

But, what do we find? Instead of the Government of Barbados presenting the public of Barbados the true position of the Commission, in relation to the one-armed bandits, we see yet another attempt to cover up and a sly attempt to suggest to the public of Barbados, that the churches in this country supported that kind of activity, in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have, in my possession here, the Royal Commission Report on Gambling - I will not read from it - both volumes. What is clear is that the kind of expertise and technical knowledge required to a proper analysis of what is actually taking place, in respect of the one-armed bandits, that expertise was never made available to the so-called Royal Commission. It is a highly complex, highly complicated business involving very delicate mathematical computations and various other factors and none of these factors were considered, or dealt with, or can be considered, or dealt with, by the persons who constitute the Commission, unless they had that kind of technical support.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in the Honourable House, that these gambling machines in Barbados are rigged and I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that they are rigged by placing bits of plaster seam material between the rotating discs at the bottom of the slot machines, which will prevent the coins, when they acquire a certain weight from falling down. That is the technique, it is a clumsy technique, but that is the way in which it is rigged. Whereas, you will find, that in the Royal Commission Report, in the United Kingdom, there is a very specific formula worked out, Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that you get between a 10% and 13% payout, the payout in this country, can be less than 10% they are rigged, Mr. Speaker, by using small bits of plaster seam on the rotating discs, to effect movement of the coins and the payout.

Mr. Speaker, fundamental to any operation of a one-armed - I am not agreeing with it, but, if you are going to legalise it, then you have further responsibilities to establish a proper inspectorate to determine

that there is a reasonable payout. In the United Kingdom, alone, Mr. Speaker, over one billion pounds a year and this comes from official reports, it was some hundred millions as stated in this report in the last comments I saw on it. Over one billion pounds a year are involved in the one-armed bandits business. Here, in Barbados, the most conservative.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Member has now come down to the ground.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you rise on a point of order?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I believe that he should check the figures in those Royal Commission Reports. He will not find, that one thousand million pounds are spent on one-armed bandits. Let him look up the table again. The one-armed bandit business, in Britain, is much more limited than that. Let him look.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I read it up to this morning and it says several hundred million dollars, that is what it says and although limited in the U.K., there was a Report.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Did you say dollars?

Dr. HAYNES: Pounds, several hundred pounds. That is what the Report says.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are saying dollars.

Dr. HAYNES: Sorry, pounds and it is a limited business in the United Kingdom and yet, several hundred million pounds, at the time of this Report.
3.20 p.m.

Since that date, Mr. Speaker, there was a report in a British newspaper, I think it was the Times, in the third week of July of this year, and they put it over a billion pounds a year being turned over in the one arm bandit business. Here in Barbados I hear figures like \$200 million. I do not believe it is \$200 million, but I would settle for an estimate of about \$18 million in Barbados. There is a lot of money involved in this one arm bandit business, about \$18 million, in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, everyone recognises that if you want to prevent the worst aspects of the one arm bandit business that you have to control, and the Royal Commission on Gambling in the United Kingdom said this. You have to control such matters as supply, maintenance, contractual arrangements for hire purchase, also most fundamentally you have to mount a massive programme for an inspectorate to make sure that there is a reasonable pay out as far as one arm bandits are concerned. I think it is highly irresponsible of this administration, though

I fundamentally and totally disagree with any legalising of one arm bandits in this country on ethical and moral grounds, and if they could take that step then they should not take that step without making sure that the public of Barbados has significant protection against these undesirable effects.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened in Barbados with the one arm bandits? The children of the wealthy and the wealthy people hardly play the one arm bandits, or if they can, they can afford it. The people who play the one arm bandits are the poor people of this country by and large, and it is wrong that we as a Parliament should sit down and allow the poor people of this country to be robbed, and I say robbed nakedly, in this particular manner. Mr. Speaker, I go even further, and this is very serious, the amount of money that goes into those one arm bandits has seriously disturbed the cash flow of shopkeepers in Barbados. It is affecting their capacity to extend credit to their customers and consequently..... (ASIDES). If you do not believe me, Mr. Speaker, you just ask anyone who has a bar, who has wet goods and who has one or two one arm bandit machines in his shop, and he will tell you that the most lucrative part of his business would be the one arm bandit section. That is money that would normally go into the bellies of their children and buy clothes. That is what they are stealing, they are destroying the poor people and they are making them poorer and poorer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a significant upsurge of crime in this country of a violent nature. I am not saying the operations of the one arm bandits is the only factor responsible, but it is recognised even by the Royal Commission — and here, Mr. Speaker, if I may just glance at this and read from the Royal Commission on Gambling, Final Report, Vol. II, page 396 — it says:

“The great upsurge of uncontrolled gaming in the mid sixties was accompanied by criminal activities associated with the supply of slot machines, particularly the jackpot variety, to the rapidly multiplying casinos.”

All over the world it is a recognised fact, and it is going to be no different here in Barbados, and it has been no different. Prostitution is associated with it, dope peddling is associated with it. Let us face the facts. I am going to tell the hon. member for St. Thomas now that the suppliers of these one arm bandits are a Mafia outfit, and if you do not control the supply, maintenance, etc. that connection has been firmly established and it is going to create problems not only at the levels of crime in this society, but it might even affect Governments in Barbados, it might even effect the survival of Governments, if you are not careful. The debts of the Mafia must always be paid.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making what I believe in other countries is a sound point. Let us be realistic, would not the hon. member agree, no making political points, no reading out of minority reports and pretending them to represent the majority, would not the hon. member agree from his own personal knowledge of some of the operators that one of the most remarkable things about the one arm bandits in Barbados is that they have not attracted criminals and that there is in fact no crime attached to their operations? That you cannot find a one arm bandit man who can be spoken of as an associate of criminals, and that is something we should be proud of?

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot agree with the hon. member's invitation, but he must accept that if he does not agree with me that it is here he must know deep inside that that potential is there and something that must be guarded against, and that is why the Royal Commission in the United Kingdom put so much stress on the question of supply. They even went so far as to suggest that those machines should be manufactured within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom so as to prevent them from having ties with the Mafia in the United States and elsewhere. That was a very positive recommendation within that report, because if you cannot supply those elements then you are in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, the money spent in those one arm bandits has a serious effect on the retention of repatriation of hard currency to this country. Many a \$10 note that comes in an envelope, a \$20 note from relatives in the United States finds itself being changed at the arcades where those one arm bandits are played. There is a secondary black market in Barbados in US dollars, the hard currency emanating from those dollars taken in by the one arm bandit operations, and I am going to tell the hon. member, if he pretends he does not know, and there is no point challenging me and trying to lock me up as has happened before on the floor of this House, that there is a significant leakage of foreign currency from that one arm bandit operation, and I am going to tell you how this takes place, what I did not know before. It takes place via couriers, because the owners do not want to risk the penalties of the Exchange Control Act. They have their own couriers, girls who take the money out to Puerto Rico, they take it to the Antigua-Anguilla connection, they take it to Miami, but I do not wish to say any more because I believe that I will put certain people's lives in danger. I will say no more on that, but I am just telling you how it goes out.

I will tell you that the element of repatriation which I believe has always been underestimated in Barbados over the past 20 years was being seriously compromised by the operation of the one arm bandits in this country so that at every level, at the level of justice, at the level of crime, at the level of being able to eat in this

country, at the level of the overall economic position of this country you find that the one arm bandits are exercising a very deleterious effect on the survival of this nation, therefore why do you keep them?
3.30 p.m.

You only keep them because several senior politicians in the Barbados Labour Party are involved in the one-arm bandit racket.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, what nonsense have we come to now? Several senior politicians in the Barbados Labour Party are involved in the one-arm bandit racket? Just let the hon. member say he does not mean anybody in here or withdraw it. I only know one politician in this House who is involved in it, who used to receive money from it and that is the hon. member, and I say as a fact he used to get money from the bandits.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, if that is the position....

Mr. SPEAKER: You must withdraw the remark.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I did not refer to anyone on that side. You wish me to withdraw the remark?

Mr. SPEAKER: You did not refer to any member in here?

Dr. HAYNES: I did not refer to them. I said senior politicians in the Barbados Labour Party. I did not refer to anyone there. I only see juniors on that side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: You did not refer to any member of this House?

Dr. HAYNES: I only see juniors over there, Mr. Speaker. I see no seniors.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not making fun at this time. You withdraw the remark and continue your debate.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as you wish, as you have instructed, Mr. Speaker.....(Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: There is only one Chair and I will rule from the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: As you have instructed and ruled, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue your debate.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, I am referring specifically to the rule which says that hon. members ought not to make insulting remarks about other hon. members. While the hon. member was making his point

of order, the Prime Minister, I heard him say that the hon. member is the only person in here who has taken money from the one-arm bandits. I believe that that is insulting and the hon. member should be asked to withdraw it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not mind withdrawing it if I have to, Sir. The point is I have said that the hon. member was the landlord of premises where the one-arm bandits were carried on. He used to get rent.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Prime Minister did use the remark, I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South Central would have heard it. He is up to the present in a position to request a withdrawal.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, with the greatest and humblest respect, I was under the impression that any hon. member who hears a remark which he deems to be offensive may draw it to the Speaker's attention for his ruling on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: And you have done so.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for St. Thomas thinks he can persuade Barbadians that I am involved in the one-arm bandit racket, let him do so, because when I am ready for them, I will call the names in due course when these people are already out of the country and are protected. You take it easy. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the short time available to me I have been able to point out the very major problems affecting this country from the one-arm bandits operations.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would draw, on a point of order, your attention to Standing Order No. 30(7) — Private Members' Business — "In a debate on any matter of Private Members' Business, the speech of a Member shall not exceed 30 minutes, provided that this time limit shall not apply to a Member in moving a motion of "No Confidence" in the Government and a Minister who speaks in final reply to such a motion....."

The hon. member started speaking at 10 minutes to three, it is now 25 minutes to 4, and I am sure he was not interrupted for fifteen minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: He must have no interruptions.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I respectfully submit he is now beyond his time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given very careful consideration to the interruptions and he is now winding up.

Dr. HAYNES: And, Mr. Speaker, I have been able to point out that there have been substantial misrepresentations of the position taken by our own Commission of Enquiry on Gambling that was established in this country. I believe that all hon. members will give serious consideration not only to the positions taken by the Commissioners but to the statements made on the floor of this House in the public interest by this hon. member who is now on his feet.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion and reserve the right to speak.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have listened quite attentively to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and believe me, Sir, the approach to matters of this nature I thought was now under the carpet. A report was handed in after a Commission was set up by the Government to determine what views the public had on gambling.

Now, Sir, I take it that this is a very wide area: bingo, horse racing, poker, dice, black jack, Turf Club sweepstake, Instant Cricket Draw, the limbs of the law raffle, all of these things as far as I understand came under the Commission of Enquiry on Gambling, but there seems to be a hang-up on the one-arm bandits since 1976 around the month of October after this party came into power.

With respect to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central I can produce documentary evidence of him walking hand in hand in the year 1976 through Chapman Lane with Mr. Michael Parks, a big operator at that time and owner of amusement centres in Barbados. There was no condemnation on that occasion. Mr. Parks was a decent man, he was the nicest person in the whole world. The hon. member walked with him hand in hand putting the case against the Government, not that Mr. Parks was on a platform, but Mr. Parks may have been supplying funds for the party of which the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is now a member.

In the very by-election in St. Michael South Central a man by the name of Castro, I am not sure of his correct name, but he had a place in Nelson Street, I saw helping put up the microphone and the lights for the hon. member's platform during the by-election, and Castro himself rented a building from the hon. member to carry on one-arm bandits to play for dirty money as he calls it.

3.40 p.m.

Now it is known as dirty money, blood money. That is what you call it. Now, if you received money from Castro from out of the proceeds you are receiving the very quarters that went into the machines, the blood money, because you like blood.

Now what is even more amazing, Sir, in the very Report, Mr. Speaker, on page 5, the Report of the Commission of Enquiry on Gambling, July, 1979, on page 5 this is what it says:-

"The Churches views on gambling range from complete abstention (Jehovah's Witnesses and the Salvation Army) through an official anti-gambling position not supported fully by the members (the Methodist Church) to a more liberal position whereby money earmarked for entertainment after all the domestic needs are met may be spent on gambling as amusement or recreation."

Now, Sir, this is the Roman Catholic and the Anglican, two of the most powerful Churches in the world. These are the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican but this part you did not read and when I got up on a point of order and I asked you to speak about the Roman Catholic Church you told me you would speak on it in your own time. Now this is what you call the impressions which the hon. member speaks so highly about, the impression, not facts or truths. This part would never come to light but I am saying and I am calling on the hon. member now that in 1973 there were imported into Barbados illegally. His Government was in power. He would have known that they would have been illegal because he was at that time the second most powerful man in the country so he would have had an idea but it is out of the efficiency of this Government that we recognised that they were coming in here or they were already in here illegally and what did the Government set out to do, legalise them or control them.

I have played the one armed bandits, Sir. In every single amusement centre in this country I have played them. Nobody did not send and call me. When I go into the amusement centres, if I go into one for one month and I go into another amusement centre for another month, you almost see the same faces that you can know about people not by name but just by face.

I knew faces, Sir, during the months that I played from February 1979 until June 1980. I wanted to find out what it was all about and you would see the same faces in there and outside and I would say categorically on the floor of the House that that group of people did not lose \$18 million in Barbados as the hon. member tried to make out.

Now, Sir, when they brought the West Indies Hospital Sweeps into Barbados they brought a corrupt — nobody over here knew about the Mafia. They were selling tickets under the pretence that it was to go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to help the sick. This is what they started. This is how the Hospital Sweeps was closed down. They owed the Government money and they owed the people Severance Pay. They have not paid the people and the then Prime Minister who is now the Leader of the Opposition got up on the floor of the House — you were in the Opposition then, Sir — and defended the Hospital Sweeps to the hills.

The Resolution was brought into this Honourable House by the late Sir Ernest Deighton Mottley, the Senior member for the City of Bridgetown. They used to bring in people into Barbados and take pictures of someone from Finland, Czechoslovakia saying that they won \$8 million. Nobody in Barbados ever got a cent but what they had up there in George Washington House, where my son now carries on a business and where I have my constituency branch office, it was in there, Sir. I have never seen so many telephone directories, Mr. Speaker.

There are some places in the World that you never heard of. I know that you are well travelled. I know that you are a traveller, Sir, but you have never heard of these cities. I do not think you would know. I do not think you would even see them on the map. I believe if I ask him myself to bring the directory you will see places like Hung Jeung Wung, not in Hong Kong or China. I went there but they could not even get up there. All over the World, Sir, all those people they were sending these Sweepstake tickets and Barbados had a bad name.

In the United States and in England the people bought those West Indian Hospital Sweepstakes and they never heard one single word about them. At that time you had a different kind of a journalist. You were a good journalist, the most feared in your time, a great journalist. I think you wrote something about it, Sir, on that occasion. It is unfortunate that Mr. Brandford is not as good a journalist as you are, Sir. Mr. Brandford is not as good a journalist as you are. He will never reach your heights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I get reports from time to time. I read the Reports. I do not agree with every single thing that is in the Reports. There are opinions by persons set up by the Government to submit their views and it is a matter for the Government to carry out all of the orders of the Report and if they accept it, it is the duty of the Government and the Government has done what they thought was right by legalising the one armed bandits or the slot machines which they brought in here in 1973 and because of the inefficiency of the Government machinery they were not mindful of the situation to see that they

were coming into Barbados illegally and that is how the whole aspect of the one armed bandits crept into Barbados.

It is just like I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South West got up on the floor of this Hon. House and denied that inflation was well at 40% in 1974. He denied it emphatically and challenged the Leader of the House. He said he had to put the records straight once and for all. It was not 40% and only a few days ago while I was going through their Manifesto I saw in it, the First Edition of the Manifesto, the background of their Manifesto. Sir, we are dealing with a machine and money that will bring in revenue into the country so this is a revenue bringer, Sir.

"Although our bill for fuel and lubricants rose from \$22 million to \$69 million between 1973 and 1975 we managed to reduce the rate of inflation from 40% in 1974 to less than 12% in 1975."

3.50 p.m.

Now, this is exactly what we were saying because they were in Government, so they would have had the Economic Report, they would have had the advice of the Central Bank whom they had all the respect for, they respected all the figures from that. Now, they disrespect them and he would have said to them that it was 40%.

Now, the Hon. Member, who was in charge of Trade and Industry came before the Hon. House and emphatically denied that it was ever 40% and we hear the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central trying to skip around something, by saying that they were brought into Barbados illegally that they had not given a licence to import them. Well, Sir, the Government of Barbados does not give licence to import drugs, to the best of my knowledge and the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central is in the drug business, Sir. He is a Physician Specialist, he is in the drug business.

All of a sudden today Sir, we are hearing how the machines, at the bottom have something, I cannot remember the technical term, Sir, but something at the bottom where you cannot get back your money. All of these types of things. All we have done, since it is in the area of amusement, we feel the public should benefit from it and therefore, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Hon. Minister of Finance in his Budgetary Proposals put some of the stiffest taxes on them Sir. Make sure that they employ security guards that young children under the age of 18 cannot go into these places and they must pass the health standards of Barbados, while they had them knocking dog about here and the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West recently, Sir, went to Mr. Louis Crichlow and told Mr. Crichlow that when they

win the Government, they are going to legalise them. When Mr. Crichlow reads the papers tomorrow - I see the Hon. Member has gone out of his place - when we are going to take the vote, I am going to ask for a division because I want the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West to vote against the one-armed bandits which he told Mr. Crichlow they are going to These are the types of things, Sir, that you hear.

That is why the papers always make it very clear they have great respect for two gentlemen, one that they will always remember you and the Hon. Member for St. Michael South, as sound in his approach to his parliamentary duties. The only gentleman in here now, Sir, the others do not want any vote, they are not going to take the vote, Sir. This is a typical approach they have to parliamentary duties. They come and say something, they cannot back up what they say and then back out from the Honourable House.

Of course, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has to give up now the \$12,000.00 he got from the Hon. Member for St. Michael West in a libel case, as a gift to charity and he has also to give up his parliamentary increase.

Mr. SPEAKER: One-armed bandits.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. He had to give up his parliamentary increase for charity and he has to give up the increase on this occasion again, so that people can put them in the one-armed bandits Sir. We are talking about the one-armed bandits. You know the Hon. Member well enough, Sir, that if he had given away a single cent to anything like charity, the Public Relations Officer of J.E.R. would have had the whole front page splashed down Sir with him handing over a cheque.

Of course, Sally Shelton, the American Ambassador just gave him a couple of tickets to go abroad and he went to meet Carter, Mugabe, he met Anderson, he met the International Monetary Director, the World Bank Leader, McNamara. All of these people and all that he brought back, so far, to tell the country is that the hospital has old mattresses, worn out. That is all he has brought back so far. He has brought back the expertise advice on the machines and the hospital wants new beds. That was the tone of his meeting last night, Sir.

Now, Sir, it is immaterial to me, Mr. Speaker, if you ban gambling once and for all in all forms. It is no big thing to me. I have had my fill of poker. I do not have to give account to my wife, or to my parents, or to my family as to how I play my money. You know the amount of poker players they have in this Honourable House, Sir, and in the gallery today? You know the amount of dice players and one-armed bandits players, I believe may be sitting down listening to this debate to-

day, Sir? I believe Sir, that if you were to search the bill folds or the attache cases of some of the Hon. Members, or all the Hon. Members on the Other Side, you will find race tickets trying to win the half million dollars which the Turf Club raffles, Sir and that is a form of gambling, Sir. So, you would have to ban all aspects of gambling Sir, as far as, I am concerned, or the one-armed bandits, the BTC Instant Sweepstake, everybody Sir have a share of what they believe is some form of recreation in the society.

In the United States, the most powerful country in the world, there are one-armed bandits, there are jackpot players, all sorts of things, in England, Sir in the city of London, in France and Italy where you have the home of the Roman Catholic Chief, here Sir, you have people who support gambling. At the Marine House, I could not get in on evenings, Sir, you see the Roman Catholic priest there, in his big, long white gown and shouting out half black, black page and a black on bingo. These are the views expressed by a number of people, in the society and therefore, Government set about to do what they believe is right and that is to legalise the whole form of it Sir, where the Government could collect some form of revenue, unlike others. They had an illegal approach, as they always had, in so many things, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am not a gambler, let me declare that early. I put my money on anything else. (ASIDES). But, I believe the time has arrived to lay the ghost of those so-called one-armed bandits.

The Democratic Labour Party, or one wing of the Democratic Labour Party decides that their campaign in the coming Elections will be the one-armed bandits and I want that wing of the Democratic Labour Party to know fully and clearly, the full story about the one-armed bandits.

Now, I have heard the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central talk about one-armed bandits for a long time. I have said absolutely nothing about the one-armed bandits because if you do not play them and you do not know about them, do not get mixed up in them. But, for a long time, I have been hearing about people who lose their whole week's pay, I heard about the crime attaching to one-armed bandits, I heard today about prostitution, I heard about the payout, I heard everything that they say is bad about one-armed bandits. I have not heard about the \$32,000.00 that somebody won out of one. I am not saying that that should be the yardstick of deciding whether you have them or not, but I know and I believe, that it is time for the general public to know.

The Hon. Member said in here, that they came in illegally. I want to deny that now because they were put on licence in 1975 and only two people were supposed to

bring them in here. A man from Nelson Street and another gentleman who has a business down in Fontabelle. I can tell this Honourable House that when I became Hon. Minister for Consumer Affairs, my first day in the Ministry of Agriculture in Crumpton Street, I found people queuing from the gate on Crumpton Street right up to my office door. Everybody wanted a permit, a licence to bring in a one-armed bandit. Now, we were just in office, you know, Mr. Speaker, licences had been granted. I did not even know, I must confess, how you prepare a licence to bring in anything into this country. 4.00 p.m.

Mr. Louis Crichlow to this day believes that I am his greatest enemy because he had in the Port or on sea somewhere coming the billiard tables and those fell in the category of gaming machines which the Democratic Labour Party had put on licence and only two men I was told had permission to bring the bandits into Barbados and then distribute them, so that is where the corruption started, if there is corruption in the one-armed bandits. Let him come back in here and deny that. He cannot deny that, nobody on the benches of the Democratic Labour Party can deny that.

When I took office I told the Prime Minister that there were so many people in this thing, and do you know the strange thing about it? The people who knew the corners and the angles and how to twist and turn were the high supporters of the Democratic Labour Party who knew about the machines, so when I hear the hon. member in here talking about the Royal Commission and a minority report, he has the belief, as he has said that he is going to talk on everything under the sun in this House because the people outside who know no better must believe he is the most brilliant man in this Chamber, but he must come in here with facts, he must not lead the public at large to believe that he knows what he is saying when in truth and in fact there are other people who know different.

I do not mind what anybody says, gambling has been in this world from its inception. In my view, when Adam cried out to God that he wanted a companion and he got a woman, that was a gamble, and it has been a gamble since then. You talk originally about rum, alcohol. They tried to ban it in the United States and I believe more lives were lost during the prohibition period than probably in the Civil War in the United States, but today it is legalised. Any respectable Government cannot shut its eyes to what is happening in a community, you must sit down and face the problem head on, you cannot please everybody but you will please the majority of persons. There will always be the minority who will pretend to be pure, but if you can find out what they do after dark you will recognise whether they are truthful or not or whether it is a great pretence, and that is exactly what is happening with the one-armed bandits.

Horse racing was in Barbados for a long time, it is called the sport of kings. Go up at the Garrison any race day and you will see the three card business. You do not hear anybody talking about the three cards, and there is nobody ever known to have won on the three card table. I have never heard anybody say they have ever won money from the three card business, but I have not heard the hon. member come in here and talk about banning them or throwing them back out. Go on the Garrison and you will see all sorts of hoop-la and everything else, and little children of age 6, 7, 8 and 9 go at the Garrison probably 12 times a year and are permitted to gamble in every form of gambling you can think of, and I have not heard the hon. member come in here and talk about it, because he would offend some people in this country. You see, when you can fool the little ones down at the bottom, that is what he is playing on.

I have not heard him talk about race horse gambling, he has not talked about bingo, he has not talked about poker, he has not talked about the various forms, the illegal practices that go on in this country, but he comes in here and talks about the one arm bandits simply because the two men connected with the one arm bandits, who would have had the licences to bring them into this country, their aims were frustrated when the Barbados Labour Party came to power. That is the only reason why the Democratic Labour Party is fighting over them now. If they had won the 1976 election and their members had controlled the one arm bandits, like they controlled the sweepstake tickets in Bay Street, you would not have heard a word about them, but when this House went for a Resolution to pass an Act to shut down the Bay Street operation, the then Government said no way brother, no way, and it went on.

Did you hear Mr. Patsy Springer say he was not a half of a millionaire? He was a whole millionaire, he used to go into Brooklyn and pick up people out of the streets and tell them he would bring them to Barbados, wine them, dine them and give them some money, but they must keep their mouths shut. I know the watchman, the man who served ex-Judge Thorne from District "C", the man who drove Thorne for a number of years became the watchman in Bay Street at George Washington House, and the man used to talk about how many books were burnt at night every time you were coming to a draw, but they are not going to talk about that.

When the hon. member says that \$18 million is going into the one arm bandits and affecting the cash flow of shopkeepers, he should look back and see that there were not any shopkeepers to be affected in 1976, the shopkeepers had already gone out under his colleague in 1974, 1975 and early 1976, so who were being affected? The cash flow went through the window, but let him look at today, Mr. Speaker. Walk down Broad Street and see if you do not see nuts being sold on the sidewalk at four quarters, not a dollar, per bag. Look and

see English apples twelve months a year in Barbados, and you do not see any of them in the gutter spoilt because you cannot buy them. You even see grapes on the side of the road now and people buying them. Where is the cash flow that is being destroyed? You never saw grapes around here in 1976 when we came in, you could only get apples at Christmas time. Their Government's cash flow was bad while certain members' pockets were good, and they lost the cash flow from the bandits. That is what he wants to tell you, he is not telling you the truth. He lost the cash flow from the bandits, so I do not know what he is talking about cash flow.

Wherever you turn, Mr. Speaker, this Government finds problems now in controlling the number of itinerant vendors who want to set up shops all around the bus stands and car parks, every little alley, and you talk about money going into one arm bandits? You do not set up a shop to look on it, or to sell yourself, you set up a shop because people passing will buy, and they can only buy if they have money, so what foolishness is he talking about cash flow? He does not understand, he is looking for a political gimmick now for the next election, but if this is the only thing that that faction of the Democratic Labour Party has, tell him he has to start looking again. Tell him to go to the Price Control Division, go to the Consumer Affairs Division of Government and he will find the records of the licences that I cancelled, like I had to cancel the licences for cement, and that is what put them in trouble, because in the first month in office — he talks about cash flow? There were no shopkeepers — in my first month in office I wrote off 120 goods off licence to let the same shopkeepers he talked come back into existence, so what is he talking about?

He and his colleague — because I believe he prepared the orders for his colleague to sign — they had nearly everything in this country on licence and only the favourites of the Democratic Labour Party could have got licences.

4.10 p.m.

In the first month 120 items including cement came off licence; Harry, Bob, Dick, whoever cared to could import them into the country. Sydney had a licence for cement. Only few people had licences to do certain things in Barbados, and those are the people who tell you they are gentlemen. It is like a man who called me at 4 o'clock a morning and told me that Mr. So-and-So who was a Minister in the last Government was a proper gentlemen because he too had a licence to import. That is how they operated in Government where only certain people must win, and because this Government has legalised the one-arm bandits, they have set up arcades, they have set rules and regulations that if you can qualify by pre-set rules, it is not who you are a friend of, it is not whom you know, but if you can follow the rules and come within the rules you are entitled to an arcade or a machine or what you

want. That is what you call open Government, and that is what we have done. In his system there was no open Government. His fellow doctor and colleague sitting on that side complained that he could not even run the hospital because this member when he was outside of Parliament controlled even the hospital. That does not happen in this Government, but he believes because he is over there now he can still control the Government over here and tell us what to do. He went abroad, he talked about how much money is spent in Britain on purchase and maintenance, hire purchase. The man is so out of step. You don't hire purchase between Barbados and the United States. He does not understand what is going on. He reads the Royal Commission of Britain and talks about hire purchase. Do you hire purchase a machine? You hire purchase a motor car, you hire purchase a bicycle. You don't even hire purchase food now. You hire purchase a stove or a fridge. You don't hire purchase a machine. Can you hire purchase a one-arm bandit. The man must read and understand what he is talking about and stop trying to fool the people of this country.

He talks about the peddling of dope and prostitution. Mr. Speaker, I heard of these losses in the one-arm bandits. A friend of mine told me you only have to frequent the bandit houses and you find women after they spend their money ready to sell themselves. Well, I followed the one-arm bandits for a little while to find out if it is true. Far from losing money I have well over 100 odd dollars in quarts that I have won out of the bandits, but I only put in four. When I get to four, that is my limit for the day.

Mr. Speaker, it is like taking a man from out of the street and he walks down the wharf-side. If he jumps in the wharf and he cannot swim, the logical conclusion is that he will drown. You do not go in the sea if you cannot swim. If you come from St. George you stay on the shore. If you take a man and put him in a factory and you leave him and he pushes his finger in the cogs, he is bound to lose the top of his finger, but commonsense tells you that you will go from here to Timbuktu, they will invite you to visit a factory, you walk through and you keep your hands behind your back. Nobody can put their hands in your pocket and take out your quarts and feed the machine, and if the hon. member knows so well that plasticine is placed in the revolving drum, as he said, to prevent the flow of money, he must be involved in rigging the machines, and he can only know if he is involved in rigging them, because he should have said "I have been told" and he did not say that in here. He must have a connection with rigging them. I know where used to be the home of several machines. He must have been involved with them that he knows so well. He must tell the public how he knows that less than 10% is paid out, and he has not told them. You don't walk about and listen to rumours if you are a responsible parliamentarian

and come in here and try to make it a record in Hansard. You must prove your points.

Mr. Speaker, how does he know that less than 80% is paid out? Has he ever played the bandits? Has he ever worked out the complicated mathematical problems that are involved in setting the machines? He does not know. The Royal Commission was set up. If they thought they wanted more information, more expert knowledge on the payment of the machines, they could have called the Government, they could have summoned anybody and said "tell us your views" and incorporated it in the report. They did not do that. He must not seek at this stage to ridicule the members who sat on that Commission.

What is happening in this country, Mr. Speaker, is that it is members like that one on that side and like the other member when he came in here and attacked the Adjutant of the Defence Force and told him to go back to the bushes. I cannot understand how these people, calling themselves responsible parliamentarians, can come to Parliament with rumours. They said Mr. Lewis had come from Jamaica; they said he came here to kill people and told him to go back in the bushes. Lewis came from St. Joseph, a decent man, but because you want to throw dirt, you don't look to see where you take the dirt from; you do not look to see where you throw it, but be careful, it will go up in the air and fall back on top of your head. That is what you have got to prove, Mr. Speaker.

We came into office with \$109 million in a food bill; today it is well over \$130 million of food being imported into this country, but where is it going? If people were not buying and eating it, where is it going? So I cannot draw the conclusion that the hon. member has drawn. He says that money is going into the machines that should be spent in food. A machine operator last week told me that business is falling off. He said when he went into the business he kept his place open 24 hours a day. He keeps it open 24 hours a day now with the hope that after 9 o'clock somebody will come in, but we know Barbados. Barbados like nine day wonders. If tomorrow morning a space ship landed down at Pelican Village, for the first nine days you could not get down the wharf-side to see it. Nine days afterwards it would be out there like an ordinary piece of metal and nobody would care about it. Once before I heard you could not get in the arcades to play the bandits. Today you pass them and they look deserted. I forecast that in another two years nobody would want them either. This is not the first new thing that has sprung up in Barbados that excited people, but it will pass. I cannot understand why the hon. member keeps harping over one-arm bandits. I am sorry; I am truly sorry because according to their

writer in yesterday's Advocate they have not yet declared a candidate for St. Joseph. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? It is because they told the last man who ran against me that they cannot use him because he has one-arm bandits. That is the criterion on which the Democratic Labour Party would set out to run an election. Not one issue can they bring before the public of this country; they cannot condemn this Government for doing anything wrong, and the only issue they can hold on to is the one-arm bandits issue which they allowed to come into this country in 1973 illegally. They knew they were being imported. They were being played in this country, and the then Gaming Act created an offence for anybody gambling in Barbados. They never sought to prosecute, they never sought to control, they never sought to regulate, they never sought to seek out, but now today when a Government with guts has stood up and said we will handle the problem, they set up a Royal Commission, they invited the Churches, they invited the lawyers, they invited the public at large to give evidence before the Commission in order to arrive at a consensus of the people of this country as to whether they should go or not, they have looked at all the social problems that have been levelled against the one-arm bandits, and the report has not justified in any way anything that people have been saying.

As I said earlier, it is like alcohol. When it first came into existence everybody wanted it and you had to control it. You have to deal with it, you don't shun it. You do not put your head down in the sand like an ostrich and decide it will pass over you. If it had remained as it was the Mafia would have been in here; but do you see who is talking about the Mafia? He who knows about it speaks about it. If they had left it you would have had the Mafia in here; we would have had gang wars, you would have had all the fights you hear about, but you have not got them today and this is what has taken the Democratic Labour Party by surprise, that this Government has been able to deal with something they have not been able to deal with. 4.20 p.m.

It is like the Tenancies Bill when they said they had put it in their Manifesto too but they never hoped to implement it because they said it had too many problems. We have tackled it. We have succeeded and I hope that the public outside would recognise that we are a Government that is not afraid to tackle problems and to solve them successfully. Thank you.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think that it is very important that any presentation that is made on this matter that accuracy and facts that are justified and capable of truth are used. I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South Central in here made a statement again today that millions of dollars of foreign

exchange were leaving this Island, foreign exchange that was originally tendered in relation to slot-machines and not recorded.

I would like to draw to the House's attention that this very point was exhaustively investigated during the course of the Sittings of the Commission of Enquiry on Gambling and at page 124 of the Report the conclusion is quite clearly stated at paragraph 26 and it is important that we see the methodology used by the Commission. Their conclusion is "On the whole the Commission saw no evidence to support the alleged exportation of huge sums of money either legally or illegally."

Now it is known that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has been persistent in his allegations that this is so. He had full opportunity to go before the Commission to give evidence. To this day he has the opportunity to report to the Central Bank the information on the foreign exchange in Barbados, and to report to the Gambling Committee regarding the operation of the Gaming Act which regulations control this. The hon. member as far as I am aware has made the allegation but has not communicated the information to these bodies and nothing has been done.

The truth of the matter is that there is nothing to support the allegations of the hon. member and if he was a public spirited citizen, if his concerns were genuine, he would have carried out his duty to the public and reported to the relevant authorities the information that he has had at his disposal.

Now, Sir, the other point the hon. member persist in making is that as a result of the gaming machines in Barbados shopkeepers have been going out of business. Mr. Speaker, Sir, again at page B-17 in the Report, the exhibit, a list of all of the places where gaming machines were at the time is set out. St. Lucy -1. Now seriously, is the hon. member suggesting to this House that the one machine which is in St. Lucy affects the purchasing power and the turn over of the large number of shops there in St. Lucy?

St. Andrew-2. Is the hon. member suggesting that the shopkeepers in St. Andrew are losing business because of the fact that there are two there? St. Joseph-3. Again I must ask the question. St. George-1, but of course I know the hon. member has no use for the parish of St. George because the people of St. George knows that the particular characteristics are undesirable that the hon. member has and they are not to be fooled by his mouthings. They rejected him. They know him well. You see, Sir, sometimes in judging a man and his character it is best to look at his associates and see what they know about him and the people of St. George

who knew him at an early stage know him for what he is, an exaggerator and a manipulator of facts.

St. John-3. No wonder the hon. member for St. John is not going to come in here and support the hon. member. St. Thomas-5, then we go to the other areas. St. Peter-19, St. James-34, Christ Church-71, St. Michael-187, Total 349.

Now since this Report, I know for a fact because I have been in my own constituency and I have discussed this matter with my own constituents particularly those shopkeepers and almost universally the comment now is "They are not anything at all. We have gone back to the dice, rummy, whist and so forth." As a matter of fact in places like Lodge Road or Oistins Town or any of those areas, go and ask any shopkeeper in there and the people will say they are like a seven day wonder. They will tell you that.

The hon. member despite the fact that a majority of the Commission recommended that on exhaustive evidence that Barbadians were divided equally on this matter and that the majority of the Commission said that it was no big issue in Barbados, he is still coming forward here and speaking in terms of gloom and doom in relation to these activities. He is out of touch with the public because the public down there in a vast majority of the areas has decided in their own minds that as far as they are concerned that it does not do them anything if they do not go foolishly and put their money in it and this is the position and a good indication of that is the fact that many areas where they were before people are calling back people and telling them to take these things out of here.
4.30 p.m.

Let me get the space, so that the men can sit down and do what they are accustomed to doing, participating in a little exercise of amusement among themselves, on Friday, Saturday and Sunday nights and in activities which they traditionally exercise their time in. So that, Sir, I believe that areas where machines are operated now successfully are areas where the people will always gamble, whether you have machines, or not, and in the tourist area which, as a matter of amusement, the Commissioners themselves had recommended that they saw nothing wrong with it.

Now, it is also very important to note that subsequent to the recommendations of the majority.....

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have observed that we have not got a quorum and I am suggesting that the bell be rung.

The bell was rung.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I understand it Sir, the Commissioners came down very clearly, by a majority and recommended that the hotels and certain types of arcades should be the only people who should operate these machines. These recommendations were duly passed by the Commissioners to the Committee.

Now, I want to make it clear Sir and I think that the public should know this, the composition of the Committee because the Committee does not consist of politicians, the Committee consists of people who are Civil Servants, who hold no political office, who carry out Statutory offices and I am going to get to the composition of the Committee because I think that it is very important, that the public should understand that, when the Hon. Member talks about the Gambling Committee, I think that they should know about whom he is talking because if the Hon. Member feels that any member of this Committee is a person lacking in integrity, that is a person who is subject to bribery by the operators, that any member of this Committee is guilty of irregularity the Hon. Member, as a responsible Hon. Member of this Honourable House knows that each and everyone of them holds a position which is subject to the Public Service Commission and the Hon. Member is in a position, or ought to be in a position to know, that.

The first page of the Report, the Committee Sir, consists of 7 people (ASIDES), not more than 7 Public Officers. I saw it here just now, Sir, and I am not going to let the Hon. members heckle me, because I am going to read out, for the benefit of the public, the names of Hon. Members of the Committee, so that they will know when the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central comes in here and makes his wild and vicious allegations, they know whom he is talking about. The Comptroller of Customs, Chairman. Is the Hon. Member saying that the member is subject to bribe?

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I never, at any stage in my speech referred to that Committee, at any point in time. The Hon. Member must have been sleeping when I spoke.

The only Committee which I referred to was the composition of the Commission. I never even spoke about that Committee and to accuse me, Mr. Speaker, of making wild, vicious allegations, I really think that the Hon. Member needs his head examined.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I may need my head examined, but I think that any examination which is necessary is your head. The Hon. Member got in here and said that, as a result of the gambling operation in

here, prostitution, vices, corruption in Customs, all of that. The Hon. Member made those allegations.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I made no allegations. The Hon. Member has said that I made certain allegations about crime, corruption, bribery of Customs Officers. I found that they were not allegations, they were read from the Report. If you would like me to refer to the specific page that I read it from, for his own benefit because it appears to me, that the Hon. Member is not thinking very well today.

If he starts on page 152.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Then, you really did not rise on a point of order.

Dr. HAYNES: Yes, I am pointing out that I did not make the allegations, the allegations are contained in the Report.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are elucidating.

Dr. HAYNES: No, Sir, on a point of order because he is misquoting me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot be on a point of order.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am not misrepresenting the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member distorted the Report in here. The Report was talking about 1973, before this Government instituted legislative measures to ensure regularity of operation. That is what I am talking about and the Hon. Member is using facts which relate to 1973 and portraying them in the manner that they are operating today. The Hon. Member distorted and that is why I am going to say, that the Hon. Member distorted the content of the Report and I am asking the Hon. Member whether he is saying that the Commissioner of Police today is being bribed? Are you saying that? Is that what you are saying?

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Hon. Member is imputing improper motives to me in saying that I referred, or in any way intimated, that the Commissioner of Police, a very distinguished man is subject to bribery. I never mentioned his name, I never said anything of the kind. The Hon. Member is quite confused about the whole thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now seems to be a question of whether or not you said so.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is right. The Solicitor General of Barbados, the Senior Assistant Secretary, Budget, in the Ministry of Finance and Planning, the Hon. Minister responsible for Sport, the Assistant Commissioner

of Inland Revenue. What is the Hon. Member saying? He is saying that they are not paying their Income Taxes.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that I never, at any time, in my speech, referred to that particular Committee, at any time. The Hon. Member still persists in that line of argument and goes further, now in imputing improper motives to me, in respect of Public Officers and he should be asked to withdraw his total remarks in relation to that Committee.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Member, by his omission to mention the fact that this Government, under Legislation set up a high powered Committee to regulate and monitor it, so that he was only twisting the Report for the purpose of trying to substantiate his own wild views on these facts. That is what I am saying.

4.40 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is justifying the gross malefactions in debate now by saying that I by omission accused people of something by not mentioning them.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member looked at all of the undesirable features set out in the report, an allegation, when the hon. member quoted he did not have the intellectual honesty to point out in the course of his speech that the Committee was saying.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. The hon. member says I did not have intellectual honesty. I think that is unparliamentary and I will ask that he withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree that the hon. member should withdraw it.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I withdraw that. The hon. member did not carry out his speech in a manner which honest people are accustomed to carrying them out in debate, that is, that if you make an allegation or you quote from a report you should quote so much of the report that is relevant.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: We need not have this heat generated. You cannot withdraw that he did not have the intellectual honesty and then go on to say he did not discharge his duty in an honest fashion, or words to that effect. You cannot have it both ways, just withdraw it, and I am sure that you are sufficiently mature to overcome a situation such as this in the course of your debate.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Very well, Sir, I withdraw that, but I will say this. I have always heard when you

are debating that you have a duty if you want to be classified as an honest debater that when you are quoting from a report that you set out fully the gist of what you are quoting so that the public would be able to differentiate between your own gloss on a report and what is fact. I say, Sir, that the hon. member from the quotation from the report here did not do that, and the hon. member can pick his own classification.

The position is very clear, Sir, that this Government in the most exhaustive manner possible has made every attempt to ensure that all of the evil features which may characterise gambling in other countries in the world do not operate here. One of the dilemmas that the Commission found themselves in was that among a substantial section of the community they felt that either you were going to prohibit all gambling or you were going to have regulated gambling. The Instant Money, the Turf Club, the Bingo, the dice, all of those things were considered, and a majority of the Commissioners felt that in Barbados one could not discriminate between various forms of gambling, and therefore recommended that in the light of the *de facto* practices, customs, values and usages of Barbados, that all that could be done would be to insist on a rigid regime of regulation and taxation.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure whether the hon. member did declare his interest in the usual manner, seeing that a close relative of his is a one arm bandit operator.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Now you see, Mr. Speaker, that is part of the intellectual. A relative of his is also a murderer, so therefore he is a murderer too.

Dr. HAYNES: A relative of yours is a murderer.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let both hon. members sit. I knew it would come to this some day, I did not expect it today. Let us get on with our debate without all of this.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the gist of the position is very clear, that we have appointed a Committee which has been described.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 4.45 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I will continue next week, Sir.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I move that Government Business be now resumed.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business. Government Business is the instant Order of the day. When the suspension was taken the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works was addressing the Chair. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I think he had concluded his address, Sir). He had concluded.

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

THE DEFENCE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1980

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is a very short Bill, Sir. The first section deals with definitions of children to conform with the general law of Barbados, and it also deals with maintenance orders and affiliation orders.

It will be recalled, all those who have an intimate knowledge of the original Bill, and the very large number of regulations — you know, Sir, soldiers like their lives to be controlled very tightly by rules, they are worse than lawyers in respect of the particularity with which they wish to have their rights, duties and liabilities clarified, and there are a lot of rules there about the conditions under which a soldier may be made to support his children in any part of the Commonwealth, as far as I can judge, Sir, and the first amendment sought is to clarify the definitions. The second amendment is related to pensions. 4.50 p.m.

It provides that persons who are appointed to the Defence Force — I do not have the Principal Act to hand at the moment, but again the hon. member for St. Michael South, his knowledge of the details of the Act will no doubt supply the deficiencies in my memory. It relates to pension. Some difficulty has been discovered in the payment of pensions to certain members of the Defence Forces on retirement, because for some reason when we passed the Act we put in the words "temporarily transferred from" when we did not really mean temporarily at all. People who leave from being a gym mistress or whatever or master in a secondary school or indeed security guards in Government service or hospital orderlies to join the Defence Force, it does seem that this word "temporarily" would prevent them if in fact they left permanently and there really is absolutely no reason that that should be so, because you must provide for people who are in the Defence Force in a permanent or fairly long term basis, and we are therefore seeking to remove that word as from the date of the original Act.

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

Mr. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Mr. BRADSHAW, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. WEEKES in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE TRESPASS TO PROPERTY (REFORM) ACT, 1980

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9 stands in the name of the Hon. Attorney General to move the second reading of a Bill to reform the law respecting trespass to property.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I believe, Sir, that temporarily I am in charge of the Ministry under which this matter comes, and I therefore formally rise to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

It deals with matters regarding trespass to property. Trespass at common law is not a crime, Sir, trespass to property. Traditionally you could enter upon another man's land, sit down in his house, relax on his rocking chair in his verandah, but as long as you did not drink his liquor or do violence to the persons of his family, tear up his crops, separate them from the earth and carry them therefrom or otherwise misconduct yourself, you committed no crime. The hon. member for St. Michael West will be able to tell us about the Six Carpenters' case, the Doctrines of Trespass *ab initio*, the case of Harrison and the Duke of Rutland, but I fear that my memory of these byways of the common law of real property is sadly deficient.
5.00 p.m.

All that I know is that in Barbados it was made a crime at some time and the then law was purified in 1903 in the interest really of the plantation owners of this country and the law dealt not only with trespass by persons but trespass by animals.

It is a very unsatisfactory Act. Under the present law the Police, it is conceived, and I believe supported by many legal opinions do not even have the power to remove a trespasser from your premises. They can only help you to remove them and therefore an old lady finds

herself being menaced by several able-bodied trespassers — apparently the construction of the present law says that she has to place a hand upon one of the trespassers and the Police will then help her to remove them. Of course, by the time the Police comes to her assistance the able-bodied trespasser may very well have committed several other offences much more injurious to the person than trespass to the land.

The fine for petty trespass is \$9.60 without the option of a jail sentence. You can opt in Barbados to go to jail for trespass, a fact which has escaped even the Judicial Officers. A certain Judicial Officer whose rights I think were being enthusiastically defended by his colleagues in the Democratic Labour Party in my hearing of presence once sent a young man to jail for trespassing on the property of Sunset Crest, and I was sitting in the St. James Magistrate Court at the time and I was trying to signal to the gentleman that he had no power to send somebody to jail for trespassing and the man was taken off and carried into the cell and I then got up and whispered into the Magistrate's ear while passing by his desk, you have made yourself liable to very severe damage for false imprisonment because you have no power to jail anybody for trespassing and I believe in the end he was able to make it good with the assistance of the Judiciary or in judicial discussions but I will leave him to my colleague, the Minister of Housing in due course.

In order to cure judicial ignorance and the laxity of the law the Attorney General and his Department have been working for some years on a Bill dealing with Trespass to Real Property and also Trespass by Animals and the law generally in respect of civil liability for animals, the hon. member for St. Michael South West being thoroughly familiar with the cases of Macquaker and Goddard and their interesting observations of the sexual habits of camels, but that I must not anticipate. We are taking camels out of the trespass Act and we are just dealing with occupiers of land, trespassers upon land, trespassers on any land with weapons, even the diplomatic trespassers.

We think that we have a good Act here. It does provide for criminal offences of trespassing under conditions as set out in Section 5. We have Section 3 which is a new crime dealing with prohibition of injury on premises. We have changed the penalty, Sir, and we think that we have an Act which would allow the Police to deal with the problems that we have met recently in Barbados in respect of unlawful entry on premises and remaining on the premises although they are forbidden so to do.

The penalty has been raised to \$250 for the first offence or imprisonment of three months, or \$1,000 or imprisonment for six months for any subsequent offence. Many people may feel indeed, Mr. Speaker, that when you are looking at some of the mischievous behaviour on

the people's premises by certain persons and I do not only by any means mean the Rastafarians. We may well think that \$250 as a fine errs upon the generosity and mildness. There are a lot of offences that involve less criminal determination than interfering with people's property that carries a higher fine. Nonetheless, I think that at this stage we will try a moderate fine to arm the Police with power to prevent trespass and control trespass and we will see where we will go from there.

I think this Bill is long overdue. I think we need a little more self discipline in Barbados. I do not want to go to great length to discuss this subject but we can see in many regards how a bad example is bred in discipline that itself breeds public discomfort. As I have already said we are not only talking about the Rastas occupying people's premises.

I think personally that the behaviour at the National Stadium on certain occasions is a disgrace and I think it is very sad that conditions at the Stadium are such that wrestling, a popular sport, cannot be carried on there because of the indiscipline of people who wish to see it and the incapacity to control them properly on premises such as that, but as I said, it is a matter of example. Nobody thinks of going to cricket at Kensington and behaving as they behave at the Stadium because the standard of behaviour at Kensington is an example which has been laid down over a long period of time and people just do not behave badly but in other places the example is a difficult example and I think we must strive for more discipline and control in a small country such as Barbados.

I am a great libertarian, Sir. I believe people must have as much liberty as is consonant with they not interfering with other people's liberties and other people's liberty includes the right to have a bit of land on which nobody should squat or occupy. It includes the right where you can go and watch sport in a seat that you have paid for without having stow-aways stepping on your shoulders as they move forward to the best positions.

I hope that all hon. members will support this Act which brings the law up-to-date. It is not severe. It does not make it being found on somebody else's land an automatic criminal offence. That might be going a little too far when you consider the background of a small Island. I hope that members will support it and understand that we are striking a blow to restore some of the honour of good behaviour which in limited years of our society appear to have been lost sight of.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak on it.
5.10 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the presentation of this Bill for debate today. Mr. Speaker, to my mind, this is so important a piece of Legislation, that perhaps the movers of the Bill itself do not appear to see the far reaching consequences of this and I think that the timing of this Bill at 5.10 p.m. today, is perhaps a little injudicious because I feel that this is a Bill which merits maximum publicity and unfortunately, there are not all the reporters here, perhaps as there should be, to give the Bill, the necessary publicity because the general public of Barbados want a piece of Legislation which bolsters their confidence in being secure in this Island.

I think that the Bill goes some way towards assuring members of the public, that the Government is aware of certain trends in the society, certain trends of deviance also certain trends towards criminality which are having a disturbing and disconcerting effect upon the broad mass of people.

Now, I am not one who is impressed by criminal statistics. I never relied on them having been trained in criminology. I realise that much crime is hidden from ultimate entry into the books and you never get a true picture of the level of crime, but it is clear and only recently, on my trip to Australia, I bought a book by Professor Radzinovech who is perhaps the leading expert on Criminology. He has made it very clear that the growth of crime is international. It is no use Barbadians feeling, all of a sudden, that there is an upsurge of crime in Barbados, in isolation to an upsurge in crime throughout the whole world.

All States, including Russia, Yugoslavia, Cuba are recording increases in crime and Barbados is just a microcosm in the general international increase in criminal activity, particularly offences against property, house breaking, breaking and entering, stealing in a dwelling house and more recently, some offences against the person stabbing, shooting and so on. People are still searching for the causes of crime without being able to give a total explanation for the development of crime.

A lot of criminality is rooted in the problems of society, but what we are having, in Barbados, is the rasta movement and I am only speaking about the rastas because of certain recent statements attributed to an Hon. Member from the Other Place which got into the Press in the last week. Barbadians are the best imitators of any trend, or fad that you can wish to see. The rastas themselves, the vast proportion of rastas in Barbados are not genuine rastas, like the original rastas in Jamaica and I know some of them. We have Calypsonian Lord Funny calls them, "counterfeit rastas, imitation rastas".

But, we have a breed of people, be they rastas, or otherwise, who now feel that it is their right to come on your property and pick your itals and sell them at a

pretty, pretty place here below Government House, its food, or carry them home and cook them without any respect for the fact that it is your property and if the property owner threatens one or injures, there is a ring of crime. I want to be fair, the rastas are distinctive by their hair, they are also distinctive, to some extent, by their colours, I believe that their colours are red, gold and green. As another Calypsonian says, Explainer, "No part of the country's Constitution can tell you how to dress, or how to wear your hair", and one has to respect the rights of these people who may not be of the same persuasion, as some of us, to wear their hair as they like and to dress as they like.

But, they must understand that the Constitution and the Laws of this country give you certain rights to your property and they must treat people's properties, be they its, houses, or what with respect. That is all I ask of the rastas. I want to make it clear, I concede to them their right to dress and comb their hair as they like, but they must concede to me, my right to live on my property and to grow my vegetables unmolested. If they do not concede that to me, well then we are going to get into trouble. There will be a conflict.

Now, the Petty Trespass Bill which is on the Statute Books, at present, has always been totally out-of-date. It has been a very difficult Bill under which to gain conviction. In fact, the original Petty Trespass Bill never gave any meaningful rights to small people, in the society. It was designed to protect plantation owners, but the ordinary individual had difficulty in getting criminal conviction under that Bill. It calls for some skill in drafting and also in the matter of evidence.

This Bill, seems to me, in its broadest principles, to be trying to meet some of the deficiencies in the original Petty Trespass Act and at the same time, taking account of some of the crimes and problems in the society. I want to deal with the question of trespass and people just feeling that they have a right to go on your property and do as they like with it, especially if you happen to be away for a couple of days, or weeks.

Recently, Government offered to C.B.C. a building called Rose Reef on Culloden Road. We want an extension to our premises, more space. The Government made this place available and I was invited to go and look at it, very good thing I did not go. Representatives of the Corporation went and had a look, but they did not get too far.
5.20 p.m.

The building had been taken over by a set of people and had been used as a toilet. There was evidence of faeces from upstairs to downstairs, and there was no way that I was going to clean that up and put the

Corporation's staff in it, so I rejected the offer from Government. They can do what they like with the building, but CBC staff will not be going into it, not so long as I am Chairman. That is one of the problems, that the building had been lying down for months and has suddenly been taken over by a group of people who have no fixed place of abode and used in circumstances ill befitting human beings. If this Bill will go anywhere towards eliminating the illegal occupation of premises and illegal trespassing, then I think it merits all of our support. If it goes anywhere towards assuring the public that there were deficiencies in the current legislation which are recognised and which are going to be covered and the loopholes blocked by new legislation, then I think again it is a Bill that merits our support.

I do not know how much time hon. members have had to study it, but I am sure that hon. members are familiar with a scene that happens 18 days a year. Every race day there are people who stand up by the 7½ furlong pole at the entrance to the straight run and as the horses are coming into the straight run they converge on the outside rail and on to the track at great personal danger which they do not seem to appreciate, because a horse only has to break a halter or a bit comes through the side of his mouth and it rears up and knocks down 20 or 30 of them and kills them, then they will be able to appreciate it. They do it at great personal danger to themselves, to jockeys and to horses, and they crowd onto the track and ignore the pleas of the police and the security guards not to crowd on to the track but to stay behind the rails. You have advertisements on the radio on race mornings. Jockeys themselves come on and ask the public to give them a chance. It makes no difference and the police are powerless to deal with it.

I believe I see in this Bill a clause which now gives the police the power to do something positive about those people who make it a habit of trespassing on the straight run during a race at the garrison. I believe, speaking as a member of the Committee of Management of the Turf Club that the Barbados Turf Club and all people interested in racing will be very pleased to see that something is being done to strengthen the hands of the police or the security people who will act as agents of the occupiers of the Turf Club on race days so that we can save people from being injured or being killed by a race horse one of these days.

The Hon. Prime Minister has alluded to the problem at the Stadium and I will not traverse that ground again, but the problem at the Stadium is similar to the problem at the Turf Club.

Mr. Speaker, I see that it is proposed in this Bill also to grant some kind of protection to members of Diplomatic Missions in Barbados, at least the properties in which they live. I have no quarrel with that, my

concern is with the defence that is given in clause 8(3). The Act does not give defences, and that is but fair. As a matter of principle I have no quarrel with a defence being written into an Act, but I think when a defence is written into an Act the defence must be meaningful. When you tell a man he cannot trespass on the Venezuelan Ambassador's house or Mission Office or wherever, and then you give him the defence to come and say you can talk as much as you like but I really did not know that the Venezuelan Office was an Office to which the Act applied, if you allow that kind of defence you are making a mockery of the law. This is foolishness. It is too simplistically drafted to be of any use really if you are trying to protect the Diplomatic Corps. Do not give that kind of defence where the man just comes up and says that he did not know that it was a Consular Office.

There used to be in the old law a defence that if there was a genuine dispute between two neighbours about the boundary line, one trespassing on the other, the defence was that if the person charged on reasonable grounds *bona fide* believes that there was at issue a question as to title to the land, then the magistrate had to dismiss the case. I believe that a similar provision is retained in this legislation and that really is all the defence you need, but this one in clause 8(3): "In any proceedings for an offence under this section it is a defence for the person charged to prove that he believed that the premises in question were not premises to which this section applies," how is he going to prove it? Prove that he believes? You are asking for a defence based on mental processes not a defence based on conduct, you are asking a man to just come and say that he believes the premises were not premises to which the section applied. He can say that in a statement from the dock and nobody can cross-examine him afterwards, he cannot be questioned.

Do you know how you could get around it? Perhaps the Government may want to consider this as an administrative matter, but to get round the nugatory effect of this clause as presently drafted, and the folly in it as presently drafted, you will have to do like you do with the cars. Every diplomatic car has to have CD plates, well ensure that at the front of every diplomatic office or house or something they have a plaque clearly distinguishing that it is a diplomatic or consular office or premises. That is the only way to get around it, otherwise to leave it as it is you are only talking foolishness. (ASIDE). I am glad the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister has accepted my proposition, it is a matter that can be done by regulation through the Ministry of External Affairs who will issue the plaques and put them up, but otherwise to leave it like this is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I am not physically able to take part in any lengthy debate. I came today just out of loyalty but against the advice of my doctor and the air-condition-

ing is now affecting me, but I should just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this piece of legislation is a very important piece of legislation. We have had lots of problems in the last few years with praedial larceny. We have had lots of problems with small farmers growing their crops only to see their crops stolen in the middle of the night by unscrupulous dishonest people. I hope that some effort is made to explain this Bill to the public, because it is one that needs some public relations. The big farmers, the small farmers, the plantation owners would get a little hope that we are serious about protecting their interests and that we are tightening the law where they were lacunae before with a view to seeing Barbados run as a disciplined, orderly society. It seems that all we need to do now in future is to give a fellow notice that he is not to come on your land or your premises and the notice can be by word of mouth, you do not have to put anything in writing; and the Act goes very far because in clause 3, this is a far-reaching principle, it says you don't have to give notice. Entry is prohibited without any notice on premises which are a garden, lawn, field, plantation under cultivation or orchard; so nobody unless at your invitation or call or consent can come on to your lawn, garden, field, orchard or even plantation — there may be one member of the House who may be interested in plantations though not in the House at present — nobody can come on to. Entry is now prohibited and barred unless you consent, agree or invite the person, or where you have any area that is fenced in to show that you intend to keep people out or animals out like your backyard where you have a paling, anybody you find behind your yard unless you tell him to come, entry is now prohibited, and I think that the simplification of the law in this regard is very welcome.

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two typographical matters that I saw in looking at the Bill and I will draw them to the attention of the House in Committee. The Bill uses certain language like "weapons of violence". I am not too sure that I like the nomenclature or even understand what is intended in Clause 7 as indeed provided for, but when we come to deal with the Bill clause by clause in Committee stage, I will have a few quick observations to make as to the drafting.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Prime Minister was introducing this Bill he anticipated that I would speak on it and suggested that I might wish to deal with certain aspects of the law. The fact is, Sir, that I do not propose to do that because I do not think that, except as I shall point out in Committee a few areas that are dubious in their formulation as the hon. member who has just sat down has observed, it is necessary. I do not propose to deal with a matter which seems to improve the law that has been standing since 1903.

I wish however, Sir, to utter a voice perhaps of caution in the context of the social aspects of this Bill. All those hon. members who have spoken so far have alluded to the fact that the Bill that is now being repealed by this Act operated to the advantage of the plantocracy and to the detriment of the ordinary, little people in the society, and those of us who are over 35 years old can speak with knowledge about the various and sundry ways in which the rights of the ordinary people were trammelled legally in this country over a period of time.

Sir, the phenomenon of the Rastafarian movement has struck the Caribbean in a manner that is perhaps second only to the movement in the 1930s which seemed to have transmitted themselves from Island to Island without any conscious carrier or courier of the message which they bore. Let me start off by saying, Sir, that no one who believes in the concept of Government of laws can deny the rights of all the citizens in a community be protected under the law. To the extent that this Bill seeks to strengthen the law in that regard, Sir, we on this side would have no difficulty supporting it, but as I was saying, the Rastafarian movement has been a strange phenomenon for many of us. The plain truth is that except for some people in Jamaica, many of us do not seem to understand the Rastafarian movement, and I suspect that many persons who themselves now proclaim to the world that they are "Rastas" may not in fact understand the movement. I think it would be wrong for us as a Parliament and indeed as a community to fall into the error of which we have read other societies throughout history fell, that is to say, to identify a particular group, to identify the shortcomings of some members of that group and then to stereotype an entire group in such a manner that persons who are less discriminating in their thinking processes judge the group on the behaviour of some members of the group.

Mr. Speaker, without great fanfare I have said in this Honourable House before and I shall say again that I profess to be a Christian. Now, Sir, in the early days I may have been because my parents decided that I should be, but in my later years I have chosen to be a Christian because there are certain aspects of christianity which appeal to me, and I wish to remind this Honourable House that in the early days of christianity, the Christians were persecuted throughout the Middle East primarily because the other sects and the other societies did not or could not understand what christianity was or what it was supposed to be. Of course, Sir, it is now well known that christianity has survived and persevered nearly 2,000 years and it is ironic, Sir, that the Christians themselves in turn became or so-called Christians became some of the greatest perpetrators of persecution under the guise of doing that which was right and that which was christian. But, Sir, we all know that christianity needs to be examined in great detail before one can embrace it

totally, or worse, before one can embrace certain persons who deem themselves christians.

The point I am seeking to put to this Honourable House, Sir, is that we must be extremely careful that we do not allow ourselves and I have reasons to believe that no hon. member in here would allow himself or herself to fall into the trap if once he or she gives some thought to the matter.....

5.40 p.m.

But we must be particularly careful not to be seen to be legislating here today against the Rastafarians. That is not what we are doing in this Bill but it does not fall for a community to conclude if we are not careful that this is Rasta Legislation.

Those persons who masquerade as Rastas or who believe that they are Rastas and go through the length and breadth of the community breaking the law ought to be dealt with within the Law. I have no quarrel and I do not think that people would have any quarrel about that but, Sir, we have seen under different circumstances where a total community turned on a group of persons slowly at first but eventually it became a human cry where the mere sight of a person who is different was sufficient to incite violence against that person.

Any of us who have lived in the larger countries where because of the colour of our skins we have had to be part of the minority know the utter terror which can strike the heart if one should go into an area or neighbourhood that is reputed to regard people from minority groups as fair game. I think the hon. member who just sat down is in an excellent position to indicate how easily persons who were sworn to uphold the law were able because of public attitude to take the law and use it against other persons merely because of the colour of their skins.

I speak here, Sir, of Diplomatic Officers for the Government of Barbados being assaulted and treated in a manner not commensurate with the normal human dignity and the only reason they were so treated was because the particular Policeman in question in England could not distinguish between one black man and another black man. To them all black men were the same and all black men were to be condemned, beaten and if necessary jailed on sight.

We must be very careful while all of us maintain the right of every citizen who has defence against his property through the law, we must be very careful that the mere sight of a Rasta or person who wears dreadlocks and whose clothing is not what is considered the customary clothing in Barbados may fall a victim to what I should say is the enthusiasm of a few misguided and unenlightened persons.

I do not wish to be singled out although I may very well be, as the person who defends the Rastafarian attitudes in Barbados. I represent the constituency, Sir, where there are pockets of Rastafarians or persons who say they are Rastafarians. I also happen to know, Sir, that those persons are the children of other people in that constituency and many of those persons who so identify themselves by their dress, their speech and manner of behaviour, only a few months ago it seemed, were ordinary Barbadian boys and girls walking about the constituency.

I think that we as a community have a duty not only to deal with the symptoms but to examine the causes. I hope that hon. members in this House will lend themselves to a commitment of trying to find out what are the basic reasons or what are the basic motivations which have been leading so many of our young people willy-nilly and sometimes without a second thought to embrace the cult warm in religion, Mr. Speaker, which seems to us in Barbados at least so alien to what we have known in the past.

I think it should be put in the records of this Honourable House too, Sir, that in the sister country of Jamaica the Rastafarian is an entirely different kind of individual who is greeted by the rest of the society. I think it is well known that they are Rastafarian Doctors, Rastafarian Lawyers and I believe one or two Rastafarian members of Parliament and indeed throughout the entire spectrum of the society in Jamaica one can find persons who are committed to the Rastafarian Movement or the Rastafarian Religion and our Constitution says clearly that a man or woman is entitled to religious freedom and we so accept in Barbados.

I agree with the hon. member that it also says that a man's property must be protected, and to the extent that this Law seeks to do so, no one would quarrel with it, but as I said, Sir, I am merely issuing a cautious note, not necessarily to hon. members on that side but to the public at large that we must try very hard not to slide into attitudes that Rastas should be beaten on sight or that Rastas should be dealt with more harshly than other persons in the society. I think that the Rasta criminal should be dealt with like all other criminals in this country.

Some time ago, Sir, two young men who identified themselves by their manner and approach as members of the Rastafarian came to see me to point out that they were very afraid because they had reason to feel that certain Police Officers whenever they saw them and their colleagues were stopping them, making them strip, sometimes cutting their hair and generally treating them in a manner which, to my mind, if it was true, would have been dehumanizing.

I took the trouble to go and have discussions with some Senior Police Officers and in the end that same division *modus operandi* between the Police in the area and those Rastafarians who function in the area where the Police indicated that there were some criminal body or otherwise who was using the Rasta appearance and the Rasta disguise, if you will, to pervert certain crimes in the society in the area and their concept of how to deal with those kinds of criminals was protective measures. If you beat them in advance they would be unlikely to commit such crimes. The problem was, Mr. Speaker, that they could not identify who were the criminals from who were the sons and daughters of decent families who had merely accepted and adopted the cult.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that not long ago, the son of Mr. Albert Alleyne, I believe a man who is functioning at BIMAP with distinction had inadvertently found himself walking along a certain part of Bridgetown. He was collected, because to say arrested, might not be correct. He was taken to a Police Station, they cut his hair, they bathe him, even though he had a bath the same morning, and it was alleged, I cannot say I had the knowledge, that he was handed out other brutalities which were not necessary or commensurate with what one would expect in a civilized community.
5.50 p.m.

I believe that that matter was dealt with either inside the courts, or outside the courts. I believe that that matter is still pending, I am not sure, it may have been settled out of court in the usual manner.

The fact is that one cannot distinguish between Mr. Alleyne's son with long hair, if his clothes are not like the ones you now wear and Miss Busby's son down in Upper Goodland, with long hair and I do not believe that such a distinction must be made before a citizen could be expected to be treated in a reasonable way, by Law Enforcement Agencies, or members of Law Enforcement Agencies.

Again, Sir, it may be said that I accused the Police of brutality, but the Police generally know, in Barbados, that I am one of their defenders, although I would never be a defender of any policeman who takes the Law in his own hand, merely because he is an agent of the Law.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that this Law, Sir, I believe has a number of good attributes about it. I as I said Sir, am a little concerned that some of the language seems so nebulous and so without proper foundation, in its intent, that we may really only be passing the time, when we pass the Legislation in this form. I regret that the Hon. Attorney General is not here himself to explain some of these things, but I am sure that other competent persons will do so.

One good feature of this Bill Sir, which commends it for me, is that at least persons are going to be responsible for some of the very horrible advertising which springs up overnight around the community. Anyone who drives from Eagle Hall, to Speightstown is bound to be offended by the sight of some of the worst, I could only call them malefactions of the environment, what is described as advertising and at long last, persons responsible for the message will be brought to bear, if the person who actually puts piece of advertising cannot be discovered. That is a good feature of the Bill Sir and I hope that it will go somewhere towards improving the environment of Barbados because unfortunately, there are a number of persons who believe that advertising is sticking up something saying something to people and they do not realise, that a lot of it helps to turn people off the particular product which is sought to be advertised.

Without attempting to discuss particular Clauses in the Bill, Sir, I am a little concerned about a phrase which I see here, "without a warrant arrest that person for the purpose of establishing his identity". Now, Sir, one of the basic freedoms which a person has in any community is the right to remain silent and this Legislation, it appears to me, seeks to give, not police officers, alone, Sir, anybody, willy nilly, the right to arrest somebody for the purposes of identity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a suspicion that this might induce more violent crime because there are times when persons will not identify themselves as occupiers, or authorised persons who might seek to ask somebody else, you Your Honour, or me, what are you doing here? Who are you? Unless the persons who is being challenged is satisfied, that the person who is challenging has authority to do so, that person might seek to keep his mouth shut. If you are dealing with a person who is a trespasser *per se*, that is not a problem, but if you are dealing with persons who happen to be described as a trespasser, unless he proves otherwise, this Act, as I understand it, seeks to give other persons the right to arrest him for identity purposes.

I should like to suggest, that that matter needs some rethinking. It could lead to some very strange and dire consequences and I do not see that this Act would interfere with the Common Law right against unfair imprisonment and therefore, the Government, in its Public Relations campaign on this piece of Legislation should take steps to let occupiers and *quasi* occupiers know that they are not being visited with any special police rights, other than those which they have always had because to do otherwise Mr. Speaker, might lead some very law abiding citizens to get themselves into trouble.

As I said Sir, there are some matters which raised questions in my mind and which I will raise in Com-

mittee. But, by and large, it is always good to see the Law as making some progress, especially when we are moving away from Legislation which was imposed particularly for planters, on the rest of the society. But, in so doing, I hope that opportunity will be taken in assisting the community in holding a level attitude on this question of rastafarians.

I believe that a public statement made recently, might have been made in the wrong context, or might have been reported in the wrong context, for I refuse to believe that anyone who has been in Public Service for a substantially long time and anyone who is a Christian, which the person attributed with the statement, I believe to be, could hardly wish that persons would be beaten on sight, or jailed on sight. I would wish to disassociate myself from that kind of sentiment and I believe, that that statement must be clarified and I believe that it cannot be the attitude of the Government and I hope that nothing which is said by any of those Hon. Ministers, or any of the Hon. Members, especially the Hon. Ministers on that Side be so interpreted for, if that were to be the case, we would indeed have very serious problems, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am going to be rather brief, but I thought that I had to make a contribution since the origin of this Bill, as now is, comes largely from the Ministry of Agriculture. But, before doing so, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Member for St. Philip North on a very good speech. He has touched on actually all aspects of the Bill, he has dealt so adequately with it, that he certainly lessens my task in saying what I would have liked to say.

I should also like to assure the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West, that the Rastafarian Movement never at all entered into the consideration of the Government, in bringing this Bill into Parliament. The reason for this Bill is purely that a number of people, within the past few years, decided not to plant their lands and to grow provisions and so on because they were stolen whenever they were planted. They became very fed up with the planting of their lands and they decided not to plant any more.

So, the Government thought that the people needed some assurance, that the Government was aware of their problems and the Government decided to make amendments to the Bill as it was. As a result, they have brought this Bill before Parliament. You have to take into account, whenever you are drafting Legislation, the total community as such. I do not believe and I want to say, at the outset, that I believe that all Hon. Members of this Side and I believe, on the Other Side as well, have friends who are rastafarians. But, I remember once a baker said, there is bread and there is bread. There are rastas and there are rastas.
6.00 p.m.

Some people say they are rastas and some people say they are Rastas. I do not know what is actually meant by that, but we have some very thrifty Rastas in our community, people who are committed to hard work, people who are prepared to utilise their skills for the benefit of themselves and the benefit of the community. We in the Barbados Labour Party applaud them, we wish them well, we are prepared to give them assistance and where possible make provisions whereby they can operate in their craft and with their craft in peace. In other words, if they came tomorrow morning to Government, those of them who like land, I do not mean land for the pot because some of them like to come and say they want land but they do not want anybody near them. I want them to have land near to other people. If they are not concerned with the growing of marijuana and they want any amount of land from the Government, we are prepared to put them on those lands and allow them to work and produce food, and this Bill seeks to protect him in growing his food against the other Rastas who will come and steal what he has planted. That is all we have set out to do.

This is a very progressive piece of legislation in the direction that the people who are involved in planting would wish to see on the Statute Book in order to assure them that their property would be safe for the future. At least the property may still not be safe but the mere fact that the law is there will give them the feeling of some form of security. We have got a situation, Mr. Speaker, whereby we are importing over 130 odd million dollars in food stuff per year. A considerable amount of this food can well be grown here in this country but it will only be grown if the people who grow this food understand that at the end of the day when the food is to be reaped that nobody will come and steal it. There is no question of any laws to affect the Rastafarians. I would be the first if I saw a Rastafarian being unfairly interfered with out there to go out there and to give him a measure of protection. I can tell you that the Rastafarians enjoy a sympathy from this Government that is really unbelievable.

This piece of legislation is vital and important and I welcome it, and I sincerely hope that the people in this country will see the need for it and that when it is passed by both Houses of Parliament that the Government will give the necessary publicity to this Bill in order that the people, particularly those to whom I referred, who grow vegetables and fruits in this island will be willing once again to plant their fruit trees and crops and be sure that at the end of the period they will have their crops to reap.

With those few words, I welcome this Bill and give it my wholehearted support.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the question of Rastafarians in Barbados seems to have over-

taken the true nature of the new Petty Trespass Act. As one who has practised in the law courts of this island for a long time I know that the old Petty Trespass Act had many deficiencies. I believe one of the problems that lawyers have met with the Petty Trespass Act was that people could enter your premises under any pretence and not even the police had the power to remove those persons, you a land owner would only ask the person to leave your premises and you had to go through, if that person did not leave, the legal gymnastics of proving that he either entered lawfully and then misbehaved himself, or several other variations of that theme, and this is after any damage had been done to your property.

I believe that many people in Barbados seem to look at human rights or rights of an individual only in singular terms. We have reached the situation where every man is entitled to a right, and some persons sit down and pontificate without really studying the true implications of what is happening in our society recently. I remember being involved in a matter at District "B" Police Station some time ago in which a hotelier complained that persons were coming on his property under the pretence of selling curios to the visitors, but those were the persons whom he could identify at a later stage who were involved in many of the disturbances happening on his property. He had no right to move them because the term "visitor" in law came into play.

I remember another incident in which a man accompanied a girl into a public place, a bar, and they fought and the proprietor got a cut on his head and this went through the law courts for many months tangled up in the legal implications of what was a trespasser under the Petty Trespass Act and what was a visitor.

Now, we come down to the Rastafarians and I say that I must equate them like you equate Christians. There are a lot of people who go to Church every Sunday morning decked down in their Sunday-go-to-meeting hat, their pretty dress and their once a week shoes, and they kneel down and pretend to pray, and they come out and tell you 'I am a Christian' but only for the occasion. But you find some of those same Christians in the law courts every morning that the law courts are open. They are either charged or they are witnesses, or they have somebody in court. You have to determine the true Christians out of the make-believe Christians, you have to determine the sincere from the insincere.

Now, I hear the hon. member talking about anybody with a Christian conscience. There are Rastafarians and Rastafarians. In Jamaica where I believe the Movement originated, the Jamaica Government and the people of Jamaica found that people masqueraded under the guise of rastafarianism to carry out their criminal activities. We in Barbados have got to be aware of whether or not we are not now reaching the same situation. Nobody, no

Government, nobody who believes in fair play and justice would say that if a man chooses to wear his hair in dreadlocks, put on a long coat and walk down the road that you can interfere with him. He has a right to dress as he likes, but he must abide with the law. There are Rastafarians who believe in their religion. I have in my Ministry now a gentleman who wears his hair in locks, but he comes to work every day, he does his work, there is no complaint against him, so you cannot say that he is a drag on society, or you cannot brand him as somebody who is offensive to the society.

6.10 p.m.

Each and everyone of us must be prepared to play our part in the society and there is freedom of worship, freedom of association under the Constitution of this country, and therefore we cannot quarrel with the type of religion anybody chooses to practise. But we must look seriously at those people who masquerade as Rastafarians to give the true Rastafarians a bad name and a bad religion in our society. Any Act which is passed in Parliament and becomes law and remains on the Statute Book and it only comes into operation if you run afoul of that law, and that is something that must be remembered. There is a law on the Statute Book that he who kills and is convicted, the sentence of death can be passed upon him, but it does not mean that because it is on the Statute Book you can hold every man who walks the street and hang him. So it is no use trying to bring the question of Rastafarians in the passing of a Petty Trespass Act.

If people go out there following the advice of the Government that you must now increase your food production in this country and they toil by day and by night to produce food, they are entitled to be protected from the sheep, the goat, the cow, the Rastafarian or anybody else, and that is what the law is about. If you have your property and you do not want anybody to trespass, that is what the law is about. The Opposition must not try to tell the public at large that this Government is passing a law against Rastafarians. We are protecting every human being and property in this country. Barbadians are a property loving nation. The amount of praise that has been showered on this Government through the new Tenantry Bill can show you how Barbadians regard their own property. I am happy to say that Barbados has not reached the stage of some Caribbean Islands or some Latin American countries. I was recently in a Latin American country. They have beautiful houses, beautiful lawns but the only way you can see them is if you walk up to the five foot six foot wall with a six foot iron rail on top of that and peer through the rail to see what is behind. Every window, every door is covered by wrought iron grills. So far we are still able in this country to build a house, put up a green hedge around it and have your house like living quarters rather than a gilded cage,

and if we are to continue living in that way we must provide the foundation to make people believe and understand that the Government is anxious that anybody can secure his property and that anybody can go out and he who sows must reap, not some sow and others reap.

We must remember, Mr. Speaker, one thing in this country, that we are a small island community. Agricultural plots in this country as far as 90% of the people are concerned do not measure more than one hectare at the maximum. There are many cases where people have less than half or a quarter hectare and are making a living out of it. When you plant a crop and somebody reaps it, you are put in double jeopardy, Mr. Speaker, and these people must feel sure that the Government respects what they are doing, and the Government must pass laws to protect them in their houses, in their lands and in their crops. It is useless to bring Rastafarians into this. If they are a bunch of people out there who believe that they want to leave society, let them leave society, but do it in a legal manner. If they believe that they want land to work, let them acquire it in a legal manner, but don't for heaven's sake believe that any Government or any society can tolerate people who believe that they have the right to take what is not theirs. The criminal law provides for people who take what is not theirs. We have an ancient Act and the Government is modernising this Act today. It is not modernising it to get anybody. If you run afoul of the law, as far as I am concerned the law must be executed and the penalty will be applied to those who are found guilty. There is one thing in this country; you have to be found guilty before the law can come into operation. You can be charged under the law; the police or whoever is the complainant must give the evidence to satisfy the presiding officer that you are guilty of the offence charged, and then and only then can the law come into operation, and if anybody out there figures that this law applies to him, all he has to do is to walk the straight and narrow path, the law will remain on the Statute Book and he will not fall under the penalty that is set out under this law.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my comments, but I should like to examine one or two other aspects of the necessity for legislation of this kind which this side has already given its support.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the upsurge of the problems as outlined lies in areas which legislation of this kind will not correct. These areas, Mr. Speaker, are socio-economic in origin and in a sense cultural in origin. Mr. Speaker, when the rate of inflation fostered and fuelled by incompetence and inadequate Government policies has reached the kind of levels which obtain in Barbados today, when the levels of

unemployment remain at an unacceptably high level, when young people, Mr. Speaker, can see no hope of progress, no hope of accumulating savings, no hope, Mr. Speaker, of being able to improve their lot, when the effects of inflation bear hardest on areas such as food, clothing and essential factors such as housing and health, when these factors are all combined, then they add up to a situation where people will opt out of society or either out of sheer necessity may be driven beyond their better moral judgment to take actions of a kind which they might not take.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should just like to give you one example. Last Tuesday morning I had an opportunity to speak..... (ASIDES)

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. James is behaving in his usual manner and it is very difficult to concentrate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to you the kind of example which I think is very pertinent.
6.20 p.m.

Last Tuesday morning a gentleman came to see me having gone to five Banks in Barbados to try to borrow \$500. The gentleman has a wall house which he owns. He has no mortgage on his house. (ASIDES). I am going to make a stipulation in my chargeable trust that the extra \$400 to bring your salary to \$100,000.00 should be given to you. To get back.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suppose he also had land and he cultivated it.

Dr. HAYNES: Yes, Sir, I am getting back to that. The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that here was a man who through his savings down the years had a tangible asset but on going to five Banks in Barbados to raise \$500, he had lost his job due to illness, he was unable to work and he could not get \$500 and had four children to feed. These are the kinds of situations that people are faced with day-to-day.

Now when a man, Mr. Speaker, is faced with a problem of a hungry wife and four hungry children, when a man has assets which represent what he has saved throughout his entire life, what does a man do in a situation like that? Such a man, Mr. Speaker, would require a lot of restraint not to pass by a field and see potatoes or yams knowing that he cannot get the \$500 because of a credit squeeze and probably stop and pick up a couple of yams or potatoes.

The point I am trying to make is, Mr. Speaker, that the Government must recognise that at the same time they bring legislation of this kind that they must pay attention to the serious socio-economic problems in the

society that would result in the kind of behaviour pattern that we see emanating in Barbados.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. I would just like to point out to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that the Government is aware of these socio-economic problems which can pre-dispose criminality and that is why we have kept the rate of inflation down to 30% last year whereas in this document here by the Democratic Labour Party in 1976 they said that "we are mandated to reduce the rate of inflation from 40% in 1973/74 to less than 12% in 1975." Page 3 under the General Heading - "Background". This is Volume I, Sir, this is the big one, Sir.

They themselves admitted that the rate of inflation in 1973/74 was 40%. That is why the Commissioner of Police last week could say that 1975 was a peak year for crime, following his argument, Sir. Thank you, Sir.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should not start getting into waters which could be foreign to him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe he is following in your trend that the truth does not matter. He might only be trying to create an impression.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, if such a misquotation did not come from your eminence I would respond.

The point is, to respond to the hon. member, that if he looks at the Quarterly Report of the Central Bank in June 1976 he would see that the rate of inflation in this country was 0% and by the end of the year despite the ill advised extravagancies in the commercial sector which followed a very generous and the highest increases ever granted to public servants in this country that it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is that to do with the Bill?

Dr. HAYNES: I am responding to the remarks made by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, respond to the Bill.

Dr. HAYNES: I am responding to the Bill in that if the present administration allows the rate of inflation to increase by over 400% above these figures over a 4-year period whilst at the same time the value of the Barbados dollar continue to fall, while at the same time the rate of unemployment in this country remains at best the same and is probably increasing, where particularly in the essential areas people cannot eat, this is going to give rise to the kind of petty crimes which they are trying to solve by the kind of legislation which they are bringing before this Honourable House today and I would think that if they would address themselves to effective agri-

cultural policies and try to find some effective means of reasonable stabilisation of food prices in Barbados and if they would stop certain persons whose heads are grey from selling dope in the community, if they would do that, Sir, I think then that they will find, Mr. Speaker, that the rate of petty crime relating to trespassing for food and so on.....

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe the hon. member just offended the rules of this House by alluding to members of the House selling dope. He identified them as people with grey hair but whether those people are on this side or on that side it is offensive and should be withdrawn.

Dr. HAYNES: Now, Mr. Speaker, one final point. It has been proven in developed countries and this is a very interesting point that apart from people who have emotional disturbances, where people although they have money would shoplift and so on that people would not steal food because of the difficulties involved in picking up yams and that sort of thing, if they have enough money in their pockets to buy food at a reasonable price. In other words when in a society it becomes more convenient and easier to spend your money on buying food.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Now I would really like the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have not just spoken.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, I have.

Mr. SPEAKER: You introduced the Bill.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member would be serious for a moment. The hon. member knows that the reason why the people in the South Bronx or in Harlem or in the East End of London do not steal food is because there are no potato fields nearby. The hon. member could not seriously say that people in the South Bronx are better off than the people in Barbados in terms of access to food.

Dr. HAYNES: The point is taken and it would be relevant for urban areas of course but it is an established fact, especially by Sociologists that it is a curious thing that anytime a society reaches the point where incomes are such that people can easily purchase food then the theft of food automatically declines except in people who have emotional and physical disorders. Therefore, I would say that pay attention to inflation, pay attention to wages, pay attention to unemployment, pay attention to

the levels of social services that you have within the society and you will find that you will make a far more significant impact on the kind of serious problems.

I accept that there is a serious problem which has been described by members on the other side but this kind of approach in the long run would have far greater and far more long reaching effects in terms of the solution of the problem. This should be regarded as an interim measure. It should be regarded as a historical piece of legislation on the Statute Book but at the same time whereas foolish persons would not absorb what we are trying to say.

6.30 p.m.

We all are Barbadians, we all live in Barbados and hopefully, we will live for many years in this country, but we have to recognise that these problems have to be solved and unless they are solved, no amount of Legislations, even if they were to pass Islamic Laws are going to solve the problem. I would once more urge the present Administration, to look at your level of social services, their availability. This represents some degree of subsidy in an inflationary unemployment situation and I believe that we would be able to contribute much greater and much more rapidly to a solution of the problem which you have identified, rather than by Legislation.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Hon. Members, on this Side for the responsible way in which they spoke and I equally congratulate the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West who made a very valuable contribution to this Bill. Of course, Sir, I must condemn the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central because in his speech was active encouragement, for people in this country, to break the Laws which relate to security of property which relate to prohibition of theft and things of that kind.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe that I went to great lengths, Mr. Speaker, to point out that we support the Legislation and I just tried to look at the other components which generate the problem.

If the Hon. Member feels that he has an obligation to get up and distort everything I say in the Honourable House today, let him go ahead I would not bother to reply to him any more. He is not worth replying to that kind of nonsense.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is the same kind of speech that you get from the Hon. Member at a political meeting in which active encouragement is given not to cut canes because a certain class of people do not own canes. It is the same kind of speech that you get.....

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have never spoken on a political platform.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you are on a point of order.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. I just would like to draw to the Hon. Member's attention that I have never referred to any problems relating to the cutting of canes on any political platforms and that he is unwittingly, misleading the Honourable House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the basic position is that, for a long period of time, complaints have been going to the Ministry of Agriculture, to the Attorney General's office, to the Police Department about the attitude of some people, in Barbados a small minority of people in Barbados who believe that it is their God given right not to respect property which is owned by others and irrespective of what property owners, large and small do, this very small group of people still openly defy the ownership of these property owners. We had reached a stage, that so persistent were these complaints, that unless something was done by way of an amendment to the Law, the Police would not be able to exercise their functions and we were really reaching a situation, in which many property owners of this country were attempting to take the Law into their hands and bloodshed would have arisen in this country. That is the position.

The situation was exacerbated when an old woman in the Constituency next to mine was actually murdered in Christ Church because two or three people living around there believe that she could plant her vegetables on her plot of land, but she must not reap them.

This bit of Legislation was inspired by that activity and it is the intent of the Legislation to cure that type of illegal activity. Any Hon. Member here, who has a Constituency group in the country areas, in particular and he goes there and talks about more land production, more food production, which the Hon. Member is constantly talking about, one of the first things which his constituents tell him is, how do you expect us to grow food and people walking about here and when you grow them, stealing the things that are on the land.

What is more, we have had cases before the Supreme Court, in which people who owned bungalows, who had four vans, who were the biggest suppliers to hotels in Barbados, drove about stealing and when people in authority challenged them, they brought out guns and knives and cut up the people. Thank God, the Jury knew exactly what to do and the person got seven years (ASIDES). So that, the position is very clear. Do not let us mix words on this. We have a tiny, a very small minority of people, who are just out to ignore all of

the elemental rules in society. That is why I wrongly condemned and I agree with all Hon. Members who seek to put the Record straight, this Bill is nothing to do with Rastas. This Bill is to do with thieves. People who do not respect other people's property. That is what this Bill is to do and if some people masquerade as Rastas and do it, it is the thieves that we are after.

As far as, I am concerned, people are entitled to freedom of religion. If Rastas say they have a religion, let them exercise the religion, but any religion that says that you can steal, I am against that because no decent society, in any part of the world and I have done a certain amount of comparative religion and I do not know of any religious persuasion, which does not have some moral code attached to it and I am yet to read, or hear of one which does not prohibit the carrying away of another man's property. I do not know of any. If you are Communist, some people say that that is a religion, I believe that comparative penologists, and criminologists have always been pointing out that under communist system, stealing carries a greater penalty, than offences against the person. So, let us look at this Bill, in its proper perspective.

Now Sir, the Hon. Member, over there, the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central uses every opportunity for constant repetition of his pet theme, the economic situation in Barbados is worse now, than when the Democratic Labour Party was in power. So, without any relevance to the matter, under consideration, he is going to trot out in his pontifical manner, or in his usual style, that because you have more unemployment, when all statistics show that the unemployment has gone down because you have more inflation, when the statistics show that on a three year average, the inflation rate is half what it was under their period of time, when there is more money in people's pockets now, than there ever was, in the history of Barbados. In spite of all of that, for the Hon. Member's own purpose, he will continue to repeat that this is the cause of crime, in Barbados.

Now, I want to say one, or two other things, Sir. A number of questions have been raised on the technical aspect of the Bill, by the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West and the Hon. Member for St. Philip North. All Governments in the Western world and indeed, in the communist world because China had this problem too, are being confronted with the question of bad behaviour, abuse of the terms and conditions of entry at sporting events and things of that type and in your Legislation, you have to have a balance between the role of the owner and the role of the State Authorities, who are there to protect Law and Order.
6.40 p.m.

Now the reason for the special language in this Bill is an attempt in simple language to balance these two interests. That is why you will see provision being made for a challenge for identification, and when we come to the particular section of the Bill we will be able to point out that a police officer has a right to arrest but because of certain judicial decisions in relation to the owner of property or his agent's right, it has to be drawn in that manner to ensure that the arm of the law, a representative of the law, the police force is brought into play almost immediately after this challenge for identification. What is the point of having a Bill in which people commit an offence on another person's property, you do not have enough police to guard every property in Barbados, the people do what many other people all over the world have to do, they either appoint a security guard or a watchman. The person is there, will you ring up the police station while the man is there and give the man time to leave the place? What object is that? The Bill says that you can challenge the person and ask him for his name and address. If he does not give you his name and address which you can then give to the police so that they can come and make the arrest, you are entitled to hold him but you must immediately hand him over to the nearest police station. That is the position.

Hon. members will also recall that the Attorney General has repeatedly pointed out that the rise of security guards has been so great in this country that it is necessary for legislation to be brought down at a very early date to deal with their training, their powers and their relationship with the police force, but until we can get that legislation the only thing that we can do now is to ensure that where there is such a person and an offence takes place in their presence that we cannot make them equal with a policeman, we say that they must hand over to the police as soon as possible. That is the object behind that legislation.

Now the Commissioner of Police as well as the Ministry of Agriculture and other interest groups have been asking for this Bill for years and we have had a long time going over it because we want to balance their legitimate rights, to exercise a right of passage and their traditional rights, and that is why defences are being drawn in the manner in which they are being drawn, and we hope that when this Bill is passed that all those who have respect for law and order will operate under those terms and conditions. Those who do not have respect for law and order, well the Bill has been designed to deal with them. As far as those who believe that they must have a special religious philosophy, the Constitution guarantees this religious philosophy, provided of course that the tenets and that religion do not include the breaking of known laws in the country.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short contribution to this Bill which my col-

leagues who have spoken have described somewhat as the anti-Rastas Bill. We have heard the member for Christ Church South Central indicating that it is a Bill to prohibit theft in Barbados. It is clear from the speeches which have been made on this side that no right thinking person, and indeed no member of the Democratic Labour Party, would condone theft of any sort, so that we would want to say very very clearly that whereas one sees that this Bill is designed to prohibit theft, one must however reflect and try to examine, as my two previous colleagues have done, the socio-economic situations which lead to the kind of problems which have been identified here during this debate.

Listening to the members from the Government side, it is very clear to us that one of the major considerations behind this Bill is the emergence of the Rasta movement and the behaviour of some of those persons who pose under that particular persuasion. Again, I think it is very clear that those of us who have spoken on this side have indicated that we certainly do not support any situation where any member of the society could sail under false colours as it were to commit any kind of crime, be it stealing or anything of that nature, so that I think we have to be very careful about this particular matter.

What strikes me as being strange is the way in which the member for Christ Church South Central spoke as to the reasons behind this particular Bill. One could almost hear and feel what was coming through in the speech which he made. He said that this Bill is designed to cure the kind of behaviour which he has described as persistent complaints which have been reaching the police and the Ministry of Agriculture about people entering other people's property and stealing and what have you. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have a serious problem in this particular area and I would want to draw an analogy behind this particular socio-economic problem and indeed the kind of problems which one encounters in the area of the provision of health services in any country. I seem to get the impression that one talks today in medical terms of placing much more emphasis on preventive medicine as against curative medicine. There was a time when the emphasis was on curative medicine where you allow people to develop, not of course deliberately but through lack of foresight and proper planning, to develop all sorts of diseases and all sorts of medical complaints, and then you would seek to develop cures for the particular complaint, whereas the more recent approach to medicine is to try to prevent the development of disease and the development of the kind of ailments which would affect a person's health, so if we can transfer that situation into the situation which we are describing, I would like to suggest that while we have to look at the curative aspect, we have to try to devise ways and means of preventing people from entering into other people's properties and ravaging their

properties, but at the same time we must go beyond that particular point. I am suggesting that this is not the be all and end all this certainly will not be the solution to the problems which are confronting the society. I am suggesting that this Bill no matter how stringent it is will not prevent stealing, will not prevent people from entering into other people's property and carrying away whatever they have planted.

6.50 p.m.

It would seem to me that we would at the same time also have to be directing our attention towards the socio-economic problems which have led these people into these kinds of areas. There is no point in coming to say that we now have legislation, we have studied this and we are going to produce this legislation and after that everything is going to finish. All that is well and good. I am suggesting we need to go beyond that; we have to look as it were for the preventive kind of care which would deal with the problem. I do not think that anybody would deny that we have a very serious fundamental socio-economic problem on our hands in this country, and therefore the Government must go beyond the mere provision of legislation to prevent, as the Deputy Prime Minister has said, theft.

I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in going beyond this and trying to get to the bottom of this problem that the Government would be well advised, it seems to be a Government that is prone to the setting up of Committees and Commissions to study all sorts of things within the society, to study the matter, because I would think this is a matter which is in need of some study, and I believe that the public of Barbados would support the setting up of some investigative machinery to try to get to the root of this particular problem. I would go further and suggest that we have got to make sure and certainly re-emphasise that proper discipline and proper qualities must be instilled in our young from the beginning at home and in the schools, and I think that the schools will have a very important part to play in this particular area. I think this will go a far way, Mr. Speaker, in ensuring that we get to the bottom of the problem as we try to prevent some of the difficulties and problems which we are now dealing with and which we see emerging within the society. Of course I think we have got to be able to provide more opportunities for young persons in particular to give vent to their creative talents, so that they themselves will be able to use those talents for their benefit. Of course I am not talking about the talents which they might use in the various devices that they might be using to steal and to indulge in praedial larceny. I think that if as one identified there is a lot of stealing of food and crops, it would seem to me that this is an indication that people might be using this as a means of also getting something to eat, and of course, as has been identified, they are taking these and

selling in various areas. But as I have said, we have got to try to get to the bottom of this problem, and certainly I should like to say that we in the Democratic Labour Party have been giving some very serious thought to this matter.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, we welcome an overall investigation, Commission, whatever you want to call it into this particular area of our social and economic life, and one of the things which we would certainly be looking at and which we would be promising in our manifesto for the upcoming elections would be the provision of food stamps for the people of Barbados. We think that this will be one of the important aspects of looking at this particular problem to ensure that people in this country do not go hungry if this is one of the problems which are confronting people, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should definitely try, rather than going only into the curative line, to do some preventive work in this particular area.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I propose to reply to the debate if there are no other hon. members who wish to make a contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen this Bill as a Rasta Bill and therefore I have some difficulty in responding to it at that level. Indeed I must say that the hon. member for St. Lucy has responded as adequately at that level as any hon. member on this side or on that could have responded. I do not think that the Rasta movement is the cause of the Bill. I think that the common law of England made a great mistake when it made the remedies for trespass civil remedies and not criminal remedies, and I think that this Bill is just one step out of that. It is founded on the land law of 700 years ago in North Western Europe and we are the unfortunate beneficiaries of it and have to be arguing about these things. If trespass had been an offence all along, the example of squatting in people's houses would never have arisen. In Barbados in fact there seems to me to be a lot of belief that the law lacks teeth to remove you from premises that are not yours.

I remember when I first started to practise here, accustomed as I was to the situation in London where if notice was given to you to leave the house at 12 o'clock on the 31st day of October, about 2 o'clock the landlord would come, the door would be opened and your things would be put on the roadside under the eye of a policeman and the landlord would stand up and bar the way to you to come back inside the premises. No doubt, the fact that we are not so hard in Barbados has caused the squatting which some members see as the occasion for this Bill, but the occasion for this Bill goes back to the early days of the new Government. It was clear that property rights in Barbados have not always carried the

same respect on the part of those who infringed them as on the part of those who assert them, and it was decided that \$9.60 for trespass was nothing, the police have no power and we would deal with the Bill. Praedial larceny grew. In the last four years Barbados has made itself virtually self-sufficient in vegetables. People all over the country grow vegetables. They supply vegetables to supermarkets in a way that they did not do before. The BMC ceased to be the sole outlet for local produce and the hotels for local consumption, but how can you ask people, just as the hon. member for Christ Church South Central said, to grow vegetables when there are men driving about the country with vans, guns, knives and helpers prepared to use violence who are going to steal the vegetables out of the ground.

I do not regard the activities of the gentleman from St. Philip South, not the hon. member, but he well knows who I mean, I do not regard the activities of men who themselves are growers of vegetables, who own vehicles and who arm themselves with guns and knives and go in a man's property at night, chase down the man when the man shoots in the air over their heads and proceed to carve up the man and his family, I do not regard those as unfortunate victims of the inflation rate such as the hon. member for St. Michael South Central would have us believe. Without severe remedies to protect agriculturists who grow vulnerable crops you will not have the incentive to grow those crops. I also must confess that we have seen an outbreak of squatting since this Bill has been in operation, and the Bill will help with the Rastas, but I do not see the squatting as evidence that there is no shelter in Barbados available to squatters.

7.00 p.m.

Barbados is actually notorious in the International Agencies for having a tremendous amount of physical rooms available for its inhabitants, 225,000 rooms for 248,000 people; one of the highest if not the highest to be discerned anywhere in a developing country and indeed in most of the developed Worlds as well. Barbados is not a place where it is hard to get a roof over your head. It may not be the type of roof you want but it is not a place where we are short of the actual premises where people can rest their heads.

I also do not believe that the stealing of food has anything to do with the standard of living in Barbados at present. Indeed I was astonished to hear the hon. member for St. Michael South Central say so. When we took over the Government.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister is likely to wind up his debate in ten minutes time?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, Sir. When we took over the Government there were 17,000 people on welfare in this country of one sort or another not count-

ing the old age pensioners receiving welfare old age pensions. Of these 11,000 were children. The remainder were able-bodied adults who received small payments to help them tie over periods not at work and so on. Those 11,000 children were receiving weekly grants for their support. The number of children has been reduced from 11,000 to 8,000 and this very week the grants have been doubled. I do not see in that the part of hungry children that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is making us believe are running around Barbados.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation. I wonder whether the hon. member can tell us.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You must elucidate your own point.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am elucidating my point. I was talking about the effects of inflation on prices and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Remember, you cannot raise additional evidence.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not, Sir. The point I am making is that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister did not distinguish between organised stealing like what took place in St. Philip South and the other mass of people. I take the point of his argument but I think that he would agree that stealing of this kind is most predominate among the lower income groups and not the middle or upper income groups and that that is of some significance.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: If the hon. member is asking me to engage in a sociological argument about the nature of stealing, I would be happy to do so. The upper income groups chiefly write bad cheques, falsify their cheques, do not pay Income Tax and so on. The lower income groups generally break into houses. The more professional ones steal jewellery, cameras, electronic equipment and sell in Nelson Street and elsewhere but where in Barbados, as it happen, you meet a certain intermediate type of group between those that the hon. member is speaking of, those who he says will steal food and those who are yet more organised because where in fact at the present time, although it has nothing to do with this Bill, we are meeting many burglaries where food forms the component part of the burglary, but it is clearly not a burglary for food. It maybe a particular group or two groups but if the hon. member takes a look at the crime sheets, I suppose he would have some access to the crime sheets, we are really finding this, that a lot of the crimes are of a sort that you cannot understand.

Groups of people are breaking into houses, they go into the refrigerator and they take out meat. They take out milk and throw it over the floor. They sweep the things out of the refrigerator. There are three separate

burglaries in the Newton area of Christ Church where this happened recently but at the same time they carried away a T.V. set and they broke and carried away the jewellery. Is that a stealing for food or is that proven stealing? Those are questions you ask Sociologists to deal with rather than asking for politicians to deal with.

We have to deal with protection of people. We have to try to remove the possibilities of people organising themselves by squatting on premises, to remove the concept of lawlessness which might be prevalent only in small groups of which this Bill will contribute to reducing.

I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that the children of Barbados are getting less to eat than before. I think that the children of Barbados are getting more to eat than ever before in history and I do not believe that there is another developing country, I do not believe there is any communist country, not Russia, not East Germany and certainly not Cuba, I believe there may only be a dozen countries or so in the World where the children are getting anymore to eat than in Barbados and I say this statement quite advisably.

I remember at the last Estimates Committee asking why we were continuing to vote so much money for Malnutrition Studies. I said there is abundant evidence. You produce the evidence from the Ministry of Health showing how well-fed the children are. Frank Ramsey showed much initiative in St. Thomas and St. George, and in St. Thomas particularly to put an end to protein energy malnutrition among children in this country and an end was put in four or five years of the operation. Malnutrition was stamped out in this country among children that gave rise to the effort. That went on till 1967 onwards. It is not this Government. This particular exercise was not this Government. I am not claiming it for us but I said all this was stamped out and you still want money for Malnutrition Studies and the answer was that the children are eating too much, that they are developing dietary habits which would lead to Diabetes of early middle age and so on.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central can deal with this professionally but I can only say what I am advised and I am advised that the questions of starvation are not now questions to which the Government needs to address itself as an economic problem. It may have to address itself to it as a social problem because they are some people who cannot look after themselves although the means of so doing are there.

The hon. member will agree that the Medical Records of many elderly persons all over the World are abundant examples of people starving to death with \$100,000.00 in boxes under their beds. I believe that Howard Hughes starved to death. Is that correct? Howard

Hughes starved to death and his relatives are fighting over \$1 billion that he left behind him so I really do not think that if Howard Hughes went into a Super-market and took up bread and ate it that you would say that that is because of the economic policies of the Government. He might have been hungry and he might have taken the bread because he was hungry but it would not be because of the economic problems. These are social problems.

As regards inflation, I sat down here and did a rough estimate, Mr. Speaker. As far as I can judge from the 1st October, 1976 to the 30th September, 1980, inflation has not been as great in Barbados as it was in 1974. In all of the months that we have been in power the cost-of-living has not gone up by as much as it went up in the single year of 1974. You can add it up. It was 2% in the remaining months of 1976, 8% in 1977, 11% in 1978, 13% in 1979 and 6% to the end of this year.

7.10 p.m.

The cumulative average, well, they come to 40%. No, that is what I am saying that it is, the cumulative averages as I remember them. I am going by the books on which the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central relies. I was reading the Inter-American Development Bank's Report this morning, and seeing how moderate inflation is, seeing all the impressive things which they say about the Government, but taking note that the Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central apparently has a stooge in the news media who can still pick out not even adverse, something that is adverse to the United States and pick it out of a whole Report to say about Barbados. Leave out the word impressive, leave out the words stability and safety, leave out all of those words and mention the others.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have come to the end of the time, I would like to thank all Hon. Members who have contributed to this debate and I beg to move that this Bill be now 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.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting now stands suspended until 8.00 o'clock.

7.13 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that further consideration of this Item be

postponed. As Your Honour will recall, we had reached the stage where the Bill was read a second time and I beg to move at this stage, that further consideration be postponed. There are a number of obvious typographical errors which we have detected and I do not want to move amendments in the Committee stage of the Bill, unless I am absolutely sure that there are in fact typographical errors, but we know that some are definitely typographical errors, so we would like an opportunity to compare the Bill with the original Bill.

In addition, the Hon. Member for St. Philip North and the Hon. Member for St. Michael South West have raised some questions and I would like to have an opportunity to look at it.

Thank you.

Mr. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

The question that further consideration of the Bill be postponed, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Item Number eight, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item Number eight is the Instant Order of the day.

BILL TO REFORM THE LAW RESPECTING CIVIL LIABILITY TO ANIMALS

Item Number Eight was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to reform the Law respecting civil liability for animals.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill is a companion Bill to the previous Bill, except that this seeks to regulate, in a civil way, and not a criminal way, the relationship between neighbours and others, with respect to the Law of Trespass. As a result of sub-divisions, which have taken place, over the course of the last 10 years and increasingly so, I believe, in the future, as a result of the Urban Development Scheme and the Spring Hall Scheme, occasions will arise where, as a result of mixed farming activities, between various people. Conflicts between land owners, as a result of those who farm livestock, as opposed to those who farm vegetables and already, in certain areas, particularly like the Gibbons area in Christ Church, acute problems have arisen from the fact, that pig keepers and others fail to take proper steps to ensure that the pens are secure and that the livestock do not escape and trespass upon land of other farmers, in the area, who may not, in the slightest bit, be interested in livestock, but are more interested in vegetable production.

We feel that the old rules which hitherto regulated these disputes are a bit out of date and that opportunity

should be taken to deal with the regulation of the respective responsibilities and liabilities. This is not trespass arising from human act directly, but arising from neglect, or omission by the owner of animals, to secure them securely and prevent them from committing trespass on other people's lands.

That is the object of the Bill, Sir.

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

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

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Again, Mr. Speaker, I would want the opportunity to check this very carefully, against the original Bill because there are some spellings which I think are wrong, Sir.

I beg to move Sir, that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

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

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: The last Item Sir, that we would like to deal with is Item One Sir. Then we can conclude. Item One Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item Number One.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Item Number One was called – To move the House into Committee of Supply to grant sums of money for the service of this Island.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. WEEKES in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1980-81 No. 7

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the first of these Resolutions is for the sum of \$570,000.00. This is a supplementary Provision, under the Ministry of Civil Aviation.

When the Estimates were being prepared, the estimated consultative fees which was done on a preliminary estimate, before the wage negotiations had taken place between Government and the Unions and while

before the tenders had been awarded, in respect of the works at Heywoods. Subsequently, as a result of movements in increase in the prices in construction and in light of a Quantity Surveyors' Report, which took into consideration, the likely increase and cost, it became clear that the provision for the first stage of the Consultants' fees, which is based on a percentage, during the course of the Project will be inadequate. The contracts have been signed and the contracts provide for space payments, based upon the Quantity Surveyors' estimation of the total cost of the job, so we have to move that it be supplemented.

I beg to move Sir, that the sum of \$570,000.00 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government, to supplement the Estimates 1980-81 Part II Capital as shown in the supplementary Estimates 1980-81, No. 7 which form the schedule to the Resolution.

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

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

8.10 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1980-81 No. 8

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: In this Resolution for \$11,700 which comes under the Head Governor General, in the Estimates the sum of \$6,200 was provided to buy certain equipment. They were a tractor mower, a deep freeze and a three cycle automatic washing machine. The provision obviously did not reflect the real price of the equipment in that the amount tendered for the equip-

ment was in excess so it is needed to supplement the item by the provision of \$11,700.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER, resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st October at 12.00 noon. The reason for that is that we have a number of Select Committees which are sitting and we would like an opportunity in the interim to have time to deal with those so that we will make sure that we have a quorum. We have a very important meeting of the Debates Committee and other matters. Thank you.

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

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

8.18 p.m.