

THE
House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13th January, 1981.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met on Tuesday, 13th January, 1981 at 12.20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, C.B.E., J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry) (Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc., (Econ.) and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

Dr. HAYNES and Mr. TAITT entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 16th December, 1980.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and subject to any observations as to

errors by any hon. member, I beg to move that they be now confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by hon. members, let those Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE
SPEAKER

I have to announce that I have received copies of the Report on the results of the examination of the Accounts of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1980, as prepared by the Auditor General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to lay The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) (No. 3) Regulations, 1980.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to lay the Report on the Probation Service for the year 1979.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Sixth Annual Report, Auditors' Report and Statements of Accounts of the National Housing Corporation for the year 1978–79.

Mr. Speaker, this now brings the National Housing Corporation's Accounts up to date only for this year's now to be done, and I must say I would like to make it publicly clear that I feel proud and I feel that all Barbadians should be proud to know that you have been able to get these accounts up to date since none of them has ever come before Parliament since 1971. We are now in the process of getting the ones for the year just finished.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to approve the lease of land at Gravesend, St. Michael, to Hashim Degia for the purpose of operating a shop.

Resolution to approve the vesting of land at Roebuck Street and Spry Street, St. Michael, in the Central Bank of Barbados for the erection of offices.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land together with the building thereon known as Buccaneer situated at Baywoods, St. James for the use as a Community Centre.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$2,374,328 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. 29, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, a Bill to amend the Barbados National Bank Act.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Barbados National Bank Act, be now read a first time.

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

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

OBITUARY SPEECHES

RESOLUTION RE THE LATE GORDON BOLDEN

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, during the course of our recess the hon. member for St. Joseph lost his father.

Hon. members of this House I am sure would be aware of the late Mr. Bolden. He was a member of the Southern District Council during the course of the time that we had Local Government in Barbados. He was a well-known and outspoken person particularly in respect of matters of politics.

Throughout his life he worked exceedingly hard in his chosen area of financial occupation, namely, metal

fabrication. Those of us who listened to the eulogy by the Rector of the parish of St. John would appreciate the great contribution he made towards the adornment of a number of buildings in that parish. He was also responsible along with others for the fabrication of a number of new styled vehicles which convey sugar cane in Barbados. 12.30 p.m.

I am sure that all of us in this House would like to extend to the hon. member for St. Joseph our profound sympathy and to the surviving relatives of the late Mr. Bolden.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I would say, Sir, with the passing of the late Gordon Bolden, I have lost a sincere friend and brother. I say that, Sir, because I had the privilege of serving as a Councillor in the defunct Southern District Council with the late Mr. Bolden who was also a Councillor.

It is during my two terms as Chairman of the former Council that the late comrade Bolden, as I called him, gave me his wholehearted support on all occasions and I remember, Sir, that on one occasion when there was a tie for the Chairmanship and the Chairman cast his vote by favour that Councillor Bolden was one who gave me his support. It was a crucial moment at the time for me.

In addition, Sir, he was a friend to me. We from time to time would discuss all aspects of politics, not only Local Government but Central Government and therefore when I heard of the death of the late Mr. Bolden, I considered it my duty to be present at the funeral though not feeling 100% fit because I owed a debt of gratitude to Mr. Bolden. As a friend he was sincere to me and I must admit that his passing has caused me to lose an inseparable friend.

On behalf of my colleagues I want to express my deepest sympathy to the hon. member for St. Joseph and to all relatives, especially his wife, children, grandchildren and all members of the family and those friends and I am sure the number is numerous. To them we offer our deepest sympathy. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. SIMMONS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my desire that I should be associated with the remarks of sympathy extended by both side of the House on the occasion of the death of Mr. Gordon Bolden, father of the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. Bolden was a person who often said of himself that he knew one half of Barbados and the

other half knew him. He helped one half of the country and the other half would help him. He never shirked in his duties in any respect in aiding anyone where he could and whenever he could.

In the field of politics Mr. Bolden saw to it that where he was on either side of the fence he made his presence felt. His passing means a loss, not only to his relatives who he leaves now to mourn but to his many other friends whom he has left behind and I can only now ask hon. members to join in the passing of this Resolution.

Be It Resolved that the Honourable the House of Assembly record and extend its profound sympathy to the honourable member for St. Joseph on the death of his father,

And Be It Further Resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his relatives.

I now ask hon. members to stand with me for a minute of silence in respect of the passing of this honourable gentleman.

Members stood in their places for a minute's silence.
12.40 p.m.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question Number 56 is ready and the reply to Parliamentary Question Number 57 is ready.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to inform, that the reply to Parliamentary Question Number 59, asked by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South is now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the Instant Order of the day.

Item Number two.

INTEGRITY IN PUBLIC LIFE ACT, 1981 X

Item Number Two was called – To move the Third Reading of a Bill to make provision for the avoidance of conflicts of interest by persons engaged in governing, guiding or administering the public affairs of Barbados and to establish a body to monitor the assets of persons in public life.

The Report of the Select Committee was laid in the House of Assembly by Hon. H. deB. Forde on Friday, 19th day of December, 1980.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am moving the adoption of the Report from the Select Committee on the Integrity in Public Life Bill, which was first introduced into this Honourable House in 1979 and had a First and Second Reading by this Honourable House.

Your Honour will recall, that the Select Committee met under your Chairmanship and with the assistance of representations from members of the public and of officers of my Chambers, we were able to consider the various points made both in this Honourable House and outside of this Honourable House and to make certain recommendations which I am commending to the Honourable House.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw Honourable Members' attention to the new Bill which is attached, which was circulated and which seeks to incorporate the recommendations made by the Select Committee. There are perhaps four matters to which I should advert at this time.

In the light of representations made, we have amended Clause Seven of the Bill, in order to remove any suggestion, that the Bill was having retroactive effect to affect any Member who was not a Member of the Honourable House on 2nd September, 1976 and therefore, in the new Sub-clause Seven, it is proposed, that persons who were members of the Honourable House on 2nd September, 1976, or who indeed were members of the Senate at that time, should file with the Commission, a declaration of assets for the whole period since 2nd September, 1976 and that this declaration must be filed within nine months after the commencement of the legislation, at the latest. In short, the Government is quite prepared to accept, that any member, who came into Parliament, at the time of change of Government should be fully subjective to the rigours of the provisions of the Integrity in Public Life Bill and I trust, that all honourable members of the Honourable House will accept that.

The second point to which I would like to refer is that the Committee has recommended deleting from the Bill provisions dealing with secret trusts. Mr. Speaker, although that point has been taken, let me make the point fully in the Honourable House, as a personal note, that I consider the criticisms of that provision totally misguided and misunderstood and the persons who advanced the views about that, outside of this Honourable House – since I cannot refer to Honourable members of this Honourable House – totally dishonest and misunderstanding in their criticisms of such a provision because elsewhere, (ASIDES) elsewhere in the Commonwealth, in which that provision has occurred, it has been said, without doubt, that it is a rigorous provision leading to control of members, rather than against their interest.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, in his usual *sotto voce* makes a comment, as to why it is taken out, to satisfy the stupid criticisms, which would come from members, who may well have advanced that point of view, Sir and I do not know whether the Honourable Member qualifies in that description, or not.

But, for the benefit of Honourable Members, the Committee has decided to remove the Provision and of course, being a member of the Committee, I accept the Committee's contention on this point, but, for the purpose of history, let me state, that the Bill is perhaps worse off for the removal of that Provision, and that is a personal comment, which I make and I believe, that legal history and the history of this Honourable House will judge that comment a correct one in due course, Sir.

Now, the third point that we wish to make is that the Committee has taken the points made on Section 45 of the Bill and has deleted the Provisions of Section 45(2) in keeping with an undertaking which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister gave when he spoke on that, Sir. I am not going to make any further comments on Section 45(2), although I will be prepared to reply to any further statements, that may be made on either side of the Honourable House, on that particular Provision.

The features of the Report of the Committee, that I would like to underline are features which have gone a long way to ensuring two things, Sir, that a Committee, which is appointed is as non-partisan as possible and secondly, that the Committee which is appointed will also be subjected, its Report and its conduct will be subjected to full scrutiny and debate in this Honourable House.

I believe, that more than ever, that those specific Provisions, the new innovations coming out from the Committee go a long way towards strengthening parliamentary democracy and the integrity of persons in public life in this country. There are features which the Government has sought fit to introduce in the Ombudsman Bill and once again, in its dedication to multi-party democracy in Barbados, it has sought fit to introduce into this Bill.

Let me cite one, or two features, Sir. In the first place, the appointment of persons to the Committee, the Integrity Commission will be done with full consultation between the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, those consultations taking place through the Governor-General, who can only appoint a member recommended by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, after the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has consulted with the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, or a member recommended by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, after the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition has consulted with the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and who, in his absolute discretion, has the right to appoint a third member.

But, there is a further safeguard, before the appointment takes place, the names of the members are submitted to both Houses of Parliament, for the approval of members of Parliament and I consider those features to be novel features, originating particularly in Barbados and coming from the deep conviction held by this Government, that wherever possible, that offices such as this should not be based on purely partisan considerations and that every attempt should be made, in the context of Barbados to choose people of upright, probity and respect. 12.50 p.m.

I wish strongly to commend this part of the Committee's Report to hon. members as worthy of adoption.

There is another feature under this particular aspect of the Committee's Report which I shall underscore, Sir, and it is that the Commission when it has sat has the duty to report generally to Parliament, and that report will be laid in Parliament for the consideration of Parliament, both the Lower House and the Upper House in this country. This is a feature which again we incorporated in the Ombudsman Bill, and in my view it strengthens parliamentary control and parliamentary consideration of these types of matters. I believe that the Bill has been much improved by this type of provision in the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, when debate on this Bill took place on Second Reading, many members omitted to advert to provisions in this Bill which go a long way to ensure that there is integrity maintained by people who come into public life, provisions which are at the moment almost non-existent, and where they do exist, exist in only a rudimentary form, an unsatisfactory form in our laws, and I deal in particular with the sections of the Bill which spell out in detail what amounts to a conflict of interest and the circumstances in which members, people in public life, may enter into contracts with the Government or with quasi Government institutions.

I believe that this is a fundamental improvement on the legislation in this country. There are provisions which should long have been brought into effect as part of the law of Barbados, and indeed those of us who have read the Constitutional Review Commission's Report should be cognisant of the unanimous recommendation of that Commission that similar provisions ought to be included as entrenched rights, as entrenched provisions within the Constitution of Barbados, and indeed I believe in most of the updated Constitutions of democratic countries in the Commonwealth, and in other western democracies you will find that provisions such as these figure strongly.

I said at the time of the Second Reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, that I would challenge any subsequent

Government to repeal this Bill, and I again today repeat that this Bill is a landmark provision in taking positive steps to try to stamp out corruption in public life in Barbados. It is not the end of the road, because legislation by itself unless it is enforced will not achieve this object, but it is an important step, Sir, that is too long overdue, and together with the Corruption Bill which has already cleared this House and now awaits passing in the Other Place, it is a significant contribution to improving public conduct in Barbados.

I could not allow this occasion to pass without a few comments about the role of an Opposition in circumstances such as this. An Opposition has the duty to oppose, but it can do so in several ways, constructively and destructively, and another is a mixture of both. I believe that the Opposition failed in its duty in not sitting on this Select Committee. I would have welcomed an opportunity for hearing them debate their point of view on this particular Bill and on the Corruption Bill. They were offered the opportunity to participate in the debate on this Bill, and you will recall that there were different views of the Opposition. Some section said there was no need for such legislation, they held on to one or two provisions and refused to participate in the deliberations of the Select Committee.

Nobody was preventing them from exercising their due rights in Parliament. I want to repeat, Sir, they were not being prevented in any way from exercising their due rights in Parliament on this Bill, but they took the deliberate position for short term partisan political reasons not to participate in a Select Committee on a bit of legislation of fundamental importance to how they will conduct themselves if at any time they ever form the Government of the country, and indeed how they should conduct themselves now as members in public life, and I want the record to show and the public to remember that this Opposition shirked its duty and said it was taking issues to the public, and when it came to the time to give constructive criticism in the Select Committee they were nowhere to be found. I do not think that perhaps we are the poorer for their absence, because I believe if they had valuable points to make they would have welcomed the opportunity to serve rather than posing, rather than being serious about these issues, Sir.

The Bill is there, we have compared it in the Select Committee, as you, Mr. Speaker, will know, with similar legislation throughout the Commonwealth, even those provisions which were excluded, we were able to justify to the Committee that there are similar provisions in legislation throughout the Commonwealth. The secret trust provisions are included in legislation in Canada, in the United States, in Scandinavia. This evidence was shown to the Committee, Sir. Various Commonwealth countries have provisions such as this.

Section 45(2), the much talked about section, we were able to show that similar legislation was included in the Bahamas, Sri Lanka, to cite two of the Commonwealth countries in which there was similar legislation. I believe that India as well has those provisions. I believe that when we look at the total provisions of the Bill the Committee found that substantially the Bill was one that would go a considerable way towards improving the present rules and regulations for conduct in public life. We have used by and large Commonwealth precedents which have stood the test of time. I think there is also in the Singapore legislation a similar provision as 45(2) and we have used the precedent provided to us by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association of legislation that is throughout the length and breadth of the Commonwealth, and which Commonwealth countries have followed from time to time.

So that, Sir, I move the adoption of this Report before I proceed to ask that the Bill be read a third time. The Government intends to promulgate this legislation as soon as all of the three conditions for its proclamation have been adequately met. The Commission has been established and any rules which are necessary have been made at that time. The Government intends to see that during its tenure of office the legislation is properly enforced.

One slight matter, Sir. Some reference was made to the provision of the Third Schedule by hon. members in debate on the Second Reading of the Bill. We have again consulted with the Accountant General on that Third Schedule, and we have recommended a few changes, or one or two changes.
1.00 p.m.

Again the Third Schedule has been designed after consultation with accountants and taking into account similar precedents in Jamaica, in the Bahamas and in other parts of the Commonwealth, in Australia and in Canada, and therefore we consider the Third Schedule absolutely adequate.

Some of the fears expressed by hon. members were reported to the Accountant General, and they were not considered by the Committee as sustainable, hence the Committee has reported on this part of the Bill as it stands.

So I wish to move that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted.

Mr. ODLE: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Hon. Attorney General moving the adoption of the Report of the Committee, we were once again subjected to a lecture from that Honourable Gentleman who during my time in

this Honourable Chamber has demonstrated that so far as he is concerned, he is the most knowledgeable person perhaps in all Barbados in all these matters and matters related thereto, so that when we are lectured on the role of an Opposition, and when he essays to speak for this Opposition, we can only take it in the context in which he is giving it, speaking from his, I cannot say throne, Sir, but speaking from his knowledge on high to us lesser mortals, but, Sir, Barbados will not forget what it was that led this Opposition to decide that it would not sit on a Select Committee or any Committee as the leading spokesman on this side said at the time to consider a Bill which had been brought in the circumstances it had been brought and bearing in mind the history leading up to the bringing of that Bill.

Sir, in passing let me say that after myself having sat on another Committee of this Honourable House and hearing statements made by the Prime Minister arising out of the sitting of that Committee, I am fortified in my view.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please stick to this Committee.

Mr. TAITT: I am fortified in my view that the decision by the Opposition not to sit on the Committee considering this Bill was a wise one. Sir, no parliamentarian, no aspiring politician can be heard to say with impunity that he is not in favour of any kind of integrity legislation. There is a certain aura that has been attached to the word "integrity" which by definition forces any one who seeks public office to declare that he or she is a person of integrity, for integrity is the one thing which is required in abundance if one is to serve or to seem to be serving in public office. But in all the presentation of the Attorney General, we did not hear him at any point refer to the issue that is fundamental to this Bill and the issue which in our opinion the Committee ought to have adverted to and ought to have taken the advice given by this side to the House when the Bill came to this Honourable House for second reading.

The Second Schedule of this Bill as it now stands, Sir, still shows a substantial number of Statutory Boards which according to my understanding of the Bill will be exempt from the provisions of this Bill. I shall not tire this Honourable House by reading out those Statutory Corporations, but they include the Barbados Development Bank and they include the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation.

Now, Sir, I am not able of my own knowledge to speak of any malefactions which have gone on in any Statutory Board in the last few years, but I wish to draw attention, Sir, to page 153 of the Parliamentarian of July, 1973 Volume 54 No. 3 in which the Committee established to report on the implementation of Integrity legislation in Jamaica has summarised for the information

of Parliamentarians in the Commonwealth in the usual manner, and there was on that page in about the fourth paragraph a sentence which goes like this: "If a significant section of the population believed certain rumours, their belief became politically important and might affect the psychological basis of constitutional stability."

I believe that that is a proper statement of the reality of the political life in these small countries such as Barbados, and, Sir, it has been the declared policy of the Government and they have implemented it that for reasons best known to themselves they believe that the Statutory Corporations in Barbados, by and large the more important Statutory Corporations will better be run if they are headed by members of Parliament. Now it seems to me, Sir, that there is a short-sightedness of policy and/or concept if you insist on integrity legislation for members of Parliament including members of the Other Place and especially Ministers, and then in the area of administrative activity which has been created specifically to deal with a number of areas which have been traditionally the areas where public corruption, if there is public corruption in any country, would occur, you specifically exclude those areas from consideration of the provisions of the Bill which you bring for the implementation of integrity.

Mr. Speaker, it is axiomatic that if you close the stable door after the horse is out that you have wasted time. During the second reading, we were given to understand that the Governor-General would be able to bring into the provisions of the Bill as he considered it fit no doubt on the advice of the Government such Corporations as may be considered necessary. Mr. Speaker, the logic and the rationale behind that kind of decision escapes me and escapes the members on this side of this Honourable House, as I believe and daresay that it escapes the understanding of a large number of the population of Barbados. A Minister in the constitutional arrangements we have in Barbados, unless something is happening of which we are unaware, does not during the course of his activity as a Minister touch a single cent of the Treasury of Barbados. A Minister is not, except in the final analysis, at least when I was a Minister I can speak for that, concerned with the awarding of contracts, sometimes very lucrative contracts for the carrying out of certain public works in a community. Except in a very peripheral way Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries have very little opportunity to participate in what could be called if you will excuse the term, Sir, normal public corruption.

1.10 p.m.

It is in the Statutory Corporation, not only in Barbados, Sir, but in the wider world it has always been the equivalent of the Statutory Corporation in Barbados where most of the so-called and not so so-called public Corporation where this has tended to occur.

The Law Courts in the United Kingdom and to a lesser extent the rest of the Commonwealth are replete with evidence of corruption in the awarding of contracts by local authorities in those particular countries and the Statutory Corporation in Barbados was established, as I understand it, primarily to relieve the local authority of a number of activities which those local authorities hitherto had to perform.

For those reasons, Sir, if there is going to be legislation, the Objects and Reasons of which are to make provision for the avoidance of conflicts of interest by persons engaged in governing, guiding or administering public affairs of Barbados, Mr. Speaker, how by all logic and even commonsense can we essay to leave out such Statutory Institutions as the Barbados Marketing Corporation, The Barbados Port Authority, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, the Barbados Development Bank, and the Barbados Tourist Board. When we look at the expenditure of this country, we would see from the Estimates that a substantial amount of public monies is spent by, through, and on behalf of, the Statutory Corporations in this country.

It is wrong, Sir. It is beastly wrong to give to the public the impression that something has been done, something extra-ordinary has been done to preserve the public integrity while excluding the vast majority, a substantial part of that area that falls within the ambit of what might be called the public administration of Barbados.

I do not know what is the significance of leaving out the Gambling Committee. I do not know if there is any significance in that but it seem to me that any Statutory Corporation that wanted to be left out of this legislation ought to have made a water-tight case as to why it should be left out.

I do not believe that any of the Corporations or any of the Boards that run a school in Barbados necessarily would have to be included in this kind of legislation. I do not believe that there are any great amount of public Corporations that it is possible for anyone sitting on a Board of one of the Secondary Schools in Barbados and such corporation as there maybe in that regard could easily be dealt with through other means and other methods but I find it impossible to accept that the Attorney General tells us that our duty to oppose, including sitting on a Committee where the policy of the majority of that Committee had established clearly and within the duty that it had no intention whatsoever of including, for example, the Barbados Development Bank within the net of this Integrity Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the politicians in Barbados are any more corrupt, generally speaking, than

the people who function in the private sector who work in public Corporations. I do not believe that, Sir. What I believe is that the politicians are in a glass-hole and therefore are subjected to much more scrutiny and it is precisely because the politicians are subjected to more scrutiny than would those who are outside and are holier than thou are called upon to perform in these small areas of public administration that they too should allow themselves to be subjected to the same scrutiny which we would ask of those who call themselves anti-politicians.

Mr. Speaker, some of the people who serve in Corporations are more politicians than any of the hon. members in this House. We know that, Sir, and it is impossible to believe that out there where it comes that many of those persons require not only public scrutiny but perhaps investigation by the Courts, that that is what people out there believe.

The Attorney General challenged this Government or any subsequent Government to repeal this legislation. This is not legislation to be repealed. This is legislation to be added to, to be made sensible or at least to be understood. Instead, what do we get? They came down to this Honourable House asking honourable members to go back five years and find out from their wives how much money they spent at the Supermarket and put it in the schedule. That is the kind of legislation which for some reason unknown to most of us came down and they had provisions in the original Bill which would have us all going home subjected ourselves to find out what the wives spent.

Fortunately, Sir, the counsel which the Opposition gave both inside and outside of the House has been adhered to. That has been removed. Forty-five (2), that famous Clause which would have permitted a man to be prosecuted for making a simple observation that a Minister who went in with two had come out with eight, for as simple an observation as that. As 45(2) stood, a man could have been prosecuted and the Attorney General floundered forth that this was legislation you could find in the Commonwealth and then he produced two countries, Sri Lanka and the Bahamas.

Mr. Speaker, I put it to this Honourable House that Barbados in no way could ever be behind Sri Lanka and the Bahamas. We are not too great to learn but there are a number of things which occur in the Bahamas which apparently are being brought into Barbados very subtly which we on this side maintain that we oppose it now, we were opposed to it before and we will continue to be opposed to it. We believe that the moral fabric of this country requires that we do not have the Bahamas type country in Barbados, with all due respect to our friends in the Bahamas, for we all have friends and relatives in the Bahamas.

Sri Lanka, I believe, is the country which just had an Election and the Government side won all of the seats, all, completely. I believe so. I may be wrong but the Attorney General will correct me. It is not Sri Lanka. The hon. member if he checks will see. Is that where Lee Keum Yew is the Prime Minister? He corrects me, Sir. He says it is Singapore but if you remember the hon. member got up.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, if the hon. member will give way. This is a course of lecturing for the hon. member who does not even know of which country Lee Keum Yew is Prime Minister. He is Prime Minister of Singapore, Sir. It is in his country that he has just won all of the seats for the third time in his career.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. If you will recall, Sir, before the lecturer gets up and tries to correct the student let the student tell the lecturer that when he himself was adumbrating the Commonwealth countries it was he who said the Bahamas, Sri Lanka and then Singapore. He said Singapore, Sir.
1.20 p.m.

If in passing, I said Sri Lanka, Singapore, that is acceptable, but he said, Singapore and Singapore is a country where the Government just won all the seats, but since he wants me to dwell on Sri Lanka, let me dwell on Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka is a place where they just chased away the Leader of the Opposition and banned her for seven years from having any kind of civil rights, so if Sri Lanka and Singapore are his idea of what a country should be and I do not know who Ching Yang is Prime Minister of, I know who is the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Barbados and I know, that his days are numbered, as Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Barbados. I do not have to know, who is the Prime Minister of Singapore, or I do not have to know, who is the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, Sir, I know who is the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Barbados. (ASIDES). Mr. Speaker, Sir, my friend the hon. member for the City has just graded me, Sir, the hon. member for the City is not a charitable grader at all, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a great deal in this legislation which distinguishes it from legislation in other parts of the Commonwealth. There is one part of this, however, which disturbs me. Why is it Sir, that in Jamaica, in Barbados, in the Bahamas, and in Sri Lanka and all those countries which have just become independent and are seeking to run and manage their own affairs, they have to resort to Integrity legislation, when in Westminster, Sir, the mother, or father, or parents of Parliament, this question does not arise?

While researching this particular issue, Sir, I looked at the Parliamentarian for July, 1980, Sir, on page 159:

"Conflicts of Interest, Rules relating to the Shares and Directorships of Ministers."

You know how they deal with it in England, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, in a letter, from the equivalent of the Cabinet Secretary to the House, the Cabinet Secretary pointed out what are the rules for the Cabinet, as set out by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Sir, that is enough.

But, we, in the developing countries so-called, have so little faith in ourselves generally speaking, that we feel it necessary to legislate the colour of the hair, the length of the eyebrows and if necessary, Sir, one of these days, in fact, it has happened in India, they started trying to legislate how many children you should have.

Seven hundred years of parliamentary history in Britain and the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister says and I am quoting, Sir, from that page:

"Ministers must, on assuming office, resign any Directorships which they may hold, whether in public, or in private companies, and whether the Directorship carries remuneration, or is Honorary."

She goes on:

"The only exception to this rule is that Directorships in private companies established for the maintenance of private family estates and only incidentally concerned in trading may be retained, subject to this reservation, that if, at any time, the Minister feels that conflict is likely to arise between this private interest and public duty, he should even, in those cases, divest himself of his Directorships."

I need not read all of it, Sir, to make the point, but I recall, that soon after the present Rt. Hon. Prime Minister came to office and when questioned about Integrity Legislation four years ago, Sir, he said, that he had received a declaration from all his Ministers.

Mrs. Thatcher in response to a question in the House of Commons made a statement, as to what the rules are for her Cabinet. I do not wish to accept Sir, that the honour of the Cabinet in the United Kingdom is superior to the honour of the Cabinet in Barbados. I do not wish to accept that, but the enthusiasm, the oratory and the joy with which the Attorney-General presents the Bill and now this Report seem to suggest to me, Sir, that he believes, that the honour of his Cabinet is somehow different from the honour of Mrs. Thatcher's Cabinet. So be it.

We are not going to oppose this Bill, for there is nothing in it to oppose, except to say, that we are not going to accept, that the Statutory Corporations ought not to be brought into Integrity Legislation. We have not heard a single thing about the public officers and what public officers' attitude must be in the holding of public office. Mr. Speaker, it must, of necessity, raise some questions among people, who do thinking, in these matters, why the Government feels constrained to have something called an Integrity Bill, or Integrity Legislation, if it is not going to examine the matter in all of its ramifications and deal with it in all of its ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, that in due course, the people in Barbados would have come to the level of maturity, where they can regard their representatives in more or less, the same manner as representatives are regarded in a number of countries, that are admired, by many of the people in Barbados.

I believe, that this Bill had to come from that Government, for it must be recalled, that it was that Government's position in Opposition, when it promulgated to the whole of Barbados, that the then Government was engaging in public corruption which led to the establishment of a Commission to examine the then Government, which Commission demonstrated the truth of what the Jamaica Committee had to say, that if a significant section of a population believes certain rumours, they believe to be politically important and might affect the psychological basis of constitutional stability.

That Government did not dare go back to the people of Barbados, as they must this year and tell them, that they had not brought in Integrity Legislation. Now, Sir, with the Report of this Committee, they will be able to say, we have had Integrity Legislation, but we will feel bound to tell the people of Barbados, that the Integrity Legislation, as reported out of the Committee, which we now have is more form than substance, deals with those who are not likely, than those who do.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that the Government, even at this late hour will see fit to do that which is necessary, in the context of this Bill and include the Statutory Corporations, especially the important economic Statutory Corporations, which are headed by hon. members of Parliament, or senior members of the Barbados Labour Party, we hope that, at this late hour, the Barbados Government will consider it desirable to include such corporations in what they describe as Integrity Legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

1.30 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat has put the case very effectively and very adequately for this Opposition. It is of fundamental importance that the people of Barbados should know that what is now before this House purporting to be integrity legislation is not what was promised to the people of Barbados in the 1976 election Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. Mr. Speaker, I specifically wish to quote from this document, infamous though it might be, which has been made a document of this House on many occasions. On page 2 of that document it says:

Mr. SPEAKER: State the document to which you are referring.

Dr. HAYNES: The Manifesto, Barbados Labour Party, General Elections 1976, page 2. This is what the people of Barbados were promised:

"It will pass legislation providing for Members of Parliament, Senators, and politically appointed members of Statutory Corporations to disclose their financial assets and liabilities on assuming office, periodically during office, and on termination."

That was the integrity legislation which was promised by the Barbados Labour Party to the people of Barbados should they win the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us examine the background to this situation. A group of people, some with the distinguished status of pimps, some pompisette as experts, some well known inveterate gamblers.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, please we are now debating the adoption of the Report of the Select Committee.

Dr. HAYNES: I am talking about the background that has led.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please. I am just reminding the hon. member what is before this Hon. House at this time. That is my duty.

Dr. HAYNES: Thank you for your reminder, Mr. Speaker, and I am confining myself to this Report. Their activity led to that Manifesto pledge, a Manifesto pledge which this Report before this Hon. House does not in any way reflect. So far the fact that the blind trust to protect the interests of members of the other side, like the hon. member for Christ Church West and people like Mr. David Seale, that has been removed due to public pressure and due to the position taken by this Opposition. Section 45 which instead of placing a penalty.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation, Sir. The hon. member is alleging that the provisions in relation to blind trust were incorporated in the legislation to protect my interest. I can assure the hon. member that I do not need any blind trust, Caymans trust, local trust like the hon. member who has companies in the Cayman Islands, manning his affairs. I do not need any trust, everything I own is in Barbados and there is no necessity for a trust, so if the hon. member will stick to the legislation rather than personal remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, I am inviting hon. members not to take this debate out of bounds, if not I will some day be accused of many more things. All right.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, to continue. First of all, I think I should inform this Hon. House that I have no companies in the Cayman Islands or any companies outside of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, let us get on with the adoption of the Report.

Dr. HAYNES: To continue with the debate on the adoption of the Report, Mr. Speaker, it is as a result of pressure from this side that the whole question of blind trust has been removed, and we were happy, and we are happy that that has been removed, because since none of us on this side has any properties or has anything to protect through a blind trust, we have no interest in seeing it in the legislation.

We are also happy that due to public pressure and pressure from this side of the House the infamous clause 45 has been removed, the one which nobody knew how it had got into the legislation, but certainly was clearly intended to make sure that the public of Barbados could not comment on any acquisitions by persons in public life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to this whole question of integrity legislation, one would have felt that unless some major fraud is contemplated in terms of giving the public of Barbados the impression that they are now protected by legislation from corruption in public life, that every effort would be made to ensure that all those people, particularly those who have the opportunity to be corrupt and to misuse public funds, that they would be the people that would come principally within the orbit of this legislation.

Now when you look at it, Mr. Speaker, members of the Opposition, in what way can we be corrupt in terms of public life? In what way can we be corrupt as members of the Opposition? By maybe participating in a debate on a matter in which we have an interest. There are already rules that make that an offence. By

being bribed to cast our vote, Mr. Speaker? That is already a serious offence and there is already legislation covering the activities of members of the Opposition, so this legislation in no way applies to us. In fact, it in no way applies to the members on the back bench on the other side unless they are at the same time Chairman of Statutory Boards or hold some other similar post. It can only be to the Ministers of Government, and has been pointed out by the previous speaker, in a very limited manner. But the problem is this, that in matters of this nature the Cabinet of Barbados is not independent. People like David Seale can determine.....
1.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, please. The hon. member has been in here long enough now. I have had no notification.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, people like the man popularly known as J.R. from the new television series among the Caucasian sectors in this country. People like J.R. can make sure that legislation of this kind can be so frustrated in a way that whilst the masses of people would like to see all statutory corporations particularly those handling large sums of money brought within the orbit of this legislation, then it becomes a discretionary matter whether or not they are included, and worse than that, Mr. Speaker, when this matter was debated during the second reading, we on this side raised that question again and again and the Hon. Attorney General, the member for Christ Church West gave an assurance that there was some kind of problem which he never spelt out in any detail, but he would hope that in a matter of months they would be brought within the orbit of the legislation. Now this is not a year later and the legislation comes back here with the same exclusions before this Honourable House. Now why is that? I would like him to tell us why he has gone back on his word, a word that he gave to this Honourable House that he would seek to bring these statutory bodies within the orbit of this legislation within a matter of months. That is my recollection of a commitment which he made at that particular time.

I do not think that I need to belabour this point of statutory boards any longer. Today in Barbados there is much said about corruption that has taken place at the Barbados Development Bank, some evidence of corruption at the Barbados National Bank, even resulting in a situation where one of the Chief Executive Officers had to send a circular out.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. Is this really the Barbados Development Bank or the Barbados National Bank, as you have said both?

Dr. HAYNES: I have gone from one to the second. I am going through them one by one. The Barbados Mar-

keting Corporation. There has been much concern about the activities of the Agricultural Credit Bank in the past and also in particular about the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation. There has been concern about the way in which funds have been used for people travelling, people who are either employed by or are on the Board of Tourism. There has been concern about certain aspects of the Industrial Development Corporation. There has certainly been concern about certain aspects of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is certainly considerable public concern about the activities of the Public Utilities Board in this country and the positions they have taken in recent years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we look at all these areas, we are talking about millions and millions of dollars and opportunities for people to steal masses of money, opportunities for people to hand out masses of patronage, and these are all excluded from this legislation that is called integrity legislation. In other words, Mr. Speaker, one would have expected that one of the aspects of the report would be to deal with this particular matter, and this has been completely left out, and therefore as far as I am concerned, I will reiterate once again that we on this side have no objections whatsoever to integrity legislation, but we want to see integrity legislation that is meaningful, integrity legislation that gets to the core of the matter of corruption, and we do not wish to see this kind of politically motivated legislation coming before this Legislature. Thank you very much.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to traverse the territory which has been covered by the two previous speakers. When I first saw the Bill over a year ago and it was directed that the Select Committee should report in three months, my first reaction to this Bill was in the Second Schedule. (*Asides*) If we could have a debate without interruptions. The Second Schedule of the Bill on page 30 contained all of the(interruptions)

Mr. SPEAKER: We must have no cross talking in this Honourable House. This is a warning to both sides of the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Bill contained in the Second Schedule when I first cursorily glanced through the Bill over a year ago, but before I came in here I opened my order papers and prior to my meeting with my colleagues, I glanced through the Bill and I saw on page 30 the Second Schedule and I was rather pleased because the Second Schedule on page 30 appeared to contain all of those Institutions and Statutory Boards which should be particularly under the scrutiny of legislation of this kind: the Agricultural Credit Bank, the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation, the Board of Tourism, the Development Bank, the Industrial Develop-

ment Corporation, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the National Bank, The National Stadium Corporation and so on *ad infinitum*, the Barbados Port Authority, the Caves Authority, the Central Bank. Well we could omit the Child Care Board. We do not have to go through it *ad nauseam*.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What is the problem, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a good question. The question is that the Standing Orders of this Honourable House do not permit one hon. member to recite this and a second hon. member to get up and rehash the same thing, and a third hon. member to get up and rehash that, and a fourth hon. member to get up and go over the same thing. The Standing Orders do not permit this, I am very sorry.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If I can follow you correctly, I do not think anyone referred to page 30 specifically and I think I have made my point and the point has been made. What you are trying to tell me is that my point is well taken. Thank you very much. All I am saying is that when I read the Schedule to the Act I said this is a good thing because here are set out all the institutions that should be under the scrutiny of legislation of this kind, and I was finished with this. That was my reaction, but when I had my meeting with my colleagues some two to three days later prior to the discussion on the second reading of the Bill in this House, they drew it to my attention that these were the institutions which were exempted; so the point that has been made by my colleagues on this side is one that it is a strange piece of legislation in that respect.
1.50 p.m.

I will go further now, Sir, and say this that there are certain private Corporations or Companies, private in the sense that they are public but public in the sense that they are private. They are not Governmental but in which the Government has taken shares and has given guarantees for substantial amounts of money such as the Barbados Light and Power Co. which would come under the scrutiny of this legislation because it is now an established fact which I have in writing admitted by the Manager of the Light and Power Co. that they have got guarantees from the Government which we in this House gave and which I am not questioning now, but they have purchased machinery from Swedish Companies which is more than twice the price than they could have got machinery to the extent of some \$20 million from Germany.

I have documentary evidence of this and I do not want to go into the technical details. I do not want to go into the technical details but the machinery which they are purchasing to enhance the viability, so-called, of the

Light and Power Co. is machinery of two-stroke diesel engines which will cost twice what four-stroke engines from Krupp in Germany will cost.

Now, we are trading with West Germany. I know the history of Krupp. They are not objecting to Krupp on the basis that they mobilised the German industry for the Nazi regime. They are trying to tell people who are in the know, qualified engineers in the Caribbean and outside of it that two-stroke diesel engines are more efficient than four-stroke engines, but.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am glad for the information that is being offered by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition but I believe that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has enough to initiate a debate in his own right on a matter of this sort in this Honourable House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thank you. I am just serving notice, Sir. Thank you for the invitation, Sir. I will follow Your Honour's advice in this respect.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not really the time for going into four-strokes and two-strokes because somebody might get a stroke before we are finished.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It will not be me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am standing by for a stroke but for a stroke of luck.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The 500,000 stroke, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us adopt the Select Committee's Report.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: When I am finished, not in the middle of my speech. What I am really saying is this, Mr. Speaker that I am only giving an illustration on how a Corporation which is not governmentally owned but which has Governmental backing can abuse a guarantee and the trust which the Government has placed in it.

I am surprised that the Hon. Minister of Trade with the information does not know about it already because it is nothing short of a scandal. I do not wish to go into other examples, Sir, because a debate can be initiated so what I am merely saying is that far from omitting our several Statutory Corporations which should have been included what we should have investigated was the feasibility and the necessity, I should say, of including any institution which comes to the Government or has come to the Government and asked of the Government for guarantees to purchase equipment, particularly where the Public Utilities Board, to give an example, Sir, is going to base the rate which the consumers of electricity have to pay in this country, on the capital formation of

the Company itself and the interest payments and the amortisation charges and so on.

It has been calculated that the decision taken by the Barbados Light and Power Co. will cost the ratepayers collectively some \$5 million a year more.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. I cannot permit that kind of contribution in this debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will change now, Sir, to other aspects of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must have no cross-talking. The guarantee came before this House and that was the occasion.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We did not know it was going to be abused in that way, Sir. That was the problem.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now you have your information you can initiate a substantive motion and debate the motion.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Your point is well taken. Mr. Speaker, the problem is that in a democratic society as the people in the United Kingdom have learned, you can abuse Laws. It is claimed that the Constitution of Great Britain is an unwritten Constitution.

We have a situation here in Barbados where the Chairman of a Statutory Board in Barbados is associated with two Companies which collectively have borrowed within the past six months some \$4.8 million from that Institution. Now, when this was mentioned on the floor of this House the reaction of the Government to that disclosure which was admitted by no less a personage that the Minister of Finance, himself, *imperator ipse* to introduce within three or four weeks legislation making it an offence for any member of that, not of any Statutory Board, of that particular Statutory Board to discuss anything about loans made by that institution.

Now, this is the same institution which I accused of the height of vulgarity every time they made a \$500 or \$1,000 loan to a small businessman, flashing the businessman's or the small person's picture all over the Newspaper saying that this wonderful Bank of ours has lent money to Mr. So and So.

Now, my objection to that was this that if any private Bank Manager did that to me when I went for a loan to the Bank as I have had to do from time to time for various reasons — some of us buy motorcars and some of us have to get mortgages and so on.....(ASIDES) and planes as well. Yes, \$38,000 fully repaid with interest too, U.S. \$19,000. Some of us have to go to

Banks for that kind of thing. If any Bank Manager flashed my picture over the *Sunday Advocate News*, I would report it to Head Office.

Let us take the small shopkeeper now. He might owe other people money. He might have to borrow money to put in a deep freeze or something like that in a shop because he wants to accommodate the hon. member for, I think it is, St. Michael West, to sell chicken backs but he owed somebody else \$300 that he had borrowed some two or three years before but he wants now to expand his business so that he would be able to repay his previous creditor \$200 or \$300 that he may have borrowed to help pay his son's school fees at Toronto University or matters of that kind. Immediately you, see Mr. X of Wellhouse has borrowed \$2,000 from the Bank.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member likely to conclude in ten minutes?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think so, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: We will break now then.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thank you, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On Resumption:

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, before we go on to Question Time. I wonder if, with your Honour's permission, and the Honourable House's indulgence, we could have the question of Notices re-opened. There are two notices which should have been given in not for today's Sitting, but for next week, which unfortunately, and regrettably, did not reach here at the appropriate time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Immediately after Question Time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Thank you, Your Honour.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Question No. 56, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 56.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 56 is as follows:

It is considered that the Polyclinic being constructed at Wildey and the one to be constructed at Ladymeade, will provide services for the catchment areas currently served by Bayville Health Clinic. The Clinic will however remain open until both the Wildey and Ladymeade Polyclinics are operational. I am not therefore considering any expansion in the services offered by Bayville.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 59. I am so sorry.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Is the Honourable Minister proposing, that the residents, or persons now served by the Health Clinic at Bayville, that they will in future be served by the Polyclinics at Ladymeade and Wildey? In other words, is she saying that the Bayville Health Clinic will be closed?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is proposed, that the people who are now serviced by the Bayville Health Clinic will fall into the catchment areas of Wildey and Ladymeade and other plans are being made for what is now the Bayville Health Clinic, which is in fact, within the premises of the Geriatric Hospital and it is proposed, that when Bayville ceases to be operational, as a Health Clinic, that it will become a Day Care Centre for senior citizens who share certain of the support facilities, within the Geriatric Hospital, such as Occupational Therapy and the like.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 59, asked by the same Honourable Member.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Question No. 59, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 59 is as follows:

Of a total of 106 Corporals on the strength of the Royal Barbados Police Force, all but 13 were promoted to the rank of Sergeant with effect from 1980-10-10. Of those not promoted, 12 did not satisfy the requirements of promotion in accordance with the police procedures and the Police (Promotion) Rules, 1954, as amended. The remaining Corporal has been with effect from 1980-04-01 on secondment to the Ministry of Communications and Works.

The Corporals concerned have been advised that on satisfying the basic requirements for promotion they will be immediately recommended for promotion to the rank of Sergeant. Vacancies in the rank of Sergeant have been retained for the expressed purpose of accommodating these Corporals.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister indicate whether any arrangements have been made to enable those Corporals who have not obtained promotion to fit them for promotion into those vacancies which he has said have been specifically left open for them?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have asked the Commissioner of Police, as Director of Training to arrange with the Commandant of the Regional Centre to arrange a special course for these 12 remaining Corporals and the thirteenth, if he returns from secondment to enable them to satisfy the requirements for the promotion, in accordance with the Police (Promotion) Rules and I am assured, by the Commissioner, that these arrangements are being made and special steps will be taken, as the Honourable Member has implied in his question, special steps will be taken to facilitate them passing these exams.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, Sir, to ask a second supplementary question. Assuming that the Honourable Minister is aware that there is grave dissatisfaction among those 13 Corporals, or 12 plus one, as evidenced in publications such as the Bajan Copper and other official publications of the Royal Barbados Police Association, would the Honourable Minister indicate whether these special promotional requirements and the necessary steps, in terms of police procedures, whether these had been indicated as requirements for promotion, from the post of Corporal to that of Sergeant?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Police (Promotion) Rules to which I refer have been in existence since 1954 and they apply now to all promotions in the Force and before an officer can be promoted in the Force, he must have satisfied certain examination requirements and be, as well, within the current zone of promotion.

In the case of the Corporals concerned, for one reason or another, they have either not satisfied the Rules, or if they had in the past, they have gone out of the zone of promotion. At the time of the decision of the Government to increase the number of places available for Sergeants in the Force, it was communicated to the Police Association, that the rank of Corporal will be phased out and that all Corporals who were suitable for promotion would be promoted to the rank of Sergeant. That indication is still being carried out.

I know, that the Commissioner of Police feels very strongly, that people should be promoted on merit and I am sure, that he is equally conscious of the need to improve training opportunities, so that people who merit promotion would have the opportunity to qualify and it is for this reason, that I have requested him, after listening to the representations of the Association on the matter to make special arrangements, outside of the

normal arrangements, that are being made for promotional training, to make special arrangements in this case to assist these 12 plus one, possibly one other Corporal.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Bearing in mind, that apparently, some of the letters of promotion of these officers from Corporal to Sergeant had gone astray, would the Honourable Minister give some details about the proposed special training courses that he has asked the Commissioner of Police to put on for these Corporals?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not aware, that any letters have gone astray, but I can assure the Honourable Member, that my request was communicated to the Commissioner of Police, I believe that it was on 19th December, 1980, immediately after I had addressed the Annual General Meeting of the Police Association and that request was repeated to him at the first meeting, which he had with me this year and I have usually a monthly meeting with the Commissioner, as I do, with all Heads of Department under me and he has assured me, that he is in communication with the Commandant to arrange a special training course for the men. I am hopeful, that this could be fitted in before April, when we begin the second set of training at the School. People are coming out of the School in February, we have Graduation in early February and there is a time between February and April, that we can arrange these courses, so we are trying to fit it into that period, Sir.
3.00 p.m.

QUESTION RE OUTBREAK OF BUBONIC PLAGUE IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 57 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 57 reads as follows:

To ask the Minister of Health and National Insurance:

(1) Is the Minister aware that an outbreak of Bubonic Plague has occurred in the state of New Mexico, USA; and that up to October 4th 1980, some thirteen persons had been reported as having contracted the disease this year? (2) Will the Minister state what steps, if any, have been or are being taken to preclude the spread of the disease to Barbados by visitors from that state?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 57 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West is as follows:

Bubonic plague is essentially a disease of rodents, particularly rats. It is transmitted from rodent to rodent, from rodent to man, from man to man by fleas. The disease is endemic in some States of the U.S.A., in the western third of the country and in large areas of South America, e.g. Brazil, Bolivia. In all these countries it is found in wild rodents and the persons affected are persons coming in contact with these animals. Because of the parts of the U.S. affected and the mode of transmission, the occurrence of bubonic plague in New Mexico poses no threat to Barbados at this time and no special precautions are necessary. The matter, however, is being kept under observation by the Ministry.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Private Members' Business. I am advised there is no Private Members' Business. The Hon. Leader of the House gave an intimation that he wanted to introduce some measures and he may proceed at this stage.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$2,063,067 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1980-81, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1980-81, No. 31, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$181,893 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. 30, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Government Business. When the suspension was taken the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was addressing the Chair. He may continue to do so if he so desires.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Report of the Committee on this Bill covers certain amendments to the Bill and to the Schedules to the Bill. I should like an explanation from the introducer of the Resolution, the hon. member for Christ Church West, if he would refer to the Third Schedule on page 37 and to the Report itself.

I see under the heading of Expenditure in Item 12 the particulars have been deleted. This will be found on page 6, the sixth line of the Report, "In the Third Schedule delete the words 'current' and 'household' appearing under Item 12 - Expenditure." What we therefore have in this Item 12 - Expenditure in the Third Schedule - I am dealing with the actual mechanics now rather than the principle - and also in 13 - Liabilities, you will see on the same page, Mr. Speaker, there you have blank particulars. Now, there was some explanation before the Bill went to the Select Committee, particularly with respect to Item 12 - Expenditure. This has now been removed and I do not know how any one could intelligently fill in a declaration in which the particulars are completely missing.

I just want to make that point, because it seems to me rather strange that the Committee went out of its way to remove any assistance that the Clerk may have had in filling out the forms in the Schedule.

Apart from that, Sir, and the observations which I have made already, I have only one other point which I should like to make now. Under the legislation in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, at the end of every calendar year the Commission publishes not a report but the declarations which have been made by the Ministers of Government in particular, and when I say publishes, not only publishes in the Official Gazette of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, but in the newspapers of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas. I have a copy of last year's declarations. They publish in the newspapers a complete copy of the declarations that they have made.

Now, if the purpose of integrity legislation is to make people who are in public life act openly, if you are going to have integrity legislation at all, Sir, my submission is that you should go the whole way. You either have no integrity legislation or have integrity legislation whereby you do not depend on a report based on information which has been confidentially submitted to three persons who have been selected in the manner prescribed by the legislation itself, but you report to the general public who would know whether the Clerk is speaking the truth or not.

The Commissioners are in no position, unless they have people coming forward saying 'I do not know what the particular person has omitted in his declaration, but I want you to watch out for so-and-so,' and even then they would have been imperilled for giving or causing undue alarm or despondency or whatever the description is, according to the Bill itself. But when somebody has to make a declaration knowing that that declaration will be seen by his constituents and the members of the general public and people with whom he has had dealings I think he will be a little more cir-

cumspect as to the accuracy of the statements which he makes in such a declaration.

It is a comment which I wish to make, because I say that if you are going to have this kind of legislation, do not let us have a hypocritical kind of legislation, let us go the whole way. I personally believe, as I started off by saying, that no matter what you do in these days by way of prescribing rules of conduct for persons in public life, if people wish to circumvent them they are going to find ways and means of circumvention and therefore the public purpose is best served by the careful selection by the populace of people in which they can have confidence and integrity.

3.10 p.m.

When they found that the confidence has been betrayed, well by the ordinary machinery of the ballot box those persons should be removed. If they have committed criminal offences, I have submitted before and I maintain that the Statute Law of Barbados is sufficiently all-embracing to cover all the sins of corruption that anyone whether in public or private life may be foolish enough to commit, but passing this legislation, I respectfully submit, is not going to be a guarantee of anything, particularly in the way the legislation has been drafted and in which the report has been drafted and in which the report has been submitted to this House, that if the members of the Government feel that having put it in their manifesto they want to get back before the election and say that we have done it, I am only saying they are not fooling anyone, because right in the report itself they have contracted out of doing anything before the next election by the nine months clause and the two month extension if you fail to submit a report even if it was proclaimed tomorrow. So as far as I am concerned they dragged their feet for four years and therefore the sincerity of this introduction has been one which the general public will probably wish to question. Having said that, I would expect the hon. member for Christ Church West to try to explain to the House what was the purpose of deleting the particulars from the Third Schedule of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wants to make a contribution? The Hon. Attorney General may reply.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the contributions made by the three hon. members who have spoken in this debate and if I may say so, the positions of the hon. members have not altered much from what they said when this Bill originally came before the House, except that I am much indebted to the hon. member for St. Michael South West for conceding that this legislation in this House is very similar to legislation in other parts of the Commonwealth. Indeed if that point had been recognised from the time when this Bill was introduced into the House, perhaps there would have been less

acrimony in the debate here within the Chamber and certainly less acrimony in the debate on the public platform, and I would have expected the hon. member at that time when he was speaking on several occasions from the public platform to have explained to the people that the Integrity in Public Life Bill which was introduced by the Government is in keeping with similar legislation in other parts of the Commonwealth. We have taken about a year for him to concede that point.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation if the hon. member would give way. Sir, in the reference which the hon. member makes, he seems to have missed the gravamen of the point I was making at the time when I referred to such legislation. I was referring to such legislation and juxtaposing such legislation as there is next to the facts as they occur in the United Kingdom, and I then used the example of Mrs. Thatcher's reply to a Parliamentary Question to show that the feeling of inferiority which may be abroad in certain Commonwealth countries is endemic to small countries and developing countries as compared with the United Kingdom, so that the hon. member need not dwell on the technical fact which was overture to the point which I was making.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have listened to the hon. member's explanation and I still, Mr. Speaker, insist on my contention that the hon. member is even now by way of that explanation conceding that there are other Commonwealth countries which have passed similar legislation. The hon. member however seeks to qualify his contention by suggesting that such legislation is limited to developing countries of the Commonwealth. This cannot be so. In Canada which is one of the developed countries of the Commonwealth and one of the oldest democracies, legislation almost identical in wording with the legislation before this House has been passed, and the Canadian Provinces as well as the Federal Government itself of Canada has seen it fit to bring by way of legislation such as this further provisions to strengthen existing conventional rules dealing with integrity in public life.

Indeed in the United Kingdom itself, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the convention of which the hon. member spoke, the United Kingdom Parliament has passed by way of Resolution and Rules legislation making it obligatory for members to declare and register their assets with the House of Parliament. The hon. member must know that the register of members' assets is additional to the practice by which Ministers of Government are warned of the situations which arise and which amount to conflict of interest and any declaration which they may file with the Cabinet Secretary. Now here in Barbados the Government of Barbados, the Cabinet of Barbados have issued a similar letter as the one of which the hon. member spoke which was issued by Mrs. Thatcher's Government and indeed by other Governments preceding her in the United

Kingdom, and every member of the Cabinet knows and has been warned of the situations which can amount to a conflict of interest in his dealings with members of the public; so that the Bill which is now before Parliament does not stand alone.

It is in addition to the current practice in Barbados whereby Cabinet members make disclosures in Cabinet and to the Cabinet Secretary of any interest or situations in which they enter which might be liable to amount to conflict of interest, and that is why I have seriously contended that this Resolution goes further than any existing practice and strengthens rather than undermines the existing practice.

The hon. member must concede that there are provisions in this legislation which ought to have been in place during the tenure of office of fifteen years of the Democratic Labour Party rule, and I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. It is a fact that some of the most stringent criticisms made in the Commission on National Housing related to the Minister and or Ministers at the time. It was not the members of the Statutory Corporation who were being criticised, it was a former Minister of Housing in particular, the then Hon. member for St. Andrew, about whom the Commission found irregularities amounting to breaches almost of the criminal law of this country, and had he been confronted at that time by legislation such as this, the conflict of interest which he found himself in would never have occurred. I do not expect the Democratic Labour Party either in public or in here to concede that situations existed during their tenure of office in which there were blatant and flagrant violations of conflict of interest situations, some of the worst standards of public conduct that could have occurred in public life, and that they should have been the first to hang their heads in shame that fifteen years passed and they never had a minimum of criteria laid down by which their Ministers could conduct themselves.

3.20 p.m.

The Rt. Hon. member is in his place. Had he had legislation similar to this that is contained in Part II of this legislation, Mr. Edwards, as he then was, would not only have been sacked but all of those contracts would have been void and illegal. The hon. member must concede that. This legislation is justified by the scandalous conduct which occurred by a Minister of Government during the last Democratic Labour Party Government.

What are they going to say to this? What is their pious answer to this, Sir? The pious answer to this is to get up and say that there is nothing in the legislation which distinguishes it from other legislation in other parts of the Commonwealth. Let us go on, Sir. They may disown him now. They can disown him as much as they

like now because we know the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. Blessed be the name of the Lord.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us wind up the amendment.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am trying to wind up the debate, Sir. I am trying to wind up by examining the reasons which they have advanced and to show how contentious those reasons are, how unfounded there are, how much they shirk the issue, how lacking in security they are and how lacking in strength and argument they are or in any conviction there may be.

If we had a conflict of interest situation we might have been able to examine the granting of licences to people like Sydney Alleyne to carry on a Bank here. That is another example.

I want to deal with the Statutory Boards situation so that the public must not be misled. The hon. member for St. Michael South in his opening said that he listened to a lecture and I was in my usual didactic mood, Sir. I regret very much if the hon. member fails to follow the very simple submissions which I make from time to time on the Floor of this House and if his way of trying to put me off from an argument is to cite me as the epitome of the didactic teacher but when you are dealing with a certain level of approach in politics, Sir, you have to be didactic, particularly if the heads of the pupils are not very bright.

The hon. member, I have to rewrite the ABC to tell him that Lee Keum Yew is not Prime Minister of Sri Lanka. (*Asides*). The Minister of Education was not in his place but I am going to ask the Minister of Education to open a special class for the hon. member on these issues and I will stop lecturing him any more after that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Which Schedule is that?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In the Taitt Schedule, Sir, but seriously, the hon. member made a few points of substance which I would like to add to Sir.

It is not a fact to state broadly that this legislation does not apply to Statutory Corporations or to officers of such Corporations. In the first place it is provided that the Conflicts of Interest Provisions of the Bill should be extended and can be extended to Statutory Corporations and indeed the sort of situations in which members who serve on Statutory Boards are liable to find themselves under our usual conflicts of interest situations and any study of the legislation in the Commonwealth countries will show you that that legislation applies to Statutory Boards where there are conflicts of interest in relation to contracts which they may enter into in Government and that is one of the reasons why we have provided that

Part II of the Bill dealing with conflicts of interest may be extended by affirmative Order, by an Order subject to affirmative Resolution to the Chairman and members of Statutory Corporations as well as civil servants.

When the Bill was being formulated there were various representations made concerning the need to provide in this Bill for the position of civil servants since there were other codes dealing with civil servants and the necessity for them to disclose assets and the public must understand that the Bill deals with two sets of situations. One is disclosing your assets and the other more fundamental one is being in a position where you must use your public office for your own private gain and therefore a conflict of interest will occur.

It is in that more serious position that the Bill has provided that both Chairmen of Statutory Corporations, members of those Corporations as well as public employees of Corporations and of the Government can find themselves in breach of this Act, so it is misleading to merely get up and say that they are excluded from the provisions of the Bill.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I cited to hon. members the fact that the Corruption Bill dealing with the Criminal Section for corruption applies to every citizen of Barbados, be he a member of this House, a member of a Statutory Corporation, a Government servant or in the private sector and those provisions have been considerably strengthened and improved to the extent where there are very vigorous provisions of the law now dealing with corruption in public or private life in this country.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government intends to strengthen both the Financial and Audit Act and the Financial Rules to bring under greater control and scrutiny the manner in which public servants and quasi public servants deal with financial matters affecting the public interest in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the contentions by hon. members, not by the hon. member for St. Michael South West, because I do not expect him to make this sort of non-point but by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, who is not now in his place, was that legislation of this sort does not apply to members of the Opposition or to members of the backbench because such members could never be accused of corruption. It can only be legislation being applied to Ministers.

Now the hon. member for St. Michael South West is too shrewd a politician and more learned than the hon. member for St. Michael South Central in these matters to make that broad statement which has no basis whatsoever. It portrays a lack of analysis. It portrays an immaturity in appreciating political life and it portrays an absence of knowledge.

If the hon. member had been weekly reading the *Times Magazine*, he would have found out that as recently as last year in the United States members of Government and the Opposition, if you will, in Congress were being brought before the Courts and not merely before Congress for situations which would amount to corruption in public life although they were not members of the Cabinet and what was the corruption, Sir? Peddling their influences as members of Congress, peddling their influences to take bribes from alleged businessmen in the Middle East in order to get Government Contracts and in order also to improve the chances of particular legislation going through Congress.

3.30 p.m.

Now, it is a fact, that an Honourable Member of Parliament, be he on the Government, or on the Opposition Bench could come in here and put forward a particular point of view and indeed create public confusion because he may be backed by Financiers outside, who want a particular answer to a particular public situation and the circumstances must also be legislated against and it is this that is done by Part II of this Bill and had the Honourable Member read the legislation correctly, rather than the emotional way in which he approaches these issues and had he brought the type of understanding, that I would have expected of an Honourable Member of Parliament, who is qualified to come into this Honourable House, to bear on his approach to the discussion on this debate in this issue, then, he would not have got into such confusion and he would at least have made a valuable contribution, on a simple point as this.

He is not now in his place, Sir. As usual, he never remains to hear the reply to himself, on any issues, that he considers fundamental. That is the only point that he made in the debate, other than side swipes about why the Provisions about Blind Trusts are not in the legislation any more. He made no other point of substance, that I could really reply to, Sir.

Now, the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John, who obviously used the tactics, which his several years in this Honourable House have taught him, so well, that is, he debated for 15 minutes, Sir, successfully from the point of view of time, although not from the point of view of the substance of his contribution, in order to ensure, that I did not reply immediately after the Opposition had anything at all to say in the pre-lunch period. I characterise his intervention in the debate, as due to that because by then, he had not even looked at the new Bill, Sir, he was reading it, as he was going along, so he made no points, prior to lunch at all.

After lunch, what has he said? He said, that we have removed the particulars from the Third Schedule, under the heading Expenditure and Liabilities. That

is a fact, but the Committee took into account representations. He came into the Honourable House on the Second Reading in 1980 complaining that he had to write out his grocery bill, how much he spends on bread and how much he spends on flour and how much he spends on butter.

Now, I put forward, Sir, the point of view, in the Select Committee, Sir and on the basis of the Accountant General's advice, we found that his contentions were unfounded, but the Accountant General advised, that so that it will be no doubt, to leave it general, so that there will be general statements of expenditure and of revenue as well. That is the reason for it.

Sir, out of the representations, he cannot complain, that we want to know how much he spends at Goddard's Supermarket weekly on his grocery bill any longer, Sir. That is the reason the Committee was not blind in the way it sought the advice, from the Accountant General, on the matter.

Now, Sir, he said, that the Bill had affected Members of Parliament because it has a nine months' exclusion Clause and a two months' expansion, *et cetera, et cetera*. Now, let us be serious, Sir, when the Government first brought this Bill, we were told, that we were being vindictive to bring the Bill because we only wanted to catch "Sleepy" Smith and we have back-dated the Bill, prior to our coming into Parliament, in order to catch "Sleepy" Smith and Philip Greaves. That is what the Opposition was saying from public platforms. Now, despite my legal view, that nothing in the first draft would have affected the position of either Mr. Smith, or Mr. Greaves, or anyone else, who was in there prior to the 2nd December, 1976, we went out of our way to provide that it should only apply to the date on which this Government assumed responsibility for governing this country, so that, it cannot be said, that we are victimizing any political opponent and at the same time, the Government was not scared, no hon. member of the Government, either of the Cabinet, or of the governing Party is afraid of declaring their assets for the public of Barbados, so what is it that the Opposition wants? They are blowing hot and cold.

They say, that this legislation is not necessary. That is the first contention. If it is not necessary, what are they complaining about, if we put it from 2nd September, 1976? They said, that we were putting it prior to 2nd December, 1976 because we wanted to catch members of their Party. We have removed it to the 2nd September, 1976 and the Opposition now says, well, you will have to declare in a maximum of nine months from the coming into being of the Act, so your legislation has no sincerity. This is an Opposition that, as I have said about the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, not even God could please when he is

on his power trail. No matter what you do, no matter how much you try to answer their criticisms both founded and unfounded, by concession, the Opposition is still fractious, they are still finding an excuse without admitting that this legislation should have been brought by them 15 years ago, not today. They should have brought legislation 15 years ago.

The sincerity of the opposition is tested, not by all the impressions, rather than the truth, that they would preach to the public. It is tested by the fact, that 15 years they sat down and could not possibly pass legislation of this nature, either to conceive, or to execute it, far less to impose it and had they done so, the scandal which occurred with an Honourable Minister of Government in the National Housing Corporation would not have occurred. (ASIDE: What scandal?) What scandal? Even now, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central does not know what were the irregularities that an hon. member of the Cabinet of the Democratic Labour Party indulged in when he was an Honourable Minister of the Government. Even now, he is not even repentant, he is not repentant, I do not expect that he would ever be repentant, Sir, he is not repentant, he is not repentant. Why can't he not be repentant and say to the people, that that is a black sheet, a black mark against the Democratic Labour Party legislation and the public of Barbados wants this legislation.

I want to campaign on it against you. I want, in your constituency, where I live, in that area, to tell people, that you do not know what scandal occurred in the Ministry of Housing when your Party was in power. That is what I want to do, Sir. The vote in this country is secret, Sir, but the hon. member could rest assured, that it would not happen. My vote would not help him at all. I will vote in my constituency, exactly in the manner in which he will vote in his constituency, in the constituency in which he lives.

Sir, I could tell you, I do not rely on his vote. Eighty-five percent excludes him, Sir. Last time I got 77.9%. I have never seen the ballots, but one thing I am assured, as to the hon. member and Mr. Bernstein never voted for me. That is one thing that I am assured, Sir.

The point is I can find no other point, that is worthy of reply, in the debate. I want to restate again, three things, Sir. The Government has improved the criminal law which deals with Corporations and therefore, the Corporation Bill has already cleared this Committee and this Honourable House and gone to the Honourable Senate. That is a tremendous improvement in strengthening the penal provisions to deal with corruption, regardless of whether it is by hon. members of Parliament, people on Statutory Boards, private citizens, the private, or the public sector. That is one. 3.40 p.m.

Two, the Government has introduced for the first time conflicts of interest legislation to prevent people in public life, and particularly members of Parliament, from using their positions or inside information to enter into contracts with the Government to enrich themselves, their friends or families at the expense of the public.

Thirdly, the Government has now produced legislation to make it obligatory for members of Parliament to disclose from time to time to the Integrity Commission and through the Commission to the public what is their financial standing.

Fourthly, the Government is improving the Financial Rules in order to ensure that civil servants and persons who work with Statutory Corporations are subject to more rigorous provisions in relation to dealing with public funds and assets, and also in their own private capacity.

Fifthly, the Government has enforced the Convention by which members of the Cabinet are not only warned of what is their duty as Ministers, resigning from Boards, etc. and being straight in not having conflicts of interest situations, but the Cabinet is insisting through the Prime Minister that this letter be not merely a letter sent and no more than that, and I submit that in those circumstances that the Committee's Report is a valuable contribution to the improvement of public life in this country, and I am happy to hear that the Opposition, even the Opposition, is convinced that they dare not vote against this legislation and must support it, and I expect their total support, not even a division of this House on this measure at all.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: We cannot have a point of order at this stage.

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, the Bill was passed and cited as the Integrity in Public Life Act, 1981.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was seeking Your Honour's attention not on the substance of the motion that was put, I was drawing to Your Honour's attention that the Attorney General had moved when he got up to speak the adoption of the Report. Your Honour when you put the question, Sir, moved that the Bill be read a third time. That is all I am drawing to Your Honour's attention. He had moved that the Report be adopted, I was merely drawing it to Your Honour's attention.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I studied this last night on this submission of the Report, and I should point out to Your Honour for future reference that there is a mistake in the Standing Orders, because there is no Order 61(5) on page 79. I do not think it is a great irregularity, but on page 79, "A Bill reported from a Select Committee, together with a report on the bill, shall be ordered to lie upon the Table without question put." That was done last week. "The report shall be ordered to be taken into consideration upon such day as the House may determine." That is today, Sir. "On the order for consideration of the report being read, any Member may move that the report be adopted and, if that motion is agreed to....." This is the point I think the hon. member wanted to make, that I stopped him from making, inadvertently, if that motion is agreed to, then the third reading is put. That is what the Order says.

But may I respectfully draw to Your Honour's attention and ask the printers to correct, the last paragraph, paragraph 6: "Where a Select Committee does not report to the House in the period set out in Standing Order No. 61(5) the House may commit the bill to a Committee of the whole House....." There is no Standing Order 61(5), so I think that correction will have to be made at some time. I am not here challenging the procedure, two motions were necessary.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Procedurally, Sir, may I ask that we recommit the Question and that the motion we put be that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted?

The question that the Report be adopted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the Bill as amended was read a third time and passed.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Item No. 3, Sir. Notice was given of this matter on the 16th December and it has been circulated, I understand.
3.50 p.m.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FITTS VILLAGE,
ST. JAMES FOR THE PROVISION OF
OPEN WINDOWS TO THE SEA**

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I think it was some time in.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this Resolution, if it is the same one about Fitts Village, was only circulated today. I do not challenge it was given notice of, but it was only circulated today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members received this Resolution just before lunch.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I can appreciate members on the other side receiving it before lunch. I got mine too just before lunch, but notice was given of it since 16th December, and it is only a small acquisition. The plans are already drawn for the business, and the contracts are to be given out. From 1967 I asked you for it; so I mean this is only a little acquisition.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should just like to explain that I think all hon. members agree that the hon. member for the past ten years has been speaking about an esplanade in St. James. At one time I thought your house was in jeopardy, he was so vociferous about it, but that is not the point. We were not aware of the area of land sought to be acquired and there is a little controversy about other windows to the sea in St. James, so we have to examine it in that light. I do not think that a week's postponement would do violence to the desires of the hon. member to have his esplanade in his constituency whichever that is. I have now got confirmation that the hon. member is for the north, taking off part of St. Peter. Anyhow, Sir, I respectfully suggest that we would like to have time to look at that whole question of windows by the sea so that we can make a useful contribution to the debate, not to frustrate the wishes of the hon. member, because we agree with him that we should have some esplanades, but we do not agree on some of the other things that are going on down there.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I believe Your Honour and I were in that position on several occasions and when we had nothing to offer we would ask for a postponement knowing that the Government would still come through. I do not know of any controversy in St. James and windows to the sea and the north and the south. I represented St. James for fifteen years against all the money you gave George Moe, beat you, beat George Moe and will do it again. I agree with the postponement; so don't talk about north or south or St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please be quiet.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am quiet, but it is my style and nobody can change it overnight. I agree with the

postponement for a week. It is unfortunate if it has not been circulated but the contract is to be given out and we will get all the windows we want.

I do not know what controversy there is and north and South and St. Peter. I know that in respect of Mrs. Leacock we will work that out. Sir, we have fought side by side for fifteen years and we are going down together, Sir. Let them not be worried. *(Laughter)*

Mr. SPEAKER: We must have order please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Let them take it in the manner they feel. We are going down together and fighting side by side.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are up north.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: North to Alaska, that is how we will be going; so the week's postponement I can appreciate. It is true I am sorry I did not get it through today because I know members on the other side are anxious to talk about Reverend Hatch and the windows to the sea. I too. We all will talk about it.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir, regrettably this Resolution obviously was not circulated. We looked for it in our Order Papers but it was not there. In the circumstances I would like to ask to second the postponement.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th January, 1981 at 12 o'clock noon, and I hope all of the stuff we gave notice of today is circulated in good time.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th January, 1981, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 4.00 p.m.